Economic Relations in the Terminological System

Irmatov Ikhtiyor Rizakulovich
Gulistan State University, Guliston, Uzbekistan

***Abstract*---**The purpose of the study is to study the peculiarities of terminology based on the analysis of economic relations in the dictionaries of Uzbek linguistics. In order to achieve the purpose of the research, the following tasks are identified: analysis of the literature on the relationship between terms and equonyms, a critical approach to existing theories; highlighting the relationship between terms and equonyms; coverage of equonyms and equonymic relations in Uzbek linguistic terminology. The following methods of scientific analysis were used in the research: linguistic description, system, statistical, contextual analysis methods. The method of linguistic analysis was used in the analysis of the scientific literature on the research topic. The system analysis method was used to illuminate the relationship. Statistical analysis has been widely used in the study of the place of linguistic terms in the Uzbek dictionaries. The results of the research allowed to develop the following scientific and practical conclusions and recommendations: analysis of terms and equonymic relations, helps to organize the terms and interpret the meanings and include them in the general dictionary. In particular, in Uzbek linguistics, issues such as the relationship between equonyms and terms, the peculiarities of linguistic terms are relevant.

***Keywords*---**equonym, equonymous relationship, hypero-hyponymic relationship, hyperonym, hyponym, term.

Introduction

In world linguistics, the emergence, formation, stages of development of national languages are studied in different aspects. Terms, which are the main tool of any scientific research, their linguistic nature, sources of origin, methods of construction, types according to the structure of terms, ways to eliminate synonyms and doublets in them, the relationship of terms and concepts have also become one of the main issues in linguistics (Morris et al., 1987; Zahra & Covin, 1995). Anthropocentric study of the emergence of linguistic terminology in world linguistics and its formation as a separate terminological layer, the regulation of terms based on the degree to which they express the linguistic concept. In this sense, one of the urgent tasks of linguistics is the emergence of new terms with

the development of linguistics, identifying the causes of economic relations, synonymy, polysemy and variability in terms, revealing the impact of assimilation terms on the national terminology system.

Achieving independent national development of Uzbekistan has had a positive impact on all spheres of society, in particular, on the restoration of national and cultural values. The enrichment and development of the lexicon of the Uzbek language was also associated with the opportunities created by independence. At the same time, a number of studies have been conducted in Uzbek linguistics aimed at determining the Turkic nature of our language. Uzbek linguists have done a lot of work on the regulation of terminology, the interpretation of various terms in the Uzbek language, the development of methods for creating Uzbek terms. At the same time, with the development of linguistics, problems arise in its terminology that also need to be studied. One of such issues is the definition of hypero-hyponymic and equonymic relations in terminology on the example of Uzbek linguistic terms (Issakova et al., 2015). Although the relationship between lexical-semantic groups in Uzbek linguistics has been studied as an object of study, the equonomic relations in the system of terminology have not been sufficiently studied. In particular, R. Safarova's dissertation "Hyponymy in the Uzbek language" defended in 1990 (Safarova, 1990) and the pamphlet "Types of lexical semantic relations" published in 1996 (Safarova, 1996) were the first monographs in this field in the Uzbek language is calculated. In addition, "Lexical microsystem and its research methods" co-authored by H. Nematov, E. Begmatov, R. Rasulov (Theses of systemic lexicology) (Nematov et al., 1989); A.Nurmanov's "On the features of linguistic signs" published in 1992 (Nurmonov & Mahmudov, 1992); "Fundamentals of systemic lexicology of the Uzbek language", co-authored by H. Nematov, R. Rasulov (Nematov & Rasulov, 1995); The works "Modern Uzbek literary language" (Nurmonov & Mahmudov, 1992), co-authored by A. Berdialiev and I. Ermatov, are devoted to this issue of language. As an object of research work A.Khojiev's "Explanatory Dictionary of Linguistic Terms" consisting of more than 1,700 words and phrases (Hojiev, 2002), and "Explanatory Dictionary of Linguistic Terms" consisting of about 1,500 words and phrases co-authored by N.Makhkamov and I.Ermatov (Mahkamov & Irmatov, 2013) are analyzed.

Research Methodology

The object of research is the explanatory dictionaries of the Uzbek language and the Uzbek linguistic terms in the explanatory dictionaries of linguistic terms. The following methods of scientific analysis were used in the research: linguistic description, system, statistical, contextual analysis methods. The method of linguistic analysis was used in the analysis of the scientific literature on the research topic. In the terminological system, the method of system analysis was used to illuminate the equonomic relations. Statistical analysis has been widely used in the study of the place of linguistic terms in the Uzbek dictionaries.

Research Results and Discussion

It is well known that vocabulary forms the core of language. However, this core is so complex that in addition to the lexical units actively used in public communicative activity, there are lexical units that are not important for public

communication and therefore "falsify" public communication in the same linguistic status. In this sense, the vocabulary and its holistic system are reminiscent of different linguistic individuals and their inseparable group gathered in one room. Inactive lexical units for public communication also form a peculiar paradigm, and among them the terms and their system are distinguished by specific linguistic features.

The term and their system also have a specific linguistic complexity, and their first, that is, initial "activity" may be "unfamiliar" to some of the professionals to whom these terms belong. For example, in linguistics there is a term "allusion". Allusion (lat. Allisio - gesture, joke). A methodological figure consisting of referring to a literary or socio-historical fact through certain linguistic units. In linguoculturology, allusion is studied in terms of the interaction of two cultural-semiotic areas (Xudoyberganova, 2015).

In the paradigm of "allusion" and the linguistic concept associated with this term, "allusion denotation", "allusion indicator", "source of allusion" and so on. terms are available. These are terms of certain concepts related to the science of linguistics, but are these terms and their essence the same for all specialists in the science of linguistics and are they actively used in their scientific work? No, of course not. For those who are engaged in the field of linguoculturology formed in the XXI century, these terms are special linguistic units, ie terms that are easy to understand and actively used in their scientific work. These terms and their essence are inactive linguistic units for professionals in traditional linguistics and their scientific activities.

However, the specificity of the terms for certain areas of science and technology does not interfere with their linguistic status in the description of the linguistic unit, the word (lexeme). Hence, the term and their system are also no different from the word in linguistic status. Therefore, the terminological system of a language in a particular field of science and technology has common linguistic features with a system of lexical units in the broadest sense of the common language.

The lexicon of the national language as a specific heterogeneous system (system) consists of subdivisions (homogeneous systems) of lexical units in the description of micro-, media- and macrostructures. Accordingly, in the lexicon of the vernacular, lexical units function within different logical-linguistic groups according to formal, semantic, and melodic relations. A set of lexical-semantic micro-, medio- and macro-structures, ie their whole association, forms a unique integrated system of language vocabulary, ie lexicon. Because of this system, the being that surrounds us is perceived as a whole and as a whole (Berdialiev & Ermatov, 2021).

Terms related to a particular field of science and technology and their system also have a heterogeneous systemic character inherent in the lexicon of the common language, and this is a holistic system (ie terminology) manifests itself. A set of lexical-semantic micro-, medio- and macro-structures, ie their whole association, forms a unique integrated system of vocabulary language, ie lexicon. Because of

this system, the being that surrounds us is perceived as a whole and as a whole (Berdialiev & Ermatov, 2021).

Terms related to a particular field of science and technology and their system also have a heterogeneous systemic character inherent in the lexicon of the common language, and this is a holistic system (ie terminology) manifests itself. The terms equonym and equonymy are a relatively new lexical unit in the system of linguistic terms. Therefore, the term is not mentioned in current scientific and lexicographic sources related to linguistics. The terms equonymy and equonymy are considered only in the textbook of M.V. In Uzbek linguistics, the terms equonym and equonymy were first studied by A.Berdialiev (Berdialiev & Ermatov, 2021) as a lexical-semantic phenomenon related to hyponyms, partonyms, functions in the group of lexical units "lexical-semantic media structures that differ on a denotative basis". Although the linguistic concept of equonyms and equonyms is "adjacent" to the linguistic concepts of polysemy, homonymy, synonymy, antonymy, and hyponymy, it is not yet officially popular in linguistics, especially in Uzbek linguistics (Roelofs, 1992; Singh & Siddiqui, 2015). It is an urgent task of the time to widely and formally popularize the linguistic concepts defined by the terms equanimity and equonymy in science (Moller et al., 1998; Zipfel et al., 2000). Because the phenomena of equonyms is, by their very nature, very close to antonyms and antonyms, in traditional linguistics some linguistic cases related to the same equonyms and equonyms (e.g., boy and girl, sister and sheep, ram and sheep, etc.) are interpreted as antonyms and antonyms. etilavergan.

Equanimity, according to M.V. Nikitin, is a semantic subordination of lexical units representing the meanings of a particular species to lexical units denoting gender meanings (Menaka & Sankar, 2019; Aripov, 2021). For example, the father and mother lexemes in the vernacular are lexical units that are semantically subordinated to the family lexeme in the sense of species and gender. The lexemes of father and mother are semantically subordinated to the lexeme of the family and perform a linguistic function in the status of equonyms that form its meaning and function. Hence, it is clear that the concepts of equonymy and equonymy are linguistically synchronously-syncretically mixed phenomena with the concepts of hyperonym and hyponym (Olga et al., 2021; Shulga et al., 2021). This is because the consideration of lexical units in the sense of gender as hyperonyms, lexical units semantically subordinated to these lexical units in the sense of type as hyponyms is already widely recognized in linguistics, including Uzbek linguistics (Safarova, 1996; Nematov et al., 1989; Nematov & Rasulov, 1995; Nikitin, 1988; Chafe, 1975). However, the study of linguistic concepts, terminological and professional vocabulary, as well as the lexical material of the vernacular, has just begun (Abdualieva, 2014).

The phenomena of equonymy and their linguistic practice arise and operate under the influence of the phenomenon of suppletivism specific to the lexical level. Lexical suppletivism (in general, suppletivism) is an associative requirement of semantically close lexical units, one of which lexically has a linguistic relationship with another lexical unit that has a common meaning in memory (Suryasa et al., 2019). For example, brother and sister, sister and father, father and grandfather, father and mother, and so on. a few words belong to a common semantic circle in

terms of close kinship. One lexical pair has an associative connection in memory with another lexical unit belonging to that pair.

Also, the lexemes of brother and sister, sister and father, father and grandfather, father and mother are considered equonyms in relation to each other, as well as hyponyms in relation to the family lexeme of a hyperonym character (Roelofs, 1993; Levelt, 1992). This evidence is a convincing indication that the lexical units formalized in the status of equanimity also officially function in the status of hyponymy. Hence, equonyms are lexical-linguistic units that are semantically subordinate in terms of their meaning to the lexical unit in the status of a hyperonym at the lexical level. Due to the fact that a lexical unit in the sense of a species is a dependent lexical unit in the sense of a species in relation to a lexical unit of the hyperonym character denoting gender, equonyms are connected with hyponims in the same linguistic source, equal to them. However, the equality resulting from this connection does not limit the linguistic differences that apply to the relationship between the phenomena of equanimity and equanimity and the phenomena of hyponim and hyponimia. No matter how similar and mixed, the phenomena of equonymy and equonymy are different from the phenomena of hyponymus and hyponymia. This difference is primarily related to the hierarchy of meanings that operate on the semantic scale of lexical units. The hierarchy on the semantic scale of linguistic (lexical) units is based on the law of negation of the negation of dialectics, in which the place of meaning and task at a certain stage is replaced by the next place of meaning and task belonging to the same semantic series. A linguistic unit in the status of a hyponym becomes a linguistic unit in the status of a hyperonym (Pulvermüller & Schönle, 1993). For example, cattle, horses, sheep, and so on. pets are lexical units that are semantically subordinate to the linguistic unit. Because cattle, horses, sheep are pets. At this stage, the lexemes "pet" are hyperonyms, and the lexemes "cattle", "horse" and "sheep" are hyponyms "pet". At the same semantic stage, the meaning of the lexemes horse, cattle, sheep, which are considered hyponyms, is also expressed in lexemes such as stallion, mare, toy (horse), bull, novvos, heifer, cow, calf (cattle), ram, sheep, sheep (sheep). At this stage the stallion, mare, toy to the lexeme "horse"; to the lexeme "cattle" of bull, novvos, heifer, cow, calf; There are also equonyms for the lexeme ram, sheep, sheep. It is felt that equonyms are the final, final semantic stage in the hierarchy of hyponym and hyperonym. From the point of view of this stage, the linguistic unit in the status of equanim is connected to the linguistic unit in the status of hyponym in the same linguistic source, that is, the same linguistic unit is considered both hyponym and ekvonim. According to M.V. Nikitin, hyponyms that are semantically dependent on one hyperonym are considered equonyms relative to one another. Equanimity, on the other hand, is a semantic relationship that arises from the relationship of equonyms (Nikitin, 1988).

These features related to the semantic and functional level of the national lexicon are also specific to the semantic and functional level of the linguistic units of the terminological system. This is because the terminological lexicon does not differ linguistically from the general lexicon, except for the scale of consumption.

The main function of both terminological vocabulary and popular vocabulary is nomenclature. The difference is that while the common lexicon refers to things

and phenomena of the objective world that are common and familiar to all, the terminological lexicon refers to things that are known and familiar to certain groups of a particular ethnic community that differ in occupation. Also, while linguistic units belonging to the common lexicon (usually lexemes, i.e. words) name denotations based on the meaning of these linguistic units, linguistic units belonging to terminological lexicons (these can be words, i.e. lexemes and simple and complex word combinations) denote denotations of a certain abstract nature. More precisely, while linguistic units belonging to the general lexicon are the names of concepts, linguistic units belonging to the terminological lexicon are the names of special concepts (Fischli et al., 1998).

As for the practical application of the phenomenon of equonymy and equonymy to the terminological system, for example, the system of linguistic terms, it is important to note that each level of linguistic units of language, as mentioned above, operates within certain micro-, media- and macrostructures. If a set of linguistic units (terms) specific to each branch of linguistics and their subdivisions describe the macrostructures of the terminological system in the status of a specific thematic group and lexical-semantic fields, linguistic units within these groups interact with these macrostructures - and in the description of microstructures. For example, at the phonetic or phonological level of a language, its basic unit is the phoneme or sound. At the same time, phonemes or sound terms include hyponyms originally known as vowel phonemes and consonant phonemes as lexical units of hyperonym status in terms of expressing the meaning of linguistic gender. Vowel phonemes in the status of hyponyms, and consonant phoneme terms are also equonyms in relation to each other. Or at the same level of language there is a concept called the term "joint". "Joint" is a term that means a linguistic gender. There are functional-semantic types of the concept that this term means by the terms "open joint" and "closed joint". These next two terms (open syllable, closed syllable) are linguistic units that are subject to both hyponym and equonym status in relation to the term "joint" in the description of the hyperonym.

Equonyms is related to hyponyms at the lexical level of language, similar to them are spiritual-functional units. Each lexical unit in the equanimous sentence differs from the other lexical unit in the same status according to the denotation it represents. For example, the scope of meaning of a morpheme lexeme also includes the meaning of lexical units such as lexical morphemes, affix morphemes. The terms lexical morpheme and affix morpheme are hyponyms of the morpheme hyperonym. The lexical morpheme is also a reciprocal equonym with the affixes of the affix morpheme hyponyms to the morpheme hyperonym.

Hyponymic and hyponymic relations work in the linguistic system of units of each level of language. It is important to note that the equonymy and equonymy relations associated with the phenomenon of hyponym and hyponymic relations differ in some specific features in the system of units of language levels. In addition, in the terminological system, in contrast to the common lexical system, there is also a hierarchical process within the linguistic units with the status of equanimity. For example, the term "consonant phoneme // sound" is a hyponym-equivalent of the term "phoneme // sound". The terms "voiced phoneme // sound" and "voiceless phoneme // sound" are equivalents as functional-semantic

forms of the term "consonant phoneme // sound". Such important linguistic processes are present in all level phenomena of language. We will therefore consider this complex linguistic phenomenon separately in larger plans for each level of language. M.V. Nikitin interprets hyponyms under one hyperonym as equonyms, and the semantic connection between them in the form of equonymy (Nikitin, 1988). Sensing such diversity, the Russian scientist L.A. Novikov emphasizes that hyponymy is a phenomenon close to synonymy and suggests calling it a quasi-synonym (Novikov, 1982). We have also commented on this with our suggestions below.

The fact that the lexical meaning of two words or terms has an opposite expression gives rise to an antonymy that is considered an extralinguistic phenomenon (Mirtojiev, 2010). Antonym pairs that exist in the same semantic field are actively used in the Uzbek terminology system. Terminological antonyms such as assimilation - dissimilation, symmetry - asymmetry, resonant - soundless, productive constructor - unproductive constructor are found in modern linguistic terminology.

In linguistics, antonymic units, which are lexically and semantically contradictory, paradigmatically differentiated by a single differentiating sign, are classified into contra, contractive, complementary, and gradual types (Fedorchenko, 2004). It focuses on the nature of the resistance: direct or indirect, complete or partial resistance. Complementary antonyms are based on the binary relationship between two terms: implicit - explicit, symmetry - asymmetry, and so on.

Conradictive antonyms include terms: compound sentence - broad sentence, main word - subordinate word, open syllable - closed syllable, simple sentence - compound sentence, capital letter - lowercase, microtext - macromatn, etc. Counter conflict occurs as a result of a conflict between more than two terms: attack, attack / retreat, retreat. This contradiction does not exist in Uzbek linguistic terminology. It is expedient to name lexical knowledge with opposite meanings in the terminological system by the term equounymous lexical units rather than antonyms. There are equivalent lexical units: open syllable - closed syllable (syllable), hard consonant - soft consonant (consonant), one-head sentence - two-head sentence (part of speech), full sentence - incomplete sentence (simple sentence).

Conclusion

In conclusion, it can be said that linguistic terms are not radically different from words in a language dictionary. But just as lexical-semantic aspects differ and words are grouped differently according to categories, linguistic terms are also divided into different groups according to word categories. But the grouping of linguistic terms by word groups differs from the grouping of ordinary words by word groups. This phenomenon can be seen in economical lexical units.

Under certain conditions, equonyms interact with hyponims at the same linguistic stage: hyponim also serves as an equonym. For example, vowel, consonant terms are hyponyms of a sound word (hyperonym); the resonant,

unvoiced terms are derived from the hyponyms of the consonant word (hyperonym). All these lexical units, which are semantically subordinated to the hyperonyms "sound" and "consonant", are equonyms.

The resemblance of equonyms to hyponims, their equivalence to hyponims at certain stages of meaning, should not lead to the conclusion that there is no difference between these two lexical-semantic phenomena. Hyponyms and equonyms are mutually different lexical-semantic categories.
The difference between them is that the meaning of a word in the hyponym function is broader than that of a word in the equonym function. A word in the function of a hyponym can also become a hyperonym at some meaning stage. Such a feature is not present in lexical units of an equonymous character. Equonyms are the final stage lexical-semantic units of the semantic coverage hierarchy of lexical units. Hyponyms, on the other hand, are lexical-semantic units that can operate in the intermediate stage of this hierarchy.

References

Abdualieva, Z.U. (2014). Giponimo-ekvonimicheskie otnosheniya v sisteme zoonimov russkogo i uzbekskogo yazykov. Monograph.

Aripov, M. P. (2021). Semantics of wishes/applause/prayers associated with religious terms. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Culture*, *7*(4), 274-278. https://doi.org/10.21744/ijllc.v7n4.1808

Berdialiev A., & Ermatov I. (2021). Modern Uzbek literary language. Turon-Iqbol, 80-84.

Chafe, W.L. (1975). The meaning and structure of language. M .: Progress.

Fedorchenko, E. A. (2004). Formation and development of the terminological vocabulary of customs in Russian. *Abstract of the thesis... Doctor of*.

Fischli, A. E., Godfraind, T., & Purchase, I. F. H. (1998). Natural and anthropogenic environmental oestrogens: the scientific basis for risk assessment. *Pure Appl. Chem*, *70*(9), 1863-1865.

Hojiev, A. (2002). Annotated Dictionary of linguistic terms. *Tashkent: National Encyclopedia of Uzbekistan*, 51.

Issakova, S., Taganova, A., & Oralbaeva, M. (2015). Term Semantics from a Cognitive Viewpoint. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *214*, 965-969. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.11.683

Levelt, W. J. (1992). Accessing words in speech production: Stages, processes and representations. *Cognition*, *42*(1-3), 1-22. https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(92)90038-J

Mahkamov, N., & Irmatov, I. (2013). Explanatory dictionary of linguistic terms.

Menaka, G., & Sankar, G. (2019). The language learning assessment using technology for the second language learners. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Culture*, *5*(4), 1-6. https://doi.org/10.21744/ijllc.v5n4.674

Mirtojiev, M. M. (2010). Semantics of the Uzbek language. *T.: Classical word*.

Moller, J. T., Cluitmans, P., Rasmussen, L. S., Houx, P., Rasmussen, H., Canet, J., ... & Gravenstein, J. S. (1998). Long-term postoperative cognitive dysfunction in the elderly: ISPOCD1 study. *The Lancet*, *351*(9106), 857-861. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(97)07382-0

Morris, M. H., & Paul, G. W. (1987). The relationship between entrepreneurship and marketing in established firms. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *2*(3), 247-259. https://doi.org/10.1016/0883-9026(87)90012-7

Nematov H., Begmatov E., Rasulov R. (1989). Lexical microsystem and its research methodology. (Theses of systemic lexicology) OTA, №6.

Nematov, H., & Rasulov, R. (1995). Fundamentals of Uzbek language system lexicology. *T.: Teacher*.

Nikitin, M. V. (1988). Osnovy lingvisticheskoy teorii znacheniya [Bases of the Linguistic Theory of Value]. *Moscow, Vysshaya shkola Publ.*

Novikov, L.A. (1982). Semantics of the Russian language

Nurmonov, A., & Mahmudov, N. (1992). Theoretical grammar of the Uzbek language. *Tash-kent: O'qituvchi.*

Olga, K., Ravshana, I., Firuza, O., Navruza, B., & Farida, K. (2021). Emotive verbs of the Russian language in the semantic and grammatical aspect. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, *5*(S2), 1451-1459. https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5nS2.1961

Pulvermüller, F., & Schönle, P. W. (1993). Behavioral and neoronal changes during treatment of mixed transcortical aphasia: A case study. *Cognition*, *48*(2), 139-161. https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(93)90028-T

Roelofs, A. (1992). A spreading-activation theory of lemma retrieval in speaking. *Cognition*, *42*(1-3), 107-142. https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(92)90041-F

Roelofs, A. (1993). Testing a non-decompositional theory of lemma retrieval in speaking: Retrieval of verbs. *Cognition*, *47*(1), 59-87. https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(93)90062-Z

Safarova, R. (1990). Hyponymy in the Usbek language. Tashkent, (Hoponyms in Uzbek).

Safarova, R. (1996). Types of lexical-semantic relations. *Tashkent: Teacher*.

Shulga, M. A., Poperechna, G. A., Kondratiuk, L. R., Petryshyn, H. R., & Zubchyk, O. A. (2021). Modernising education: unlearned lessons from Frederick Taylor. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, *5*(S2), 80-95. https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5nS2.1332

Singh, S., & Siddiqui, T. J. (2015). Role of semantic relations in Hindi word sense disambiguation. *Procedia Computer Science*, *46*, 240-248. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2015.02.017

Suryasa, W., Sudipa, I. N., Puspani, I. A. M., & Netra, I. (2019). Towards a Change of Emotion in Translation of Kṛṣṇa Text. *Journal of Advanced Research in Dynamical and Control Systems*, *11*(2), 1221-1231.

Xudoyberganova, D. (2015). A concise glossary of linguoculturological terms.

Zahra, S. A., & Covin, J. G. (1995). Contextual influences on the corporate entrepreneurship-performance relationship: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of business venturing*, *10*(1), 43-58. https://doi.org/10.1016/0883-9026(94)00004-E

Zipfel, S., Löwe, B., Reas, D. L., Deter, H. C., & Herzog, W. (2000). Long-term prognosis in anorexia nervosa: lessons from a 21-year follow-up study. *The Lancet*, *355*(9205), 721-722. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(99)05363-5