

KEY FEATURES OF TERMINOLOGY SYSTEMS IN THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC DOMAIN

Ayaqulov Nurbek Abdug‘appor o‘g‘li
Gulistan State Pedagogical Institute Vice-Rector For Scientific Affairs and Innovations,
Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Philological Sciences, Associate Professor
nurbek.ayaqulov.1992@gmail.com +998915022325

Xidirov Olmosbek Abdurazak o‘g‘li
Gulistan State Pedagogical Institute
Head of International Cooperation Department, +998918019545

ABSTRACT

This article emphasizes the importance of studying term elements as linguistic units possessing “dual systematicity.” These elements exhibit all the characteristics of words in the standard literary language and can fulfill any functions typical of a word.

Keywords: terminological systems, pragmatic meaning, cognitive-discursive approach, metaphorical rethinking, dual systematicity, evaluative terminology.

Introduction

A terminological system is a collection of terms that designate the fundamental concepts within a specific field of knowledge or activity, interconnected through logical, semantic, and other relationships. Essentially, it is a structured set of terms intended to fulfill key functions such as organizing knowledge and concepts, facilitating the transfer of knowledge, skills, and technologies, disseminating scientific and technical information, and creating conditions for information storage.

Most studies on terminological systems have primarily focused on the languages of technical and natural sciences. However, applying many principles of terminology to the study and description of the languages in the humanities, socio-political, and economic sciences has revealed their relativity or even complete inconsistency.

The main distinction between the terminological systems of the socio-economic domain and those of technical and natural sciences lies in the interplay of objective and subjective factors, particularly the role of the subjective principle in social cognition. This distinction explains why:

1. A significant number of terms in the specialized languages of socio-economic sciences are subject to conceptual differentiation.
2. Some terms within the socio-economic domain exhibit uncertainty or vague meanings.
3. Connotatively and pragmatically colored words are used to reflect the value component of social concepts.

METHODOLOGY

This study uses a cognitive-discursive approach to analyze the pragmatic and semantic aspects of terminological elements in socio-economic and technical languages. A comprehensive corpus

of texts from various scientific fields, including academic papers, textbooks, industry reports, and professional jargon, was compiled. Key terms and phrases were extracted using automated tools and manual analysis, then classified into two categories: informemes, which serve an informative function, and pragememes, which carry pragmatic meaning. The study examined how terms align with both their specific field's concepts and the broader language system, evaluated their pragmatic meanings, and analyzed metaphorical expressions. Evaluative terminology in economic discourse was also explored, particularly the impact of word order and term choice on interpretation. A comparative analysis of metaphorical names for economic phenomena across social groups was conducted, considering linguistic and cultural contexts. Findings were validated through peer review and feedback, ensuring robustness and reliability. This approach aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the dual systematicity, pragmatic potential, and evaluative functions of terminological elements.

RESULTS&DISCUSSION

Terminologists who analyzed languages for technical and natural sciences special purposes concluded that “terminological systems are independent of the language” and “terminological vocabulary is quite distinct from literary language vocabulary.” [1]. However, studies of languages for special purposes in the socio-economic domain completely contradict this viewpoint.

It is evident that any industry-specific terminology emerges and evolves from the language in which its speakers attempt to name new objects and processes in the real world, drawing on existing experience and terminology. Most intellectual problems are solved using existing knowledge, which means that any terminology incorporates words from the general literary vocabulary as terms. The processes of term formation and the integration of term elements into general literary vocabulary are continuous. Recently, many terms from computer science (a technical field), economics, and politics have become firmly established in everyday use and continue to be reinterpreted and acquire additional nuances of meaning (including pragmatic ones). This can be explained by the fact that everyday life initially included realities requiring designation, which already exist in the relevant terminological systems.

All these observations indicate that terminology, as a core component of specialized language, represents only a fraction of language as a comprehensive entity. Using a traditional metaphor, language can be likened to an organism, where specialized language serves as an organ, and terminology functions akin to a molecule — the smallest unit of a substance possessing all its defining properties [2]. At the smallest level, a term can be compared to an atom, the fundamental particle of an element that retains its essential characteristics [3]. From this perspective, studying specialized language requires integrating knowledge about the world and the social context of statements within specific discourses. Terminology, like lexicology in general language studies, focuses on paradigmatic relationships. A term itself is examined as a linguistic unit that encapsulates all layers of meaning, enabling it to perform any function typical of words in everyday language.

Since terminology is a simplified model of a language, it mirrors the hierarchical structure of a general language's lexical composition. In other words, terminology includes not only "literary

elements" in the form of terms but also borderline phenomena such as professional jargon and, in some cases, even non-literary professional slang.

Linguists understand professionalisms and professional jargon as follows:

Professionalism is "an expressive equivalent of a term with a diminished element of direct nominative meaning, not conforming to professional standards, and used in the conversational speech of professionals." [4]

Professional jargon refers to "a specific expression found exclusively in the informal spoken language of professionals, characterized by strong emotional-expressive connotations and very weak nominative meaning." [5]

This perspective comes from a linguist who studies and describes business sector vocabulary. However, economists, particularly those directly involved in professional practical economics, are likely to disagree. In the group of professional argotisms (or jargons), there are words where the primary focus is on nominative meaning rather than emotional-expressive coloring. This is evident from their consistent inclusion in nearly all economic dictionaries. The regular incorporation of many professionalisms and professional argotisms, especially from the language of economists, into specialized dictionaries and educational materials indicates that these non-standardized lexical units, which denote specific concepts, possess a defining feature of terms: the presence of a definition. Furthermore, in some instances (notably in applied economics), professionalisms lack conceptual synonyms among standard terms, such as "sticky prices," "pendulum migration," and "dirty money."

When describing terms, professionalisms, and professional argotisms, it is more logical to use the concept of a "term element," as proposed by D. S. Lotte. This structural unit can be expressed by both a word-forming affix and a word within a term phrase. [6] This approach is warranted for two main reasons: first, there are no comprehensive works that clearly distinguish between terms and professionalisms (including professional argotisms), and many authors acknowledge that these are often overlapping concepts. Second, any term element, including affixes, can carry pragmatic meaning.

Therefore, a term element, as part of a terminological field, can function like a word in the general language, performing any of the typical functions and encompassing any aspect of the lexical meaning of a word.

From the cognitive-discursive perspective, the lexical meaning of a word includes both a semantic aspect, which involves denotation and signification (i.e., the conceptual content and its relevance to a subject), and a pragmatic aspect, whose central component is the connotative element, encompassing emotionality, expressiveness, evaluativeness, and optionally, imagery. Until the late 20th century, terminologists believed that "it is hardly advisable to look for in a term everything that is characteristic of an ordinary word." [7] However, at the beginning of the third millennium, new works emerged whose authors do not consider the phrase "pragmatics of a term" to be an oxymoron, but instead attribute significant meaning to it. For example: "terms, while being the main means of ensuring a high degree of information content and integration in a scientific text, can also possess communicative and pragmatic properties. Since a scientific text can be emotional and expressive, its main component—terminology—is also involved in conveying pragmatic meanings." [8]

Each scientific text conveys scientific knowledge as a concept that is emotionally experienced. The term used in a specific scientific text serves as a special cognitive representation, modeling not only the studied reality but also the author's cognitive strategies and, through them, their mentality. Although "terminological meaning does not contain ethnocultural, qualifying, or emotional connotations,"[9] the term itself can, "in addition to the general positive pragmatics of a special information sign that conveys knowledge, encompass all shades of evaluativeness according to parameters such as 'own//foreign,' 'unusual//traditional,' 'successful//unsuccessful,' and 'fashionable//outdated,' as well as 'reclamative//pejorative.'"[10]

In modern economic discourse, many synthetic words and expressions convey information with varying evaluations. For instance, economists often use terms like "dirty money," "black money," and "wooden money," none of which have short, neutral equivalents in official language. These terms, which serve as concise names for specific realities, carry strong connotations due to the negative implications of their descriptive adjectives. Conversely, terms like "quick money" and "real money" also carry distinct connotations, influenced by the connotative meanings of their adjectives. Given the importance of the personal factor in market economy language, the same expressions can sometimes have dual connotations.

The official stance on offshore zones assigns a negative connotation to the term "tax havens" (as seen in codes and textbooks), while Russian entrepreneurs and sometimes journalists view it positively. The same applies to expressions like "money laundering," "gentleman's agreement," and "big laundry." The components forming these expressions typically have positive or neutral connotations, indicating that a positive assessment was initially intended in professional contexts.

The choice of optimal means to convey information to the listener is influenced by the speaker's social position and characterizes their perspective: whether they are evaluating the situation from within or from the outside, and whether they consider the subjects as "friends" or "strangers." For example, "exploration work" versus "industrial espionage" and "expropriation" versus "robbery."

The evaluation of words resulting from various semantic transformations often has vivid connotations, with metaphor frequently used for this purpose. In other words, "tell me what metaphors you use, and I will tell you who you are."

The foundation of terms and concepts is logical. In contrast, the basis of metaphorical names is sublogical, encompassing both the denotative and connotative content of a word. Metaphors reflect the cultural perspective on the phenomenon represented by the word, capturing a range of associative connections.

Different social groups may have specific semantic and evaluative perceptions of socially relevant words and terms in the language of economics. These perceptions, influenced by ideological disagreements, can lead to completely different, and sometimes mutually exclusive, metaphorical names for the same economic reality.

In the professional language of economists, the term "skimming the cream" means "receiving high profits when introducing a new product to the market." Conversely, the term "milking for cash" refers to "selling a product at a price significantly higher than cost," essentially the same concept viewed from an opposite perspective. Non-specialists also use expressions such as "inflate exorbitant prices" and "tear three (seven) skins" to convey similar ideas.

Evaluation is closely linked to the communicative purpose of a speech act, influencing actions. The following example highlights the deliberate choice of evaluative terminology arising from metaphorical reinterpretation: "A couple of injections for show will not save the situation on the farm; the region needs serious investments that can not only support the existence of the farm but also make it completely profitable" (TV). Here, the speaker evaluates the current situation negatively and uses the term "injections" (from a range of synonyms such as investment, infusion, injection), aligning with their cognitive strategy. This choice not only conveys the essence of the situation but also expresses the speaker's attitude towards it. The pragmatic component aims to distinguish a specific economic reality by explicating the connotations of the general literary language from which the term element originated.

It's intriguing that not only term elements carry pragmatic potential, but also the sequence in which they appear in a sentence. For a specialist in venture financing assessing the future prospects of a new company, the word order within a term like "living dead" or "dead alive" is crucial. Depending on how these terms are defined, the specialist will formulate their forecast accordingly.

Upon recognizing that a linguistic sign can convey pragmatic meaning — which includes subjective-evaluative and emotional attitudes of speakers towards the denotations of signs, in addition to their cognitive meanings[11] — linguists have attempted to classify words based on the relationship between their nomination and connotation functions. Currently, there are various classification systems; for instance, Yu. P. Solodub [12] proposes a four-category classification, while M. N. Epshtein [13] suggests a three-category classification. In the context of describing terminological vocabulary, a two-category classification suffices, as outlined by L. A. Kiseleva: informemes and pragmemes [14].

- Informemes are terms that primarily serve an informative function and convey only semantic meaning.
- Pragmemes, on the other hand, are elements of terminology that not only serve a semantic function but also convey pragmatic meaning, including subjective evaluations and emotional nuances alongside their cognitive content.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the primary characteristics of terminological elements, which form the core of any terminological system, include their association with a specific sphere of use, correlation with a specialized concept (object or phenomenon), and the requirement for definition. One of the fundamental properties of a term is its "dual systematicity." This means that a term, serving as a verbal representation of a concept, must align with the system of concepts within a particular field of science or practical activity. Simultaneously, as a linguistic unit, the term must conform to the broader system of language.

For a significant period, linguists specializing in terminology imposed specific criteria on terms, aiming to eliminate perceived shortcomings of natural language such as polysemy, synonymy, and context-dependent meanings. However, contemporary experts in terminology increasingly recognize the impracticality of achieving this ideal. Instead, they emphasize the unique ways in which these properties of terms are implemented in practice.

REFERENCES

1. Аякулов Н. А. СЕМАНТИЧЕСКИЕ ОСОБЕННОСТИ СПОРТИВНЫХ ТЕРМИНОВ В МУЛЬТИСТРУКТУРНЫХ ЯЗЫКАХ //Страны. Языки. Культура. – 2020. – С. 59-61.
3. Большой толковый словарь русского языка / Под ред. С. А. Кузнецова. СПб., 1998. С. 51.
4. Abdugappar A. N. Sport Terms Borrowed from Different Languages into Uzbek Language //International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation (IJLLT). – 2020. – Т. 2. – №. 6. – С. 159-166.
5. Кодирова Ф. Ш. и др. PROBLEMS OF SYNONYMY AND ANTONYMY OF TERMS–THEORETICAL REVIEW //МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ ИСКУССТВО СЛОВА. – 2022. – Т. 5. – №. 6.
6. O’G A. N. A. A. et al. Anglicisms in sport terminology of the Uzbek language and its difficulties in translation //European science review. – 2019. – №. 9-10. – С. 54-57.
7. Азарова Л. Е. Лексико-семантические особенности термина // Языковые единицы: логика и семантика, функции и прагматика: Сб. научных трудов к 75-летию П. В. Чеснокова. Таганрог: ТГПИ, 1999.С. 191-196.
8. Ларина 10. Е. Прагматика термина как семиотическое свойство (на материале русской лингвистической терминологии). Краснодар, 2007. С. 6
9. ЛемовЛ. В. Система, структура и функционирование научного термина (на материале русской лингвистической терминологии). Саранск: Изд-во Мордовского ун-та, 2000. С. 103.
10. Кузнецова, И.М. Педагогическое руководство самообразованием студентов технических вузов: дис. ... канд. пед. наук: 13.00.08. - Алексеевка, 2009. - 161 с.
11. Никитин М. В. Основы лингвистической теории значения. М.: Высшая школа, 1988.
- С. 12. Солодуб Ю. П. Типология значений языковых единиц докоммуникативного уровня (функциональный аспект анализа) // Филологические науки. 1988. № 5. С. 37-46.