TERMINOLOGY AS A DISTINCT LEXICAL SUBSYSTEM WITHIN A LANGUAGE.

Raimov Lazizjon Alisherovich
Teacher of "Foreign languages" department of
Termez University of Economics and Service
E-mail: lazizjon_raimov@tues.uz
Tel: 93-610-85-56

Abstract: This article encompasses an exploration of terminology and terminological vocabulary within linguistics. It involves a critical examination of fundamental terminology concepts such as terminology, term, term field, terminological system, and sublanguage. The aim is to define the position and limits of terminological vocabulary in relation to other lexical subsystems of the language. Additionally, the article seeks to identify key parameters for constructing terminology in both Uzbek and English.

Key words: terminology, artificially created terminology, professional slang, lexical-semantic system, term, sublanguage, term field, lexical units, professional jargon, dialectology.

An examination of literature on the linguistic analysis of terminology indicates that the origin and evolution of this group of lexical subsystems predates its scientific understanding and the establishment of criteria for categorizing specific units within terminological vocabulary. According to M.A. Chigashev, these processes unfolded in parallel with the spontaneous emergence and evolution of denotations and their associated concepts, relying on the foundation of the broader literary language. This perspective enables us to regard terminology as an integral component of the overall lexical-semantic system of the language.[1]

V. Raskin asserts that language, as a social phenomenon, finds expression through speech and is inherently individualistic in its nature[2]. E.G. Grigoryan highlighted that language is a cohesive, interrelated, and mutually dependent system. According to the scholar, this system is comprised of elements that hold specific positions within its structure[3]. Systemic organization is evident across all language levels, yet the structure of the lexical system differs from that of the morphological or phonological components, making it challenging to precisely delineate its boundaries. While the number of phonemes in a language is limited and grammatical phenomena are constrained, the lexical composition remains incompletely known, with no native speaker having complete mastery over the entire vocabulary. Unlike other language subsystems, vocabulary undergoes rapid changes, constituting the most dynamic aspect of the system. Throughout one's life, individuals witness the disappearance of certain words and the emergence of new lexical units. Nevertheless, as emphasized by E.G. Grigoryan, such changes should not be viewed as capable of fundamentally reshaping the lexical system. Instead, the lexical system comprises smaller subsystems that bring together

---

[1] **Чигашева** М.А. Исследование терминологической лексики методом семантического поля. // Вестник РУДН. – Серия: Лингвистика. – 2004. – № 6. – С. 80-86

[2] **Раскин** В. К теории языковых систем. – Изд. 2-е, доп. – М.: Эдиториал УРСС, 2008. – С.14.

[3] **Григорян** Е.Л. Лексическое значение слова. Лексика как система языка [Электронный ресурс] – URL: http://window.edu.ru/ window/library?p_rid=20177

groups of words sharing common meanings[4]. N.N. Amosova concurs with this perspective, asserting that language readily incorporates lexical elements, with the syntactic structure and form-making system being comparatively less susceptible to external influences. Furthermore, the phonetic composition of the language exhibits even greater resistance to alteration. Comprehensive studies on the historical grammar of the English language consistently demonstrate that the evolution of its grammatical structure follows a natural and intrinsic process, minimally affected by any significant influence from other languages[5].

O.S. Akhmanova characterizes vocabulary as a stylistic stratum within the language's lexicon[6]. Yu.V. Baklagova articulates a straightforward viewpoint, stating that a language's vocabulary is a structured collection of elements interconnected by specific relationships. Despite the lexical system's openness and the significantly vast number of elements compared to other systems, the vocabulary remains a relatively stable and observable system within each given period of language development. All words in the language are encompassed by its lexical system, and there are no words considered outside this system, existing in isolation. The lexical microsystem, corresponding to the concept of a complex semantic field in linguistics, is an integral component of an individual's worldview, signifying the intricate interplay of various structures of their knowledge[7].

V. Raskin underscores that various linguistic disciplines focus on studying specific types of language subsystems. He posits that these subsystems represent languages tailored for specific groups of people bound by particular relationships. As an example, he highlights dialectology, which examines subsystems serving groups residing in specific territories and occupying distinct positions in societal structures. Additionally, Raskin notes that specialists in bilingualism explore subsystems used for communication by groups facing unique territorial or social circumstances where two different language systems intersect. S.G. Nikolaev addresses both general and specific issues within bilingual communication, exploring the interplay of two languages - the "first" and the "second" - in bilingualism. Nikolaev also delves into various types (or varieties) of bilingualism, including social, professional, and individual, as well as creative/literary bilingualism[8]. According to V. Raskin, in all these instances, the focus is on investigating subsystems utilized by specific groups as inherent modes of communication[9].

Based on the utilization of words within a specific community, vocabulary can be categorized into the following subsystems: professional vocabulary, general vocabulary, slang vocabulary, and dialect vocabulary.

We find it intriguing to delve deeper into the examination of professional vocabulary. Our goal is to analyze various definitions of professional vocabulary, refine them, and develop

[4] **Григорян Е.Л.** Лексическое значение слова. Лексика как система языка [Электронный ресурс] – URL: http://window.edu.ru/ window/library?p_rid=20177

[5] **Амосова Н.Н.** Этимологические основы словарного состава современного английского языка. – М.: Изд. лит. на иностр. яз., 1956.—С.89.

[6] **Ахманова** О.С. Словарь лингвистических терминов. – М.: Советская энциклопедия, 1966. – С.214.

[7] http://www.tconference.kemsu.ru/GetDocsFile?id=11667&table=papers_file

[8] **Николаев С.Г.** Феноменология билингвизма в творчестве русских поэтов. – Ростов-на-Дону: Старые русские, 2005. – Часть 2: Онтологические, корреляционные и функциональные характеристики иноязычия в поэзии. – С.3.

[9] **Раскин** В. К теории языковых систем. – Изд. 2-е, доп. – М.: Эдиториал УРСС, 2008. – С.102.

a definition that precisely captures the essence of this phenomenon, providing a solid justification for it. Furthermore, we aim to explore the connections between professional vocabulary and terminology.

Professional vocabulary is employed by individuals within a specific profession, encompassing any specialized field of science or technology. Each realm of human activity possesses its own set of terminology. According to L.V. Molchkova, professional vocabulary constitutes a complex association grounded in terms, on one hand, and on the other, in common vocabulary—words and phrases utilized to describe various specialized facets of activity, known as metalanguage. Terms form the nucleus of this vocabulary group, a natural arrangement. However, the scope of professional vocabulary extends beyond the terminological system, encompassing professional jargon and outdated lexical units. This broader inclusion allows for illustrating the dynamics of the system's development and elucidating the characteristics of its current state[10]. According to A.I. Marochkin, professional lexical systems notably feature "scientific and technical terminology that is deliberately crafted and typically documented in specialized dictionaries" [11].

V.M. Leichik argues that within the realm of science, there exists an inherent contrast between the artificial and the natural, the spontaneous and the conscious. The author deems the amalgamation of these opposing elements inappropriate. Consequently, the assemblages of terms comprising terminology are not intentionally fabricated, even though the process of their formation cannot be distinctly characterized as either artificial or natural[12]. From these statements, it can be deduced that terms are integral components of both professional vocabulary and terminology. However, in professional vocabulary, terms are deliberately constructed based on those that operate within narrower linguistic subsystems. B.A. Serebrennikov clarifies that there are points of intersection between naturally evolved professional vocabulary and artificially created terminology, often leading to confusion in speech practice. Nevertheless, artificially created terminology tends to be more stable, standardized, and lacks territorial variations. Professional vocabulary is typically employed in business styles, characterized by precision in meanings and is less expressive, primarily due to the abundance of terms[13]. Professional vocabulary, according to D.E. Rosenthal, I.B. Golub, and M.A. According to Telenkov, professional vocabulary encompasses words and idioms employed across various sectors of production, including procedures that have not gained widespread acceptance. Telenkov emphasizes that professional vocabulary is rooted in professionalism. Professionalisms, distinct from terms that function as official scientific designations for specific concepts, are predominantly utilized in spoken discourse as "semi-official" expressions that lack precise scientific origins[14].

According to A.B. Superanskaya, N.V. Podolskaya, and N.V. Vasiliev, envisioning the vocabulary of the national language as a sphere reveals common vocabulary at its core, while individual sublanguages occupy the perinuclear or peripheral zones. The distance of each

[10] Молчкова **Л.В.** Профессиональная лексика англоязычных средств массовой информации: прагматика, семантика, структура. – Самара, 2003. – С.7.

[11] **Марочкин** А.И. Лексико-фразеологические особенности молодежного жаргона (на материале речи молодежи г. Воронежа). – Воронеж, 1998. – С.19.

[12] Лейчик В.М. Терминоведение: предмет, методы, структура. – Изд. 4-е. – М.: Либроком, 2009. – С.107.

[13] http://www.classes.ru/grammar/l 15Serebrennikov/chapter7/html/ unnamed_8. htm

[14] http://www.classes.ru/grammar/126.Rosental-modern-russian-language/clO- p40.htm

sublanguage from the core is influenced by the age of the respective branch of knowledge[15]. Conversely, O.V. Klimova views terminology as the central component of the language used in professional communication. In her perspective, the periphery of this field structure comprises units of oral professional vocabulary, or professionalisms. Beyond that, there may exist professional jargon, and at the outermost periphery are nomenclature units[16]. Despite the disagreements and occasional conflicting viewpoints among the authors, these statements point to a clear connection between terminology and professional vocabulary.

We find it reasonable to establish hierarchical relationships between these concepts and construct the following endocentric series: terminology - professional vocabulary (PL) - professionalism (P) - professional slang (PS) - professional jargon (PZ).

Simultaneously, an alternate perspective on the discussed issue is plausible. I.V. Arnold defines professional vocabulary as the language specific to a particular branch of human activity or profession. Notably, this vocabulary is exclusive to oral communication and lacks formal definitions in specialized literature. In the truest sense, professional vocabulary refers to historical periods when knowledge about various crafts was predominantly conveyed orally[17]. T.B. Kosareva shares a similar view, defining professional vocabulary as "the vocabulary specific to a particular professional group, employed in the speech of individuals connected by a shared profession[18]".

Considering I.V. Arnold's perspective, we posit that professional vocabulary represents a distinct manifestation of terminology, and its domain of operation is professional communication, encompassing both written and oral forms. We find V.F. Novodranova's viewpoint particularly apt in distinguishing professionalisms from terms; she underscores that, unlike terms, professionalisms are subjective units. They make note of the professional information that is manifested in everyday acts, is linked to a person's personal environment through experience, and verbalizes specific everyday concepts. According to the researcher, within professionalism, both scientific and everyday knowledge acquired through sensory, everyday perception of the world are objectified[19]. We believe that the crucial distinction between professional vocabulary and terminology lies in the correlation of professionalism with everyday knowledge.

The lexical system is a vital component of the overall language structure, and it stands out as the most dynamic subsystem in comparison to others. Within the lexical system, there are distinct yet interconnected subsystems, including professional (terminological) vocabulary, common vocabulary, slang, and dialectal vocabulary. Common vocabulary is essential at every level of communication, spanning various forms and registers. Terminological vocabulary exhibits high dynamism, continuously evolving with scientific and technological progress, necessitating the creation of new terms for emerging concepts. The development of terminology within specific spheres or sciences occurs as individuals engage in the process of cognitive exploration. Nonetheless, there exists a constant interchange between common and

---

[15] **Суперанская А.В. [и др.].** Общая терминология: вопросы теории. – Изд. 5-е. – М.: Либроком, 2009. – С.28.

[16] **Климова** О.В. Лексика предметной области PR современном газетном тексте и обыденной речи. – Екатеринбург, 2010. – С.9.

[17] **Арнольд И.В.** Стилистика современного английского языка. – 3-е изд. – М.: Просвещение, 1990. – С.284.

[18] http://www.oim.ru/ reader@nomer=502. asp

[19] **Новодранова В.Ф.** Соотношение обыденного и научного знания в профессиональной коммуникации // Материалы Международного конгресса по когнитивной лингвистике. – Тамбов, 2008. – С.636.

terminological vocabulary, resulting in the delineation of special vocabulary and the infusion of terminology into common vocabulary. This reciprocal process contributes significantly to the expansion of the language's lexicon by introducing new phrases and concepts.

References:

1.Амосова Н.Н. Этимологические основы словарного состава современного английского языка. – М.: Изд. лит. на иностр. яз., 1956.

2. Арнольд И.В. Стилистика современного английского языка. – 3-е изд. – М.: Просвещение, 1990.

3.Ахманова О.С. Словарь лингвистических терминов. – М.: Советская энциклопедия, 1966.

4.Григорян Е.Л. Лексическое значение слова. Лексика как система языка [Электронный ресурс] – URL: http://window.edu.ru/ window/library?p_rid=20177

5. Климова О.В. Лексика предметной области PR современном газетном тексте и обыденной речи. – Екатеринбург, 2010.

6. Лейчик В.М. Терминоведение: предмет, методы, структура. – Изд. 4-е. – М.: Либроком, 2009.

7. Марочкин А.И. Лексико-фразеологические особенности молодежного жаргона (на материале речи молодежи г. Воронежа). – Воронеж, 1998.

8.Молчкова JI.B. Профессиональная лексика англоязычных средств мас¬совой информации: прагматика, семантика, структура. – Самара, 2003.

9.Николаев С.Г. Феноменология билингвизма в творчестве русских по-этов. – Ростов-на-Дону: Старые русские, 2005. – Часть 2: Онтологические, корреляционные и функциональные характе-ристики иноязычия в поэзии.

10. Новодранова В.Ф. Соотношение обыденного и научного знания в про¬фессиональной коммуникации // Материалы Международного конгресса по когнитивной лингвистике. – Тамбов, 2008.

11.Раскин В. К теории языковых систем. – Изд. 2-е, доп. – М.: Эдиториал УРСС, 2008.

12. Суперанская А.В. [и др.]. Общая терминология: вопросы теории. – Изд. 5-е. – М.: Либроком, 2009.

13.Чигашева М.А. Исследование терминологической лексики методом се¬мантического поля. // Вестник РУДН. – Серия: Лингвистика. – 2004.

1.http://www.conference.kemsu.ru/GetDocsFile?id=11667&table=papers_file

2.http://www.classes.ru/grammar/l 15Serebrennikov/chapter7/html/ unnamed_8. htm

3.http://www.classes.ru/grammar/126.Rosental-modern-russian-language/clO- p40.htm

4.http://www.oim.ru/ reader@nomer=502. Asp