



## STRUCTURAL-SEMANTIC DESCRIPTION OF TERMS IN THE FIELD OF TRANSPORT IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK POLYSEMY AND HOMONYMY OF TRANSPORT TERMS

**Bazarbaev Azamat Bakhramovich**

Karakalpak State University

English Teacher

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7451609>

### ARTICLE INFO

Received: 08<sup>th</sup> December 2022

Accepted: 15<sup>th</sup> December 2022

Online: 17<sup>th</sup> December 2022

### KEY WORDS

*Term, concept, terminology, term system, meaning, semantic variability, seme, polysemy.*

### ABSTRACT

*In this article, we study some important term characteristics and aspects of its rise and operation. It is shown that a significant number of terms have a dual role as they operate in a specific domain where they are customary and widely used, and in the common area where they have a highly specialized nature. It is conjectured that to carry out demarcation of the terms from the non-terms, it is expedient to take into account the fact that all terms are generally divided into two major groups: proper terms and terminological words. Morphological and semantic differences between terms and ordinary words are discussed. The national and international tendencies in terminology are reviewed. It is argued that a terminological neologism can and should be based mainly on the native lexical reserve. Also, the generalized attributes of an apt term are presented.*

'Lexico-semantic term formation is a method of language nomination in which the main means of creating a new term is the semantic development of the word' [Dubner, 1983:132-133]

Before a commonly used word becomes a term, it must undergo semantic specialization by being used in a specific context. These terms bring with them symbols from everyday vocabulary that can be expressed in new terms and are the basis of metaphorical transference. Thus, an already known form speaks of 'new' content.

It must be said that not all scientists think the same of the productivity of the

semantic method of formation. For example, Elena Ivanovna Chupilina believes that most of the existing terms are semantically created and names a number of reasons that explain its spread. Metaphor serves as an excellent means of knowing something new through what is already known; convenient information requires the means of finishing complex scientific objects, it helps to better psychological understanding of scientific concepts, creates an economy of linguistic means [Chupilina, 1967:20].

This situation is important in the conditions of rapid development of science and technology.



There is another idea, Professor Valery Petrovich Danilenko points to a slight weakening of the productivity of the semantic method, saying that

'Systems of terms are created not by external analogies, but by taking into account classification features, the presence of which cannot ensure semantic word formation' [Danilenko, 1971:7-67]

However, research findings show that a large number of words transfer from common English to transport terminology through metaphorical transfer. Cases in which several concepts are called by one lexical unit belong to polysemy – multiple meaning or homonymy. In terminological practice, it is known that these phenomena are unacceptable, because the requirement of unambiguity in the definition of the term comes to the fore.

Thus, Dmitry Semenovich Lotte put forward and justified the following requirements applied to the term: brevity, ambiguity, motivation, simplicity, agreement with other terms in the terminology, i.e. consistency, priority over already introduced terms [Lotte, 1991:23].

However, leading terminologists have an ambiguous attitude to the phenomenon of ambiguity, because in practice the requirement of unambiguity is not always fully implemented. So Valery Petrovich Danilenko, A.I. Moiseev, V.M. Leichik et al. acknowledge the legitimacy of the term's ambiguity. Their attitude to polysemy is considered a natural phenomenon.

The study showed that this linguistic phenomenon is typical of general terminology, particularly of railway transport terminology. So, by polysemy in this work, we understand the presence of several concepts in one lexical form.

Sergey Viktorovich Grinev-Grinevich identifies two main reasons for the phenomenon of polysemy:

- 1) The emergence of a new concept with similar characteristics to the concept called this term;
- 2) Developing and changing the concept, naming it creates the need to separate the semantics of the term [Grinev-Grinevich, 2012:132].

Linking of different meanings in a poly-semantic word Irina Vladimirovna Arnold defines as an ordered set of lexical-semantic options. The set is called 'ordered' because the lexical-semantic options are connected not only by the same set of morphemes, but also by the possibility of explaining each option by at least one of the others [Arnold, 1986].

According to Anna Anfilofyevna Ufimtseva, ambiguity is a manifestation of the internal regularity in the structure of language and it is related to a necessarily limited set of units and the absolute sufficiency of the specific conditions of the word – phrase, context, that ensure that each word functions in only one sense in a certain communicative action [Ufimtseva, 2002:240]

The study of transport terms showed that most of the analyzed terms meet the requirement of accuracy, that is, they have one meaning. There are relatively few examples of polysemy of terms in the transport terminological system, about 1% of the total sample. Most terms have two meanings. However, in many cases the terms have a close semantic relationship, for example,

**drum** – in logistics –

1. Barrel – a transport container with a cylindrical or parabolic body, with a ring or edges, a bottom – **Bochka** – tsilindrsimon



yoki parabolik korpusli, halqali yoki qirrali, tubi bo'lgan transport idishi,

2. A drum – a transport container with a smooth or corrugated cylindrical body, without rings and edges, with a flat bottom and with or without a lid – **Baraban** – silliq yoki gofirovka qilingan silindrsimon korpusli, halqasiz va qirrasiz, tubi tekis va qopqog'i bo'lgan yoki bo'lmagan yuk tashish idishi.

### **bunker** –

1. Bunker – fuel storage room – **Bunker** – yoqilg'i saqlash xonas;

2. Tanker – liquid cargo storage tank or storage capacity; Tank – liquid cargo storage tank – **Tsisterna** – suyuq yuklarni saqlash sig'imi;

**trap point** – in the railway sector – temir yo'l sohasida –

1. dead end bullet – boshi berk ko'chadagi o'q;

2. safety arrow – xavfsizlik strelkasi;

### **goods line** –

1. goods line – tovar yo'nalishi;

2. method of loading and unloading; locking angle – yuk ortish va tushirish usuli;

### **locking angle** –

1. turning angle – burilish burchagi;

2. closing angle – yopilish burchagi;

### **through traffic** –

1. transit transportation – tranzit tashish;

2. tranzit – tranzit.

### **bale** –

1. pile, stack;

2. Bale;

3. Briquette

– all three values denote a cargo unit, a large soft tied bundle, a large bundle of something, however of different configuration.

The group of three-meaning terms includes 3 terms, which make up 1% of the total number of polysemic terms, for example:

### **rail car** –

1. automatic machine – avtomatritsa;

2. locomotive – lokomotiv;

3. wagon – vagon.

### **capacity** –

1. maximum permissible capacity – ruxsat etilgan maksimal quvvat;

2. nominal load – nominal yuk;

3. rated power – nominal quvvat.

In all the given examples, the semantic connection of the meanings of the terms is visible. For example, the term 'Oil' comes from the Latin 'oleum' – vegetable oil.

Initially, this term means 'olive oil', then any 'oily liquids' – including technical:

1. Oil – Yog';

2. Oil – Neft';

3. Fuel – Yoqilg'i.

All three meanings of the term transport system have similarities, that is, they refer to a liquid load for transport, which has an oily consistency.

When working with such terms, the translator must follow the context, for example:

'Where commodities such as 'wheat' or 'crude oil' are concerned, then options to buy certain quantities may be negotiated in advance'

[Rushton, 2014:237].

In the case of commodities such as wheat or crude oil, the purchase of a specific quantity may be agreed upon in advance. In this example, 'crude' – 'xom' can only be oil, since there is no concept of 'crude fuel' – 'xom yoqilg'i' or 'crude oil' – 'xom yog'.

Distinguish two main forms of uncertainty in the transport terminological system possible: interdisciplinary polysemy and



polysemy based on metonymic or metaphorical transfer.

In all the above examples of polysemy, there is a semantic connection between the terms. That is, all the meanings of a polysemantic word are interrelated according to different criteria, for example, based on the principle of action or the similarity of performed functions. If this connection is very weak or not visible at all, such terms can be considered homonymous.

Homonyms are words that sound the same but have different meanings. And here the problem of distinguishing the concepts of homonymy and polysemy arises. K.Ya. Averbukh identifies three reasons for terminological homonymy:

1. Working in separate terminological systems of the same sound and spelling language units with completely different semantics;
2. Entry of the term into another terminological system due to its metaphorical use;
3. The existence of the same names representing different concepts in different special languages [Averbukh, 2004:39].

It should be noted that 'in terminology, the phenomenon of homonymy is represented by one of its types, more precisely, when polysemy is extended to the extent that it becomes homonymy' [Reformatsky, 2005:188].

In the terminological system of transport logistics, there are many cross-industry assimilations; interdisciplinary polysemy is also a common form of polysemy. But the meanings of such terms practically do not have a common semantic component, which gives grounds for attributing such terms to homonyms. For example,

**clearance** –

1. **Space** – the distance between the supporting surface and the lowest point of the central part of the car – automotive terminology –

**Bo'shliq** – qo'llab-quvvatlovchi sirt va avtomobilning markaziy qismining eng past nuqtasi orasidagi masofa – avtomobil terminologiyasi;

2. In **customs** affairs, as the execution of sanitary and other formalities, payment of port fees and other related documents – customs terminology –

**Bojxona** ishlarida, sanitariya va boshqa rasmiyatchiliklarni amalga oshirish, port yig'imlarini to'lash va boshqalar bilan bog'liq hujjatlarni rasmiylashtirish sifatida – bojxona terminologiyasi;

**overdrive** –

1. Overdrive – car terminology – **Overdrive** – avtomobil terminologiyasi;

2. As a commercial vehicle rental firm or agency – business terminology – **Avtotransport** vositalarini ijaraga beruvchi tijorat firmasi yoki agentligi sifatida – biznes terminologiyasi;

**car** –

1. Car – car terminology – **Avtomobil** – avtomobil terminologiyasi;

2. Railway wagon – railway terminology – **Temir yo'l vagoni** – temir yo'l terminologiyasi;

In this case, the meaning is revealed by the context, for example:

- 'For example, when purchasing a car the same model may be offered for sale with different types of engine, gearbox, paintwork and interior trim' – 'Misol uchun, avtomobil sotib olayotganda, xuddi shu model turli xil dvigatel, vites qutisi, bo'yoq va ichki bezak bilan sotuvga chiqarilishi mumkin'

[Rushton, 2014:239].



• For example, when buying a car, the same model may be sold with a different engine, gearbox, paint and interior trim. In this example, we are talking about a car, because characteristics such as engine type, gearboxes are not relevant for a railway car. Thus, there are few ambiguous terms in the terminological system of transport logistics. Ambiguity occurs as a result of the division of the semantics of the term, as well as the metonymic or metaphorical displacement of meanings. In polysemy, terms have a semantic connection. In addition, homonymous

terms appear in the transport terminological system. The reason for their appearance is the existence of inter-system acquisitions.

The number of polysemantic terms and homonymous terms is relatively small, about 2% of the total sample, but the studied terminological system is at the stage of formation, due to the emergence of new acquisitions and the emergence of new realities in the process of transport terminology, the number of such terms is large and shows an increasing trend.

## References:

1. Rushton, A. The Handbook of Logistics and Distribution Management: Understanding the Supply Chain. Fifth Edition / A. Rushton, P. Croucher, Dr.P. Baker. London: Kogan Page, 2014. 689 p.
2. Авербух, К.Я. Общая теория термина / К.Я. Авербух. Иваново, 2004. 252 с.
3. Арнольд И.В. Лексикология современного английского языка. Учебник для ин-тов и фак. иностр. яз. 3-е изд. М.: Высшая школа, 1986. 295 с.
4. Грин-Гриневич С.В. Терминология: учебное пособие для студентов высших учебных заведений. М.: Академия. 2008.
5. Грин-Гриневич, С. В., Сорокина, Е. А. Основы семиотики. М.: Флинта, Наука. 2012.
6. Даниленко В.П. Лексико-семантические и грамматические особенности слов-терминов / В.П. Даниленко // Исследования по русской терминологии / под ред. В.П. Даниленко. – М. : Наука, 1971. с. 7-67.
7. Даниленко В. П. Русская терминология: опыт лингвистического описания. М.: Наука. 1977.
8. Даниленко В. П. Актуальные направления лингвистического исследования русской терминологии. Современные проблемы русской терминологии / под ред. В. П. Даниленко, 5-36. Москва: Наука. 1986. 197 с.
9. Дубнер Г.Я. Методические рекомендации по деловой переписке на английском языке по коммерческим и финансовым вопросам. М.: В/О «Мортехинформреклама», 1983. сс. 132-133.
10. Кухно И.Ю. Терминология – семиотическая система «второго порядка» // Язык. Словесность. Культура. № 4. 2014. С. 41-55.
11. Лейчик В.М. Терминологическая наука: предмет, методы, структура. М.: КомКнига, 2009. 256 с.
12. Лейчик В.М., Шелов С.Д. Российское терминоведение: опыт синтеза 'старой' и 'новой' парадигмы. Научно-техническая терминология. 2004. сс.45-48.
13. Лотте Д.С. Основы построения научно-технической терминологии: Вопросы теории и методики. М., 1991. 157 с.



14. Моисеев А. И. О языковой природе термина. Лингвистические проблемы научно-технической терминологии. М.: Наука. 1970. с. 127-138.
15. Реформатский, А.А. Введение в языковедение: Учебник для вузов / под ред. В.А. Виноградова. 5-е изд., испр. М.: Аспект Пресс, 2005. 536 с.
16. Уфимцева А.А. Лексическое значение: принцип семиологического описания лексики / ред. Ю.С. Степанов. 2-е изд., М.: Едиториал УРСС, 2002. 240 с.
17. Уфимцева, А.А. Слово в лексико-семантической системе языка / АН СССР. Ин-т языкознания. М.: Наука, 1968. 260 с
18. Чупилина Е.И. Структурно-семантические особенности общеупотребительных слов в медицинской терминологии современного английского языка. Автореф. дисс. на соискание уч. ст. канд. филол. наук / ЛГПИ им. А.И. Герцена. Ленинград, 1967. 20 с.