

Words / Terms as the Object of Linguistic Research

Husan Berdiev

PhD-Student, Senior Scientific Researcher, Samarkand State University, Samarkand, Uzbekistan

Abstract: *There are terms of different form which are actively used in the Uzbek and Karakalpakian yurt building terminological system. Sometimes they were used in ancient times as special terms. The terms of yurt building were used in Uzbek language representatives speech as well as in Kazakh, Karakalpak, uzbek and turkmenian languages. There are a lot words/terms meaning/defining building materials of yurt, material types, features, functions, significance, decorations of yurt materials, blankets – coverings and other objects. The lexics of yurt building are analyzed basing on the results not only of linguistic sources and oral speech materials but also archeological, ethnographical, artistic – folk – lore researches. This proves the fact that the materials dealing with this terminological level should be studied specially and thoroughly. The yurt building lexics of Uzbek and karakalpakian languages has a special place in the lexical system of the language and is considered a significant linguistic value connected with the ancient legacy. For, semantics of the words of the sphere lexics, linguistic units of different periods, meaning scale of historical dialectal words are reflected in the yurt and words/terms connected with it up to now have not been in wide scale the object of research.*

Keywords: Turkish people, Uzbek and Karakalpakian languages, lexical level, mentality, terminology, words/terms, yurt, yurt – building lexical system

1. Introduction

It is known that the Yurta is a bright sample of ancient national culture. The research of the lexical system of the sphere is of great significance in the present day process of globalization. In the vocabulary of the language the notions dealing with the social life of people, their life style, jobs, deeds, views, traditions, customs and lexical level reflecting them and one of its components – the terminological systems have been developing. It is doubtless that they were formed on the basis of national mentality and imaginations, developed and rose to the level of a value. As it is given in the “ explanatory dictionary of the Uzbek language” – “ mentality “- from German Mentalitat< Lat. Mens,mentis – sense, mind “ it covers the level of thought of a society, nation, or a separate person developed historically, their cultural ability, the force analyzing their life laws, their mental ability in the definite social conditions, spiritual power, mentality of a society and person, their peculiar traditions, customs, religion and superstitions” [1].

So, the yurt building lexics research is useful from the point of view of spirituality of the people, revealing their traditions, learning the dialectological, lexicological, terminological, semasiological, word forming, morphological parts of linguistics and the problems dealing with defining them and filling them with particular theoretical thoughts.

2. Materials and Methods

In this work meeting the demands of the theme, the comparative – historical classification methods are used. Scientific source materials form its object.

3. Results of the Research and the Discussion

Word is a main structural – semantical unit of the language and is used in practice as a complex of phonetical, lexical, semantical and grammatical signs and it serves to name the objects, features of events, things , etc [2].

The word, besides having semas supplying stable semantic structure has contextuality and L.A.Novikov mentions that: “in speech (text) because of contextual semas the connotative nuances of the meaning of the unit of language occur. On the basis of connotative meaning the occasional meaning appears” [3].

We can see that the word is a specific complicated linguistic event. It is not surprised that there are lots of different definitions of the word. As, nature, society, thought are quite profound and many sided and the word being their linguistic expression has found its reflection [4].

The word “term“ as M.Fesmer mentions, is a Latin word “terminus“ meaning – “ limit sign“ [5]. It came into the Uzbek language in the 40 – 50 s of the XX century. Before that time the words “ istiloh “ and “ atama “ were used [6].

The term in the researches is used in the following two meanings: 1. Terminology is a complex of words and word combinations giving a special meaning. 2. Terminology is a part of linguistics dealing with the learning of terms, their meanings, grammatical structure and the laws of their usage in the language [7].

As A.A.Reformatsky mentions, the terms always expresses the connection within a terminological field and in it has the only meaning [8].

Thus, the terms expressing objects or notions of a sphere closely connected by their meaning, lexical – grammatical structure and other peculiarities form the terminology.

Nomenclature should include the words used to express the objects of the same type. Accordingly, nomenclature is defined as a level connecting terms and proper nouns, considers V.M.Leychik [9].

As G.O.Vinokur mentions, terms are not special words, they are words of special function [10].

Lots of scientists as G.O.Vinokur, V.M.Leychik, A.I.Moiseev, R.Doniyorov think, that the feature of term formation is peculiar only for nouns. In the monographic works devoted to terminology terms are considered to be the words concerning the definite notions of the sphere, possessing definition and having the function of naming. The Noun has all the above mentioned characteristics and more than the other parts of speech has semantic abilities.

In the opinion of A.A.Reformatsky : "... as the main function of a term is naming the objects and events, mainly the noun comes in the function of a term" [8]. Also, in the research of R.Doniyorov there is a following opinion: "only the words of the noun part of speech can be terminology objects" [11]. But in the opinion of V.N.Prokorova: "the scale of notions which must be terms is so wide that the semantic abilities of nouns are not enough to express them" [12].

V.G.Gack insists that: "The term function is one of the usage of lexical units. Any dictionary unit having the following two features can be terms : being able to define something and having a definite place in the notions line" [13].

The sphere lexics is two planned that is a dictionary unit used both as a term and non – term unit. Thus, there is a scientific and logical basis to define it as above mentioned term/word.

While learning the typology of dictionary units from the point of view of a meaning plan, V.G.Gack shows the mutual accordance of the functions of terms and non – terms in the following conditions: while having different expressions and coming in the different meanings of the unit; when having different notion of the same expression; having expression of the same definition.

As it is mentioned in the monography of M.Abdiev, the problem of the system of dictionary units in linguistics much discussed to possess a stable systematic structure, to be asigned on the basis of paradigmatic relations (dictionary – paradigmatic) and has become an axioma condition in science.

Uzbek linguists have also worked and made research on the scientific – practical problems of terminology. U.Tursunov, S.Ibrohimov, A.Hojiev, E.Begmatov, OlimUsmonov, Kh.Doniyorov, H.Jamolkhonov, N.Mamatov, S.Akobirov, S.Usmonov, R.Doniyorov, N.Kosimov, N.Mahkamov, Sh.Khakimov, T.Tursunova, A.Madvaliev, M.Abdiev and other scientists in their works revealed different problems of Uzbek lexicology, different spheres of term – learning: the ways of its formation, formation types, used of terms in different spheres of science, other actual problems of terminology, professional terminology as a part of Uzbek terminology.

In the works of professor S.Ibrohimov the professional word/terms of Ferghana valley such as kettle – making, blacksmith, knife – making, padlock – making, tool – making, jewelry and other about 20 words dealing with metal – work and pottery, oven – making and other non –

metal work words/terms are researched. In the doctoral work of M.Abdiev the professional term system of Samarkand region is learned. There the carpet – making, cap – making, embroidery sphere system terms are widely learned. Also, in the work of Sh.Norboev the onomasiological analysis of professional terms of Khorezm region is given.

It is known that at the beginning of the II century as a result of great migration the mobile household objects suitable for nomadic life began to develop. The words defining them became popular and formed the the household and yurta objectslexics [14].

The units of this lexical system and their connection with traditions and values, specific features of life of Turkish people, natural, social, spiritual roots are mostly revealed in ethnographical scientific literature.

In the problem of the research made in the sphere of the yurta we can say, that within different themes sphere the relation was shown and they are different scientific directions.

In Asia two types of yurtais wide spread. The yurtas of Turkish people such as kazakhs, kirgizs, uzbeks, tukmans and Mongolian yurtas of mongols, buryats, kalmyks. The inhabitants of these areas live in the states having historical, social – political, linguo – cultural relations.

The process of house transformation is the main factor in the historical development of mankind. The imagination dealing with building made a basis for appearance of different habits. Slowly they became traditions and played a role in the formation of sphere terms. Imagination dealing with nature and world enriched this terminological system. Yurta having traditional construction system is specific. Yurta building lexics reflects a lot of events of cultural life civilization. The ornament signs of the material of this type hosing proves that fact. From this point of view yurta building lexics is characterized by its peculiarities.

A large part of yurta building lexics has a general Turkish basis. They have some phonetic differences. As it is mentioned in the researches, terms exist in ancient written monuments also. The works of S.E.Malov give such terms as badiz(description), badizer (describer), karaku (yurta), silver, gold and others [15].

In the work of Sh.Allaniyazova it is vivid that in Turkish languages the meaning of the word is the same, but they have some phonetic, semantic peculiarities. For example, the word " karauy " – " yurta " in Kazakh language is " kiyizuy ", in turkman " Garaoy", in uzbek " karauy", in bashkird language " turme ", in nogay language " terme" [16]., also in kirgyz language " bozuy ". Also the names of yurta parts are the same in all Turkish languages. For example, in karakalpakistan :kerege, kanat, tunluk, uyik, uzyk, belbeu, baskurt; in kirgyz: kerege, tunduk, uuk, uzik,bosogo, jabyk bash, tegirish; in turkmanian : ganat, terep, tuyruk, uk, uzuk, yup; in Kazakh : kerege, kanat, kuk, eshik, tunduk, baskird; and others. This condition is also observed in the historical process of non – relation people. As well, the term of Mongolian yurta name "ger" (ker, ger) in the relation with

ancient Turkish term “ keragu “ giving the meanings of house, yurt is shown in the sources [17].

4. Conclusion and Recommendations

It proves that there are no wide researches done in the system of lexics of Turkish type of the yurt.

The words of yurt building system should be researched on the basis of historical and scientific sources. This, naturally is closely connected with actual problem of spiritual – material heritage dealing with values, investigating their peculiarities of linguistic features and their role in the treasury of language vocabulary.

References

- [1] Explanatory dictionary of Uzbek language, 5 volume. II v, Uzbekistan National Encyclopedia, 2005, p.580.
- [2] G.B.Gack. The Word./ Linguistic encyclopedia dictionary. – M. Encyclopedia. 1990, p.464.
- [3] L.A.Novikov. Sema/ Linguistic encyclopedia dictionary.-M.Encyclopedia. 1990.p.437.
- [4] M.Abdiev. The problems of analysis of sphere system lexics. – Herutage of people edition named after A.Kadiry.- Tashkent, 2004, p. 9
- [5] M.Fasmer. Etymological dictionary of Russian language. 2- edition, M. Progress, 1987, p.48
- [6] M.Ahadova, Is it a term, a name ?- Tashkent, 2007. №4, p.24 – 27
- [7] A.N.Rajabov. Problems of Uzbek linguistic terminology in comparison with Russian. – Tashkent, 1993, p.8.
- [8] A.A.Reformatskiy. What are terms and terminology? In the collection: “Problems of terminology”. – Moscow, 1961, p.52.
- [9] V.M.Leychik. Nomenclature-intermediate link between terms and proper nouns. Problems of terminology and linguistic statistics. – Voronej, 1974, p.13-25.
- [10] G.O.Vinokur. On some phenomena of word-formation in Russian technical terminology/ Works of Moskow Institute of Istory, philosophy and literature. Collection of articles on Linguistics. – Moskow, 1939, p.5.
- [11] R.Doniyorov. On an important problem of Uzbek lexicography/ Uzbek language and literature. – Tashkent, 1981, №6, p.21.
- [12] V.N.Prokorova. Synonymy in terminology/ Semiotical problems of science languages, terminology and information. V-II. – M., 1974, p.471-473.
- [13] G.B.Gack. Assymetry of linguistic sign and some general problems of terminology/ Semiotical problems of science languages/ Materials of science Symposium. – M.: MSU, 1971, p.68.
- [14] Sh.Usmonova. Common economic lexics in Altay languages. – Tashkent, 2011, p. 42.
- [15] S.E.Malov. Monuments of ancient Turkish writing. – M. – L., 1951, p.405.
- [16] Sh.allaniyazova. Terms of applied art in Karakalpakian language. Tashkent, 1986, p.9-10.
- [17] S.A.Kozyn. The Sacret Legend. Mongolian chronicle 1240. – Moskow, 1941, I, p.12.

Author Profile

Berdiev Husan Holnazarovich , Applicant, elder research fellow of the chair of Uzbek linguistics, Samarkand State University, Uzbekistan, Samarkand, Kudratova street №4. Index 140101