An Anthropocentric Approach to The Linguistic Essence of The Term in Uzbek Linguistics

Ikromjon Toshpulatovich Khabibjonov

Acting Professor at Kokand State University, PhD in Philology, Uzbekistan

Abstract: Every language has its own unique grammatical structure, which serves as a medium for conveying specific meanings and essences. These elements are closely related to the linguistic, scientific, and spiritual worldview of the speakers of that language. This article briefly discusses the anthropocentric approach to the linguistic essence of the term in Uzbek linguistics.

Keywords: Linguistics, term, research, linguistic essence, language.

Introduction: In Uzbek linguistics, M. Mukarramov, who studied the scientific style of the Uzbek language, identifies the following key features of linguistic units that express scientific concepts—terms—based on numerous studies: "1) A term is monosemous or tends toward monosemy; 2) A term has a clear, nominative function and does not possess emotional, expressive, or modal functions; 3) The meaning of a term is equivalent to a concept; 4) A term is stylistically neutral; 5) Terminological vocabulary forms a separate system; 6) A term is a function... The distinction between a term and an ordinary lexeme, based on these six features, is noted in nearly all linguistic literature" [1: 5].

Russian linguist S.G. Dudetskaya, who studied metaphorization in terminology, explains the continued existence of synonymy among terms as follows: Medicine, as a developing field, is not free from synonymy in its terminology. The reasons for the emergence of synonyms in terminology include: traditional usage of terms, the existence of diverse viewpoints within the field, multilingual information exchange often connected to distinct national microsystems, and the lack of systematic efforts aimed at limiting the proliferation of synonym terms [2: 11].

We believe that this situation described by the scholar can also be observed in many fields of Uzbek terminology. In nearly all previous studies dedicated to the investigation of terms in Uzbek linguistics, the existence of synonymous terms in the field has been emphasized.

N. Mahmudov also addresses this linguistic issue, posing the following question: A question naturally arises—are these requirements applicable to all terms in the languages of all scientific disciplines without exception? Of course, answering this question in the affirmative would not be correct. Naturally, the phenomena, laws, and objects studied differ across disciplines. Therefore, the classification of sciences based on such and similar aspects has become common in philosophy of science.

In the humanities, particularly in linguistics, some terms appear to be polysemous. For example, sixty years ago, Polish linguist A. Schaff lamented: "Today, semantics as a field of scientific research is becoming so complex, and the term itself has acquired such polysemy, that if we wish to avoid unpleasant confusion and logical ambiguity, we must subject the lexeme 'semantics' itself to semantic analysis" [1: 6–7].

Based on N. Mahmudov's observations, we can conclude that today, the polysemous nature of terms in the social and human sciences and the variability of terms even in the natural sciences to some extent indicate that such diversity is conditional. In approaching the linguistic essence of a term, one must consider the specific characteristics of each field.

It is well known that anthropocentric linguistics recognizes the existence of conceptual and linguistic

metaphors. In the cognitive model of metaphor, it is presented not only as a linguistic phenomenon but also as a psychological one. The existence of metaphorical expressions in language is a result of the presence of metaphorical models in human psychology" [3: 34].

Cognitivists George Lakoff and Mark Johnson proposed a new interpretation of metaphor within the framework of the Conceptual Metaphor Theory. A conceptual metaphor is defined as a way of understanding one domain through another in a non-formal manner—that is, experiences structured by cognitive frameworks are transferred from a source domain to a target domain. Metaphorical relations between polysemous lexemes and metaphorical expressions in language are reflections of conceptual metaphors. For example, the metaphorical expression "Our relationship has hit a dead end" and the metaphorical meaning of the lexeme "dead end" express the conceptual metaphor "Love is a journey," in which concepts typical of travel are mapped onto concepts related to love.

The theory of conceptual metaphor developed by G. Lakoff includes the following important conclusion: Metaphor is a key mechanism for understanding abstract concepts and reasoning about them. Metaphor is not inherently a linguistic phenomenon but a conceptual one. Metaphorical language is merely the external expression of conceptual metaphor. Metaphorical concepts are based on non-metaphorical concepts—that is, on our sensorimotor experiences. Rather than relying on similarity, metaphor is more often based on correspondences within our experiences. The source and target domains are not inherently connected in essence [4: 179–180].

Durdona Khudoyberganova has also expressed her views on cognitive metaphor, emphasizing its anthropocentric nature in accordance with the principles of modern metaphorology. She regards cognitive metaphor as an effective means of understanding, categorizing, conceptualizing, evaluating, and interpreting the world. She defines it as a phenomenon of conceptualizing one concept or judgment based on knowledge structures related to another concept or judgment, which belongs to an individual's cognitive activity [5: 9].

Z.I. Rezanova outlines the following characteristics of linguistic metaphor: a) it is expressed through linguistic means; b) due to the duality of meaning, it can appear in logical classifications beyond the natural boundaries of categories—relating to objects, features, and processes—based on analogy (or sometimes other bases) [6: 26].

In modern linguistics, due to the study of terms in relation to national-cultural values, social and political phenomena, and knowledge about the external world within the language of the society to which an individual belongs, new scientific conclusions are emerging. Attention is being paid to evaluating the unique linguistic features of terms in connection with the need to express new processes and realities, studying terminological materials based on primary sources, defining historical perspectives on terminology across different periods, exploring the genesis of terminological units, their linguistic relationships with other linguistic elements in language development, and identifying both their unique and shared features.

Contemporary linguistic research increasingly supports the view that linguistic phenomena previously considered foreign to terminology—such as terminological synonymy and doublets—are in fact inherent and unavoidable in the composition of terminological systems. For instance, Z. Jo'raboeva states in her research:

"Synonyms are regarded as the most frequently and actively used lexical units in the ecological terminological system. When determining relationships among lexical units in the ecological terminological system, semantic commonality and compatibility are more significant than formal similarity" [7: 16].

In addition, despite the fact that many scientific and practical studies have been conducted on the terminological systems of different languages, it remains evident that phenomena such as terminological synonymy, doublets, and polysemy cannot be completely eliminated. Without fully addressing these features in the science of linguistics, new synonymous, doublet, and polysemous terms continue to emerge across various fields of terminology. This process places new linguistic challenges before linguists and terminologists, particularly in terms of genus–species relationships.

Modern linguistic studies are now exploring how this process of transterminologization is connected to human cognitive processes. Research in this area suggests that transterminologization first occurs within the cognitive activity of an individual. It is then transferred into the linguistic landscape and the scientific worldview, and finally, it is reflected in the language of a community whose cognition has undergone such a transformation, thus becoming part of that language as a term.

Leading linguists around the world are gradually moving away from defining terms solely as lexical units representing domain-specific concepts. Instead, they

are beginning to interpret terms in connection with human cognitive, psychological, sociological, and cultural domains. For instance, in Western linguistics since the 1980s and 1990s, there has been growing interest in the influence of cognitive processes on the terminological foundation of language. Meanwhile, in Russian linguistics, efforts are being made to identify the national and mental nature of terms used in various fields. These and similar developments are leading to fundamentally new approaches and recommendations in the study of language, especially in explaining the linguistic essence of terms.

The views of researchers L.M. Alekseeva and S.L. Mishlanova fully support the above-mentioned argument. Firstly, the cognitive aspect does not allow the term to be viewed simply "in and of itself" as a descriptive object but enables it to be understood and recognized in the way it is presented by the specialist who created it. Secondly, cognitive research of a term compels researchers to come to terms, to a certain extent, with the complexity and inconsistency of the term, thereby directing the terminologist's attention toward exploring the internal regularities of the term's distinctive features. Thirdly, cognitive research in terminology contributes to a deeper understanding of new problems related to terms. This includes issues such as the human relationship with the surrounding environment and the reflection of a person's knowledge about the world through language [8: 8–11].

Initially, science regarded metaphor as a phenomenon of literary art and did not attract the attention of scholars and artists as a phenomenon of language, culture, and art. Later, especially in the 1960s and 1970s, scientific interest in metaphor began to grow. One scholar studying the history of metaphor research once said, "If the number of students studying metaphor continues to grow as it is now, by the beginning of the 21st century, they will outnumber the population of the earth" [9: 7]. Even today, interest has not diminished. In Uzbek linguistics, the cognitive aspects of metaphor have also begun to be explored, and numerous articles and dissertations have been produced. In this regard, it is appropriate to mention Sh. Mahmaraimova's dissertation. Her research stands out because it is devoted to the language as a whole system. Since language is a unified system, metaphor can also be studied through its combinations. As terms are formed as products of scientific thinking, metaphorization inevitably occurs in the process. This process, without a doubt, necessitates the study of Uzbek terminology from the perspective of metaphorization.

REFERENCES

Mahmudov, N. (2013). Fan tili va til fani. O'zbek tili va adabiyoti, (5).

Dudetskaya, S. G. (2007). Metaforizatsiya kak sposob terminoobrazovaniya (na materiale angliyskoy terminologii cherepno-chelyustno-litsevoy khirurgii i stomatologii) [Metaphorization as a method of term formation (based on English terminology in cranio-maxillofacial surgery and dentistry)] (Author's abstract of PhD dissertation). Samara.

Mishankina, N. A. (2012). Metaphor in terminological systems: Functions and models. Vestnik Tomskogo Universiteta, (4).

Kobozova, I. M. (2014). Lingvisticheskaya semantika [Linguistic Semantics]. Moscow: LENAND.

Khudoyberganova, D. (2013). Matnning antropotsentrik tadqiqi [Anthropocentric analysis of the text]. Tashkent: Fan Publishing.

Rezanova, Z. I., Mishankina, N. A., & Katunin, D. A. (2003). Metaforisticheskiy fragment russkoy yazykovoy kartiny mira: klyuchevye kontsepty. Ch. 1 [The metaphorical fragment of the Russian linguistic worldview: Key concepts. Part 1]. Voronezh.

Djurabayeva, Z. (2018). O'zbek tilida ekologik terminlar [Ecological terms in the Uzbek language] (Doctoral dissertation abstract). Tashkent.

Alekseeva, L. M., & Mishlanova, S. L. (2007). On the trends in modern terminology studies. In Aktualnye problemy lingvistiki i terminovedeniya [Current issues of linguistics and terminology studies] (International collection of scientific papers dedicated to Prof. Z.I. Komarova's jubilee). Yekaterinburg.

Baranov, A. N. (2017). Cognitive metaphor theory: Almost twenty-five years later. In Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. Metafory, kotorymi my zhivem [Metaphors We Live By] (A. Baranov, Ed. & Trans., 3rd ed.). Moscow: LKI Publishing.