

DUPLICATE RELATIONS IN THE TERMINOLOGY SYSTEM

Ixtiyor Ermatov

Doctor of Philology (DSc), Associate Professor, Gulistan State University, e-mail:
ermatov.yazar@mail.ru

Abstract. The word is the basic unit of language. It is impossible to imagine a language without speech sounds, grammatical forms and outside the communication process. The system of speech sounds, the complex of morphological forms and the devices serving for communication - all together constitute the language, its whole organism. All this is formed with the help of words. One of the functional-semantic manifestations of the word is the term. The “partial similarity” of words and terms to the content aspect of the language is that, while the content aspect of words, as mentioned above, includes meanings that are jointly formalized in the memory of the whole people, the content aspect of terms includes concepts that are jointly formalized in the memory of certain groups of individuals specializing in a particular science, technology and profession. Concept and meaning, although they are considered common phenomena related to the content aspect of language, differ from each other: the “practical scope” of the concept is wider than the “practical scope” of meaning, since meaning is an ideal unit included in the scope of the concept. This article studies the functional-semantic features of the Uzbek intralinguistic (immanent) linguistics terminological system related to the content plan, and is devoted to the terminological systems of modern areas of lexicology and the issues of doublets in terminology. Linguistic terms serve as illustrative material for the article.

Key words: language, word, term, synonym, homonym, antonym, doublet, denotation, synonym, absolute synonym, lexical unit, etc.

In this article, we will consider the relationship between lexical units that are not contradictory in meaning and their lexical-content media structures in the terminology system, as well as doublet terms, which are one of the lexical units with a common denotative basis (synonym, graduonym, doublets).

The non-contradictory group of interword linguistic relations is based on the asymmetry of form and meaning. In them, formal units are more numerous than semantic units.

This group is divided into two internal subgroups according to the denotation relationship of lexemes that form lexical-content media structures:

- 1) lexical units with a common denotative basis and their group;
- 2) lexical units with different, differentiated denotative bases and their group.

The group of lexical units with a common denotative basis is divided into three internal subgroups:

- a) synonyms;
- b) graduonyms;
- c) doublets.



Both synonyms, graduonyms, and doublets are lexical units that do not have opposite meanings, and have the same or similar denotative basis. Through this article, we want to discuss the phenomena of synonymy and doublet in terminology.

In a language, the usual meaning, unlike the occasional meaning, is included in the semantic composition of only one word. For example, the occasional meaning of “beloved child” can be expressed in words such as “qo‘zichoq, bo‘taloq toychoq, shunqor, do‘mboq” with a positive emotional component. The usual meaning is expressed by one word, that is, it cannot be expressed in another word.

Synonyms are more than one word that is close to each other in meaning. But synonymous words in a row differ from each other either in expressiveness or in the subtlety of meaning (Tursunov, Mukhtorov, Rahmatullayev, 1970, p. 29). Only words in doublets have the same meaning (Choferov, 1970, p. 29). But doublets do not live long in the language: either one of them falls out of use, or one of them changes in some aspect (Hojiyev, 1981, p. 239). That is, not a single word is repeated in another word with its full meaning. Synonyms, which are based on the same semantic relationship of words, that is, more than one word, are called absolute synonyms in linguistics (Mirtojiyev, 2010, p. 45). Some linguists call them doublets (Kamolov, 1966, p. 130). In some works, however, it is limited to stating that there are synonyms with the same meaning: they are not called either absolute synonyms or doublets (Memedov, Akhundov, 1966, p. 183).

In fact, the terms absolute synonym and doublet have the same meaning. The synonyms expressed under these terms mean that the semantic composition of more than one word is exactly the same. For example, in the Uzbek literary language there are the words “chega” and “qadaq”, which are considered absolute synonyms. Because both of these words have two lexical meanings:

- 1) the place where broken porcelain is joined together with the help of an iron plate;
- 2) an iron plate that fixes a broken vessel.

These two lexical meanings constitute the semantic structure of both the word *chega* and the word *qadog*. There is no other semantics in the semantic structure of these two words. That is, their semantic structure is the same. They are considered absolute synonyms. Pay attention to the examples: *chegasidin sinmoq / qadog'idin sinmoq* and *chegasidin qadog'i qadog'i qadog'i qadog'i qadog*. These words are also the same in terms of grammatical category, that is, in terms of their category.

In the Uzbek language, there are word pairs such as *linguist / tilshunos*, *karsak / chapak*, *shoti / narvon*, *sinchalak / chittak*, *o'qittu / muallim*, *askar / soldat*, *sivizg'a / nay*, which do not differ from each other in terms of meaning. They are synonyms with the same lexical meaning (Mirtojiyev, 2010, p. 191).

They are truly absolute synonyms. Because they are mainly characterized by the fact that they are terms. Although the terms are expressed in words, their lexical meaning does not show any tendency to a particular style of speech or display emotional-expressive coloring.

Absolute synonyms are more than one word with the same lexical meaning. In the Uzbek language, the words in the composition of absolute synonyms are almost a pair, their lexical meanings are equivalent to the concept, and they mainly belong to the terminological lexicon. The components must be specific to one language. Phonetic variants of words and unambiguous morphological forms do not constitute an absolute synonym. Synonyms do not belong to the same root (Mirtojiyev, 2010, p. 196).

Based on the above, the difference between the terms in the linguistic status of synonym, absolute synonym and doublet is determined by their specific function in the content plan. The difference between the terms synonym and doublet is primarily noticeable in the following:

- a) synonyms have a synonymous row, doublets usually consist of two words;
- b) the lexical meaning of synonymous words has a certain style of speech, an emotional-expressive coloring, which is not observed in doublets;
- c) the meaning of synonyms is differentiable in relation to the signified, while in doublets it is indistinguishable;
- g) words are marked in synonyms, and unmarked in doublets;
- d) synonyms express the similarity of meanings of words, while doublets express only one concept;
- e) synonymous words have a synonymous paradigm, doublets cannot form a paradigm;
- yo) doublet words come in pairs, and there can be no more than that, while in synonyms it is the opposite, and two or more words form synonyms;
- j) one of the doublet words is necessarily “transient”, there are no “transient” words among synonyms, and even if there is one, it will be passive;
- z) in doublet words, the meaning of the word is not distinguished, because they mean the same concept, in synonyms there is a subtlety of meaning, the meaning is distinguished;
- i) in doublets, semantic similarity is considered an “overload”, and in synonyms it is considered their inherent feature;
- y) synonyms pass into the state of doublet through absolute synonyms, doublets usually do not pass into the synonymous series;
- k) doublets consist of only two words, synonyms are formed from the semantic similarity of two or more words;
- l) one of the synonymous words is dominant, in doublets the meaning remains the same.

The differences in the series of doublets and synonyms do not end there. From the above, we can conclude that there is a phenomenon of doubletiness, not synonymy, between terms. Therefore, the terms synonym and doublet cannot be used indifferently in relation to term words.

If lexical units have the same level of lexical meaning, stylistic coloring, and the same value in all functional styles of speech, they are distinguished as absolute synonyms (Berdialiyev, Ermatov, 2021, p. 17). For example, linguistics and linguistics, basis and root, lexicography and lexicography, form and form, term and term, subject and theme, author and author, terminology and terminology, mime and imitation word, pause and stop, affix and suffix, verb ratios and verb levels, morphemics and word composition, phrase and phraseology, etc.

This type of synonyms is called doublets in terminology. Such a synonymous series combining absolute synonym alternatives usually consists of two members. Doublet (synonym), that is, absolutely synonymous lexical units: prefix and prefix, suffix and suffix, ratio and degree, sentence and sentence, word and lexeme, vowels and vocalisms, consonants and consonants. Terminology differs from other levels of the language as a separate system consisting of specialized meaningful units. A separate, special function of a word that appears as a term is to name (Vinokur, 1939, p. 6).

In fact, terms in the form of words or combinations, like other units in the language, are also considered integral units of the lexical structure of the language. However, from the point of view of a clear, strict delimitation of concepts, the presence of synonymy, variantness or doubletiness is not considered an acceptable situation. However, in the terminological system,

there are still problems of synonymy, doubletiness. These problems arise as a result of the periodic adoption of new terms or the nationalization of an adopted term based on the internal capabilities of the language.

Absolute semantic compatibility consists of identical lexical units that do not differ in semantic and functional scope. In the paradigm of absolute semantic compatibility, one of the combining alternative members is actively used in speech, preventing and limiting the use of the other. A lexical unit whose use is limited and denied takes its place in the inactive layer of the language lexicon. As a result, over time, the paradigmatic series consisting of such lexical units is forgotten and disappears.

From the study of linguistic terms in the Uzbek language in a chronological sequence, it became clear that the synonymy between the terms arose in the two periods. For example, in the diachronic state of the language, the term suffix was used as a letter, pronoun traces, affixes, modals, subjunctive signs, subjunctive, simile, completion, verb, durkum modals, in the form of adverbs, and later as prefix, affix, suffix. To date, it has been standardized mainly as suffix and affix (Mahkamov, Ermatov, 2013, p. 144). The rest have been excluded from the language vocabulary. Also, functional-content microgroups (paradigms) formed with the participation of these lexical units, such as suffix - suffix, phoneme - sound, logical stress - word stress, root - basis, base - co-base, modifying suffixes - word-modifying affixes, possessive - accusative, infinitive - indefinite form of the verb, dot - dot, alphabet - alphabet, apostrophe - stop sign, share number - distribution number, have also moved away from the system of lexical-content media structures.

Which member of the series of absolute semantic compatibility becomes popular and formalized, and which one becomes passive and forgotten, is associated with the socio-political system of the society to which the language belongs and its ideology. For example, in the 1940s of the Soviet era, the Uzbek language actively used lexical units such as brackets, quotation marks, multiple dots, semicolons (Goziyev, 1941, p. 196), dots, suffixes, phonemes, alphabets (Usmon, Avizov, 1941, p. 256), and similar lexical units, while their alternatives such as brackets, quotation marks, multiple dots, semicolons, dots, additions, sounds, and alphabets were limited. Later, on the contrary, the use of alternatives such as brackets, quotation marks, multiple dots, semicolons, dots, additions, sounds, and alphabets (Fitrat, 1930, p. 38) became more active and popular, and the use of their alternatives that were active in the 1940s was limited. As in lexical units, absolute semantic similarity and its paradigm in terms are among the transient phenomena of the language.

Based on the above, it can be said that terms of absolute synonymy and doublet character are one of the manifestations of the lexical-content media structures of the lexical system in the description of the lexical-content media structures. Terms with such a feature do not have correspondence, proportionality in the expressive and content aspects.

These belong to the so-called paradigmatic type of asymmetry of form and content. In these phenomena, the asymmetry of form and content is based on the excess of the number of formal units over the number of semantic units.

References:

1. Berdialiyev A., Ermatov I. (2021), Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili (Leksikologiya, frazeologiya, leksikografiya). Turon-Iqbol.

2. Винокур Г.О. (1939). О некоторых явлениях словообразования и русской технической терминологии // Труды МИФЛИ. Т.5. Сборник статей по языковедению.
3. Камолов Ф.К. (1966). Семасиология. Фан.
4. Маммадов Н., Ахундов А. (1966). Дилчилијэ кириш. Маариф.
5. Mahkamov N., Ermatov I. (2013). Tilshunoslik terminlarining izohli lug'ati. Fan.
6. Миртожиев М. (2010). Ўзбек тили семасиологияси. Mumtoz so'z.
7. Турсунов У., Мухторов А., Раҳматуллаев Ш. (1992). Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили. Ўзбекистон.
8. Усмон О., Авизов Б. (1941). Ўзбек тили грамматикаси дарслиги. I қисм. Ўқувпеддавнашр.
9. Fitrat. (1930). Sərf. Özdəvnəşr.
10. Fitrat. (1930). Nəhv. Özdəvnəşr.
11. Ғозиев Ҳ. (1941). Ўзбек тили грамматикаси. II бўлим. Синтаксис. Ўқувпеддавнашр.
12. Чофəров С. (1970). Муасир азəрбајчан дили. Элм.
13. Ҳожиев А. (1981). Семасиология. Фан.