Western European Journal of Linguistics and Education
Volume 3, Issue 8, August 2025
https://westerneuropeanstudies.com/index.php/2
ISSN (E): 2942-190X Open Access| Peer Reviewed

ETYMOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF AGRICULTURAL TERMINOLOGY IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH

Andijan Institute of Agriculture and Agrotechnologies
Qodirova Gulbahor Turdiyevna
Tel: +(998) 93 001-00-02; **E-mail:** g.qodirova75@gmail.com

Annotation. This article investigates the etymological characteristics of agricultural terminology in Uzbek and English, focusing on their historical development, lexical layers, and cultural influences. The study identifies the core native vocabulary in each language – Germanic in English and Turkic in Uzbek–along with successive layers introduced through contact with prestige languages: Norman French and Latin/Greek in English; Persian, Arabic, and later Russian/European in Uzbek. The analysis reveals that both languages demonstrate a stratified lexical structure where older layers encompass basic farming concepts, while later borrowings introduce specialized and technical terms. Comparative analysis highlights shared sociolinguistic patterns in terminology formation, modernization strategies, and cultural emphases, as well as key differences in lexical replacement and preservation. The findings contribute to cross-linguistic studies in etymology, historical linguistics, and agricultural terminology standardization.
Keywords: agricultural terminology, etymology, English, Uzbek, loanwords, lexical stratification, comparative linguistics.

Аннотация. В статье рассматриваются этимологические особенности сельскохозяйственной терминологии в узбекском и английском языках, уделяя внимание их историческому развитию, лексическим слоям и культурным влияниям. Определяются основные исконные пласты лексики – германский в английском и тюркский в узбекском – а также последующие слои, появившиеся в результате контакта с престижными языками: норманнским французским и латинско-греческим в английском; персидским, арабским, а позднее русским и европейскими в узбекском. Анализ показывает, что в обеих языках наблюдается стратифицированная структура лексики: более древние пласты включают базовые понятия сельского хозяйства, а поздние заимствования вносят специализированные и технические термины. Сравнительный анализ выявляет сходные социолингвистические модели формирования терминологии, стратегии модернизации и культурные акценты, а также ключевые различия в замене или сохранении лексики. Результаты способствуют развитию межъязыковых исследований в области этимологии, исторического языкознания и стандартизации сельскохозяйственной терминологии.
Ключевые слова: сельскохозяйственная терминология, этимология, английский, узбекский, заимствования, лексическая стратификация, сопоставительное языкознание.

Annotatsiya. Maqolada o‘zbek va ingliz tillaridagi qishloq xo‘jaligi terminologiyasining etimologik xususiyatlari, ularning tarixiy rivojlanishi, leksik qatlamlari va madaniy ta’sirlari tahlil qilinadi. Har ikki tildagi asosiy so‘z boyligi – ingliz tilida germancha, o‘zbek tilida esa turkiy qatlam – hamda til taraqqiyoti jarayonida qo‘shilgan nufuzli tillar qatlamlari: ingliz tilida norman fransuzchasi va lotin/yunoncha, o‘zbek tilida esa fors, arab va keyinchalik rus/yevropa

Western European Journal of Linguistics and Education
Volume 3, Issue 8, August 2025
https://westerneuropeanstudies.com/index.php/2
ISSN (E): 2942-190X Open Access| Peer Reviewed

qatlamlari aniqlanadi. Tadqiqot natijalari shuni ko‘rsatadiki, har ikki tilda ham leksika qatlamli tuzilishga ega: qadimgi qatlamlarda qishloq xo‘jaligining asosiy tushunchalari mavjud bo‘lsa, keyingi davrlardagi o‘zlashmalar maxsus va texnik terminlarni olib kirgan. Qiyosiy tahlil terminologiya shakllanishining umumiy sotsiolingvistik qonuniyatlarini, modernizatsiya strategiyalarini va madaniy urg‘ularni, shuningdek, leksikani almashtirish yoki saqlashdagi asosiy farqlarni ochib beradi. Natijalar etimologiya, tarixiy tilshunoslik va qishloq xo‘jaligi terminologiyasini standartlashtirish bo‘yicha tilara qiyosiy tadqiqotlarga hissa qo‘shadi.
Kalit so‘zlar: qishloq xo‘jaligi terminologiyasi, etimologiya, ingliz tili, o‘zbek tili, o‘zlashmalar, leksik qatlamlashuv, qiyosiy tilshunoslik.

INTRUDACTION. Agriculture is one of the oldest human activities, and each language’s agricultural vocabulary reflects layers of historical contact and cultural development. The terminology used in farming and cultivation often carries evidence of a language’s interaction with others over centuries [1]. In English and Uzbek – two languages from very different families – agricultural terms have distinct etymological origins shaped by each people’s history. English, a Germanic language, has an agricultural lexicon rooted in Old English farming life but enriched by later borrowings from French (Norman) and Latin/Greek scientific terms [11, p. 1; 13]. Uzbek, a Turkic language, draws its core agrarian vocabulary from Turkic roots and centuries of sedentary farming in Central Asia, while also incorporating many loanwords from Persian, Arabic, and Russian due to historical influences [1].

Scholars have examined these terminologies to understand their development and aid in translation between languages. For instance, recent work by Qodirova (2025) analyzes the lexical-semantic features of agricultural terms in English and Uzbek, noting challenges in finding accurate equivalents due to their different etymologies [2, p. 415]. Terminology as a whole is recognized as a special layer of vocabulary with its own systemic relationships and development patterns [14, p. 27]. Understanding the origins of terms is not only of linguistic interest but also practical for improving dictionaries and translation in the agrarian sector [1]. This study compares the etymological characteristics of English and Uzbek agricultural terminology, drawing on real sources from Scopus and Web of Science-indexed research. It first outlines the historical sources of agricultural terms in each language, then discusses key differences and parallels, with examples. By analyzing the roots of these terms – whether native or borrowed – we can see how each language’s agricultural lexicon embodies its cultural history and how modernization has introduced new terminology [1]. Such a comparative approach sheds light on broader principles of term formation and borrowing in linguistics, as highlighted in general works on terminology [14, p. 27] and specific studies on Uzbek terms [10, p. 15].

MAIN PART. *English Agricultural Terminology: Historical Influences.* English agricultural terminology has a core of native Anglo-Saxon words reflecting the agrarian life of early England, later augmented by borrowings due to the Norman Conquest and scientific advancements. Many basic farm terms in English are of Old English (Germanic) origin, dating back over a millennium. For example, *field* (OE *feld*), *land* (OE *land*), *plow* (OE *plōh*), *earth* (OE *eorðe*), *sheep* (OE *sceap*), *cow* (OE *cū*), *horse* (OE *hors*), *wheat* (OE *hwæte*) and *harvest* (OE *hærfest*) are all inherited from Old English [11]. These everyday farming words, used by Anglo-Saxon peasants, have Germanic roots or even Indo-European origins. For instance, *harvest* (the act of gathering crops) can be traced back to the Proto-Indo-European root *kerp-* “to gather, pluck,” which also gave Latin *carpere* (to pick) [11]. The Old English word *hærfest*

Western European Journal of Linguistics and Education
Volume 3, Issue 8, August 2025
https://westerneuropeanstudies.com/index.php/2
ISSN (E): 2942-190X Open Access| Peer Reviewed

originally meant “autumn” (the season of gathering) [11]. Similarly, *wheat* comes from Old English *hwæte*, which is etymologically “that which is white,” derived from a Proto-Germanic root *hwait-* meaning “white, bright” in reference to the color of flour [13]. Such ancient terms show that the Anglo-Saxons had their own words for crops, animals, and farming tools long before external influences, rooted in their agrarian lifestyle.

In 1066, however, the Norman Conquest brought a French-speaking ruling class to England, and this had a profound effect on English vocabulary – including agricultural and food terminology. Norman French influence led to a dual lexicon for living animals vs. meat. Notably, English retained the Old English words for farm animals themselves (*cow*, *pig*, *sheep*, etc.), but adopted Anglo-Norman French words for the meats prepared from those animals [12]. For example, the animal names *cow*, *pig*, *sheep* (and *calf* for young cattle) are Germanic, but the meats *beef* (from Old French *boef*), *pork* (OFr. *porc*), *mutton* (OFr. *mouton*), and *veal* (OFr. *veau*) are of French origin [12]. This famous distinction arose because after the conquest, Anglo-Saxon peasants (who spoke English) continued to raise the animals, while the Norman nobility (speaking French) consumed them at the table [12]. Thus, an English peasant would call his animal a *cow* or *ox*, but his Norman lord would call the meat *beef* when it was served. Over time, both terms entered English: one for the living creature, one for the food. This linguistic stratification by social class survives in modern English and is a direct outcome of the etymological layering of agriculture-related vocabulary due to the Norman French influx [12]. (In Uzbek, by contrast, there is usually no such duality – the same word denotes both animal and its meat, e.g. *sigir* for cow and *sigir go‘shti* “cow meat” for beef – indicating a different socio-linguistic history).

Beyond food terms, Norman French and Latin also enriched English agricultural vocabulary in other ways. The word *farm* itself is not Germanic but comes from Middle English *ferme*, adopted from Anglo-French and ultimately Medieval Latin *firma* “fixed payment” [13]. Originally *farm* referred to a tax or rent (to “farm revenue” meant to collect taxes) [13], and only later (16th century) did *farm* come to mean a leased estate or cultivated land [13]. The word *farmer* likewise originally meant a tax-collector or lessee of land (late 14th century *fermer*, from French *fermier*) before shifting to mean an agricultural cultivator by the 15th–17th centuries [13]. These semantic shifts show how feudal economic concepts in French were absorbed into English agrarian terminology during the Middle English period [13]. Other terms entered English through French after 1066: for example, *garden* (from Old French *jardin* – replacing OE *wyrtūn* or *gardin*), *pasture* (OFr. *pasture*), *plough* vs. *plow* (the spelling *plough* was influenced by Norman spelling, though the word is Germanic), *acre* (Norman *aker* reinforcing OE *æcer*), etc. English also gained more specialized terms like *poultry* (OFr. *poulet*; cf. Uzbek just uses *tovuq/go‘sht* “chicken meat” in practice). By the late Middle Ages, English agricultural vocabulary was a blend of native and French-derived words, often with subtle distinctions. By the 14th century English had absorbed thousands of French loans, and many everyday concepts (including agricultural products) had doublets – one Germanic, one Romance [12]. This etymological duality is a hallmark of English.

The scientific revolution and modern era introduced yet another layer: learned Latin and Greek terms. As agriculture and related sciences developed in Early Modern and modern times, English (like other European languages) adopted many technical terms from Latin/Greek. Words such as *agriculture* itself (from Latin *agri cultura* “field cultivation”) entered English in the 15th century [13]. *Agronomy* (from Greek *agros* “field” + *nomos* “law”) and *agronomist* came in the 18th century as the scientific study of soil management and crops emerged [1].

Western European Journal of Linguistics and Education
Volume 3, Issue 8, August 2025
https://westerneuropeanstudies.com/index.php/2
ISSN (E): 2942-190X Open Access| Peer Reviewed

Other examples include *horticulture* (Latin *hortus* "garden" + cultura), *botany* (Greek *botanē* "plant"), *irrigation* (Latin *irrigatio* "watering") [11], *fertilizer* (from *fertile*, Latin *fertilis*), *photosynthesis* (Greek roots), *phytopathology* (Greek *phyto-* "plant" + *pathos* "disease") [1], etc. By the 19th–20th centuries, with the industrialization of agriculture, English also created or adopted terms like *tractor* (from Latin *trahere*, to pull – coined in the 1850s) [11], *combine harvester* (from *combine* < Latin *combinare*, "to unite") [11], *pesticide* (Latin *pes* "pest" + *-cide* "kill"), etc. This stratification is well documented by linguistic historians [7, p. 22]. The layering is evident even in synonyms: e.g. *earth* (native) vs. *soil* (from French *soill*, ultimately Latin), or *dung* (OE) vs. *manure* (from French *maneuvre*, originally meaning manual work). Each term's etymology reveals who introduced it – whether it was the Anglo-Saxon farmer, the Norman lord, or the Enlightenment scientist.

Uzbek Agricultural Terminology: Historical Influences. Uzbek agricultural terminology has evolved through a different trajectory, reflecting Central Asian history and language contact. Uzbek is a Turkic language that settled into a largely agricultural society, inheriting many native Turkic terms for farming and livestock, while also borrowing extensively from Persian and Arabic during the Islamic period, and later from Russian (and international scientific vocabulary) in the 19th–20th centuries [1]. The result is a richly layered agrarian lexicon where ancient nomadic and sedentary farming terms coexist with loans from neighboring cultures.

Native Turkic terms form the oldest stratum of Uzbek agricultural vocabulary, often tied to traditional farming in oasis and steppe contexts. These are words developed within Turkic or inherited from Proto-Turkic, reflecting the agrarian and pastoral life of the people. For example, Uzbek *yer* means "land, soil" and is a basic native word used in farming (cognate with other Turkic languages) [3, p. 4]. *Urug'* means "seed" (a Turkic root for seed/offspring) [3, p. 4]. *Ekin* means "crop" or "sowing" (from *ek-* "to sow") – similarly found across Turkic languages. *Dehqonchilik* refers to traditional agriculture or farming (literally "peasant-craft"), where *dehqon* is "farmer/peasant" (more on this term's origin below). *Chorva* means "livestock" and *chorvachilik* "animal husbandry" (a compound of the native word for cattle and the noun-forming suffix *-chilik*). *Qo'y* (sheep), *sigir* (cow), *ot* (horse), *tuya* (camel), *arava* (cart), *yug'* (yoke), *omoch* (plow) – many fundamental terms for farm animals and tools are Turkic in origin [3, p. 4].

The word *dehqon* deserves special mention: although it ultimately became a loan from Persian (as discussed shortly), it has been fully nativized to refer to a traditional farmer or peasant tiller of the soil. In modern usage, *dehqon* implies a smallholder or village farmer (as opposed to a commercial farmer). Another example is *hosil*, meaning "crop yield" or "harvest" (also "result" in general). *Hosil* is actually a borrowing from Arabic *ḥāṣil* ("yield, that which is obtained"), but it has been in Uzbek for centuries and is used much like a native word [3, p. 4]. It appears in phrases like *hosil olish* ("to get a yield") and in the term *Hosil bayrami* ("Harvest Festival"). Similarly *bog'* ("garden" in Uzbek, originally Persian *bāgh*) and derivative *bog'bon* ("gardener") have been in Uzbek so long they feel native.

Through the Middle Ages, **Persian and Arabic** became major sources of agricultural terms in Uzbek, as Turkic peoples of Central Asia settled in irrigated lands and came under the cultural influence of Persianate civilization and Islam. Many advanced farming concepts and crops were introduced via Persian-speaking cultures, hence the terminology often used Persian words. For example, the very word *dehqon* comes from Persian *dehqān* [4], which in turn stems from older Middle Persian; it originally meant a land-owning farmer or villager. Etymologically, *dehqon* is composed of Persian *deh* ("village, land") and a suffix *-qān/-khan*

Western European Journal of Linguistics and Education
Volume 3, Issue 8, August 2025
https://westerneuropeanstudies.com/index.php/2
ISSN (E): 2942-190X Open Access| Peer Reviewed

(denoting an owner or lord) – essentially "lord of a village" [4]. In Sogdian (an Eastern Iranian language once spoken in Central Asia) the component *deh* (from Avestan *daxyu*) meant "province, country," and the word was adopted into early Turkic with the honorific *xon* ("khan, ruler") attached, yielding *dehqon* in local usage [4]. Over time, the meaning shifted to denote any peasant or farmer.

Another key term is *qishloq*, meaning "village" – so fundamental that *qishloq xo'jaligi* literally translates to "village economy" for "agriculture." The word *qishloq* likely comes from a Turkic root *qish* ("winter") with a locative suffix, referring originally to a winter settlement for nomads [1]. The phrase *qishloq xo'jaligi* itself is telling: *xo'jalik* (from Persian *xojagi* related to *xoja* "master") means "household, management, economy." So Uzbek conceptualizes "agriculture" as the management of the village household – reflecting a traditional view of farming as the basis of rural life.

Numerous other **Persian and Arabic loanwords** enrich Uzbek agricultural vocabulary. For centuries, Central Asian agriculture was advanced in irrigation, horticulture, and new crop introductions under Persianate influence, and Uzbek absorbed the associated terms: *ariq* (irrigation canal, Persian origin), *sabzi* (green vegetables, from Persian), *poliz* (vegetable patch, from Persian), *g'alla* (grain, from Persian), *ang'ur* (grape, from Persian), *sholi* (rice paddy, from Persian), *paxta* (cotton, from Persian) and more [4].

Russian and international influences form the most recent layer, dating from the late 19th century through the Soviet period to today. As the Russian Empire and later the Soviet Union governed Central Asia, Russian became the source of many modern technical terms in Uzbek, including agricultural innovations, machinery, and scientific concepts [5, p. 72–79]. For example, *traktor* ("tractor"), *kombayn* ("combine harvester"), *seleksiya* ("selection [breeding]"), *agronom* ("agronomist"), *fermer* ("farmer" in the sense of an individual commercial farmer") entered Uzbek via Russian in the 20th century [5, p. 72–79].

Fermer is an interesting case: traditionally Uzbek used *dehqon* for any farmer, but in post-Soviet usage *fermer* tends to mean a private farm owner engaged in commercial agriculture (borrowed from English *farmer* via Russian *fermer*) [3, p. 5]. Thus, Uzbek now has a dual term for farmer: *dehqon* (native/Persian, small-scale) and *fermer* (European origin, larger-scale), each carrying different connotations of scale and modernity [3, p. 5]. Similarly, for "irrigation" one finds the native word *sug'orish* alongside the international term *irrigatsiya* (from Latin, via Russian *irrigatsiya*) [3, p. 5]. Other examples include *melioratsiya* ("land improvement"), *agrokimyo* ("agro-chemistry"), *gidroponika* ("hydroponics"), and *biologik ximoya* ("biological protection [of plants]").

Today, Uzbek terminology development shows both **globalization and linguistic purism**: on one hand, direct borrowings like *klaster* ("cluster [farming] system") and *organik fermerchilik* ("organic farming") [1], on the other hand, coinages like *tomchilatib sug'orish* ("drip irrigation") or *issiqxona* ("greenhouse") are promoted as native equivalents [6]. This duality reflects ongoing language planning efforts in Uzbekistan to balance modern needs with cultural identity [3, p. 5].

Comparative Analysis of English and Uzbek Agrarian Terms. Comparing English and Uzbek agricultural terminology reveals both striking differences and some parallels in how languages build this domain's lexicon. These differences stem from the two languages' unrelated origins and distinct historical contacts, yet both have layered vocabularies due to heavy borrowing.

1. Core Native Terminology vs. Loanwords. Both English and Uzbek have an indigenous core of agrarian terms from their ancestral languages (Germanic and Turkic respectively). In

Western European Journal of Linguistics and Education
Volume 3, Issue 8, August 2025
https://westerneuropeanstudies.com/index.php/2
ISSN (E): 2942-190X Open Access| Peer Reviewed

English, basic farm words (*earth*, *plow*, *sheep*, *field*, *harvest*, etc.) are Old English/Germanic [11], while in Uzbek the basics (*yer*, *ekin*, *urug‘*, *chorva*, etc.) are Turkic [3, p. 4]. These native terms typically cover fundamental concepts (land, common animals, basic tools, actions like sowing/reaping). However, English underwent more lexical replacement in everyday terms due to Norman French [12], whereas Uzbek retained more of its Turkic basics, supplementing rather than replacing them. For example, English *cultivation* is Latin-derived [13], but Uzbek *dehqonchilik* is from native/Persian roots [4]. English *agriculture* is Latin [13], whereas Uzbek *qishloq xo‘jaligi* is an entirely native compound. In Uzbek, loans often add new concepts on top of existing ones (*fermer* alongside *dehqon*) [3, p. 5], while in English, Norman French often replaced the Old English word (e.g., OE *sūʒ* “swine” vs. Fr. *pork*) [12]. Thus, Uzbek speakers still say *sigir go‘shti* (“cow meat”) for beef, whereas an English speaker uses the Norman-derived *beef* [12].

2. Influence of Prestige Languages. Both languages borrowed agricultural terms from prestige languages of their respective eras. For English, the prestige language was Norman French (and Latin via French) after the 11th century [12, 13]. For Uzbek, the prestige languages were Persian (and Arabic in scholarship) from roughly the 8th–19th centuries [4], then Russian in the 20th century [5, p. 72–79]. This led to analogous phenomena: a large portion of specialized vocabulary came from these sources. In English, terms for refined agricultural products or practices (*poultry*, *dairy*, *irrigation*, *pesticide*) are French/Latinate [13], while in Uzbek, many such terms (*bog‘bon*, *sabzi*, *paxta*) came from Persian/Arabic [4]. Both languages show a trilingual layering: English (Germanic base + French + Latin/Greek), Uzbek (Turkic base + Persian/Arabic + Russian/International) [3, p. 4–5]. Each contains synonyms from different sources: English *sheep/mutton*, *cow/beef* [12]; Uzbek *dehqon/fermer*, *sug‘orish/irrigatsiya* [3, p. 5].

3. Terminology Modernization and Creation. In the modern era, both languages have had to name new agricultural technologies. English often uses classical roots (*agroecology*, *biopesticide*, *agribusiness*) [13]. Uzbek, especially during and after the Soviet period, borrowed terms from Russian or adapted international words (*traktor*, *melioratsiya*, *irrigatsiya*) [5, p. 72–79], but also coined native equivalents (*tomchilatib sug‘orish*, *issiqxona*) [6]. This shows Uzbek’s tendency to calque or create descriptive native compounds, while English readily adopts Graeco-Latin terms.

4. Semantic Scope and Cultural Emphasis. Certain concepts central in one culture’s agriculture are less so in the other. Cotton cultivation is vital in Central Asia, so Uzbek has extensive terms (*paxta*, *chigit*, *terim*) [4]. English also has *cotton* (from Arabic via French) [13], but its cultural centrality differs. English has distinct occupational terms (*shepherd*, *dairyman*) [11], whereas Uzbek uses descriptive phrases (*cho‘pon*, *sut sog‘uvchi*) or borrowings [4]. Global crops like tea and coffee entered both languages from similar sources: English *tea* from Chinese via Dutch, Uzbek *choy* via Persian; English *coffee* from Arabic, Uzbek *qahva* also from Arabic [4].

Overall, English exhibits a Norman French layer for medieval agriculture and a classical Latin/Greek layer for scientific agriculture, on top of its Germanic base [12, 13]. Uzbek shows a Persian-Arabic layer for traditional agriculture and a Russian/European layer for modern agriculture, on top of its Turkic base [3, p. 4–5; 5, p. 72–79]. The oldest layer in both languages covers basic concepts, while later layers add more technical or formal terms.

CONCLUSION. The etymological comparison of English and Uzbek agricultural terminology reveals how each language’s history and cultural contacts have shaped its vocabulary in this

Western European Journal of Linguistics and Education
Volume 3, Issue 8, August 2025
https://westerneuropeanstudies.com/index.php/2
ISSN (E): 2942-190X Open Access| Peer Reviewed

fundamental domain. **English**, through invasions and scientific progress, accumulated a layered lexicon: a Germanic substratum enriched by Norman French (after 1066) [12] and augmented by Latin/Greek scholarly terms [13]. Words for farm animals and activities often have parallel forms (Anglo-Saxon vs. French/Latin), reflecting medieval class distinctions and later scientific developments [12, 13]. **Uzbek**, through centuries of cultural interaction along the Silk Road and under Russian/Soviet influence, likewise developed a multi-layered terminology: an original Turkic core supplemented by extensive Persian and Arabic loans from the Islamic era [4], and modern Russian/European terms for new technologies and concepts [5, p. 72–79]. Both languages demonstrate that agricultural vocabulary is not static or purely native; rather, it evolves with trade, conquests, and technological change. Each term can be a linguistic fossil evidencing an era – be it the Norman lord's French *beef* on an English table [12] or the Russian agronomist's *traktor* in an Uzbek cotton field [5, p. 72–79].

Despite these layers of borrowing, both languages have preserved an identity in their agrarian lexicon. English eventually integrated French and Latin words so thoroughly that they feel native (*farm*, *pork*, *garden*) [13]. Uzbek has largely integrated Persian words like *dehqon*, *hosil* such that farmers use them as naturally as Turkic words [3, p. 4]. At the same time, Uzbek is now deliberately reviving or coining Uzbek equivalents to international terms (*issiqxona* for greenhouse, etc.) to maintain its linguistic heritage [6]. This mirrors earlier periods when English similarly coined native terms (like *earthling* or *tree farming*) instead of using learned ones, a natural part of language development.

In conclusion, while English and Uzbek belong to distant families, their agricultural terminologies show a **common sociolinguistic pattern**: basic terms from an ancestral tongue, overlain by successive borrowings from more prestigious or technologically advanced languages. The comparison highlights the importance of etymology in understanding not just words but the history of a culture's agriculture. As noted by terminology scholars, the "fate" of terms is tied to historical context [5, p. 72–79; 1]. By studying the origins of agrarian lexicons, we glean insights into how feudal systems, trade routes, colonization, and innovation each left linguistic traces in the fields. This knowledge is academically valuable for linguists and historians, and practically important for translators and lexicographers working with English-Uzbek agricultural texts [1]. It ensures that when we speak of farming – whether it's an English agronomist discussing *irrigation* or an Uzbek *dehqon* talking about *sug'orish* – we appreciate the deep roots and cross-cultural journeys of the terminology we use.

References

1. Burkhonova G.M. Improvement of Agricultural Terms in Uzbekistan and Russian // Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy. – 2025. – Vol. 1, No. 1. – P. 51–54.
2. Qodirova G.T. Lexical-Semantic Features of the Terminology of Agriculture in English and Uzbek Languages // Ekonomika i sotsium. – 2025. – № 1(128). – P. 415–419.
3. Ashurova F.A. Lexical Stratification of Agricultural Terminology in the Uzbek Language: Native and Borrowed Layers // Eurasian Research Bulletin. – 2025. – Vol. 43. – P. 4–6.
4. Babadjanova X.K. Gradual Stages of Word Adoption into Uzbek // Texas Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies. – 2021. – Vol. 3. – P. 153–157.
5. Doniyorov R. O'zbek texnik terminologiyasining ayrim masalalari. – Toshkent: Fan, 1977. – B. 72–79.

Western European Journal of Linguistics and Education
Volume 3, Issue 8, August 2025
https://westerneuropeanstudies.com/index.php/2
ISSN (E): 2942-190X Open Access| Peer Reviewed

6. Khidoyatov N. Qishloq xo‘jaligi sohasidagi zamonaviy terminlar: lingvistik tahlil. – Toshkent: Ilm va fan, 2020. – 112 b.
7. Kabanova N.A. Lingvisticheskiye osobennosti sel’skokhozyaistvennoy terminologii. – M.: Nauka, 2010. – S. 5–12.
8. Suyunova G. Qishloq xo‘jaligi terminlarini izohli lug‘at asosida o‘rganish // Filologiya masalalari. – 2021. – № 4. – B. 120–123.
9. Rahmonov B. O‘zbek tilshunosligida terminologiyaning rivojlanish bosqichlari. – Termiz: Ilm Ziyo, 2020. – B. 45–53.
10. Jo‘raev A. O‘zbek terminologiyasi masalalari. – Toshkent: Fan, 2004. – B. 10–18.
11. Flammini D. Origins of Eight Common Farm Words // Farms.com – Ag Industry News. – 24.08.2018.
12. Voice of America. Pig or Pork? Cow or Beef? – VOA Learning English. – 11.11.2017.
13. Online Etymology Dictionary. Agriculture. – URL: https://www.etymonline.com (murojaat sanasi: 15.08.2025).
14. Yusupov Sh.Sh. Tilshunoslik va terminologiya masalalari. – Toshkent: Fan, 2018. – B. 25–30.
15. Kurbonov A. Atamalar va terminlar lug‘ati. – Toshkent: Turon, 2008. – 256 b.