

PROBLEMS OF INTERLINGUAL EQUIVALENCE AND SEMANTIC ASYMMETRY OF LIVESTOCK TERMS IN THE UZBEK AND ENGLISH LANGUAGES

Mukhamadiev Sukhrob Bakhtiyor ugli

Senior Teacher, University of Economics and Pedagogy

E-mail: suhrobmuhammadiyev@gmail.com

Karshi, Uzbekistan

Annotation. This article investigates the problems of interlingual equivalence and semantic asymmetry of livestock terms in the Uzbek and English languages. Livestock terminology represents a significant lexical layer connected with agricultural production, animal breeding, veterinary practice, rural culture and professional communication. Although Uzbek and English possess a rich system of livestock-related lexical units, their terminological structures do not always coincide. Some terms demonstrate full equivalence, while others reveal partial, contextual or descriptive correspondence.

Keywords: livestock terminology, interlingual equivalence, semantic asymmetry, Uzbek language, English language, translation, terminology, lexicography, animal husbandry, semantic field.

Introduction. The development of agricultural sciences, veterinary medicine, animal breeding and international cooperation has increased the importance of accurate terminology in professional communication. Livestock terminology is one of the most important components of agricultural vocabulary because it names animal species, breeds, age groups, reproductive categories, diseases, products, feeding processes and technological procedures. In both Uzbek and English, livestock terms are deeply connected with the history of rural life and the practical needs of animal husbandry.

However, the translation of livestock terms from Uzbek into English and from English into Uzbek is not always simple. At first glance, many terms seem to have direct equivalents. For example, *cow* is often translated as *sigir*, *bull* as *buqa*, *sheep* as *qo'y*, and *horse* as *ot*. Nevertheless, a deeper semantic analysis shows that these equivalents may not be completely identical in all contexts. The meaning of a livestock term usually includes several components: biological species, sex, age, reproductive condition, economic function, product use and professional register. If these components are not taken into account, mistranslation and semantic distortion may occur.

In terminology studies, equivalence is not limited to the formal replacement of one word by another. It requires conceptual correspondence between two linguistic systems. J.C. Sager states that terminological equivalence depends on the relationship between concepts rather than on the external similarity of lexical forms [1, p. 58]. Similarly, M.T. Cabré emphasizes that terms function within a specialized conceptual system and must be interpreted according to the field to which they belong [2, p. 81]. Therefore, livestock terminology should be analyzed not only as a list of words, but as a structured semantic system.

The Uzbek and English livestock terminological systems have developed under different historical, cultural and linguistic conditions. Uzbek livestock vocabulary is strongly associated with Turkic nomadic and agricultural traditions, later enriched by Persian-Arabic



and Russian-European borrowings. English livestock terminology, on the other hand, combines Germanic animal names, Norman-French product names and Latin-Greek scientific terms. This historical difference causes several types of semantic asymmetry. For instance, English differentiates between *cow* and *beef*, *pig* and *pork*, *sheep* and *mutton*, while Uzbek often uses descriptive constructions based on the same animal name, such as *mol go 'shti*, *cho 'chqa go 'shti*, *go 'y go 'shti*. O.N. Trubachyov notes that names of domestic animals often preserve ancient cultural and economic relations within the lexical system of a language [3, p. 45].

The relevance of this research is determined by the need to identify problematic zones in translating livestock terms between Uzbek and English. These problems are especially important for bilingual dictionaries, agricultural textbooks, veterinary documents, scientific articles, export-import documentation and international educational programs. The aim of the article is to analyze the main types of interlingual equivalence and semantic asymmetry of livestock terms in Uzbek and English and to propose principles for their correct translation and lexicographic representation.

The theoretical basis of this study is formed by works on terminology, translation studies, lexicography and comparative linguistics. General principles of terminology were developed by D.S. Lotte, A.V. Superanskaya, V.M. Leychik, S.V. Grinyov-Grinevich, J.C. Sager, M.T. Cabré and R. Temmerman. These scholars consider a term as a unit of a special field that expresses a scientific or professional concept and functions within a terminological system.

A.V. Superanskaya, N.V. Podolskaya and N.V. Vasilyeva argue that a term should be systematic, semantically precise and relatively unambiguous within its field [4, p. 112]. This idea is especially important for livestock terminology, where the same animal may be named differently according to age, sex, reproductive condition or productive function. For example, *bull*, *steer*, *ox*, *cow*, *heifer* and *calf* all belong to the semantic field of cattle, but each term expresses a different conceptual feature.

In translation studies, the problem of equivalence has been widely discussed by E. Nida, P. Newmark, V. Komissarov and other scholars. Nida distinguishes formal and dynamic equivalence, emphasizing that translation should reproduce not only the form but also the communicative meaning of the source unit [5, p. 159]. In terminological translation, this means that the translator must preserve the conceptual accuracy of the term. Newmark also points out that technical terms require precise contextual interpretation, especially when they belong to institutionalized professional fields [6, p. 151].

For livestock terminology, lexicographic studies are of particular importance. Bilingual dictionaries should not merely provide word-for-word equivalents; they should also include definitions, usage labels, semantic restrictions and examples. L. Juraev's *English-Uzbek-Russian Dictionary of Agricultural Terms* provides useful equivalents for many agricultural and livestock terms, but even such dictionaries require further semantic clarification for complex terms such as *breeding*, *cattle*, *livestock*, *heifer*, *steer*, *wether* and *farrowing* [7].

The comparative study of livestock vocabulary also requires attention to cultural and historical factors. In English, the distinction between animal names and meat names reflects the historical influence of Norman French: *cow* – *beef*, *calf* – *veal*, *sheep* – *mutton*, *pig* – *pork*. In Uzbek, such distinctions are usually expressed analytically: *mol go 'shti*, *buzoq go 'shti*, *go 'y go 'shti*, *cho 'chqa go 'shti*. This difference shows that semantic asymmetry may arise not only from lexical gaps, but also from different cultural models of categorization.

The material of the research consists of Uzbek and English livestock terms collected from explanatory dictionaries, bilingual agricultural dictionaries, livestock manuals, veterinary texts and professional usage. The study focuses mainly on terms denoting domestic animals, age and sex categories, breeding processes, reproductive status, animal products and general livestock activities.

The following methods were used in the research:

1. **Descriptive method**, used to describe the semantic structure of livestock terms in both languages.
2. **Componential analysis**, used to identify semantic features such as species, sex, age, reproductive status and function.
3. **Comparative method**, used to compare Uzbek and English terms and determine their equivalence.
4. **Lexicographic analysis**, used to evaluate the representation of livestock terms in dictionaries.
5. **Translation analysis**, used to identify full, partial, contextual and descriptive equivalents.

The analysis is based on the assumption that a livestock term cannot be correctly translated without identifying its semantic components. For example, the English term *heifer* cannot be translated simply as *young cow* in all contexts. Its exact meaning is “a young female cow that has not yet calved.” Therefore, the Uzbek equivalent *g'unajin* should be interpreted with reference to age and reproductive status. Similarly, *ox* and *steer* may both refer to castrated male cattle, but their functional use and regional context may differ.

Interlingual equivalence is the relationship between lexical units of two languages that express the same or similar concepts. In general vocabulary, equivalence may be approximate, because ordinary words often depend on context, emotion and cultural associations. In terminology, however, equivalence must be more precise because terms are connected with specialized knowledge.

In livestock terminology, equivalence may be divided into four main types:

1. **Full equivalence** occurs when the Uzbek and English terms have almost the same conceptual content. For example, *bull* – *buqa*, *cow* – *sigir*, *calf* – *buzoq* may be considered relatively full equivalents in many professional contexts.
2. **Partial equivalence** occurs when the terms overlap but do not fully coincide. For example, *livestock* and *chorva* are close, but *livestock* usually refers to farm animals kept for production, while *chorva* may have a broader traditional and cultural usage.
3. **Contextual equivalence** occurs when the correct equivalent depends on the context. For example, *breeding* may be translated as *naslchilik*, *ko'paytirish*, *zot yetishtirish* or *urchitish* depending on the field and communicative purpose.
4. **Descriptive equivalence** occurs when one language does not have a single exact term and the concept must be explained by a phrase. For example, *farrowing* is often translated descriptively as *cho'chqaning bolalashi* or *cho'chqa tug'ish jarayoni*.

The existence of these equivalence types shows that livestock translation requires more than bilingual word replacement. It requires conceptual comparison. As Cabré states, a term receives its meaning from its place in a specialized knowledge structure [2, p. 95]. Therefore, the translator must first identify the conceptual position of the term and only then choose its equivalent.

Semantic asymmetry means that two languages divide the same conceptual field differently. This is very common in livestock terminology. One language may have a specific

term for a category, while the other language may express it by a descriptive phrase or a more general word. For example, English has a detailed system of cattle terms: *bull, cow, calf, heifer, steer, ox*. Uzbek also has corresponding terms: *buqa, sigir, buzoq, g'unajin, ho'kiz*. However, the correspondence is not always one-to-one. The English term *steer* usually means a castrated male bovine raised for beef, while *ox* usually refers to a castrated male bovine used for work. In Uzbek, *ho'kiz* may cover both meanings depending on context. Thus, *steer* and *ox* may both be translated as *ho'kiz*, but the English distinction is more functionally differentiated.

Another example is *cattle*. In English, *cattle* is a pluralia tantum noun and generally refers to domesticated bovine animals. It does not have a regular singular form. In Uzbek, *qoramol* may refer to cattle as a general category, but it can also be used in counting expressions and broader agricultural contexts. This creates grammatical and semantic asymmetry. The translator must know whether *cattle* refers to the biological category, the herd, or the economic livestock unit.

The term *livestock* is also problematic. It includes cattle, sheep, goats, horses, pigs and other farm animals kept for economic purposes. Uzbek *chorva* and *chorva mollari* are close equivalents, but they may carry traditional and cultural meanings connected with rural livelihood. Therefore, in scientific and legal contexts, *livestock* may be better translated as *chorva hayvonlari* or *chorva mollari*, while in general contexts *chorva* may be sufficient.

A particularly important area of asymmetry is the distinction between animal and product names. English often uses different lexical roots for animals and their meat products: *cow – beef, calf – veal, pig – pork, sheep – mutton*. Uzbek usually uses analytical expressions: *mol go'shti, buzoq go'shti, cho'chqa go'shti, qo'y go'shti*. This difference reflects historical and cultural development. The Norman-French layer in English created separate culinary terms, whereas Uzbek preserved a more transparent descriptive model. Such asymmetry must be clearly shown in bilingual dictionaries and translation practice.

The term *cattle* is one of the most frequent English livestock terms. It denotes domesticated bovine animals, especially cows and bulls, kept for milk, meat or breeding. In Uzbek, it is usually translated as *qoramol*. This pair may seem fully equivalent, but several differences exist.

First, *cattle* is grammatically plural and does not normally take the indefinite article. One says *many cattle*, not *many cattles*. Uzbek *qoramol* may function as a collective noun, but it can also be used in counting constructions such as *ikki bosh qoramol*. Second, *cattle* is strongly associated with the biological and economic category of bovine animals, while *qoramol* historically contains the component *qora* and may carry broader traditional associations. Therefore, *cattle – qoramol* may be considered a near full equivalent in agricultural texts, but lexicographic description should include grammatical and usage differences. A dictionary entry should indicate that *cattle* is plural in English and that Uzbek may require counting constructions with *bosh*.

The English term *livestock* denotes domestic animals kept on a farm for production, including cattle, sheep, goats, pigs, horses and poultry. Uzbek equivalents include *chorva, chorva mollari* and *chorva hayvonlari*. The problem is that *chorva* may be used both as a general traditional word and as a professional term. In formal translation, *chorva mollari* or *chorva hayvonlari* may be more precise. For example, *livestock production* may be translated as *chorvachilik mahsulotlari yetishtirish* or *chorva mahsulotlari ishlab chiqarish* depending on context. *Livestock disease* should be translated as *chorva hayvonlari kasalligi*, not simply

chorva kasalligi, if scientific precision is required. This shows that the pair *livestock – chorva* is a partial equivalent.

The pair *bull – buqa* is one of the most stable equivalents. Both terms refer to an adult male bovine animal, especially one used for breeding. The semantic components are: species – cattle; sex – male; age – adult; reproductive status – intact; function – breeding. Therefore, this pair may be classified as a full or near full equivalent. However, in English, *bull* may also be used metaphorically in finance or personality description, as in *bull market* or *a strong bull-like man*. Uzbek *buqa* also has metaphorical uses, but the range of figurative meanings does not fully coincide. In livestock terminology, the equivalence is stable, but in general discourse it may be context-dependent.

This pair is more complex. English has two important terms: *ox* and *steer*. *Ox* usually refers to a castrated male bovine used as a draft animal. *Steer* usually refers to a castrated male bovine raised for meat. Uzbek *ho'kiz* often refers to a castrated male bovine, especially one used for work. Therefore, *ox* is usually translated as *ho'kiz*. But *steer* may also be translated as *ho'kiz* when the castrated status is important.

The problem is that English differentiates function more clearly: work animal versus meat animal. Uzbek may use one broader term. Therefore, this is a case of semantic asymmetry. In translation, *steer* may need descriptive clarification: *go'sht uchun boqiladigan bichilgan erkak qoramol*. This shows that one Uzbek equivalent may not be sufficient in all contexts.

The pair *cow – sigir* is generally equivalent. Both terms denote an adult female bovine animal, usually one that has calved. However, in everyday English, *cow* is sometimes used loosely for female cattle in general, while in professional terminology it has a more precise meaning. Uzbek *sigir* also refers to an adult female cattle, especially milk-producing. The difference becomes important in opposition to *heifer – g'unajin*. If a female bovine has not yet calved, English uses *heifer*. Uzbek uses *g'unajin*. Therefore, a bilingual dictionary should not define *cow* only as *urg'ochi qoramol*, because this may confuse it with *heifer*. It should specify reproductive status.

The term *heifer* denotes a young female bovine before her first calving. Uzbek *g'unajin* is a close equivalent. This pair is especially important because it includes both age and reproductive status. Translating *heifer* simply as *yosh sigir* is not precise enough. The term should be translated as *birinchi marta tug'magan yosh urg'ochi qoramol* or *g'unajin*. This example demonstrates the importance of componential analysis. The term contains the following semantic features: species – cattle; sex – female; age – young; reproductive status – not yet calved. If any of these components is ignored, the translation becomes incomplete. A.V. Superanskaya's principle of conceptual precision is relevant here because a terminological unit must be defined according to its distinctive features [4, p. 112].

The English term *breeding* is one of the most problematic terms in livestock translation. It may mean reproduction, selection, raising animals for certain qualities, or the professional field of animal breeding. Uzbek equivalents include *naslchilik*, *ko'paytirish*, *urchitish*, *zot yetishtirish* and *nasl olish*. For example, *animal breeding* is usually translated as *hayvonlar naslchiligi* or *chorvachilikda naslchilik*. *Breeding bull* means *nasldor buqa*. *Breeding season* may be translated as *juftlashish davri* or *urchitish mavsumi*. *Selective breeding* is *tanlab ko'paytirish* or *seleksiya asosida nasl yaxshilash*. Thus, *breeding* has no single equivalent in Uzbek. It is a typical example of contextual equivalence.

The English term *animal husbandry* is usually translated into Uzbek as *chorvachilik*. This is generally correct. However, *animal husbandry* may emphasize the scientific and

practical management of domestic animals, including breeding, feeding, housing and health care. Uzbek *chorvachilik* may refer both to the field of agriculture and the traditional occupation of keeping animals. Therefore, in scientific contexts, *animal husbandry* may sometimes require expanded translation: *chorva hayvonlarini boqish, parvarishlash va ko'paytirish sohasi*. This is especially important in academic texts where the term covers several technological processes. In general contexts, however, *chorvachilik* is an adequate equivalent.

The analysis of livestock terms shows that equivalence between Uzbek and English can be classified as follows:

Type of equivalence	English term	Uzbek equivalent	Comment
Full equivalence	bull	buqa	Same species, sex and reproductive status
Full equivalence	calf	buzoq	Young cattle; generally stable equivalent
Near full equivalence	cow	sigir	Needs distinction from heifer
Partial equivalence	livestock	chorva / chorva mollari	Scope depends on context
Partial equivalence	cattle	qoramol	Grammatical and usage differences exist
Contextual equivalence	breeding	naslchilik / ko'paytirish / zot yetishtirish	Meaning depends on context
Contextual equivalence	animal husbandry	chorvachilik	Sometimes requires descriptive expansion
Descriptive equivalence	steer	go'sht uchun boqiladigan bichilgan erkak qoramol	Uzbek may use ho'kiz, but not always precise
Descriptive equivalence	farrowing	cho'chqaning bolalashi	Requires explanatory translation

This classification shows that the greatest difficulties arise not with simple animal names, but with terms that include age, sex, function, reproductive status or technological process. Therefore, equivalence should be determined through semantic analysis rather than by dictionary replacement alone.

The problems of interlingual equivalence and semantic asymmetry have direct implications for bilingual lexicography. A livestock term in a bilingual dictionary should include the following elements:

1. **Lemma:** the basic form of the term.
2. **Part of speech and grammatical information:** especially important for English terms such as *cattle, sheep, ox – oxen*.
3. **Definition:** based on genus and distinctive semantic features.
4. **Uzbek or English equivalent:** with indication of full, partial or contextual equivalence.
5. **Semantic components:** species, sex, age, reproductive status, function.

6. **Usage label:** veterinary, breeding, colloquial, dialectal, obsolete.
7. **Example sentence:** showing professional use.
8. **Cross-reference:** especially for animal-product pairs.

For example, the term *heifer* may be represented as follows:

heifer – *g'unajin*; a young female bovine that has not yet calved. Semantic features: cattle, female, young, non-calved. Compare: *cow* – *sigir*. Example: *Replacement heifers are selected for herd improvement – Podani yaxshilash uchun g'unajinlar tanlanadi.*

Such a dictionary entry is more useful than a simple translation. It prevents confusion between *cow* and *heifer*, or between *ox* and *steer*. According to Sager, terminological dictionaries should serve professional communication by providing conceptual accuracy and not only lexical equivalents [1, p. 64].

Livestock terms are used in different types of professional texts: veterinary documents, breeding programs, agricultural manuals, scientific articles, product descriptions and legal regulations. In each type of text, the same term may require a different translation strategy. In veterinary documents, precision is essential. Terms such as *mastitis*, *brucellosis*, *rabies*, *vaccination*, *quarantine* and *biosecurity* must be translated according to accepted scientific standards. In this case, international terms are often preserved or adapted: *mastit*, *brutsellyoz*, *quturish*, *vaksinatsiya* / *emlash*, *karantin*, *bio* 安全lik / *biologik xavfsizlik*.

In breeding programs, reproductive terms require careful differentiation. *Breeding bull* should be translated as *nasldor buqa*, not simply *buqa*. *Breeding value* may be translated as *nasl qiymati* or *seleksion qiymat*. *Artificial insemination* is commonly translated as *sun'iy urug'lantirish*. These terms show how Uzbek uses both native and borrowed elements to express modern livestock technology.

In agricultural economics, terms such as *livestock production*, *dairy cattle*, *beef cattle*, *poultry farming* and *small ruminants* require contextual translation. *Dairy cattle* is *sut yo'nalishidagi qoramol*, while *beef cattle* is *go'sht yo'nalishidagi qoramol*. If both are translated simply as *qoramol*, important economic distinctions are lost.

In scientific articles, Latin-based and international terms may appear frequently. The translator must decide whether to preserve the international form or provide an Uzbek explanatory equivalent. For example, *bovine*, *ovine*, *caprine* and *equine* may be translated as *qoramolga oid*, *qo'yga oid*, *echkiga oid*, *otga oid* depending on context. This is another example of semantic asymmetry: English has compact adjective forms, while Uzbek often uses analytic constructions.

The semantic structure of livestock terminology is closely related to cultural history. Uzbek livestock terms reflect the traditional importance of animal husbandry in Central Asian life. Words such as *ot*, *qo'y*, *tuya*, *qoramol*, *buzoq*, *uloq*, *toy*, *biya*, *ayg'ir* and *bo'taloq* are not only biological names, but also cultural signs connected with rural economy, folklore, proverbs and everyday experience.

English livestock terminology reflects another historical path. The Germanic layer preserved many animal names: *cow*, *sheep*, *swine*, *goat*, *horse*. The Norman-French layer introduced many product terms: *beef*, *mutton*, *pork*, *veal*. Latin and Greek contributed scientific and veterinary terminology: *bovine*, *ovine*, *equine*, *mastitis*, *brucellosis*. As a result, English has a stratified system in which different historical layers perform different functions.

These historical differences influence translation. For example, English *beef* cannot be translated as *sigir* or *qoramol*; it should be *mol go'shti*. Similarly, *mutton* is not simply *sheep*,



but *go'y go'shti*. This type of animal-product asymmetry is one of the most important translation problems in livestock terminology.

The analysis shows that the main problems of interlingual equivalence in Uzbek and English livestock terminology arise from several factors.

First, the two languages have different ways of categorizing livestock concepts. English often uses separate lexical units for functionally different categories, while Uzbek may use one broader term supported by context. This is seen in *ox / steer – ho'kiz*.

Second, English has compact adjectival forms such as *bovine, ovine, caprine, equine*, while Uzbek often uses analytical constructions. This difference may cause translation expansion.

Third, Uzbek has many traditional terms that carry cultural and practical meanings, while English may require more technical or descriptive equivalents. For example, *g'unajin* requires explanation as *heifer*, but not every non-specialist English reader may understand the term without definition.

These findings confirm the need for a semantic-componential approach to livestock terminology. A bilingual dictionary should not only list equivalents, but should also explain the conditions under which a term may be used. This corresponds to the modern view of terminology as a knowledge-based and context-sensitive system [8, p. 43].

Conclusion

The study of interlingual equivalence and semantic asymmetry of livestock terms in Uzbek and English shows that livestock terminology is a complex and structured lexical system. Although many terms have direct equivalents, a large number of units demonstrate partial, contextual or descriptive correspondence. The main causes of asymmetry are differences in semantic categorization, historical development, cultural traditions, grammatical structure and professional usage.

The analysis of such pairs as *cattle – qoramol, livestock – chorva, bull – buqa, ox / steer – ho'kiz, cow – sigir, heifer – g'unajin, breeding – naslchilik / ko'paytirish / zot yetishtirish* and *animal husbandry – chorvachilik* proves that correct translation requires componential and contextual analysis. The translator must consider not only the lexical form of the term, but also its conceptual content, functional role and field-specific meaning.

The results of the research are important for comparative linguistics, translation studies, terminology, lexicography and agricultural education. They may be used in compiling bilingual agricultural dictionaries, preparing teaching materials, translating veterinary and livestock documents and standardizing professional terminology. Future research may focus on corpus-based analysis of livestock terms, digital terminological databases and multilingual comparison involving Russian, Uzbek and English livestock vocabulary.

References

1. Sager, J.C. A Practical Course in Terminology Processing. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1990. – 254 p.
2. Cabré, M.T. Terminology: Theory, Methods and Applications. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1999. – 248 p.
3. Trubachyov, O.N. Names of Domestic Animals in Indo-European Languages: An Attempt of Semantic Reconstruction. Moscow: Academy of Sciences USSR, 1960. – 314 p.
4. Superanskaya, A.V., Podolskaya, N.V., Vasilyeva, N.V. Obshchaya terminologiya: voprosy teorii [General Terminology: Issues of Theory]. Moscow: Nauka, 1989. – 246 p.
5. Nida, E.A. Toward a Science of Translating. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1964. – 331 p.



6. Newmark, P. A Textbook of Translation. New York: Prentice Hall, 1988. – 292 p.
7. Juraev, L. English-Uzbek-Russian Dictionary of Agricultural Terms. Tashkent: Universitet, 2020. – 540 p.
8. Temmerman, R. Towards New Ways of Terminology Description: The Sociocognitive Approach. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2000. – 258 p.
9. Russian-Uzbek Agricultural Dictionary. In 2 Volumes. Tashkent: Fan, 1983. – 600 p.
10. Leychik, V.M. Terminovedenie: predmet, metody, struktura. Moscow: Librokom, 2009. – 256 p.
11. Grinev-Grinevich, S.V. Terminovedenie. Moscow: Akademiya, 2008. – 304 p.