



Journal Homepage: -www.journalijar.com
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH (IJAR)

Article DOI: 10.21474/IJAR01/9774
DOI URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01/9774>



RESEARCH ARTICLE

THE RELATIONSHIP OF SYSTEM AND FUNCTIONAL PROPERTIES OF TERMINOLOGICAL UNITS.

Erkinov Sukhrob Erkinovich.

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages, Head of the Department “Theory and Practice of the English Language”.

Manuscript Info

Manuscript History

Received: 14 July 2019

Final Accepted: 16 August 2019

Published: September 2019

Key words:-

term, criterion, military-professional language sphere (MPLS), variation, terminology system, semantic structure, word paradigm, consistency, military-professional unit (MPU), field of term, semantic field.

Abstract

The present manuscript is about the relationship of system and functional properties of terminological units. Some theoretical aspects of terminological system in military-professional language sphere are discussed in the manuscript. Moreover, such linguistic phenomena as polysemy and homonymy of military-professional units, synonymy and antonymy, systematization of terminological fields, derivational activity of the components of term combinations related to military-professional language sphere, stylistic and functional differentiation of military vocabulary, their territorial consolidation, as well as paradigmatic and syntagmatic characteristics of these units have been investigated in the research work.

Copy Right, IJAR, 2019,. All rights reserved.

Introduction:-

The present manuscript is about the relationship of system and functional properties of terminological units. Some theoretical aspects of terminological system in military-professional language sphere are discussed in the manuscript. Moreover, such linguistic phenomena as polysemy and homonymy of military-professional units, synonymy and antonymy, systematization of terminological fields, derivational activity of the components of term combinations related to military-professional language sphere, stylistic and functional differentiation of military vocabulary, their territorial consolidation, as well as paradigmatic and syntagmatic characteristics of these units have been investigated in the research work.

Materials and methods:-

The system and functional characteristics of linguistic units regularly complement each other. As pointed out by the Belarusian linguist D.G. Bogushevich, “the classification of linguistic units should be based on two types of organizing functions: in the system of the function of realization and the function of manifestation. Thus, each unit of the language gets its own specific quality and the possibility of entering into a hierarchical relationship with units of the same quality or another” [2, p. 42].

Of particular note is the opinion of Arnold I.V., which notes that the term is a word or phrase of a special language (technical or scientific) in the language system. It serves to express concepts and objects in a special field. Those. it is a unit of language, because represents a word, and enters the language system through a conceptual level [1, p. 104].

Corresponding Author:-ErkinovSukhrobErkinovich.

Address:-Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages, Head of the Department “Theory and Practice of the English Language”.

The same opinion is shared by many linguists who are actively working in this field, who notice that terminology is delimited as a system of general linguistic concepts from a system of specific names, i.e. this is not just a specific list of terms, but still a semiological system that reflects the scientific worldview: Chebotareva 2008; Buyanov 2001; Dadabaev 1991 and others.

The following methods were used in the present work: comparative analysis – for comparing military terms and expressions, componential analysis – for revealing a military word in the structure of military-professional units, descriptive method – for giving linguistic description of the problem and critical analysis of the literature – for applying to issues written by other linguists due to the problem of investigation.

Results and discussion:-

Functionality, as well as the consistency of the military-professional language sphere, is represented by different parameters. These aspects of linguistic units are reflected primarily in such indicators as variability, polysemy and homonymy of MPU, synonymy and antonymy, systematization of terminological fields, derivational activity of the components of term combinations related to MPLS, stylistic and functional differentiation of military vocabulary, their territorial consolidation, as well as paradigmatic and syntagmatic characteristics of these units. So, some units become obsolete, new ones appear, thus, the semantic-functional volume of individual groups' changes.

The MPLS system is considered in such leading aspects as semantic, grammatical, stylistic and pragmatic. Moreover, the systemic and functional properties of MPU are manifested primarily in word-building and phrase-forming nests.

The terminological system is not the sum of the names of objects and actions, but a certain system of names of concepts about objects and actions. Since the term is a unit of the term system, we can talk about its consistency. The terms that are not related to each other are arbitrary sets of words, while the terminological system is formed only from such elements that possess the properties of an external system.

First of all, it is necessary to formulate the concept of the system as a whole. The concept of a system always implies the presence of a certain structure filled with many components. System - goes back to the Greek *systema*, literally means composed of parts, a connection. It has several interpretations: 1) a certain order in the location and connection of actions; 2) the form of organization of something; 3) something whole, which is the unity of the parts that are naturally located and interconnected [3, p. 370].

Obviously, language is a system of meaningful, meaningful forms, of which the terminological system is a part. Moreover, language is a system of systems. It provides for the stratification of the language in tiers and levels, characterized by specific structures that are closely related to each other. The entire vocabulary of the language is a macrosystem, consisting of many subsystems in which the meanings of words form microsystems. The boundaries of systems of any level are mobile and capable of transformations, both at the macro level due to the expansion of the lexical composition of the language, and at the micro levels in connection with changes in the semantic structures of individual words.

It is known that language is necessary for organizing the activities of society, the language community, as well as its members. Organization of activity as a general function of a language is carried out through its units. The structure and functions of any component of the language arise to achieve the main goal - communication. Therefore, the authors strive to emphasize the purposeful nature of the language and its individual sublevels. As a result, the possibility of a particular functional problem appears as the basis for the classification of language elements [7, p. 43].

The MPLS reflects the concept of scientific and professional activity and operates in a language system, which, in turn, includes many intersecting subsystems, which include terminology.

Reflecting a certain scientific theory, the terms are included in the general lexical system of the language, while forming its own system. The terminological system is characterized by strict hierarchy, in which connections from a general concept to a highly specialized one are traced, and vice versa. The principle of functionality characteristic of the UPLP is one of the fundamental in the organization of terminological vocabulary. A system-functional approach

to the study of UPLP makes it possible to describe the structure and composition of the components of the values of its units, as well as the relationship between them.

The function of the term, which is distinguished by its huge informational richness, is to serve specific areas of human activity, naming specific and abstract objects and phenomena related to these areas. This function is performed by a word directly borrowed from common vocabulary or a phrase specially created for this purpose. Hence the terms, being words, do not have constant formal and semantic features that contrast them with other words within the framework of a common language, but acquire them temporarily when they become units of a particular term system.

The terms and terminology are an integral part of the special vocabulary, limited in its use, they have a narrow scope. They naturally enter the lexical language system, but designate specific objects. Cf.: overflight laydown - bombing to hit targets from above, from extremely low altitudes [5, p. 72]; caisson - a charging box [3, p. 207]; jumper is a appearing target [3, 755]. The emergence of new terminology occurs simultaneously with the development of science and technology.

The "Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary" (1990, p. 509) gives the following definition of terminology: "a combination of words and phrases used in linguistics to express special concepts and to name typical objects of a given area. Being an integral part of the metalanguage of linguistics, linguistic terminology is particularly difficult to study ..." The dictionary explains that metalanguage, i.e. language - interpretation of linguistic phenomena, and language-object, i.e. the language to be studied is often outwardly the same. But the difficulty lies in the fact that the terms may not be used in the object language, and may also acquire a different meaning when used in it.

Cf.: formation 1 education, formation; institution; 2 structure, structure; design; 3 geol. 1) breeds of the same age; 2) deposition, layering; 4 railways formation, compilation (of trains); 5 military. 1) construction; 2) system; 3) battle order; 6 military unit [3, p. 545]; protect - 1 protect, guard, protect; 2 polit. pursue a protectionism policy; 3 rooms, fin. Accept; to pay; 4 military book, cover with armor; 5 amer. train station mouth signal that the path is closed [3, p. 265].

In linguistic science, there are various approaches to distinguishing between the concepts of terminology and the term system. Many researchers consider terminology as a set of special names combined into terminological systems. They argue that terminology in the broad sense itself is a collection of individual terminological systems that contain units of language that belong to different fields of science, production, art, etc. Among the authors of such works we can enumerate Lazarevich 2000; Khozhiev 1996; Dadabaev 1994; Akhmedov 2016; Palanova 2016 and others. This approach indicates that the terminology is wider than the terminological system, is a higher level of the hierarchical organization of scientific knowledge and includes many terminological systems and relates not only to a specific science, but also to the entire lexical system of the language.

According to Latu M.N. system-functional indicators of terminology are often hidden, but the terminological system is distinguished by pronounced systemic properties [6, p. 103].

However, the statement that the totality of the terms of a language cannot be called a term system is unlikely to be true, because this totality fully meets the signs of systemicity and functionality. Moreover, the terminology and terminological system has the same lexical content.

As you know, the terms often penetrate the national vocabulary. Therefore, the statement of Anisimova A.G. and Chatelet, that the concept of the terminosphere can be considered as an area of semantics, which is covered by terms, but does not reveal the nature of the relationship between the elements of the terminology that are important for communication. Perhaps this concept is approaching in its content to a semantic terminological field.

A.N. Gamov, who raises the issues of distinguishing between the term system and terminology, believes that these are completely different levels of systematization and normalization of special knowledge. So, the term system is a consciously formed set of terms. The terminology, according to him, is characterized by a spontaneously formed set of terms [4, p. 59].

The distinguishing features of the terms analyzed earlier showed that, in fact, the term differs from the commonly used word only in belonging to a certain conceptual field and a sufficiently large number of terms do not meet the requirements for linguists.

The opinion of terminology as a spontaneously established set of terms seems unlawful on the grounds that this set, like any system, consists of elements that enter into certain relationships among themselves (logical, syntagmatic, functional), and through observation of the elements and their communication can establish the order of their interaction and functioning.

However, there is an opposite opinion in linguistic science that terminology is regarded as a stable system with a strict order. It incorporates both accumulated experience and new formations, borrowings from other languages. Such an opinion is contained in the works of such researchers as L.A. Pekarskaya, Yu.N. Sdobnova, who raise questions about the principles and methods of analysis of modern military terminology, the preparation and use of scientific and technical dictionaries in the information support system, as well as some issues that consider the discursive features of the modern military terminological system of the armed forces.

Linguists who adhere to a complex-variological approach approach the interpretation of the term completely differently. So, A.P. Arkhipova expresses the opinion that the term must be considered an element of the term system. She considers it as the totality of all variants of a non-linguistic sign and these variants express special concepts of various fields of activity.

Garbovsky N.K., Mishkurov E.N., analyzing the essence of terminology, they express the idea that this is a complex system consisting of linguistic characters of a special kind. This system operates in a special field of activity of people. It helps to preserve the accumulated experience of many generations, as well as the transfer of knowledge, in addition, it also helps to refine and systematize knowledge in a special professional scientific field. Therefore, representatives of this point of view believe that the terminology is determined by the term system.

Many researchers identify the concepts of terminology and terminology. So, E.G. Pyrikov believes that in all spheres of activity both objects and their signs are related to each other. They are systematically organized into concepts. And this applies to any field of knowledge, including military. It should be noted that the concepts of terminology and terminology are sometimes considered synonymous. T.V. Demidovich just considers these concepts. But it clarifies that the concept of a terminological system has a direct connection with a person, but the concept of terminology is associated with a general language essence.

The given points of view indicate that in modern philological science there are different approaches to distinguishing between the concepts of the terminological system and terminology. However, given the systematic nature of human knowledge of the world, even if they are not perfect and will subsequently undergo changes, their linguistic reflection will be systemic. With the development of scientific knowledge, the terminology that describes them can change, as well as the terminological system is not free from external influence due to the development of scientific theories. Given that the terminology reflects the scientific knowledge that constitutes a system, the conclusion about the synonymy of the analyzed concepts suggests itself.

In any attempt to systematize terminology, the most important aspect of research is the systemic factor, in some cases understood as the interconnection of concepts of a certain field of knowledge. The connection between the terms of various sciences is especially evident when considering the terminologies of those areas of knowledge that were born as a result of the budding of previously formed industries and their terminological systems.

The meaningful structure of the term has its own semantic and functional system, the meaning of the term is represented by a set of sem components. According to the semantic and functional features, the terms form the groups from which the hierarchy of the term system is formed. The semantic requirements for the term can be implemented in the development trends of term systems, analyzing which you can judge how it meets the requirements. However, the study of the terminology of different subject areas indicates that the terms are not free from the characteristics that linguists attribute to their shortcomings.

Conclusion:-

Continuity of cognition of the world, continuous improvement of the conceptual apparatus of science contributes to the manifestation of qualitative and quantitative changes in terminology, some units become obsolete, go out of use, others appear that indicate new concepts, the semantic volume of existing terms changes. In the process of clarifying scientific theories, a variation in the meaning of terms can occur, which ensures the adjustment of semantics as a result of scientific research. The semantic variability acquired by the term during its functioning is a manifestation of the universal property of language - continuous development and change.

References:-

1. Arnold I.V. Stylistics of modern English language. – Moscow: Flinta, Science, 2006. – 295 p.
2. Bogushevich D.G. Unit. Function. Level. To the problem of classifying language units. – Minsk: High school, 1985. – 116 p.
3. Galperin I.R. Big English-Russian dictionary. – V. 1-2. – Moscow: SE, 1972. I v. – 822 p.; II v. – 863 p. [BARD]
4. Gamov A.N. Definition of “military terminology” and “military term” in modern linguistics. – Online scientific journal «APRIORI. Part: Humanitarian sciences». - www.apriori-journal.ru, 2017. - № 4. – P. 56 -61.
5. Kiselyov B.V. English-Russian dictionary of military and associated lexics. – Moscow: East-West, 2005. – 283 p.
6. Latu M.N. Military terminology in modern political discourse. // Political linguistics, 2011 - № 3. – P. 98-104.
7. Pazukhin P.V. Language, function and communication. // Problems of linguistics, 1979. - № 6. – P. 42-50.