

Theoretical and Practical Issues of Technical Terminology

Abdullaeva Fotima Bakhramovna¹, Isarov Oman Risaliyevich²
Jizzakh State Pedagogical Institute, Uzbekistan

Abstract

The article analyzes the current theoretical and practical issues of terminology, in particular, technical terminology. A diachronic study was conducted on the creation and study of technical terminology. The views of terminologists have been studied from an analytical-critical point of view

Keywords: *terminology, term, system, word, compound, combination, affix, noun, concept, formation, construction.*

1 Introduction:

Special research on technical terminology of the Russian language has played an important role in the development of technical terminology (including English and Uzbek as well).

In this regard, a well-known terminologist, the initiator of terminological researches, D.S. Lotte's works are particularly noteworthy. Prof. M.V. Sergievskiy comments on his work as follows: "D.S. Lotte's research is of great importance both for Russian linguistics and for the regulation of technical terminology of the Russian language. It should be noted at this point that D.S. Lotte's work is equally important for English and Uzbek linguistics and terminology. This is because his works reflect the most pressing issues, such as the regulation of technical terms and term creation [1].

D.S. Lotte has shown that there are a number of ways of creating a terminological system [2] which are equally important for both English and Uzbek terminological systems. He showed the following ways of coining technical terms:

1. Changing the meaning of existing terms or words in general practice (common use, circulation) by copying on the basis of technical similarity, external similarity or interdependence (meaning), for example, «*чарчаганлик – усталость – fatigue*», «*чидамлилик – выносливость – endurance*», «*темирдарахт – железное дерево – iron tree*», «*қаршилик – сопротивление – resistance*».
2. Derivation of existing words using different affixes (suffixes, prefixes), for example, in Uzbek «*магнит – магнитлаш – магнитлилик*», in Russian «*магнит – намагничивание – магнитность*», инглизтилидаэса «*magnet – magnetizing – magnetization*».
3. Creation of a new compound (polysemous) word by adding the existing independent words and stems (which can sometimes be abbreviated), for example, «*электровоз – электровоз – electric locomotive*», «*автомашина – автомашина – automobile*».
4. Formation of compound terms, i.e. the transformation of two or more independent words into a permanent compound (combination) by any existing syntactic form, for example, «*ичданёнгицидвигатель – двигательвнутреннегосгорания – internal-combustion engine*», «*яримўтказгичлиприбор – полупроводниковыйприбор – semiconductor instrument (appliance)*».

5. In the reconstruction of terminology and the formation of a new term, the question of how to reconcile, firstly, the requirements of scientific accuracy and, secondly, the requirements of conciseness issues always arise. Therefore, occasionally the work of mastering foreign terms is referred to. There are two ways of coining a new term: 1) transferring a term in written and oral form in its original ready form; 2) translating a foreign term into Russian (into Uzbek, in our case).

The methods of term formation shown by Lotte may also find their practical application in English and Uzbek terminology (translation of technical terms) as well. It should be noted that his collections of works entitled “Fundamentals of Technical Terminology”, “Short Forms of Technical Terms”, “Creation of Three-Element Technical Terms and Their Spelling” are designed to develop theoretical issues of terminology not only in Russian but also in other languages. On this basis, it might also serve as a valuable resource in the formation of a national terminology system.

It is known that in almost all works devoted to technical terminology, units which considered as terms are the lexemes representing certain concepts of a particular field, lexemes having a definition and lexemes performing mainly a nominative function.

Recently, there has been a debate over which word-groups are to be considered as terms. In one of his works, D.S. Lotte writes about the categories in which words can be termed: “... In technology, the main categories representing the following concepts are termed: processes; technical objects (materials, weapons, tools, details, etc.); properties; computational notions (parameters, geometric shapes, etc.); units of measurement” [2], [3].

Well-known terminologist G.O. Vinokur writes in one of his works: “Words expressing certain technical concepts, of course, take the form of abstract nouns, depending on their performance of the terminological function” [4]. He proceeds: “In technical terminology, a verb as a grammatical category of an action is not in the form of a verb that cannot be a logical subject, but in the form of an abstract noun that retains the meaning of the action but can associate it with an abstract objectivity *temper* – *чиниқ тирмоқ* - *закалять*, *sear* – *қуйдирмоқ* - *обжигать*, *etch* – *едирмоқ* - *травить*, etc., obviously performs technical processes, but such abstract nouns as *tempering* – *чиниқ тириш* – *закалка*, *searing* – *қуйдириш* – *обжиг*, *etching* – *едириш* – *травление* serve as the term for these processes”. Similar ideas have been expressed in the works of other scholars. It follows from these ideas that only words belonging to the category of nouns can be termed. As if the matter is clear, but the terminologist V.P. Danilenko, in several of his articles [5], challenged this rigid idea, arguing that words related to other word groups could also be termed. V.P. Danilenko tried to adduce his idea as follows: firstly, the scientific literature uses lexical units belonging to different word groups (relevant examples have been given) that have acquired terminological meaning; secondly, the linguist N.S. Avilova believes [6] that such verbs as *анимализировать*, *ароматизировать*, *локализовать*, *вулканизировать*, *гармонизировать*, as well as such general abstract verbs as *вулгаризовать*, *генерализовать*, *гипнотизировать*, *догматизировать* are termed; thirdly, such adjective-terms as *адекватный*, *иловатый*, *диспаратный*, such verb-terms as *сольфеджировать*, such adverb-terms as *абезвозмездно*, *adagio*, *grave*, such pronoun-terms as *я*, *ничто*, *сам* have been included. Proceeding from this fact, she believes that words other than nouns can also be included in the set of terms. In our view, the evidence presented cannot confirm V.P. Danilenko’s opinion. Our objection to this view is as follows:

Any word encountered in scientific-technical texts cannot be considered as a term. For instance, some Russian-Uzbek terminological dictionaries contain hundreds of words like *во-первых—биринчидан*, *во-вторых—иккинчидан*, *например—масалан*, *к слову—шу ўринда*, *требуется доказать—далил талаб қилинади*, *аналитические—аналитик*. Logically, such words should be removed from the dictionaries, but some authors of the manuscripts considered them as scientific-technical terms, grounding on the fact that such words appear at every page in scientific-technical textbooks and manuals. It is self-evident that

such a description is incorrect, for we know very well that the frequent use of a certain lexical unit in the technical literature does not give the word the status of a term. Is it correct, due to such subjective factors, to assume that *verbs*, *adjectives*, *adverbs*, *pronouns*, and *modalwords* from some dictionaries also possess the status of a scientific-technical term?!

In one of her articles the linguist N.A. Shcheglova states: “Any advanced natural-scientific and technical terminology requires a high degree of abstraction. Terminology is not a set of real thing and action names, but a specific system of names for the concepts of things and actions. Therefore, nouns are the only lexical-semantic means of expressing technical concepts about objects, qualities, and actions” [7].

Thus, we ultimately agree with the above presented view and believe that only words belonging to the category of nouns can be the object of terminology. As for other word groups, it should be noted that “... if the term does not contain a structural component, they’ll be applied in the inculcation of a particular concept, or in the process of scientific expression” [8].

References

1. Sergievskiy M.V. A Review for the Work of D.S. Lotte. - D.S. Lotte. Disclosure and spelling of three-element scientific and technical terms. - M., Publishing House «Science», 1969, - P. 4.
2. Korshunov S.I., Samburova G.G. Preface. - «D.S. Lotte. Short Forms of Scientific and Technical Terms». - M., Publishing House «Science», 1971, - P. 4.
3. Lotte D.S. The Basis of Coining Scientific-Technical Terminology. - M., Publishing House AS USSR, 1961, - P. 29.
4. Vinokur G.O. On the Phenomenon of Word-Building in Russian Technical Terminology. - Canon of MIFLI, Volume V, - P. 13-14.
5. Danilenko V.P. Terminology of Different Parts of Speech (Verb-Terms). «Problems of Science and Technology Language», - P. 40-51.
6. Avilova N.S. Words of International Origin in the Russian Literary Language of Modern Times. - M., Publishing House «Science», 1967, p. 160.
7. Shcheglova N.A. On the Issue of Grammatical Means of Terminization of Russian Verbs in Professional Speech. - M., 1963, - P. 89.
8. Burdin S.M. Speech at the Terminology Council, «The Issues of Terminology», - P. 107.