

THE INFLUENCE OF HOMONYMS ON THE PROCESS OF TRANSTERMINOLOGIZATION IN MODERN KARAKALPAK LANGUAGE

Ali Kaljanov

Karakalpak Scientific-Research Institute of
Humanitarian Sciences, Nukus, Uzbekistan
aliyxankaljanov@mail.ru

ABSTRACT

The more homonyms you learn, the more they appear, so this problem is an ongoing process. But the appearance of homonyms in terms is limited. When we examine homonyms in terms, we first distinguish between words whose meanings are numerous, and then check whether these meanings are close to one or far from one another. Then words whose meanings are far away are homonymous terms. Although the question of terms is not sufficiently studied in Karakalpak linguistics, the process of homonyms in terms consists of fragmentary studies. Therefore, in this article we will use terminology dictionaries of Karakalpak and other languages. In this situation, we select homonyms for research using the following formats: common word + term and term + term = homonym term.

Keywords: homonyms, terms, transterminologization, interdisciplinary terms.

INTRODUCTION

Vocabulary has certain system characteristics based both on the extralinguistic relations between the nominated phenomena of reality, and on the intra-linguistic relations between words. The consistency of vocabulary, as well as the units of any other language level, is ensured due to the paradigmatic and syntagmatic connections between words.

Homonyms as an extreme case of polysemy – a phenomenon that is equally characteristic of the general literary language and terminological systems. There is a constant exchange of lexical units between terminology and a common language: words of a common literary language lose some of their properties and become terms, and, conversely, terms become units of a common language. The processes of terminologization and determinologization are the cause of homonyms in various terminological systems. However, it is noted that terminological homonymy differs from a similar phenomenon in the vocabulary of a general literary language. An analysis of the terminology of certain areas of training indicates that along with unambiguous terms there are ambiguous terms and homonyms. Until now, there have been no special studies in the Karakalpak language devoted to the problem of homonymous terms. Therefore, we are based on foreign researchers.

In 1931, the first article by D.S. Lotte "The Next Challenges of Technical terminology" followed by a number of other articles. In the articles of D. S. Lotte investigated the structure of technical terminology and found out that in its composition there are terms of a polysemantic nature, terms-synonyms, terms homonyms, "semi-terms", i.e. words that in some cases are terms, for example, when designating any part in the mechanism, where it is the only one, in other cases, they are not terms, for example, when designating several parts performing different functions in the same mechanism; valid terms that do not have synonyms and are not homonyms in relation to other terms; descriptive terms that are given in textbooks to describe a particular subject or concept. Unlike works of the dictionary type D.S. Lotte was the first to not only find out the composition of technical terminology, but also gave a classification of terms in terms of their formation, put forward the tasks and methods of work

to streamline technical terminology and defined the tasks and methods of study «term» (Lotte, 1931). Later D.S. Lotte formulated the basic requirements for a scientific and technical «term» (Lotte, 1940) considered one of the ways of forming scientific and technical terms (Lotte, 1941), highlighted the issue of homonymy in scientific and technical terminology (Lotte, 1944), found out the main feature of scientific and technical terminology its systematic nature, consisting in a set of words, in a certain way related to each other, and gave the main types of terms-phrases (Lotte, 1948).

So, for example, some researchers argue that the «term» is notable for its mandatory unambiguity. A.S. Litvinenko acknowledges the existence of "ambiguous terms", but considers this expression unsuccessful and suggests considering a polysemous "term" a group of unambiguous homonymic terms on the basis that each «term» can have only one meaning (Litvinenko, 1954).

It should be noted, however, that this scientific terminology is not yet established. Terminological homonymy when there is no linkage between two meanings.

Linguists point out that terms should be characterized by the unambiguity of their semantics in order for the norms of law not to allow multiple interpretations (Mikhailovskaya, 1981; Pigolkin & Yusupov, 1983; Khizhnyak, 1997). At the same time, it is generally accepted that some terms are ambiguous. However, many linguists emphasize that terms are characterized only by absolute polysemy, that is, they have several meanings within the vocabulary of the entire language, and not a specific special area, or polysemy, in which there is not a semantic, but an onomasiological change of sign, expressing relations by adjacency.

Yu. V. Slojenikina believes that the terms of intersystem functioning are homonyms due to the fact that they are communicatively fixed in different areas of knowledge, and those highly specialized lexical units that have two or more meanings within the boundaries of one term place are polysemants (Slojenikina, 2002).

In turn, A.V. Superanskaya, N. V. Podolskaya, and N. V. Vasilyeva understand this process as terminological conversion, "the transfer of a ready-made term from one discipline to another with its full or partial reinterpretation and transformation into an interdisciplinary homonym". As we can see, this definition focuses on the fact that in the process of implementing transterminologization, the emergence of new interdisciplinary terms based on the development of polysemy, polysemy, but the emergence of interdisciplinary homonyms is carried out. Accordingly, in the course of the study, it is important to identify the essence of both the process of transterminologization itself, and to distinguish between the concepts of interdisciplinary homonyms and interdisciplinary terms (Superanskaya & Podolskaya & Vasilyeva, 2012).

The presence of common semes in concepts reflected by one lexical form puts the concept of polysemy on a par with homonymy. V. M. Leychik solves the problem of distinguishing between these two phenomena as follows: "if, as a result of splitting the meaning of a term or transferring the name to another concept, the semantic structure of the received terms retains a common main seme and the secondary semes diverge, then polysemy is formed; if there is a coincidence of the secondary semes, and the main seme splits, then semantic homonymy is formed" (Leychik, 1991). The meaning of a polysemical term can develop so much that it becomes a homonymy.

A similar position is presented in the works of O. Yu. Shmeleva. In addition to the qualities inherent in all the terms mentioned above, interdisciplinary polysemants acquire additional properties. O. Yu. Shmeleva, based on the study of interdisciplinary terms, identifies such a property of terminological

information as scattering, which is associated with the use of one term in different terminological systems (Shmeleva, 2010).

A somewhat contradictory position is presented in the works of T. V. Ryzhenkova. The author exposes a detailed study of the process of transterminologization of the transition of terms from one sphere to another, as a result of which she comes to the conclusion that during transterminologization, homonymous nominative units are formed, and in relation to terminology, even those nominees should be considered homonymous, which in their meanings retain a common semantic component in different term systems. In other words, the author adheres to the position that the transterminologization does not expand the semantic structure of the term, but the formation of a new homonymous terminological unit (Ryzhenkov, 2001).

A. G. Monogarova, E. I. Kobysheva, based on the study of the features of the functioning of transterms in the field of mediation, distinguish the following groups of intersectoral terms: 1) transterms that function without changing the meaning; 2) transterms that have undergone a special meaning specialization; 3) transterms that are part of multicomponent terms. Accordingly, according to the researchers, the development of polysemy of the term is carried out exclusively in the last group of lexical units, in a situation where the term is included in another multicomponent unit or construction, acquiring additional meanings (Monogarova, & Kobysheva, 2016).

Yu. D. Apresyan points out the presence of polysemy, polysemy even in the absence of common components of meaning: The presence of semantic connections between the lexemes of a polysemous word does not necessarily imply that all its lexemes will have a semantic invariant. A well-known phenomenon of chain polysemy... it is based on pairwise semantic connections between neighboring tokens, and the first and last or one of the last links in this chain may have nothing in common with each other. In other words, it is possible to talk about the polysemy of a terminological unit even if the generalizing lexeme, the semantics of which is able to unite all denotations, is absent, when the relationship between the meaning of denotations is of a chain nature, based on pairwise semantic relationships (Apresyan, 2009).

Jabo in his dissertation notes the following: Difficulties in translating environmental terms in the scientific and journalistic style arise mainly on the basis of the interpretation of the word as a term of different term systems, that is, the homonymy of the sign of the scientific language. A lexical or phraseological unit that already exists in the language is assigned a terminological status. An apparent transparency is created by the internal form of the term (Jabo, 2015).

In the Karakalpak language, the problems of terms are investigated. But, so far, homonyms have not been considered in terms of. Therefore, we briefly study these issues. When studying, select several dictionary terms.

DISCUSSION

Homonyms in the context of terminology are very different from a similar phenomenon in a general literary language: First, terminology uses only one kind of homonymy, namely, the one that is the result of the semantic development of the word, its polysemy. Secondly, homonymy in relation to terminology can only be characterized as an intersystem phenomenon: either these terms of different term systems, or these terms of the lexical and semantic way of formation, which have become homonyms in relation to the words of the general literary language that gave rise to them.

In a situation where the term is used simultaneously in various fields of scientific knowledge and practical activity, we are not talking about an interdisciplinary term but about homonyms. The ambiguity of many terms is caused by the fact that they are formed from common words. At the same time, having become terms, they, along with new special meanings, retain the general literary meaning.

Homonymic relations between words are uncharacteristic of terminology. However, in Karakalpak terminology, its type is widely used, such as structural homonymy, which consists in the formation of words of other parts of speech from already existing words using conversion. This type of homonyms is widely represented in the general literary Karakalpak language and in all its other varieties and is due to the lack of endings in words that manifest their belonging to a particular part of speech. Just as in a general literary language, the differentiation of structural homonyms in the vocabulary of a special sublanguage occurs on the basis of their syntactic functions in a sentence.

The method of term formation in the Karakalpak language:

1. The criteria that a term must meet in practice are not always met, and the question of the mandatory nature of certain requirements for the definition of a term, in particular, unambiguity, remains quite relevant at present.
2. The definition of the term, which we will adhere to in this work, is as follows: a term is a word or phrase of a special language created to accurately express special concepts and designate special objects, which has a connection not only with the actual terminological system, but also with the entire set of other language systems. This position in the interpretation of the term allows you to discover a variety of forms of its manifestation, which reveal this object from different sides and together give the most complete and objective idea of its essence.
3. Polysemies and homonyms of the terminological vocabulary of the sublanguage under study are a natural linguistic phenomenon, the causes of which are the semantic development of the sign itself, the divergence of the meanings of the polysemic word, the constant development and replenishment of the language due to the emergence of new concepts related to the development of science and technology and the natural interaction of the main layers of vocabulary – general literature, general scientific and special, etc.
4. The term, as well as the word as a whole, has the properties of consistency and valence. The valence of a term can be either simply syntactic or semantic.
5. The interdisciplinary terminological polysemants analyzed in our work can be classified as homonymous lexical units in cases where their semantics differ critically.

During the translation analysis of the selected terminological units, it was found that for many interdisciplinary polysemants, it is possible to choose a common semantic feature for all its meanings, but when this is not possible, we must recognize that some variants of the meanings of the same term are in the relations of homonymy, and not polysemy.

In this article, we will look at medical, chemical, anatomical, pharmaceutical terms. In the Karakalpak language, homonyms are formed in the following format: term + term and common word + term = homonym terms.

Table 1. Term + term

No	terms	Meanings	Meanings
1	butan	organic compound, a hydrocarbon of the alkane class	Country of Asia
2	titan	chemical element with atomic number 22	Austronesian language
3	uran	planet of the solar system	chemical element with atomic number 92
4	debet	left side of the accounting account	the amount due for payment or receipt as a result of economic relations with a legal entity or individual
5	xorda	in planimetry, a segment connecting two points of a given curve	Dorsal string

Above, we looked at some homonyms by form: term + term. Following we will look at the form: term + common word.

Table 2. term + common word

No	terms	Meanings	Meanings
1	bor	chemical element of the 13th group, the second period of the periodic table	soil
2	kobalt	chemical element with atomic number 27	Type of car
3	jut	fiber extracted from the plant	swallow it
4	uran	planet of the solar system	motto
5	mol	hydrotechnical protective structure for the protection of the port's water area from waves, adjacent to the shore at one end.	Much, many

Above, we have considered five terms of homonyms. In this method, we will consider all common words that have the same form as the term to be homonymous terms. Because in such a situation, the values cannot be close.

The phenomenon of terminological polysemy, based on the object of study, is primarily related to the specialization of the meaning of the term, and at the same time, in contrast to terminological homonymy, structural and semantic variants of polysemantic words show their obvious prototypical similarity. Terminological uncertainty is categorical in nature and is the result of conversion. Terminological homonymy is manifested in the use of the same terminology in terms of the set of sounds and letters in completely different fields of scientific knowledge, and this occurs in completely different contexts.

One of the most effective tools for representing the results of the implementation of cognitive processes is the term system, scientific terms that reflect the concepts of a specific field of scientific knowledge. Unfortunately, to date, the features of changes in the semantics and functioning of terms in the modern Karakalpak language remain poorly studied in the scientific literature. Meanwhile, understanding the features of the development, functioning, and use of borrowed terminological units will allow us to identify the mechanisms, causes, and main trends in the development of both the

terminological systems of the modern Karakalpak language and the language system as a whole, to identify universal, general patterns of the development of the lexical subsystem, as well as unique, distinctive features of the development of terminological systems.

Accordingly, there is a contradiction due to the increased growth of scientific interest in the study of various aspects of the development of the language system, relationships, interactions of personality-language-culture, and insufficient knowledge, understanding of the features of the development of modern term systems of the Karakalpak language. In accordance with the tasks set, it seems appropriate to turn to the identification of the uniqueness of interdisciplinary terms. First of all, it should be noted that the problem of interdisciplinary terminology is not new in the scientific literature, but to this day it remains studied in fragments. First of all, it should be noted that the appearance of interdisciplinary terms, transterms, is the result of the processes of transterminologization. This process in the modern scientific literature can be understood as an analytical process associated with the possibilities of using terms of one scientific field in another, due to the possibilities of different terminological applications of the concept in demand and accompanied by various changes in this term.

The process of using other terms, rather than lexical units-terms, as the source material for the formation of terms semantically, as well as the fact that during the implementation of the process, the term undergoes semantic transformations. The result of this process is the appearance of interdisciplinary terms based on the development of polysemy, the homonym of the term.

Transterminologization, accordingly, can be understood as one of the objective laws of the development of scientific knowledge, along with integration, differentiation, internationalization, unification and economization. The law of the language sign is the basis for the appearance of interdisciplinary terms, the phenomenon of terminological homonyms. Since the set of signs of each language system is limited, and experience and knowledge are unlimited, the units of the outer shell find themselves in a situation of stretching, the need to accommodate connections with new varieties and shades of linguistic meaning. The terminological homonyms are based on the limited means of the language of science with the unlimited derivation of new knowledge, which leads to the need for their conceptualization, as a result of which science uses words that already exist in the language to express a new concept. The creation of additional meanings saves the scientific language from the need for the endless creation of new words and facilitates the communication processes between representatives of the scientific community. It is important to add that today the perception of semantic ambiguity is characterized by ambiguity in the scientific community.

In the modern scientific literature, there is no unity in understanding the results of borrowing terms from one field of scientific knowledge to another: some researchers emphasize that as a result of transterminologization, the formation of interdisciplinary terms is carried out on the basis of the development of the semantic structure, the formation of new denotative meanings, others believe that as a result of the transfer, the formation of a new lexeme, and interdisciplinary homonym, which, coinciding in form with the term of the sphere of borrowing, has a completely different semantics.

The emergence of interdisciplinary polysemies are a progressive evolutionary process of the development of meanings already embedded in the structure of the term, the meaning of the polysemies are directly connected with the already formed meanings, while the homonym goes through a long path of its development, as a result of which it becomes identical in form and sound with the existing ones. Accordingly, the development of polysemy and homonymy is carried out in

different ways: in homonymy, two or more lexical units coincide in form, in polysemy, one lexical unit develops several meanings without undergoing formal changes, the meaning of the homonym follows from the form, the formation of the term is carried out in a situation where the meaning, the need for the nomination of scientific knowledge, is looking for a form for its expression, representation.

CONCLUSION

Within the framework of this study, the revealed difference between homonymy and polysemy is important because it allows us to conclude that the development of polysemy is based solely on the semantic structure of the term, morphological and phonetic characteristics of the word remain unchanged, and are not subject to transformations.

Transterminologization can be understood as one of the types of intersystem borrowing, but intersystem borrowing is a broader concept that is used as a nomination of borrowings from both term systems and systems of general literary language, jargon, dialects, colloquialisms. It is important to add that the development of polysemy of the word is only one of the results of the implementation of transterminologization.

The result of transterminologization can be both the development of the polysemy of the term, and the narrowing of existing semantic meanings: during transterminologization, thus, a certain change in the meaning of the term occurs: new conceptual features, components of meaning are added to the concept verbalized by it, or, on the contrary, it is deprived of the already existing features. Thus, on the basis of the conducted analysis, it can be concluded that in interdisciplinary terms these are the result of the process of transterminologization, as a result of which the transfer of a terminological unit from one field of scientific practice to another is carried out. It is important to add that today there is no unity in the perception of the results of the implementation of this process in the scientific community: some researchers believe that in the process of transition there is an interdisciplinary homonym, others an interdisciplinary term.

REFERENCES

1. Apresyan Yu. (2009). Research on semantics and lexicography. *Paradigmatika*. Moscow, Vol. 1, 425-426.
2. Kaljanov Ali. (2020). The Universal (Mixed) Homonyms in Modern Karakalpak Language. *Science and Education*, 1 (5), 142-145.
3. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). Grammatical homonyms in modern Karakalpak language. *Journal on International Social Science*, 1 (1), 1-6.
4. Kaljanov Ali. (2020). Problems of training homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language. *International journal of discourse on innovation, integration and education*, 1(2), 10-13.
5. Kaljanov Ali. (2020). The Some Questions of Grammatical Homonyms in Modern Karakalpak Language. *International Journal on Orange Technologies*, 2 (9), 19-21.
6. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). The essence of homonyms in the Karakalpak language. *Journal of Foreign Languages and Linguistics*. 2 (3), 24-26.
7. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). The short study of multiple homonyms in Karakalpak language. *International scientific and current research conferences*, 51-53.
8. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). Problematic aspects of grammatical homonyms. *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 11 (6), 815-821.

9. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). Theoretical basis of homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language. International Scientific and Current Research Conferences, 36-40.
10. Kaljanov Ali. (2020). Межъязыковые омонимы в русском и каракалпакском языках. Современная филология: проблемы и перспективы, 225-229.
11. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). Qaraqalpaq tilindegi omonimler klassifikatsiyasiniń ayırım máseleleri. Вестник Каракалпакского отделения Академии наук Республики Узбекистан, 265 (4), 196-199.
12. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). On the state of the problem of homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language. Вестник КГУ им. Бердаха, 52 (3), 182-185.
13. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). Til oqıtıwda omonimlerdiń ayırım ózgeshelikleri. «Түркий филологияның әхмийетли мәселелери». Илимий мақалалар топламы, 190-193.
14. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). Single homonyms in Karakalpak language. “Қиёсий адабиётшунослик, чоғиштира тилшунослик ва таржимашунослик: муаммо, ечим ва истиқболлар” мавзуидаги халқаро конференция, 74-76.
15. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). Omonimlerde ajratıwda konteksttiń áhmiyeti. Uluslararası Türkbilim Öğrenci Kurultayı Bildiriler Kitabı, 194-200.
16. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). From the point of view of the phenomenon of homonyms in the Karakalpak language. Yangi O'zbekistonda ilm-fan va ta'lim, 1 (1), 182-184.
17. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). Lexico-grammatical homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language. Science and Education, 2 (11), 992-1001.
18. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). The homonymous resources of the word play in the modern Karakalpak language (based on materials of Karakalpak folklore). International journal of word art, 4 (3), 212-218.
19. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). The short analysis of homonyms in the Karakalpak language. "Noi tendințe în predarea limbajelor de specialitate în contextul racordării învățământului la cerințele pieței muncii", conferință internațională online. 4, 251-255.
20. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). A short step towards the classification of homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language. Electronic journal of actual problems of modern science, education and training, 12, 41-45.
21. Kaljanov Ali. (2021). Linguistic features of the sources of homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language. Science and Education in Karakalpakstan, 17 (2), 123-126.
22. Kaljanov Ali. (2020). Роль межъязыковых омонимов в преподавании языка (на примере русского и каракалпакского языков). Advanced methods of teaching foreign languages and their implementation issues in the system of training security personnel, 276-278.
23. Kaljanov Ali. (2022). Homonyms in the modern Karakalpak language: general theoretical questions. Science and Education, 3 (1), 368-385.
24. Khizhnyak S. P. (1997). Legal terminology: formation and composition. Saratov: Sarat Publishing House. un-ta., 15
25. Leychik V. (1991). Historical terminology: its problems, methods of research direction, applications : The term. Terminology readings. Problems of languages for special purposes, scientific and professional communication. Kiev, Part 1. 27.
26. Litvinenko A. (1954). «Term» and metaphor. "Uchenye zapiski", Moscow State Pedagogical Institute, vol. 8.

27. Lotte, D.S. (1931). The next tasks of technical terminology // News of the USSR Academy of Sciences, OTN, Series VII. No. 7
28. Lotte, D.S. (1940). Some fundamental questions of selection and construction of scientific and technical «term»s // Izvestiya AN USSR, OTN. No. 7.
29. Lotte, D.S. (1941). Changing the meanings of words as a means of forming scientific and technical «term»s // Izvestiya AN USSR, OTN.No. 6-8.
30. Lotte, D.S. (1944). Homonyms in scientific and technical terminology // Izvestiya AN USSR, OTN. No. 1-2.
31. Lotte, D.S. (1948). Formation of a system of scientific and technical «term»s // Izvestiya AN USSR, OTN. No. 5-6.
32. Mikhailovskaya N. G. (1981). On the question of "special" words as part of a lexico-semantic group. Terminology and culture of speech. Moscow, 110.
33. Monogarova A. G., Kobysheva E. I. (2016). Transterminologization in the language of mediation. Conditions for the expediency of using transterms. *Juvenis scientia*. No. 6, 24.
34. Pigolkin A. S., Yusupov S. N. (1983). Ways to optimize work on legal terminology. *The Soviet State and Law*. No. 12, 47
35. Ryzhenkova T. (2001). Specificity of the process of transterminologization in the branch term system: Abstract of the PhD thesis. Volgograd, 22.
36. Slojenikina Yu. (2002). Terminological vocabulary in the general language system: a special course in the Russian language for students of philological specialties of higher pedagogical educational institutions. Samara: SamSPU Publishing House, 160.
37. Shmeleva, O. Y. (2010). Terminological processes in diachrony and synchrony (in the English language) SPb, No 119, p. 14.
38. Superanskaya. A. (2012). General terminology: questions of theory / A.V. Superanskaya, N. V. Podolskaya, N. V. Vasilyeva. - 6th ed. - Moscow: Librocom., - 248 p.
39. Zhabo N. I. (2015). On the term system of the French and Russian languages: Structure, semantics, features and methods of translation. Dissertation for the degree of Candidate of Philological Sciences. Moscow, p 130.