UDC: 8.81-139

COGNITIVE AND PRAGMATIC CHARACTERISTICS OF LEXICAL UNITS RELATED TO THE AGRICULTURAL SECTOR

Egamberdiyeva Dildora Usubjonovna
Lecturer of department of teaching languages,
Andijan branch of Kokand University
Andijan, Uzbekistan

Abstract: The article examines the cognitive and pragmatic identity of agricultural terms in English. For the first time the study presents the results of a comparative analysis of the cognitive-pragmatic potential. The cognitive approach allows us to explain the emergence and evolution of special concepts, identify the causes and mechanisms of dynamic processes in professional nomination, and determine them by the changing cognitive-communicative needs of scientists.

Key words: agriculture, lexical units, cognitive, concepts, pragmatics, educational purpose, foreign languages, aspect.

In this article, lexical units in linguistics, their pragmatic features, and the semantics of lexical units are analyzed. Definitions and descriptions of concepts such as the connotative component of lexical units, text lexicon, and rational evaluation are also studied.

Being one of the fundamental forms of manifestation of human existence, the subject area of agronomy is characterized by maximum significance for people, uniting nominations of essential categories, notions and concepts in their lives. Nevertheless, the conceptual-terminological, pragmatic, conceptual and sociolinguistic features of agronomic lexical units have not yet been subjected to systematic study,

The material for the study was agricultural texts and text fragments on various topics - on various issues of agriculture, agronomy, genetics, botany, plant growing, soil science, etc.

The methodological basis of the work is the most important principles of interpreting language as a socio-cultural and cognitive phenomenon. The theoretical provisions of the dissertation are based on the fundamental ideas and

concepts of domestic and foreign scientists in the field of language theory: E. Sapir, T. van Dijk, P. Serio, V. I. Karasik, V. G. Kostomarov, Yu. S. Stepanov, V. I. Tkhorik, V. A. Tatarinov, L. Yu. Buyanova, L. A. Novikov, E. S. Kubryakova and others.

A concept may well have a lexical expression, but it is related in language not only to one word. It also correlates with a number of word-formation nests, the original lexemes of which are included in the synonymous series, while the members of the synonymous series form the core of the conceptual paradigm, and the remaining cognate words form its periphery.

A concept is a verbal-mental core, the essence of a person's knowledge and ideas, the meaning of these ideas and knowledge, as Yu.S. Stepanov asserts, the content of the concept, in addition, a concept is a unit of knowledge.

The agronomic terminological concepts "Plants" and "Soil" fall under the definition of single-level concepts (Popova, Sternin, 2001), the base layer of which is only the subject-sensory core, the subject image. The corresponding lexical units act as subject-thematic dominants both in the microsphere of "Plant growing" and in the entire agronomic discourse as a whole, which is due to the cognitive specificity of this subject area.

The factual material showed that more than half of the formants of nouns in the agronomic terminology sphere are unproductive (55%), that is, they form one or two derivatives.

It has been established that discourse, as recognized by scientists, is an abstract invariant description of structural and semantic features realized in specific texts. The ideal to which it is necessary to strive in the process of communication should be considered the maximum correspondence between discourse as an abstract system of rules and discourse (or text) as a specific verbal

As is known, the importance of interdisciplinary connections in linguistics was emphasized back in the early 20th century. Taking into account the leading principle of linguistic research — the principle of anthropocentrism — we believe

that the concepts of “Agronomist,” “Life,” “Living,” “Evolution,” “Plant,” “Soil,” “Seed,” “Fruit,” etc. dominate in agronomic terminology as the basis of agricultural discourse. These concepts are the terminological axes around which systems of terms and basic concepts related to them are formed. It has been established that the lexical, grammatical, and word-formation basis of agricultural discourse in the Russian language are nouns — more than 40% of all lexical units functioning in it. As a specific macrosystem, agricultural/agronomic discourse is characterized by structural-grammatical, lexical-semantic and conceptual-derivational complexity and multidimensionality, which is also determined by the specificity of the agronomic term itself.

The internal structure of terminology systems and its subsystems is distinguished by the allocation of multilevel relations (species-generic, inclusive, partitive, cause-and-effect, subject-object, etc.). Such relations indicate a strict ordering of special concepts and units allocated on their basis within terminology systems.

But in addition to this, each formed (developed) terminology system has a certain conceptual organization, which is fixed by means of linguistic means that appeared as a result of term formation processes. This conceptual organization is based on certain mechanisms for the formation of specific subsystems, structures and formats of knowledge, certain patterns of processing and sorting information, which can be built according to certain canonical and prototypical forms of its linguistic representation.

The linguistic, sign-pragmatic basis of the agronomic terms is the corresponding terminology, which is a systemically ordered continuum of terms functionally aimed at the explication and nomination of scientific and professional concepts that form the logical-conceptual field of the subject area "Agronomy".

The study of agricultural discourse involves identifying the verbal-conceptual and logical-functional features of the agronomic term, which is the

most important nominative-metalinguistic unit of the formation of agroterminology.

Like any terminology system, agronomic terminology performs the following functions: 1) cognitive-gnoseological; 2) metalinguistic; 3) pragmatic; 4) diagnostic-prognostic; 5) systematizing. The phenomenon of migration of terms from related specialized fields of knowledge is relevant for agronomic terminology, due to which, as the analysis showed, the terminology system of the agronomic sphere consists of general scientific, interdisciplinary, highly specialized, and general technical terms of various genesis.

In this regard, agronomic terminology can be interpreted as an area of the language of agricultural (agronomic) science, the logical-conceptual and semantic content of the terms of which reflects the entire system of connections, relationships, patterns, processes, phenomena, etc.

Recognition of a broad approach to the stratification of agronomic terminology naturally entails an expanded understanding of an agronomic term, which is associated with not one, but several concepts, internally articulated and mutually correlated with each other. The basis of conceptual and defining gradation is both the original principle of the unity of knowledge and the principle of definability of one term through another.

It should be especially emphasized that the language of agronomic and agricultural literature as a systemic phenomenon of scientific style is determined by the subject of agronomy as a science, its specificity, as well as the “character of scientific, i.e. abstract thinking”. The predominant position of nouns in agronomic discourse is also largely determined by the structural and subject-thematic specificity of the texts of this cognitive sphere.

A feature of the agronomic discourse is that it has a very wide range of specialized vocabulary. In general, the number of branches of scientific knowledge that form agronomy as a science is about 25-30 (plant growing, plant protection, botany, genetics, seed production, selection, vegetable growing, fruit growing,

chemistry, physics, agronomy, biochemistry, plant physiology, ecology, microbiology, soil science, agricultural aviation, agrophysics, etc.).

As the analysis has shown, there are sufficient grounds to believe that in the modern scientific paradigm, the study of concepts is carried out taking into account their significance and place in culture, in the cultural and linguistic picture of the world.

We believe that if the types of concepts are an attribute of thought processes that are universal for all of humanity, then the picture of the world itself is related to the content of concepts, which differs from language to language.

List of literature used:

1. Anderson O.V. Linguocultural and scientific-mental features of the language of advertising: Abstract of Dis. Cand. Philological Sciences. Krasnodar, 2006.
2. Apresyan Yu.D. Selected Works. Volume I. Lexical Semantics. Moscow, 1995.
3. Gak V.G. Systematicity in vocabulary and typology of lexical meanings//Actual problems of lexicology. Novosibirsk, 1971. Pp. 4-12.
11. P. Askoldov S.A. Concept and word//Russian literature: From the theory of literature to the structure of the text: Anthology.1. Moscow, 1997. Pp. 267-279.
4. Akmanova O.S. Dictionary of linguistic terms. Moscow: Sov. encyclopedia, 1966.
5. Babaeva E.V. Internal form of the word and conceptual approach to language//Language personality: sociolinguistic and emotive aspects. Volgograd; Saratov, 1998. Pp. 126-134.
6. Babushkin A.P. Types of concepts in the lexical-phraseological semantics of language. Voronezh, 1996.
7. Boldyrev N. N. Cognitive semantics: Lecture course on English philology. Tambov: Tambov University Press, 2000.

8. Volkova I. N. Modeling of definitions in terminological standards//Modern problems of Russian terminology. Moscow, 1986.
9. Volodina M.N. Cognitive informational nature of the term (based on the terminology of the mass media). Moscow, 2000.