

UDC: 8.81-139

**COGNITIVE AND PRAGMATIC CHARACTERISTICS OF
VOCABULARY UNITS RELATED TO THE AGRICULTURAL
DISCOURSE**

Egamberdiyeva Dildora Usubjonovna

*Lecturer of department of foreign languages, faculty of agro engineering and
hydro melioration, Andijan Institute of Agriculture and Agro technologies*

Abstract: 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.

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

This work examines the structure and semantics of modern English terminology used in education. Education is currently one of the fundamental elements of the social infrastructure of developed countries. The organization of education systems in these countries is directly linked to the needs of the current stage of the scientific and technological revolution, necessitating educational reform. It should be noted that the process of reform in this area of human activity is virtually continuous: changes are constantly being made to the structure and organization of various components of the system. At a certain stage of a system's development, the need for fundamental reforms arises.

This article is devoted to the term as a phenomenon, since we consider it necessary to clarify what is meant by the term in our work and on what grounds this or that linguistic unit became the object of our research.

The methodological basis of the work is the most important principles of interpreting language as a socio-cultural and cognitive phenomenon. The problem of the term as a key concept of terminology has received wide coverage in domestic and foreign linguistics: it is reflected in the works of K. Ya. Averbukh, O. S. Akhmanova, M. Ya. Blokh, G. O. Vinokur, B. N. Golovin, S. V. Grinev, V. P. Danilenko, G. A. Dianova, T. L. Kandelaki, L. A. Kapanadze, A. Ya.

Klimovitsky, R. Yu. Kobrin, V. M. Leychik, D. S. Lotte, A. A. Reformatsky, A. V. Superanskaya, V. A. Tatarinov, S. D. Shelov, E. Wuster, L. Olshka, J. Sager, H. Felber and many other linguists.

The cognitive-pragmatic characteristics of agricultural lexical units include their semantic structure (cognitive aspect), reflecting knowledge about agricultural activities, and their functional use (pragmatic aspect), linked to the speaker's communicative goals. This means that such units not only name objects but also convey information about them (for example, fertilizer is a substance necessary for plant growth) and are used for specific communicative purposes (instructions, descriptions, persuasion).

- **Cognitive Characteristics: Conceptual Structure:** Words convey specific knowledge about agriculture. For example, the lexical unit "grain harvester" contains cognitive features such as "machine," "engine," "reaper," "threshing," and "grain processing."
- **Semantic Fields:** Words are grouped into semantic fields, such as "crop production" (crops, varieties, cultivation methods), "livestock" (animal species, feeding, breeding), and "mechanization" (agricultural machinery).
- **Associations:** Lexical units evoke associations with other concepts, such as "harvest" being associated with "labor," "season," and "market price."

Pragmatic Characteristics:

- **Communicative Functions:**
- Words are used for various purposes:
- Informing:
- Instructing:
- Persuading:
- **Stylistic Coloring:** Words can be neutral or have a specific stylistic coloring (e.g., scientific, colloquial, professional).

- **Target Audience:** The choice of vocabulary depends on the audience the speaker is addressing. Farmers use certain terms, while city dwellers use other, more general ones.

The relationship between cognitive and pragmatic characteristics: A person's cognitive base (knowledge of agriculture) determines how they will use this vocabulary in communication (pragmatics). The pragmatic task influences the choice of a specific lexical unit. For example, instructions for using fertilizers will use a more precise, cognitively rich term for "fertilizer," whereas in general conversation, the word "fertilizer" will suffice.

Our study examines lexical units related to agricultural discourse, specifically those describing the meat processing process. Within agricultural discourse as a subset of scientific discourse, the personal component is significantly weaker, as its participants are specialists in the field, researchers, and scientists.

The study's material included lexical units collected during direct work at a meat processing plant, as well as agricultural texts and text fragments covering various topics related to meat processing. These texts, using specific linguistic material, allow us to examine the evolution of agricultural terminology, the dynamics of its development, and determine its communicative and pragmatic potential.

The degree of vocabulary development for a given piece of vocabulary indicates public interest in it. By examining changes in agricultural vocabulary, we can trace the development of this industry.

The process of designating, or nominating, newly emerging objects and processes entails a certain degree of rethinking the scope and variation of meanings of existing units of reality. For example, the phenomenon of lacunarity, closely linked to the concept of non-equivalent vocabulary, is particularly evident in the often descriptive translation of the units under study. The introduction of fundamentally new technologies into meat processing necessitates the introduction

of lexical units denoting these objects. The innovation of technologies arises, on the one hand, from the desire to best meet consumer demands, and on the other, to introduce more economical and environmentally friendly methods of processing (in this case, cutting) meat. These phenomena are directly reflected in lexical units: previously used domestic technologies for cutting pork carcasses involved cutting into larger fragments, so-called articles. With the introduction of new imported technologies, the need arose to designate the final cutting products.

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.

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.

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.

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. Akmanova O.S. Dictionary of linguistic terms. Moscow: Sov. encyclopedia, 1966.
3. 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.
4. Babushkin A.P. Types of concepts in the lexical-phraseological semantics of language. Voronezh, 1996.

5. Boldyrev N. N. Cognitive semantics: Lecture course on English philology. Tambov: Tambov University Press, 2000.
6. Gak V.G. Systematicity in vocabulary and typology of lexical meanings//Actual problems of lexicology. Novosibirsk, 1971. Pp. 4-12.
7. Telia V.N. Nomination // Linguistics. Large Encyclopedic Dictionary / Editor-in-chief V.N. Yartseva. - 2nd ed. - M., 2002.