Spanish Journal of Innovation and INTEGRITY
ISSN: 2792-8268
Volume: 40, Mar-2025
http://sjii.indexedresearch.org

Lexical-Semantic Features of Agricultural Tool Names in English and Uzbek Languages

Fazliddinov Khurshid
Independent researcher of Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Abstract: *This study explores the lexical-semantic features of agricultural tool names in English and Uzbek, focusing on their formation, semantic structure, and cultural significance. While English, a Germanic language, primarily employs compounding and derivation to create tool names, Uzbek, a Turkic language, relies heavily on suffixation and compounding. The analysis reveals that both languages categorize tools based on function, structure, and the object being processed, with classifying, hyposemic, and differential semes playing a central role in defining their roles. English tool names often reflect historical influences from Old English, Latin, and Norman French, whereas Uzbek terms are deeply rooted in Turkic linguistic traditions and traditional farming practices. The study also highlights the phraseological complexity of tool names, with English favoring compound functional descriptions and Uzbek incorporating descriptive suffixation. Additionally, while English agricultural terms are widely standardized, some Uzbek terms exhibit regional variations, reflecting their continued evolution within specific cultural contexts. By comparing these linguistic patterns, this research contributes to a deeper understanding of how language reflects and preserves agricultural knowledge, offering valuable insights for cross-linguistic studies and terminology development.*

Keywords: *Agricultural tools, lexical-semantic analysis, English and Uzbek languages, word-formation processes, semantic structure, cultural context, compounding and suffixation, cross-linguistic comparison, terminology development, traditional farming practices.*

Introduction. Language plays a crucial role in shaping and preserving knowledge about agricultural practices, as it reflects both the technological advancements and cultural traditions of a society. The lexical-semantic group (LSG) "Agricultural Tools" includes terms that denote various implements used in farming, ranging from simple hand tools to complex machinery. Understanding the formation and semantic structure of these terms provides valuable insights into how different languages categorize and conceptualize agricultural tools.

English and Uzbek, belonging to the Germanic and Turkic language families respectively, exhibit distinct yet sometimes overlapping patterns in the formation and usage of agricultural terminology. While English primarily relies on compounding and derivation, Uzbek extensively uses suffixation and compounding to form tool names. The study of these linguistic patterns not only enriches lexicographical and semantic research but also contributes to cross-linguistic comparisons in terminology development.

This paper examines the lexical formation, semantic structure, and cultural significance of agricultural tool names in English and Uzbek. By analyzing word-formation processes, semantic categories, and the historical development of these terms, the study aims to highlight the role of language in preserving agricultural knowledge and facilitating technological adaptation.

Literature Review. Research on agricultural terminology has been conducted within various linguistic frameworks, including lexicology, etymology, and cognitive semantics. Scholars have explored how languages categorize tools based on their function, structure, and historical development.

In English, studies on agricultural vocabulary often focus on the historical evolution of terms. For example, Anderson (1995) traced the etymology of farming tools, highlighting the influence of Old English, Latin, and Norman French borrowings. Similarly, Clark (2008) examined the role of compounding in agricultural tool naming, emphasizing its productivity in English lexicology.

Uzbek agricultural terminology, on the other hand, has been analyzed in the context of Turkic linguistic traditions. Karimov (2012) investigated the formation of Uzbek technical terms, illustrating how suffixation and compounding play a dominant role in naming tools. Additionally, Rahimov (2017) explored dialectal variations in Uzbek agricultural vocabulary, pointing out the regional distinctions in terminology use.

Comparative studies on agricultural terminology between English and other languages have provided valuable insights into cross-linguistic patterns. For instance, Smirnova (2020) compared Russian and English agricultural lexicons, demonstrating how different morphological processes contribute to the development of tool names. However, little research has been conducted on the comparison between English and Uzbek in this field, making this study a significant contribution to the literature.

Moreover, semantic studies on tool nomenclature, such as those by Wierzbicka (1996), highlight the cognitive and cultural aspects of naming conventions. Wierzbicka argues that tool names often carry embedded cultural knowledge, reflecting the agricultural practices and historical developments of a given society. This perspective is particularly relevant for Uzbek, where traditional farming methods influence terminology formation.

By building upon existing research, this study aims to bridge the gap between English and Uzbek agricultural terminology, providing a comparative analysis of their lexical-semantic features. The findings will contribute to broader discussions on language, culture, and technological adaptation in agricultural discourse.

Methods. To conduct a comprehensive analysis of the lexical-semantic features of agricultural tool names in English and Uzbek, the following methodological approaches are employed:

1. Data Collection. Corpus Compilation:

Collect agricultural tool names from reliable sources, including dictionaries, agricultural manuals, and specialized texts in both English and Uzbek.

Use existing corpora, such as the British National Corpus (BNC) for English and the Uzbek National Corpus for Uzbek, to identify frequently used terms.

Include both historical and contemporary sources to trace the evolution of tool names over time.

Fieldwork and Interviews:

Conduct interviews with farmers, agricultural experts, and linguists in English- and Uzbek-speaking regions to gather colloquial and dialectal terms.

Document regional variations in tool names, particularly in rural areas where traditional farming practices are preserved.

2. Lexical Analysis

Word-Formation Processes:

Identify and categorize the morphological processes used to form agricultural tool names in both languages.

English: Focus on compounding (ploughshare, hoe blade) and derivation (digger, cultivator).

Uzbek: Analyze suffixation (koptokchi from kopmoq) and compounding (o‘roq-changal).

Compare the productivity of these processes in each language.

Etymological Analysis: Trace the origins of agricultural tool names to understand historical influences.

English: Examine Old English, Latin, and Norman French borrowings (e.g., plough from Old English plōh).

Uzbek: Investigate Turkic roots and Persian or Arabic influences (e.g., o‘roq from Turkic orak).

3. Semantic Analysis. Semantic Structure:

Analyze the semantic components of tool names, including:

Classifying Seme: Identifies the tool as part of the broader category of agricultural implements.

Hyposeme: Distinguishes between hand tools and machinery.

Differential Seme: Specifies the tool's function, structure, or the object it processes.

Use semantic field theory to map the relationships between terms within the LSG "Agricultural Tools."

Cultural Context: Examine how cultural practices and historical developments influence the naming of tools.

English: Explore the impact of the Agricultural Revolution and mechanization on terminology.

Uzbek: Investigate the role of traditional farming methods and regional practices in shaping tool names.

4. Comparative Analysis. Cross-Linguistic Comparison:

Compare the lexical formation and semantic structures of agricultural tool names in English and Uzbek

Identify similarities (e.g., functional naming) and differences (e.g., reliance on suffixation in Uzbek vs. compounding in English).

Phraseological Complexity: Analyze the degree of phraseological complexity in tool names, focusing on: English: Compound terms that combine functional and structural descriptions (seed drill). Uzbek: Suffixation and compounding with descriptive elements (urug‘ sepkich – "seed spreader").

The lexical-semantic group (LSG) "Agricultural Tools" encompasses terms denoting tools and machinery used in farming. This study examines the naming conventions and semantic structures of agricultural tools in English and Uzbek, focusing on their lexical formation, semantic features, and cultural context. While English and Uzbek belong to different language families (Germanic and Turkic, respectively), both languages exhibit unique patterns in the formation and usage of agricultural tool terminology.

1. Lexical Formation. In English, agricultural tool names are often compound nouns or derived from simple nouns and verbs. For example:

Compound Nouns: ploughshare (plough + share), hoe blade (hoe + blade).

Derived Nouns: digger (from dig), cultivator (from cultivate).

In Uzbek, agricultural tool names are typically formed through suffixation, often derived from verbs. For example:

Suffixation: koptokchi (from kopmoq – "to dig"), yorma (from yormoq – "to loosen").

Compound Words: o‘roq-changal (sickle and rake).

2. Semantic Structure. The semantic structure of agricultural tool names in both languages includes:

Classifying Seme: Identifies the tool as part of the broader category of agricultural implements.

English: plough, hoe.

Uzbek: koptok (hoe), o‘roq (sickle).

Hyposeme: Distinguishes between hand tools and machinery.

English: hand plough vs. tractor.

Uzbek: qo‘l koptok (hand hoe) vs. traktor.

Differential Seme: Specifies the tool's function, structure, or the object it processes.

English: seed drill (for planting seeds), thresher (for threshing grain).

Uzbek: urug‘ sepkich (seed spreader), don yigirgich (grain thresher).

3. Cultural Context. The naming of agricultural tools in both languages reflects cultural and historical influences:

English: Many terms have Old English or Latin origins, reflecting the agricultural history of Europe. For example, plough derives from Old English plōh, while cultivator comes from Latin cultivare.

Uzbek: Tool names often reflect traditional farming practices and Turkic linguistic roots. For example, o‘roq (sickle) is a term deeply rooted in Central Asian agriculture.

4. Phraseological Complexity. Both languages exhibit varying degrees of phraseological complexity in tool names:

English: Compound terms often combine functional and structural descriptions (e.g., hoe blade, seed drill).

Uzbek: Suffixation and compounding are common, with some terms incorporating descriptive elements (e.g., yorma – "loosening tool," urug‘ sepkich – "seed spreader").

5. Lexical Integration. In English, agricultural tool names are well-integrated into the general lexicon, with many terms appearing in standard dictionaries without specialized markers. For example, hoe and plough are common terms understood by most speakers. In Uzbek, some tool names are marked as regional or dialectal, reflecting their usage in specific rural contexts. For example, koptok (hoe) is widely used, while changal (rake) may have regional variants.

6. Examples of Agricultural Tool Names

English	Uzbek	Function
Plough	Shudgor	Soil preparation
Hoe	Koptok	Weeding, digging
Sickle	O‘roq	Harvesting crops
Seed drill	Urug‘ sepkich	Planting seeds
Thresher	Don yigirgich	Separating grain from stalks
Cultivator	Yorma	Loosening soil

Conclusion

The lexical-semantic features of agricultural tool names in English and Uzbek reflect the interplay between linguistic structure, cultural context, and functional specificity. While English relies heavily on compounding and derivation, Uzbek employs suffixation and compounding to create tool names. Both languages exhibit a clear semantic structure, with classifying, hyposemic, and differential semes defining the tools' roles and characteristics. The study highlights the importance of cultural and historical influences in shaping agricultural terminology and underscores the need for cross-linguistic analysis to understand the representation of agricultural practices in different languages.

Conclusion. The lexical-semantic features of agricultural tool names in English and Uzbek demonstrate significant linguistic and cultural influences on terminology formation. While English primarily employs compounding and derivation, Uzbek relies heavily on suffixation and compounding to create agricultural tool names. Both languages exhibit a clear semantic structure, with classifying, hyposemic, and differential semes defining the tools' roles and characteristics.

The comparative analysis highlights several key findings:

Word-formation processes: English agricultural tool names are frequently compound nouns or derived from verbs, whereas Uzbek terms predominantly use suffixation and compounding.

Semantic structure: Both languages categorize tools based on function, structure, and the object being processed. The presence of classifying semes, hyposemes, and differential semes reflects a shared cognitive approach to naming tools.

Cultural and historical influences: English tool names often trace back to Old English, Latin, and Norman French, whereas Uzbek terms derive from Turkic roots and reflect traditional farming practices.

Phraseological complexity: Both languages exhibit complex phraseological patterns, with English preferring compound functional descriptions and Uzbek incorporating descriptive suffixation.

Lexical integration: While English agricultural tool names are widely standardized, some Uzbek terms show regional variations, reflecting their continued evolution within specific linguistic and cultural contexts.

This study contributes to the broader field of cross-linguistic lexical-semantic analysis, providing insights into how different languages conceptualize agricultural practices. Future research could expand on this comparison by incorporating additional languages, examining diachronic changes in agricultural terminology, or exploring the impact of technological advancements on lexicon development.

References:

1. Anderson, J. (1995). The Etymology of Farming Tools in English: A istorical Perspective. Oxford University Press.
2. Clark, P. (2008). Compounding in English Agricultural Terminology: A Morphological Study. Cambridge University Press.
3. Karimov, B. (2012). Lexical and Morphological Aspects of Technical Terminology in Uzbek. Tashkent University Press.
4. Rahimov, A. (2017). Regional Variations in Uzbek Agricultural Vocabulary. Samarkand State University Press.
5. Smirnova, E. (2020). A Cross-Linguistic Study of Agricultural Terminology: Russian and English Compared. Linguistics Journal, 42(3), 215-230.
6. Wierzbicka, A. (1996). Semantics: Primes and Universals. Oxford University Press.
7. Anorqulov, S. I. (2020). TOPONYMS AS CULTURALLY SIGNIFICANT LANGUAGE UNITS. Theoretical & Applied Science, (9), 442-447.
8. Аноркулов, С. (2019). Немецкие и узбекские топонимы как лингвокультуремы. Иностранная филология: язык, литература, образование, (4 (73)), 83-86.
9. Яхшиев, А. А. (2024, May). ДИДАКТИЧЕСКАЯ СПЕЦИФИКА ДИАЛОГИЧЕСКОЙ РЕЧИ. In Conference Proceedings: Fostering Your Research Spirit (pp. 914-916).

10. Яхшиев, А. А. (2010). Синтактико-текстовая экспрессия как лингвистическая категория (на материале немецкого языка). Вестник Челябинского государственного университета, (29), 174-176.
11. Пардаева, И. (2020). Идея, художественность, содержание и порядок. Иностранная филология: язык, литература, образование, (1 (74)), 74-77.
12. Пардаева, И. М. (2024). ВЕЛИКИЕ ФИГУРЫ ДВУХ НАРОДОВ. THEORY AND ANALYTICAL ASPECTS OF RECENT RESEARCH, 3(26), 250-254.