



---

## **NATIONAL-CULTURAL FEATURES OF AGRICULTURAL TERMINOLOGY IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK**

Qodirova Gulbahor Turdiyevna

Andijan Institute of Agriculture and Agrotechnologies

Tel: +(998) 93 001-00-02; E-mail: g.qodirova75@gmail.com

### **Annotation**

This article presents a comparative analysis of the national and cultural features of agricultural terminology in the English and Uzbek languages. The study examines the sources of formation, historical layers, and linguocultural characteristics of both terminological systems. The agricultural lexicon of English is largely rooted in Anglo-Saxon origins and enriched with borrowings from Romance languages, while Uzbek predominantly contains native Turkic terms along with Arabic, Persian, Russian, and modern English borrowings. Through examples, the paper highlights semantic differences of certain concepts in both languages, translation challenges of cultural-specific words (realia), and the impact of socio-historical factors on the development of terminological systems.

**Keywords:** agricultural terminology, linguoculturology, realia, borrowing, terminological system.

### **Annotatsiya**

Ushbu maqolada ingliz va o'zbek tillaridagi qishloq xo'jaligi terminologiyasining milliy-madaniy xususiyatlari qiyosiy tahlil qilinadi. Tadqiqotda har ikki til terminologiyasining shakllanish manbalari, tarixiy qatlamlari va lingvokulturologik xususiyatlari o'rganilgan. Ingliz tilining agrar leksikoni asosan anglo-sakson ildizlariga ega bo'lib, roman tillaridan kirgan qatlamlar bilan boyigan; o'zbek tilida esa turkiy asosli mahalliy terminlar, arab, fors va rus tillaridan o'zlashgan atamalar bilan bir qatorda, zamonaviy inglizcha o'zlashmalar ham mavjud. Misollar asosida ayrim tushunchalarning ikki tildagi semantik farqlari, realiya so'zlarning tarjima qiyinchiliklari va terminologik tizimlarga ijtimoiy-tarixiy omillarning ta'siri yoritilgan.



**Kalit so‘zlar:** qishloq xo‘jaligi terminologiyasi, lingvokulturologiya, realiya, o‘zlashma, terminologik tizim.

### Аннотация

В статье проводится сравнительный анализ национально-культурных особенностей сельскохозяйственной терминологии в английском и узбекском языках. Исследуются источники формирования терминологий, исторические слои и лингвокультурологические характеристики. Аграрная лексика английского языка в основном восходит к англосаксонским корням и обогащена заимствованиями из романских языков; в узбекском языке преобладают тюркские исконные термины, а также арабские, персидские, русские и современные англоязычные заимствования. На основе примеров раскрыты семантические различия отдельных понятий в двух языках, трудности перевода слов-реалий и влияние социально-исторических факторов на формирование терминологических систем.

**Ключевые слова:** сельскохозяйственная терминология, лингвокультурология, реалья, заимствование, терминологическая система.

### INTRODUCTION

Language and culture are phenomena that are intrinsically and closely interrelated; in linguistics, the relationship between language and culture has been emphasized as having substantial significance [1, p. 61]. The language of every nation—particularly its specialized terminology – reflects that nation’s way of life, historical experience, and cultural values. Agricultural terminology is no exception: the terms in this domain embody distinctive features of national culture and may convey realities that are not directly equivalent across different languages [6, p. 5]. A comparative study of agricultural terms in English and Uzbek provides an opportunity to elucidate the national and cultural characteristics of these terminologies, to trace the sources of their formation, and to identify the specific features of their usage.

In the territory of Uzbekistan, agriculture has from ancient times constituted a fundamental part of the people’s livelihood; this is clearly reflected in the formation



of a rich layer of indigenous terms within the Uzbek language's agricultural lexicon. For example, it has been established that in Mahmud al-Kashgari's 11th-century work *Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk*, more than 1,200 words and terms related to agriculture and irrigation are recorded [2, p. 178]. In contemporary Uzbek as well, hundreds of new compounds and concepts have been created on the basis of the word *suv* ("water"); some sources note that over 700 different terms have been derived from lexical units denoting "water" [2, p. 179]. Such evidence demonstrates the deep-rooted nature of the Uzbek people's irrigated farming culture.

In English as well, the core concepts of the agricultural domain originate from an ancient lexical stratum; for instance, in the names of livestock and the products derived from them, a historical sociolinguistic stratification can be observed: the word *cow* is inherited from Old English, whereas *beef* (meaning "the meat of cattle") was borrowed from Norman French, a phenomenon linked to the linguistic distinctions between the nobility and the common people during the Norman Conquest. Thus, the agrarian lexicon of English also contains cultural layers characteristic of specific historical periods.

This article presents a comparative analysis of the sources of formation, linguistic features, and national-cultural connotations of agricultural terminology in English and Uzbek. Drawing upon published scholarly sources and dictionaries, the study first examines the etymological strata of the terminology in both languages, and subsequently elucidates, through illustrative examples, the semantic and cultural specificities of the terms.

## MAIN PART

**Origins and Sources of Terminology.** In English, agricultural terminology has primarily developed from two principal sources: (1) the most ancient agrarian terms are directly inherited from the Anglo-Saxon (Old English) lexicon; and (2) later, terms that emerged in the course of scientific and technological advancement were borrowed from Latin and Greek, often via French. In the agrarian lexicon of English, the majority of words related to everyday farming practices have Germanic roots: for example, *land*, *field*, and *plow* are directly derived from Old English. At the same time, terms such as *agriculture*, *irrigation*, *fertilizer*, and *tractor* entered the language



## **International Conference on Economics, Finance, Banking and Management**

Hosted online from Paris, France

Website: econfseries.com

24<sup>th</sup> August, 2025

from Latin and other European languages, forming the stratum of scientific terminology.

A number of agricultural terms in English took shape as parallel lexical pairs following the Norman Conquest of 1066, resulting from language contact and blending. For instance, in pairs such as cow – beef, sheep – mutton, and pig – pork, the first word is derived from the vernacular of the common people, while the second originates from the language of the nobility (Anglo-Norman), serving to distinguish between the living animal and its meat [6, p. 8]. This phenomenon illustrates the presence of socio-historical stratification within English agricultural terminology.

In Uzbek, agricultural terminology has developed on the foundation of a centuries-old farming culture, with indigenous terms of Turkic origin occupying a predominant place [2, p. 178]. For example, terms such as yer (“land”), ko‘chat (“seedling”), o‘rim-yig‘im (“harvest”), and urug‘ (“seed”) appear in the earliest literary sources, reflecting the ancient presence of agriculture in the life of Turkic peoples. At the same time, the agricultural lexicon of Uzbek also contains Arabic and Persian terms that entered the language through historical contacts: words such as paxta (paḥta, from Persian) and dehqon (dehqān, Persian) have been fully assimilated into Uzbek and acquired a distinctly national character.

In the subsequent centuries, particularly in the 20th century, numerous international terms entered Uzbek terminology through the medium of the Russian language [8, p. 4]. Prior to the independence period, scientific terms in Uzbek were predominantly used in their Russian forms; however, in the present era, a process is underway to adapt these terms to conform with the norms of the state language.

In contemporary Uzbek terminology, the influx of terms from Western languages – particularly from English – is a distinctive feature [8, p. 5]. For example, terms such as fermer (“farmer”), agronomiya (“agronomy”), and innovatsion irrigatsiya (“innovative irrigation”) have been borrowed directly or indirectly from English and serve to express modern concepts. It should be noted that within the agricultural terminology of Uzbek, the national (indigenous) layer and the borrowed layer coexist.

Recent studies have been devoted to examining the specific characteristics of these lexical layers. In particular, Z. Allayarova (2022) has conducted a dedicated



## International Conference on Economics, Finance, Banking and Management

Hosted online from Paris, France

Website: econfseries.com

24<sup>th</sup> August, 2025

investigation into the linguistic features and sources of enrichment of the indigenous agro-terminology in Uzbek [14, p. 12]. Findings from such scholarly research indicate that the expansion of native agricultural terms in Uzbek has occurred primarily through morphological processes: the addition of affixes (affixation) and the compounding of words (composition) have been the principal means of creating new concepts [8, p. 5]. For example, the verb sug‘orish (“to supply with water”) is formed from suv (“water”) and g‘orish, following a traditional word-formation pattern. Similarly, the term o‘rmonzor is derived from o‘rmon (“forest”) and the suffix -zor (“abundant, plentiful”), conveying the meaning “an area with many trees” [8, p. 5].

Such indigenous words are fully adapted to the phonetic and grammatical norms of the Uzbek language and are distinguished by their closeness to popular understanding [8, p. 5]. In English, by contrast, the naming of agricultural tools, equipment, and concepts frequently employs the syntactic method of word formation—namely, compounding (e.g., greenhouse – “issiqxona,” farmhouse – “ferma uyi”) [5, p. 2]. In addition, there is a notable tendency to form new terms through the use of Latin and Greek affixes: for instance, irrigation (from Latin irrigo, “I water”) and agrochemistry (from Greek agro, “field” + English chemistry) [5, p. 3]. A characteristic feature of the Germanic group to which English belongs—compound word formation—is also one of the leading methods in its agricultural terminology [12, p. 15]. For example, terms such as wheelbarrow (“g‘ildirakli arava”) and horseshoe (“ot tuyoq temiri”) are formed through the combination of two lexemes. Moreover, in English, the formation of new words through suffixes such as -er and -ing is highly productive, as seen in terms like farmer (formed with the suffix -er) and harvesting (denoting the process of gathering crops, formed with -ing) [5, p. 3]. An interesting aspect is that the English noun-forming suffixes -tion and -ation correspond to the Uzbek verbal and nominalizing suffixes -lash and -lashuv—for example, the term irrigation is rendered in Uzbek as sug‘orish or irrigatsiya [8, p. 5].

**National-Cultural Features and Comparative Analysis.** Based on the historical-linguistic analyses presented above, we now examine the national-cultural features of English and Uzbek agricultural terminology through comparative examples. The



## International Conference on Economics, Finance, Banking and Management

Hosted online from Paris, France

Website: econfseries.com

24<sup>th</sup> August, 2025

first noteworthy aspect is the presence of national specificity in the terminological expression of certain concepts. For instance, in Uzbek, both *dehqon* and *fermer* denote, in a general sense, a person engaged in farming; however, there is a semantic distinction between them [8, p. 5]. The term *dehqon*, long used in the vernacular and literature, traditionally refers—within the national mentality—to an individual who works the land and engages in farming by traditional methods, whereas *fermer*, which emerged in more recent decades, denotes the owner of a modern agricultural enterprise operating on a larger scale or on a scientific basis [8, p. 5].

Researchers note that although the concepts of *dehqon* and *fermer* are closely related, the term *dehqon* carries a more traditional and emotional connotation, frequently appearing in folklore and literary works in a positive sense (e.g., “hardworking *dehqon*”) [8, p. 5]. By contrast, *fermer* has acquired the status of a formal economic term with a new legal definition (for example, in the texts of laws “On Farming Enterprises”) and today denotes a representative of modern agribusiness [8, p. 5]. Thus, these two terms in Uzbek reflect the historical transformations of the national agrarian system and embody its cultural content. In English, however, no such distinction exists—the term *farmer* applies equally to both traditional and modern agricultural producers; this difference is a terminological feature that has arisen as a result of the specific agrarian reforms and historical experience of Uzbek society.

A second example concerns the expression of the concept *sug‘orish* (irrigation). In Uzbek, the word *sug‘orish* is a vernacular term originating from traditional farming practices, whereas *irrigatsiya* is a scientific-technical term borrowed through Russian and ultimately from Latin [8, p. 5]. In practical usage, *sug‘orish* is employed in an everyday sense (e.g., *yer sug‘orish* – “to water the land”), while *irrigatsiya* is more commonly found in formal, legal, and scientific texts (e.g., “Modernizing Irrigation Systems”). In English, by contrast, the term *irrigation* is widely used, encompassing both scientific and general meanings; however, in informal contexts, words such as *watering* may also be employed. This example illustrates that in Uzbek a single concept is expressed through two distinct terms—one national and one international—reflecting a case of diglossia and cultural stratification within the terminology.





## International Conference on Economics, Finance, Banking and Management

Hosted online from Paris, France

Website: [econfseries.com](http://econfseries.com)

24<sup>th</sup> August, 2025

A third aspect concerns culture-specific realia in each language and the challenges they present in translation. For example, the Uzbek term *tomorqa* refers, within Uzbek culture, to a small plot of land adjacent to a household, cultivated primarily to meet the family's needs. There is no exact equivalent for *tomorqa* in English; it is usually rendered descriptively as *kitchen garden*, *smallholding*, or *plot* [1, p. 61]. However, these expressions do not fully convey the entire cultural and domestic significance of *tomorqa*. Similarly, certain English terms reveal cultural gaps when translated into Uzbek. For instance, *common* and *open field* systems—concepts rooted in European agrarian history—require explanation in Uzbek, as no direct one-word equivalents exist [1, p. 61]. In such cases, translators must adopt a descriptive approach. Consider the term *mirob*: in the Uzbek farming tradition, a *mirob* is an official responsible for distributing irrigation water. In English, there is no single term that precisely corresponds to this role; it is generally conveyed through descriptive phrases such as *water distributor* or *irrigation manager* [1, p. 61]. A comparison of land measurement units further illustrates such cultural-linguistic distinctions. In English, the term *acre* historically denoted the area of land that a pair of oxen could plough in one day [6]. In Uzbek tradition, the old unit *tanob* was used, corresponding to approximately 0.113 hectares. While the international metric system (hectare) is now the official unit of measurement, the word *tanob* still appears in literary works and folklore, serving as a reminder of the agrarian heritage [2, p. 179].

## CONCLUSION

A comparative analysis of agricultural terminology in English and Uzbek demonstrates that the terminologies of both languages are distinguished by their historical strata and cultural semantics. The agrarian lexicon of English is primarily rooted in the Anglo-Saxon layer, later enriched by Romance elements (Norman French and Latin). This process led to the emergence of paired terms (e.g., *cow/beef*, *sheep/mutton*) and reflects the social stratification in the history of the language [6]. The agricultural terminology of Uzbek is predominantly of Turkic origin and encompasses a rich lexical repertoire reflecting an ancient farming culture (including terms related to water and concepts pertaining to land) [2, p. 178; 2, p. 179]. At the



## **International Conference on Economics, Finance, Banking and Management**

Hosted online from Paris, France

Website: [econfseries.com](http://econfseries.com)

24<sup>th</sup> August, 2025

same time, as a result of historical contacts—during the Arab Caliphate, the Tsarist Russian period, and the Soviet era—Arabic, Persian, and Russian agrarian terms entered Uzbek, became assimilated, and integrated into the national lexical inventory [8, p. 5]. In both English and Uzbek, national-cultural features are most evident in the semantic scope and usage of specific terms. In Uzbek, words such as *dehqon*, *tomorqa*, and *mirob* carry distinctive socio-cultural meanings that are difficult to translate literally into other languages, as they encapsulate national realities and lived experience [1, p. 61]. Likewise, in English, certain terms referring to historical agrarian systems (e.g., enclosure, common land) can only be fully understood with knowledge of the historical context of English society. Therefore, in translating agricultural terms and harmonizing them at the international level, it is essential to take into account linguo-cultural factors. Another significant conclusion is that, in both languages, agricultural terminology has expanded through a synthesis of indigenous and borrowed elements. In Uzbek, new concepts previously absent from the lexicon have often been expressed through the adoption of foreign terms (e.g., biopesticid, gidroponika) [8, p. 5]. In English, by contrast, scientific discoveries and innovations have primarily been named using Greek and Latin terms, which have subsequently been assimilated into the common language (e.g., tractor, combine).

In both cases, a key task is to maintain a balance between the precision of terminology and its national character. Scholars emphasize that it is necessary to enrich terminology in accordance with the national culture while simultaneously aligning the language of science with international standards [8, p. 5]. In conclusion, it may be stated that the national-cultural features of English and Uzbek agricultural terminology are clearly manifested in differences relating to their historical development, lexical composition, and domains of usage. Studying these features in greater depth is significant not only for linguistics but also for the practical field of terminology: for example, in compiling bilingual agricultural glossaries or in selecting equivalents during translation, such cultural factors must be taken into account. Consequently, a number of comparative studies are currently being conducted in collaboration with terminologists, and various dictionaries and reference materials are being produced. As these efforts continue, the agricultural





terminologies of English and Uzbek will, while preserving their distinctive national color, increasingly serve to express precise and universal concepts that meet the demands of the modern era.

## REFERENCES

1. Mirzayeva G. S. Milliy va madaniy koloritini ifodalashda realiyaning eng muhim xususiyatlari // Journal of Integrated Education and Research. – 2022. – №1(7). – B. 61–62.
2. Ayitbayev D. P. M. Qoshg‘ariy “Devonu lug‘otit turk” asaridagi suv ilmi atamaları va gidrografik ma’lumotlar haqida // O‘zbekiston geografiya jamiyati axboroti. – 1999. – 20-jild. – B. 178–180.
3. Jabborov X. Dehqonchilik so‘zlarining qisqacha izohli lug‘ati. – Qarshi: Nasa, 2016. – B. 10–12.
4. Egamberdiyeva D. U. Qishloq xo‘jaligi atamalarining leksik xususiyatlari tadqiqi // Ekonomika i sotsium. – 2025. – №1(128). – B. 121.
5. Usmonova Sh. R. Ingliz tilida qishloq xo‘jaligi sohasiga oid terminlarning tuzilishi va tasnifi // Ekonomika i sotsium. – 2025. – №1(128). – B. 2–3.
6. Williams D. T. The Conquest of Beef: On the food-field divide in modern English // Medium elektron jurnali. <https://medium.com/@danatwilliams/the-conquest-of-beef-9195bd95d1ab>
7. Dadaboyev H. O‘zbek terminologiyasi: O‘quv qo‘llanma. – Toshkent: TDSHU, 2019. – B. 42–43.
8. Ashurova F. A. Lexical stratification of agricultural terminology in the Uzbek language: native and borrowed layers // Eurasian Research Bulletin. – 2025. – Vol. 43 (May). – P. 4–5.
9. Abduvohidova X. M. Ingliz va o‘zbek tillarida qishloq xo‘jaligiga oid birikmalarning qiyosiy tahlili // O‘zMU Xabarları (Filologiya ilmiy jurnali). – 2023. – №1. – B. 319.
10. Ismoilov Yo., Xidirova G. Nemischa–o‘zbekcha–ruscha–inglizcha qishloq xo‘jaligi terminlarining tematik lug‘ati. – Toshkent: ToshDAU nashriyoti, 2022. – B. 5.



## **International Conference on Economics, Finance, Banking and Management**

Hosted online from Paris, France

Website: econfseries.com

24<sup>th</sup> August, 2025

11. Xamidov M. M. Some comments on the issue of the term and terminology // European Journal of Agricultural and Rural Education. – 2021. – Vol. 2, No. 5. – P. 15–16.
12. Madvaliyev A. O‘zbek terminologiyasi va leksikografiyasi masalalari. – Toshkent: O‘zbekiston milliy entsiklopediyasi, 2017. – B. 25.
13. Bektimirov H., Begmatov E. Mustaqillik davri atamalari. – Toshkent, 2002. – B. 10.
14. Allayarova Z. O‘zbek tilidagi o‘z qatlam ag roterminlarining lisoniy-struktur xususiyatlari va o‘zbek tilini boyitish manbalari. – Toshkent: O‘zMU, 2022. – B. 12–13.
15. Doniyorov R. O‘zbek tili texnik terminologiyasining ayrim masalalari. – Toshkent: Fan, 1977. – B. 5.