

## Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971  
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829  
GIF (Australia) = 0.564  
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912  
PIHHI (Russia) = 0.126  
ESJI (KZ) = 8.716  
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630  
PIF (India) = 1.940  
IBI (India) = 4.260  
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](https://doi.org/10.1177/10.15863/TAS) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](https://doi.org/10.15863/TAS)

### International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2020 Issue: 02 Volume: 82

Published: 29.02.2020 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



Nodira Abduraimovna Ergasheva  
Navoi State Mining Institute  
Senior teacher

## ANALYSIS OF LANGUAGE FEATURES OF MOUNTAIN TERMINOLOGY

**Abstract:** This article discusses the analysis of the language features of the terminology. The research material was 50 lexical units with the subject of mountain terminology. Let us analyze the main ways of forming terms of this topic.

**Key words:** analysis, term, mining, development.

**Language:** English

**Citation:** Ergasheva, N. A. (2020). Analysis of language features of mountain terminology. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 02 (82), 650-654.

**Soi:** <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-02-82-112> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2020.02.82.112>

**Scopus ASCC:** 1203.

### Introduction

UDC 4687899

Modern processes for the formation of new terms in the mining system, increase the requirements for the functioning of these terms. Their main purpose is the possibility of communication between specialists in the field of mining. For the development of science and technology, a characteristic feature is the processes of interethnic and international cooperation, which inevitably affects the trends of terminological names. All this leads to the use of international means of education of terms, as well as to the direct borrowing of terminological names [1, p. 40].

The formation of new terms as a result of the disintegration of a word into homonyms, that is, the acquisition by the same lexical unit of new meanings, is called the lexico-semantic way of forming terms. Over time, the various meanings of a multi-valued term may lose their semantic connection with each other and turn into independent words, that is, homonyms.

Another lexico-semantic way of forming the terms of English mountain terminology is borrowing. Terms can be borrowed from other English terminology, from common vocabulary, as well as from other languages. The quantitative composition of English mining terminology is equal to the amount of

knowledge at each historical stage in the development of mining. So, for example, in the Roman period there are descriptions of minerals, rocks, technical means and methods of production. A large number of borrowings in the terminology of mining was taken from the German language, because it was in Russian that the first printed works on mining appeared. It is worth noting the fact that German mountain terminology is based on the terms of Latin and Ancient Greek [2, p.20-24].

Borrowing foreign vocabulary mainly runs through two channels: sound borrowing and tracing. In the first case, the sound composition of the word is borrowed, its outer shell, in the second case, the word-formation structure of the word, that is, the sign of the concept laid down in the basis of its name. Therefore, the words borrowed from other languages include all lexical units, the appearance of which in one language is associated with copying the external or internal structure of the corresponding prototypes in other languages [3, p. 105].

Borrowings from German terminology can be traced on the following examples: adit, surveying machine, auger, zinc, soil. The term molybdenum was borrowed from the Latin language.

The most frequent are borrowings from common vocabulary.

Borrowing from other terminological systems is also a fairly common occurrence. This can be seen in

## Impact Factor:

<b>ISRA (India)</b>	<b>= 4.971</b>	<b>SIS (USA)</b>	<b>= 0.912</b>	<b>ICV (Poland)</b>	<b>= 6.630</b>
<b>ISI (Dubai, UAE)</b>	<b>= 0.829</b>	<b>PIHHI (Russia)</b>	<b>= 0.126</b>	<b>PIF (India)</b>	<b>= 1.940</b>
<b>GIF (Australia)</b>	<b>= 0.564</b>	<b>ESJI (KZ)</b>	<b>= 8.716</b>	<b>IBI (India)</b>	<b>= 4.260</b>
<b>JIF</b>	<b>= 1.500</b>	<b>SJIF (Morocco)</b>	<b>= 5.667</b>	<b>OAJI (USA)</b>	<b>= 0.350</b>

the following terms: in automotive terminology, this term means - a truck, and in mining - a mine dump truck; the term was borrowed from the terminology of chemistry with the transfer of meaning from a chemical element to a solid silver-white metal with a reddish tint; the term was borrowed from construction terminology, in which it has a meaning - a rotary funnel of a concrete bucket, in mining terminology with a meaning - a hydraulic elevator; the term in the terminology of military affairs has the meaning of the front line, and in the terminology of mining was borrowed as a place of development. The number of borrowed terms of the English mountain terminology in the articles under study is 25, which is 50% of the total number of analyzed terms.

The synonymy of mining terminology is also quite common. Due to the incomplete ordering of English mountain terminology, the same term expresses several concepts, which is called polysemy, or different terms are used to express the same concept, which is synonymy. Many synonymous terms are incorrectly orientating and may contradict the essence of the concepts they express and create false representations. The main reasons for the appearance of synonyms can be considered.

According to E.N. Tolikina, in most cases, the presence of repetitions in the terminology indicates the incompleteness of the selection of the sign, the disordered content of the terminological system [4, 61].

the presence of obsolete names of objects, techniques, methods that operate with new concepts. As well as the revival of terms that did not function under the influence of certain factors.

This phenomenon can be seen by analyzing the following lexical units: miner, outdated, but used terms are scout ore; mining, development of mineral deposits, outdated - mining; allonge is an obsolete word, but its use by authors and leading mining experts can be found in scientific papers or interviews, today the most used words which mean - filter cartridge parallel use of the native language words and borrowings, also leads to synonymy [3, c. 76];

The use of words in Russian and borrowings is shown in the following examples: miner; - hoist, steyger; surveyor, surveyor; drainage, drain, drain; thermoregulation, heat regulation; metabolic energy; metabolic energy; respiratory, respiratory; evaporation, evaporation; ventilation system; industry; industry; gas mask, respirator; infrastructure, administrative apparatus, the interaction of language with territorial or social dialects [5, p. 89].

It is worth noting that in the process of developing the activities of people, more and more words from common vocabulary were involved in the terminological circulation. As V.V. Vinogradov noted: "There is a direct close connection between the dictionary of science and the dictionary of everyday

life. Any science begins with the results obtained by the thinking and speech of the people, and in its further development does not break away from the popular language" [6, p. 14]. L.O.Simonenko believes that popular terminology is a prerequisite for the formation of more advanced scientific terminology [7, p. 36].

However, not all scientists recognize the influence of speech on terminology, emphasizing that the process of term formation, unlike others, has only a conscious and regulated character [8, p. 43].

The connection of dialects with the terminology of mining can be traced on the examples of the following terms: warehouse, hut, utility room, kildym; nail clipper, canon; bulk rock, heap; roadheader, bobik; shaft drilling rig, boomer; explosive highway, dart.

The number of synonymous mining terms is 23 and they make up 46% of the total number of studied vocabulary.

Based on the analysis of 50 lexical units with the subject of mountain terminology, we can conclude that the most frequent lexical-semantic way of forming the terms of English mountain terminology is to borrow terms from other languages, term systems or common vocabulary. Such terms make up about 50%. The second common way is synonymy - about 46%, and the share of homonyms is only 4%.

The described methods of term formation by borrowing words and terms from commonly used vocabulary, other languages or terminological systems, creating synonyms and homonyms, reveal the lexical and semantic features of the functioning of the terms of the English mountain terminology. Based on the descriptions of these methods and examples, it is possible to accurately track changes in the terminology of the mining business, which gives reason to consider the Russian terminology system a living and constantly developing process.

The morphological method of creating new terms is in the literal sense of the word word production. The morphological method means the creation of new words by adding word-building affixes to existing foundations. Using this method, new lexical units are formed, which is why modern linguists consider this method of forming terms to be the most productive. The need for a morphological method of forming terms is caused by the need to name new concepts, objects, techniques, etc., because of the rapidly developing mining technologies [9, p. 34].

To date, in modern Russian, the problem of classifying word-formation methods and methods has not been completely resolved.

Based on the classification of N.M. Shansky, 82 lexical units with the subject of mountain terminology were analyzed, on the basis of which the most productive morphological methods for the formation of the terms of the English mountain terminology can be traced.

## Impact Factor:

<b>ISRA (India)</b>	<b>= 4.971</b>	<b>SIS (USA)</b>	<b>= 0.912</b>	<b>ICV (Poland)</b>	<b>= 6.630</b>
<b>ISI (Dubai, UAE)</b>	<b>= 0.829</b>	<b>PIHHI (Russia)</b>	<b>= 0.126</b>	<b>PIF (India)</b>	<b>= 1.940</b>
<b>GIF (Australia)</b>	<b>= 0.564</b>	<b>ESJI (KZ)</b>	<b>= 8.716</b>	<b>IBI (India)</b>	<b>= 4.260</b>
<b>JIF</b>	<b>= 1.500</b>	<b>SJIF (Morocco)</b>	<b>= 5.667</b>	<b>OAJI (USA)</b>	<b>= 0.350</b>

Affixation - the formation of new terms by joining to their basis of certain derivational affixes. The most productive ways of affixing are prefixing and suffixing.

The morphological method of forming the terms of the English mountain terminology system, such as prefixation, can be traced on the following examples: underground excavation; insufficient consumption; underground haulage; underground facilities; underground coal; unfinished. Terms formed using a prefix mainly indicate a location under something or subordination, of minor importance.

The formation of terms using co- prefixes can be seen in these examples: acidity coefficient of mine water; compatibility; unknown mineral; violation of coherence; violation of convergence; subsection.

Examples of terms without the prefix can be traced on these examples: without reinforced concrete; non-productive consumption; non-ferrous metals.

The prefix after- has the meanings of "next", "back", "coming after". Examples of word formation of English mining terms can be seen in the following examples: - subsequent processing; gas after a mine gas explosion; additional quenching.

The following examples show the formation of English mining terms with the prefix prefix; inner order rules. Examples of terms prefixed with diagonal drift, diagonal layering, transverse layer; cross-sectional area.

Based on the above works, one can describe the most frequently used suffixes for the formation of the terms of the English mountain terminology. The most productive suffix, according to V.I. A carabiner is a suffix with the help of which terms are formed that designate persons by occupation, as well as the names of technical means [10]. The suffix appeared in modern English due to borrowing from the Latin language. In English, this suffix is most often added to the verb, and with its help word formation of nouns with different meanings takes place. In mining terminology, with the help of this suffix, the following terms were formed: coal transportation system; waking up (fossil when loading onto the conveyor, into trolleys, etc.); tunnel; secondary crushing; acre oil area; other.

Terms with suffixes are found in the scientific language to denote nouns denoting various types of minerals, minerals, explosives, chemical products: manacite; - apatite; magnetite; titanite; dendrite; roburite; vulcanized rubber; zeolite; magnesium carbonate; colorless tourmaline.

The suffix forms adjectives from nouns, for example: priceless; not supplied with energy; harmless.

Examples of terms with suffixes can be seen in the following examples: control unit; stone laying; mining operations; possessing the ability to resist; ethnographer.

There are 31 examples of terms formed using the suffix method and they are equal to 37% of the units under study.

Another of the morphological methods for the formation of the terms of the English mountain terminology, which identified N.M. Shansky is a compounding. Using this method, new terms are created by adding two or more words into one. Such words can be written both together and through a hyphen.

The following terms can serve as examples of this method of forming the terms of the English mountain terminology system: docking schedule; blast hole; micrometer scale; material sliding; working group; stacking; common minerals; equipment with a diesel engine; fuel cell mining equipment; fuel supply mechanisms; section of the continuous development system; ballast (rail track); holes fixed with concrete; Pipeline for coal hydrotransport (for hydraulic mining); stone laying; filling the wellbore; homogeneous coal; air flow line.

There are 18 lexical units formed using the compounding method, which is 21% of the total number of studied terms in English mountain terminology.

As for the inverse compounding, this term is understood as rederivation, that is, the dismemberment of a previously non-derivative word by rethinking it and semantic convergence with other words [10, p. 47]. This morphological method of word formation of the terms of English mountain terminology was not found in the analyzed articles. Since this type of term formation is extremely rare.

Another productive morphological way of forming the terms of English mountain terminology, according to N.M. Shansky, is the creation of abbreviations. But, it is worth noting that many modern scholars working in the field of linguistics attribute the abbreviation to non-affix methods of forming terms, that is, to non-morphological methods. So, for example, V.N. Musatov in his work "Russian Language: Morphemic, Morphology, Word Formation" indicates that affixation is a word formation in which the abbreviated elements of words are combined into one combination without adding affixes [10].

An abbreviation is a word-formation method in which a new word is formed from parts of words included in the original phrase. When using this method of word formation, the harmony and ease of pronunciation are of great importance [10].

Using the abbreviation method, 6 lexical units with the subject of English mountain terminology were formed, which make up 9% of the total number of terms studied.

Another way of forming the terms of the English mountain terminological system is conversion, that is, the transition of a word from one part of speech to another. Conversion as a method of affixless term

## Impact Factor:

<b>ISRA (India)</b>	<b>= 4.971</b>	<b>SIS (USA)</b>	<b>= 0.912</b>	<b>ICV (Poland)</b>	<b>= 6.630</b>
<b>ISI (Dubai, UAE)</b>	<b>= 0.829</b>	<b>PIHHI (Russia)</b>	<b>= 0.126</b>	<b>PIF (India)</b>	<b>= 1.940</b>
<b>GIF (Australia)</b>	<b>= 0.564</b>	<b>ESJI (KZ)</b>	<b>= 8.716</b>	<b>IBI (India)</b>	<b>= 4.260</b>
<b>JIF</b>	<b>= 1.500</b>	<b>SJIF (Morocco)</b>	<b>= 5.667</b>	<b>OAJI (USA)</b>	<b>= 0.350</b>

formation is opposed to an affix method of term formation. The morphological paradigm acts as a derivative in conversion, namely, the ability of the paradigm and its endings to convey the meaning of a certain part of speech. The use of the term in a new syntactic function is accompanied not only by its use in the desired syntactic position, but also by the acquisition by the term of a new morphological indicator. Therefore, conversion is often attributed to morphological-syntactic methods of the formation of lexical units [10].

The conversion can be traced on the following examples: a noun, in mountain terminology goes into the verb - collect samples; adjective harmfulness to health, in mining can turn into a noun harmful conditions of production; the verb prey, becomes a noun prey; mining ore becomes a noun mining ore. The terms formed by conversion are 4, which is 9% of all studied lexical units.

An analysis of 82 lexical units with the subject of English mountain terminology allowed us to consider the main morphological methods of term formation and to conclude that 65% of the terms of English mountain terminology are formed using the affix method, of which 28% are formed using the method of prefixation, and 37% through suffix. Using the compounding method, 21% of the analyzed terms were formed. Terms formed using the inverse compounding method was not found, since this method of word formation is extremely rare. The lexical units formed by abbreviation make up 9%, and the formation of terms using conversion makes up only 5% of the total number of analyzed lexical units.

Based on the analysis done, we can conclude that the most productive morphological method of forming the terms of English mountain terminology is the affixation method, the second is phrasing, followed by abbreviation and conversion, and the inverse phrasing method is not relevant for the terms of this term system.

With the rapid development of technology, as a result of which the emergence of new terms in the field of mining, the study of the linguistic features of lexical units of this subject is an integral part of the research of leading experts in the field of linguistics.

In order to determine the most productive ways of forming the terms of the English mountain terminological system, 132 lexical units were analyzed on the basis of material from journal articles.

To determine the lexical and semantic methods of term formation, 50 lexical units with the subject of mining terminology were analyzed, on the basis of which the most productive methods for the formation of terms operating in the field of mining were identified. Based on this analysis, we can conclude that the most productive way is borrowing vocabulary, the number of borrowed lexical units in the analyzed articles was 25, which is 50% of all analyzed vocabulary formed using lexical-semantic methods.

Such a method as synonymy is no less productive way of term formation and amounts to 46%, as for the formation of new terms as a result of the disintegration of a word into homonyms, that is, the acquisition of new meanings by the same lexical unit, this method makes up only 4% of the entire considered vocabulary formed by lexico-semantic methods of term formation.

An analysis of 82 lexical units to determine the most productive morphological methods for the formation of the terms of the English mountain terminology system showed that the most productive method is affixation, which is 65% of the analyzed vocabulary, 21% is occupied by terms formed using the compounding method.

To date, scientists have not yet reached a consensus on the exact attribution of term formation techniques, such as abbreviation and conversion, to morphological word formation methods. For example, some of the linguists do not attribute conversion and abbreviation to a purely morphological method of term formation and call these methods without affixes, and such linguists as N.M. Shansky and N.S. Valgina, on the contrary, refer these methods to independent morphological methods of term formation. After analyzing the lexical units from mining journals, it was found that conversion is not a common method of forming the terms of English mining terminology and makes up only 5% of the analyzed vocabulary. 6 terms were formed using the abbreviation method in the analyzed articles, which is 9% of all studied units formed using morphological and non-affix methods for forming terms.

Based on the analysis, we can conclude that the morphological method of forming the terms of English mountain terminology is more productive.

In the process of preparing the course work, the linguistic features of the English mountain terminology were studied. Based on the study, the following conclusions can be drawn: a lexical unit is a unit of language (word, term, stable phrase, etc.), which has a material nature of the main content, and the expression is in accordance with the rules for the design of a single word inherent in a given language; the term refers to units of linguistic and professional knowledge that ensure the effectiveness of intercultural communication; all terms with an English mountain theme are formed into one term system, which is part of the English mountain terminology; mining terminology, like any other, has its own morphological and lexical-semantic features of the functioning of the terms.

Based on the opinions of leading scientists in the field of linguistics, the language features of the English mountain terminology system, as well as the main lexical-semantic and morphological methods for the formation of terms functioning in the field of mining, were analyzed. 132 lexical units served as the analyzed material, 50 of which showed the most

## Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 4.971	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PИHИЦ (Russia)	= 0.126	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

productive lexical-semantic methods of term formation. Based on their analysis, we can conclude that the most common lexical-semantic way of forming the terms of English mountain terminology is to borrow terms from other languages, terminological systems, or common vocabulary. Such terms make up about 50%. The second common way is to create synonyms - about 46%, and the proportion of homonyms is only 4%.

The remaining 82 terms showed morphological methods for the formation of the terms of English mountain terminology. Based on the analysis of these units, it can be argued that 65% of the terms of the English mountain terminology are formed using the affix method, of which 28% are formed using the prefix method, and 37% through the suffix. Using the compounding method, 21% of the analyzed terms were formed. Terms formed using the inverse compounding method were not found, since this method of word formation is extremely rare. The lexical units formed by abbreviation make up 9%, and

the formation of terms using conversion makes up only 5% of the total number of analyzed lexical units.

Thus, on the basis of the analysis, it can be concluded that the most productive methods for the formation of the terms of English mountain terminology are morphological methods of term formation. The number of terms formed using this method is 62%, while the terms formed using lexical-semantic methods of term formation are 38%.

In conclusion, it is worth noting that the goals set for this course work have been achieved. Also, all the tasks set are fully implemented, namely: the concepts of "terminology" and "terminology system" were formulated; studied linguistic features of the English mountain terminology system; the features of the functioning of the terms of the English mountain terminology are investigated; and also analyzed the linguistic features of Russian mining terminology on the basis of articles from the journals "Mining engineering", "Minerals & metallurgical processing".

## References:

1. Arnold, I.V. (2002). *Stylistics: Modern English: a textbook*. (p.384). Moscow: Flint, Science.
2. Barkhudarov, L.S. (1975). *Language and translation*. (p.240). Moscow: International relations.
3. Valgina, N.S. (2003). *Active processes in modern Russian*. (p.200). Moscow: Logos.
4. Vasiliev, A.N. (1976). *Lecture course on the stylistics of the Russian language*. Scientific style of speech: study guide. (p.192). Moscow: Russian language.
5. (2000). *Wilhelm von Humboldt: Selected Works on Linguistics*. Translation from German under the editorship and with a preface by the doctor of philological sciences prof. G.V. Ramishvili, 2nd edition. - Moscow: Progress.
6. Vinogradov, V.V. (1977). *Selected Works. Lexicology and lexicography*. (p.312). Moscow.
7. Vinokur, G.O. (1994). *On some phenomena of word formation in Russian technical terminology: essay and reader*. (p.303). Moscow: Moscow Lyceum.
8. Shahodzhaev, M. A., Begmatov, Je. M., Hamdamov, N. N., & Numonzhonov, Sh. D. U. (2019). Metody jeffektivnogo ispol'zovanija informacionno-kommunikacionnyh tehnologij v obrazovatel'nom processe. *Problemy sovremennoj nauki i obrazovanija*, 10 (143).
9. Farhodzhonova, N.F. (2016). *Problemy primeneniya innovacionnyh tehnologij v obrazovatel'nom processe na mezhdunarodnom urovne*. Innovacionnye tendencii, social'no-jeconomicheskie i pravovye problemy vzaimodejstvija v mezhdunarodnom prostranstve. (pp. 58-61).
10. Xudoyberdiyeva, D. A. (2019). Management of the services sector and its classification. *Theoretical & Applied Science*, (10), 656-658.