BG Pulse Journal USA
ISSN:1947-2536 http://www.bgpulseusa.com/index.php/bg

LEXICAL AND PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF AGRICULTURAL TERMINOLOGY IN THE KARAKALPAK AND ENGLISH LANGUAGES

Yakupova Ayzada Danil qizi

Karakalpak State University, Faculty of Foreign Languages, Department of Philology and Language Teaching (English)

ayzadayakupova18@gmail.com

Doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21186653

Abstract: Agricultural terminology plays a significant role in professional communication, scientific research, and intercultural interaction. The development of agriculture and the expansion of international cooperation have increased the importance of studying agricultural terminology from lexical and pragmatic perspectives. This research aims to analyze the lexical and pragmatic characteristics of agricultural terminology in the Karakalpak and English languages through a comparative linguistic approach. The study examines the semantic structure, word formation, functional usage, and communicative features of agricultural terms in both languages. Comparative, descriptive, semantic, and pragmatic methods were employed to identify similarities and differences in agricultural vocabulary. The findings indicate that English agricultural terminology is highly standardized and influenced by scientific and technological development, whereas Karakalpak agricultural terminology reflects traditional farming practices, national culture, and local environmental conditions. The study highlights the importance of lexical and pragmatic analysis for translation, terminology development, language teaching, and intercultural communication in the agricultural sector.

Keywords: agricultural terminology, Karakalpak language, English language, lexical analysis, pragmatic analysis, comparative linguistics, discourse, semantics, professional communication, intercultural communication.

Introduction

Agriculture is one of the oldest and most essential sectors of human activity, serving as the foundation of food production, economic development, and social well-being. As agricultural science and technology continue to advance, the language used in this field has become increasingly specialized and internationally oriented. Agricultural terminology forms an important part of professional communication, allowing specialists, researchers, educators, and policymakers to exchange information accurately and efficiently. The lexical and pragmatic analysis of agricultural terminology has become an important area of modern linguistics because terminology reflects not only linguistic structures but also cultural traditions, professional knowledge, and communicative practices. Lexical analysis focuses on the semantic structure, origin, and formation of terms, while pragmatic analysis examines how these terms function in different communicative situations and professional contexts. The Karakalpak and English languages belong to different language families and have developed under distinct historical, cultural, and socio-economic conditions. Consequently, their agricultural terminology demonstrates both universal characteristics and language-specific features. Karakalpak agricultural vocabulary preserves many traditional terms related to crop cultivation, livestock breeding, irrigation, and local farming practices. In contrast, English agricultural terminology has expanded rapidly through scientific innovation,

technological development, and international cooperation, resulting in a highly standardized professional vocabulary. Comparative research on agricultural terminology contributes to a deeper understanding of lexical systems and pragmatic functions in different languages. It also facilitates accurate translation, improves foreign language teaching, supports terminology standardization, and strengthens intercultural communication within the agricultural sector. The aim of this study is to conduct a comparative lexical and pragmatic analysis of agricultural terminology in the Karakalpak and English languages, identify their similarities and differences, and evaluate their role in professional communication and linguistic development. The results of the study are expected to contribute to comparative linguistics, terminology studies, translation research, and language education.

Materials and Methods

This study employed a comparative linguistic research design to examine the lexical and pragmatic characteristics of agricultural terminology in the Karakalpak and English languages. The research materials consisted of agricultural terms collected from explanatory dictionaries, bilingual dictionaries, scientific publications, agricultural textbooks, official documents, and authentic texts related to farming, livestock breeding, irrigation, agricultural technology, and environmental management in both languages. A total of approximately 400 agricultural terms were selected and classified according to their lexical meaning, semantic fields, word-formation patterns, and functional usage. The collected terminology was grouped into thematic categories, including crop production, animal husbandry, agricultural machinery, soil cultivation, irrigation, fertilizers, and sustainable agriculture. The study applied descriptive, comparative, semantic, and pragmatic methods of linguistic analysis. Comparative analysis was used to identify similarities and differences between the agricultural terminological systems of the two languages. Semantic analysis examined the meanings and lexical relationships of the terms, while pragmatic analysis focused on their communicative functions, contextual usage, and cultural significance in professional discourse. The obtained data were analyzed qualitatively, and the findings were interpreted from linguistic and intercultural perspectives.

Results

The analysis revealed that agricultural terminology in both Karakalpak and English performs the same communicative function in professional discourse; however, significant lexical differences were identified. Karakalpak agricultural terminology contains numerous native lexical units related to traditional farming, irrigation systems, livestock breeding, and local agricultural practices. These terms preserve historical and cultural meanings that reflect the agricultural heritage of the Karakalpak people. English agricultural terminology is characterized by a highly standardized vocabulary that has developed through scientific research and technological innovation. The terminology includes numerous internationally recognized terms associated with precision agriculture, biotechnology, sustainable farming, environmental protection, and agricultural engineering. The study also demonstrated differences in word formation. Karakalpak agricultural terms are mainly formed through native derivational processes and traditional vocabulary, whereas English terminology frequently employs Greek- and Latin-based scientific roots, compound words, and abbreviations. Furthermore, English contains a greater number of internationally accepted technical terms, while Karakalpak terminology includes many culture-specific lexical items without direct English equivalents.

Discussion

The findings indicate that the lexical and pragmatic characteristics of agricultural terminology are closely connected with the historical, cultural, and technological development of each language community. The preservation of traditional agricultural vocabulary in Karakalpak reflects the importance of local farming practices and national cultural identity. Many terms possess pragmatic meanings that become fully understandable only within their cultural and communicative context. In contrast, English agricultural terminology has evolved under the influence of globalization, scientific progress, and international agricultural cooperation. Consequently, English emphasizes terminological precision, standardization, and clarity in professional communication. Pragmatically, English agricultural texts primarily aim to provide objective and accurate information, whereas Karakalpak agricultural communication often incorporates culturally significant expressions and traditional concepts. The comparative analysis confirms that lexical and pragmatic differences should be taken into account in translation, terminology standardization, language teaching, and intercultural communication. Understanding these linguistic features can improve the quality of bilingual agricultural dictionaries, facilitate international cooperation in agriculture, and support more effective communication among researchers, educators, and agricultural professionals. The findings also contribute to comparative linguistics by demonstrating the relationship between language, culture, and specialized terminology in the agricultural domain.

Conclusion

This study examined the lexical and pragmatic characteristics of agricultural terminology in the Karakalpak and English languages through a comparative linguistic approach. The findings revealed that although both languages use agricultural terminology to facilitate professional communication, they differ considerably in lexical composition, semantic structure, and pragmatic functions. Karakalpak agricultural terminology preserves numerous indigenous terms that reflect traditional farming practices, cultural heritage, and local ecological conditions. In contrast, English agricultural terminology is highly standardized and has developed in response to scientific progress, technological innovation, and international cooperation. The comparative analysis demonstrated that lexical differences are closely associated with the historical and cultural development of each language, while pragmatic differences are determined by communicative purposes, professional conventions, and contextual usage. These distinctions should be considered in translation studies, terminology standardization, foreign language teaching, and intercultural communication within the agricultural sector. The results of this research contribute to comparative linguistics and terminology studies by providing a deeper understanding of the interaction between language, culture, and professional communication. Future studies may focus on corpus-based analysis of agricultural terminology, digital lexicography, and the influence of globalization on the development of agricultural vocabulary in Turkic and Germanic languages.

References:

1. Crystal, D. (2010). The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language (3rd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
2. Levinson, S. C. (1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
3. Yule, G. (2020). The Study of Language (7th ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
4. Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). Cohesion in English. London: Longman.

5. Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2016). Methods of Critical Discourse Studies (3rd ed.). London: Sage Publications.
6. Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2010). Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics (4th ed.). London: Pearson Education.
7. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). (2023). The State of Food and Agriculture 2023. Rome: FAO.
8. Oxford University Press. (2024). Oxford English Dictionary. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
9. Cambridge University Press. (2024). Cambridge Dictionary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
10. Saussure, F. de. (2011). Course in General Linguistics. New York: Columbia University Press.