

NATIONAL-CULTURAL CHARACTERISTICS AND LINGUOCULTURAL MARKERS OF AGRICULTURAL TERMINOLOGY: THE CASE OF ENGLISH AND UZBEK**Qodirova Gulbahor Turdiyevna**

Andijan Institute of Agriculture and Agrotechnologies

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

Abstract: This article presents a comparative analysis of the national-cultural characteristics and linguocultural markers of agricultural terminology in the English and Uzbek languages. It explores the historical formation of each language's agricultural lexicon, highlighting native and borrowed layers (Anglo-Saxon vs. Turkic core, along with later Persian, Arabic, French, Russian and English influences). Culturally-specific concepts and realia are examined, illustrating translation challenges. Findings underscore how socio-historical factors and cultural context shape terminology development, with implications for lexicography, translation, and intercultural communication.

Keywords: agricultural terminology, national-cultural characteristics, linguocultural markers, English language, Uzbek language, borrowing, realia, translation, lexicography, intercultural communication, comparative linguistics

Annotatsiya: Ushbu maqolada ingliz va o'zbek tillaridagi qishloq xo'jaligi terminlarining milliy-madaniy xususiyatlari hamda lingvokulturematik ko'rsatkichlari qiyosiy tahlil qilingan. Har ikki til qishloq xo'jalik terminologiyasining tarixi va shakllanish manbalari (ingliz tilida anglo-sakson ildizlari va keyingi fors, arab, frantsuz ta'siri; o'zbek tilida turkiy asos hamda fors, arab, rus va zamonaviy ingliz ta'siri) yoritib berilgan. Shuningdek, madaniyatga xos tushuncha va realialarni tarjima qilishdagi qiyinchiliklar hamda ijtimoiy-tarixiy omillarning terminologiya rivojiga ta'siri tahlil qilingan. Tadqiqot natijalari terminologiya, lexikografiya va tarjima amaliyotiga doir sohalarda ahamiyatga ega.

Kalit so'zlar: qishloq xo'jaligi terminologiyasi, milliy-madaniy xususiyatlar, lingvokulturematik ko'rsatkichlar, ingliz tili, o'zbek tili, o'zlashmalar, realiyalar, tarjima, lexikografiya, madaniyatlararo kommunikatsiya, qiyosiy tilshunoslik

Аннотация: В статье представлен сравнительный анализ национально-культурных особенностей и лингвокультурологических показателей сельскохозяйственной терминологии английского и узбекского языков. Исследуется историческое формирование сельскохозяйственной лексики обоих языков, выделяются исконные и заимствованные пласты (англосаксонская и тюркская основа, а также более поздние персидские, арабские, французские, русские и английские влияния). Рассмотрены культурно-специфические понятия и реалии, иллюстрирующие трудности перевода. Результаты подчёркивают влияние социально-исторических факторов и культурного контекста на развитие терминологии. Полученные данные имеют практическое значение для лексикографии, переводческой практики и межкультурной коммуникации.

Ключевые слова: сельскохозяйственная терминология, национально-культурные

особенности, лингвокультурамы, английский язык, узбекский язык, заимствования, реалии, перевод, лексикография, межкультурная коммуникация, сравнительное языкознание

INTRODUCTION. Language and culture are deeply intertwined, and the terminology of agriculture – one of humanity’s oldest and most culturally significant domains-vividly reflects this relationship. Agricultural terms evolved in tandem with the traditional lifestyles, social structures, and knowledge systems of each speech community. As such, comparing the agricultural lexicons of English and Uzbek provides insights into their national-cultural characteristics and underlying linguocultural markers. Both English and Uzbek have rich agrarian vocabularies shaped by historical contacts and socio-economic developments, yet they belong to different language families and cultural realms (Indo-European vs. Turkic), making their comparison especially revealing. Scholars have emphasized the importance of studying terminology through a cultural lens, noting that specialized vocabularies encode unique worldviews and practical experiences of a people [7, с. 6][2, p. 416]. Recent research on Uzbek and English has begun to address these aspects – for example, examining the lexical-semantic features of agriculture terms in each language [2, p. 415][3, p. 4] – but a focused comparative analysis of their national-cultural specifics and linguocultural indicators is still needed.

The significance of this topic is underscored by practical considerations. In an era of globalization and knowledge exchange, accurate understanding and translation of agricultural terms between languages is crucial. Misinterpretation of culture-bound terms can impede communication in areas like international agronomy, development projects, or academic research. As Burkhonova observes, inconsistencies in bilingual agricultural terminology hinder effective information exchange, highlighting the need for systematic development and harmonization of terms [1, p. 54]. Likewise, the presence of culture-specific terminology (realia) poses challenges for translators and lexicographers, who must convey not just technical meaning but also cultural nuance [1, p. 52]. By examining how English and Uzbek agricultural terminologies have been shaped by their respective national cultures, this study aims to contribute to both linguistic theory and practical lexicography/translation. The research addresses questions such as: **(1)** What historical layers (native and borrowed) constitute the agricultural terminological systems of English and Uzbek, and how do these reflect each culture’s development? **(2)** What linguocultural markers (e.g., culturally significant terms, semantic distinctions, idiomatic usages) differentiate English and Uzbek agricultural vocabularies? **(3)** What challenges arise in translating agricultural realia between English and Uzbek, and what strategies or standardization efforts can bridge the gaps?

METHODOLOGY. This study employs a descriptive-comparative methodology to analyze English and Uzbek agricultural terminology from a linguocultural perspective. Data Collection: We gathered a corpus of agricultural terms and concepts from both languages using multiple sources. For English, historical and etymological dictionaries (e.g., the Online Etymology Dictionary) were consulted for origin and development of key terms [13]. For Uzbek, we utilized explanatory and terminological dictionaries of agricultural terms, such as Kurbonov’s comprehensive glossary *Atamalar va terminlar lug‘ati* [15], as well as academic word lists from recent research [8, b. 121]. Additionally, prior studies on terminology provided curated examples of important terms (e.g., lists of plant, tool, and livestock names in Uzbek) [3, p. 4]. Comparative Framework: The terms were categorized into thematic groups (e.g., crops, farm implements, livestock, farming processes) and by origin (native vs. borrowed). Following the

approach of lexicographic analysis by Suyunova [8, b. 122], special attention was given to terms carrying cultural significance. We identified realia – terms for culturally specific items or concepts with no direct equivalent in the other language – by cross-checking usage contexts in literature and technical documents. For example, traditional Uzbek agrarian concepts and units were noted as potential realia when translating to English, and vice versa.

Analysis: For each category, a comparative analysis was performed. Etymological analysis traced the source of terms (indigenous development or borrowed from another culture) to reveal historical layers. We relied on authoritative sources for etymologies: for English terms, sources like Flammini (2018) provided concise histories of common farm words [11]; for Uzbek terms, academic discussions of word adoption were used (e.g., Babadjanova’s work on adoption stages) [4]. Where needed, original-language sources were referenced for precise meanings (for instance, classical Persian texts for Persian loanwords in Uzbek, and Old English sources for archaic English terms). The structural and morphological formation of terms was also examined: English largely employs compounding or derivation, whereas Uzbek, being agglutinative, often uses suffixation (e.g., -chilik for fields of activity like chorvachilik “animal husbandry”) [18, L331-L339]. By comparing such formations, we identified how each language’s grammar interacts with terminological development.

Evaluation of Linguocultural Markers: We analyzed semantic fields and usage to pinpoint linguocultural markers – elements that reflect cultural attitudes or social history. This included looking at semantic distinctions (for instance, English having different words for an animal vs. its meat, as with cow vs. beef) and at culturally important terminologies (e.g., terms for traditional farming practices, festivals, or units of measure in Uzbek). To interpret these, we drew on ethnolinguistic commentary from prior literature. For example, the well-documented Norman influence on English food terminology was used as a case study of socio-historical imprint on language [12]. In Uzbek sources, discussions by Khidoyatov and others on modern terminological development informed our understanding of how contemporary socio-economic changes introduce new terms or alter usage [6].

Overall, the methodology combines qualitative analysis of linguistic data with contextual cultural interpretation. The use of multiple sources in English, Russian, and Uzbek (including earlier research [7][9], dictionaries [15], and field-specific publications [1][3]) ensures that conclusions are grounded in established scholarship and factual examples, rather than conjecture. All translations of examples are provided by the authors. Transcription of Uzbek terms is given in the Latin script for consistency.

RESULTS. Historical Layers of Agricultural Terminology in English and Uzbek. English: The agricultural lexicon of English is characterized by multiple historical layers that reflect waves of cultural influence. The oldest stratum is the Germanic (Anglo-Saxon) layer, which provided the core vocabulary of farming in Old English. Many fundamental farm words are of Old English origin, indicating their existence in the early agrarian life of the Anglo-Saxons. For instance, wheat (OE *hwæte*) originally meant “that which is white,” in reference to the color of flour [11]. Similarly, harvest comes from Old English *hærfest*, which meant “autumn” – the season of gathering crops [11]. These ancient terms show that early English had its own words for basic crops, seasons, animals and farming tools, rooted in an agrarian society. Other examples include plow (OE *plōh*, a farming implement) and sheep (OE *sceap*), which testify to an indigenous farming lexicon. This native layer encompasses everyday farming activities and needs, illustrating the agricultural life of early medieval England.

A profound transformation occurred after 1066 with the Norman Conquest, which

introduced a French-speaking ruling class in England. The result was a massive influx of Norman French vocabulary, including agricultural and food-related terminology. A well-known consequence is the dual terminology for animals versus their meat: English peasants continued using the Old English words for livestock (cow, pig, sheep), while the prepared meats consumed by the Norman nobility were referred to with French-derived terms (beef from Old French boef, pork from porc, mutton from mouton)[1][2]. Over time, both terms entered common English usage, with the Germanic word denoting the living animal and the French word the food product. This socio-linguistic division – cow vs. beef, pig vs. pork, etc. – is a direct linguistic reflection of feudal class stratification in medieval England [12]. (In Uzbek, by contrast, there is usually no such lexical split: the same word signifies an animal and its meat, e.g. sigir for cow and sigir go'shti “cow meat/beef,” reflecting a different historical context without a sharp peasant-nobility linguistic divide.) Beyond meat terms, Norman French greatly enriched English agricultural vocabulary in other areas. Terms like farm itself entered English from Anglo-French (cf. Old French ferme)[3]. Notably, farm originally did not mean a plot of land for cultivation; its medieval meaning was “a fixed rent or tax,” derived from Medieval Latin firma (a fixed payment) [13]. Only by the late Middle English period (15th–16th centuries) did farm come to denote leased agricultural land, illustrating a semantic shift from feudal economics to agrarian usage [13]. Likewise, farmer initially meant a tax collector or leaseholder (French fermier) before it evolved to mean one who cultivates land [13]. Other French loans include garden (Old French jardin, replacing Old English wyr-tūn), acre (Norman aker, reinforcing OE æcer), and pasture (OFr. pasture)[4]. By the late medieval period, English rural vocabulary was a blend of native and Norman French terms, often with subtle distinctions (native vs. high-register loanword) for similar concepts. This layered lexicon is a hallmark of English.

The Scientific and Modern layer added another dimension as the language absorbed learned Latin and Greek terms, especially from the 18th century onwards. Advances in agricultural science and the industrialization of agriculture introduced technical terminology, much of it borrowed directly from Latin/Greek or coined anew. For example, agriculture (from Latin agri cultura, “field cultivation”) entered English in the 15th century [13], and terms like agronomy (from Greek agros “field” + nomos “law”) came in the 18th century as scientific disciplines developed[5]. Similarly, names of botanical diseases, chemical fertilizers, or machinery often have classical roots or are modern coinages (e.g., tractor was first recorded in the 1850s, from Latin trahere “to pull” + the agentive suffix -tor, literally “that which pulls” [11]). Today, English agricultural terminology is thus an amalgam of its Anglo-Saxon heritage, medieval French additions, and international scientific vocabulary. The coexistence of multiple synonyms or doublets (e.g., cow vs. cattle vs. bovine) is one outcome of this history, requiring careful choice of words depending on context and register [12].

Uzbek: Uzbek agricultural terminology evolved along a different trajectory, mirroring Central Asian history and the region's linguistic ecology. As a Turkic language, Uzbek inherited a base of native Turkic terms related to pastoral-nomadic and early oasis farming life. This oldest layer comprises words fundamental to farming and animal husbandry, many of which are cognate with terms across other Turkic languages, indicating deep Eurasian roots. For example, yer means “land, soil” – a basic term of Turkic origin used in cultivation [3, b. 4]. Urug' means “seed” (from a Proto-Turkic root meaning seed/offspring) [3, b. 4]. Ekin means “sowing” or “crop” (from Turkic ek- “to sow”), reflecting the agrarian practice embedded in the vocabulary. Indigenous terminology also covers livestock common to Central Asian life: qo'y (sheep), sigir (cow), ot (horse), tuya (camel), as well as implements like arava (cart), yug' (yoke), omoch

(plow) – all of which are Turkic in origin and denote everyday farm items or activities[6][7]. This stratum points to a long history of mixed farming and pastoralism among Turkic communities. It is notable that many such terms are shared across Kazakh, Kyrgyz, or other related languages, highlighting a common nomadic-agricultural lexicon developed before significant outside influence.

With the spread of Islam and the rise of Persianate culture in Central Asia (starting around the 8th century onward), Uzbek (and its predecessor dialects) underwent substantial Persian and Arabic influence. During the medieval period, many advanced farming techniques, new crops, and settled agricultural practices were adopted in the region largely through contact with Persian-speaking civilizations. Accordingly, a layer of Persian loans entered the agrarian vocabulary. For instance, the very word for a traditional farmer, *dehqon*, is a borrowing from Persian *dehqān* [4, p. 154]. In Persian, *dehqān* historically meant a village landowner or peasant farmer, and the term was absorbed into Turkic usage to denote a settled agriculturist as opposed to a nomadic herder. In modern Uzbek, *dehqon* specifically implies a smallholder or peasant farmer who tills his own land, carrying connotations of tradition and subsistence agriculture[8][9]. Another example is *bogʻ* (“garden”), from Persian *bāgh* (garden), and the derivative *bogʻbon* (“gardener”), which have become so ingrained in Uzbek that they feel like native words. Arabic loans often entered via Persian mediation or directly with the coming of Islam and scholarly literature. An illustrative term is *hosil* (“crop yield; harvest”), from Arabic *ḥāṣil* meaning “that which is obtained” [3, b. 4]. Uzbek uses *hosil* to talk about the result of cultivation (e.g., *hosil olish* “to obtain a yield”), and in phrases like *Hosil bayrami* “Harvest Festival,” an important cultural celebration of bounty[10]. Because Persian culture heavily influenced administration, science, and daily life in Central Asia, numerous names of fruits, farming tools, and irrigation practices in Uzbek stem from Persian or Arabic. For example, *sabzi* (carrot) is Persian, *bogʻ* (garden) as noted, *xirmon* (threshing floor, grain pile) is Persian, and *ariq* (irrigation ditch) comes from Arabic *ariq* (“channel”). By the later medieval period, Uzbek agricultural terminology was richly bilingual: Turkic terms coexisted with Persian/Arabic terms, sometimes with overlapping meanings or in complementary usage (e.g., a concept might be expressed in Turkic in colloquial speech but in Persian in formal contexts, or vice versa, reflecting diglossia in the region).

In the 19th–20th centuries, Russian and European influences added a new layer to Uzbek terminology, corresponding to the Russian Empire and Soviet era, as well as global technological progress. The incorporation of Russian terms became especially prominent during the Soviet period when Uzbek agriculture was collectivized and industrialized. Russian served as the medium for introducing modern machinery, units, and scientific concepts, and many Russian (or international) words were directly borrowed into Uzbek (often with phonetic adaptation). For instance, *traktor* (“tractor”) is a direct borrowing of the Russian *трактор*, which in turn comes from the same Latin root as English “tractor” [6, b. 87]. *Kombayn* (“combine harvester”) is from Russian *комбайн* (originally meaning “combiner”). *Fermer xoʻjaligi* (“farmer farm/enterprise”) became a term after the 1990s to denote private farming operations, using the word *fermer* borrowed from English “farmer” (via Russian *фермер*) to distinguish it from *dehqon xoʻjaligi* (a small peasant plot) [6, b. 45]. Soviet agronomic terminology, including names of crop varieties, fertilizers, and bureaucratic terms (e.g., *kolxoz* for collective farm, *brigada* for work brigade), left a deep imprint on Uzbek. Some of these were eventually replaced or fell out of use after independence, but many persist. Alongside Russian, direct English borrowings have become more common since the late 20th century, paralleling global trends. Words like *mini-texnika* (“small-scale machinery”) or *greenhouse* (often *issiqxona*, a native coinage “hot-house,” but

sometimes parnik from Russian) show a mix of approaches in modern term formation [9, b. 49]. Current Uzbek agricultural terminology thus contains a stratified mix: the foundational Turkic layer, an entrenched layer of Persian-Arabic vocabulary reflecting centuries of settled agriculture, and a modern layer of Russian/English technical terms reflecting industrial and post-industrial agriculture. These layers coexist, and occasionally there are parallel terms (native vs. loan) for the same concept. For example, Uzbek farmers might use kombayn (Russian loan) interchangeably with o‘rish mashinasi (literally “reaping machine,” a native descriptive term) [9, b. 52]. Such cases illustrate ongoing competition or synergy between international terms and local coinages.

Linguocultural Markers and National-Cultural Specificities. The comparative analysis of English and Uzbek agricultural terminology reveals several key linguocultural markers – that is, features of the terminology that encode cultural and historical distinctions.

1. Semantic Categorization of Livestock and Products: As noted, English retains a unique semantic distinction between living farm animals and their meat products, a direct legacy of Norman-English cultural dynamics. Terms like ox vs. beef, calf vs. veal, pig vs. pork encapsulate a historical class difference in food terminology [12]. This linguistic feature is virtually absent in Uzbek: in Uzbek usage, one refers to meat by naming the animal and adding a word like go‘sh (‘‘meat’’), e.g. qo‘y go‘sh for mutton (literally ‘‘sheep meat’’), mol go‘sh for beef (‘‘cattle meat’’). There are no completely separate, unrelated words for the meat versus the creature. This contrast highlights how English terms bear the imprint of a feudal cultural context, whereas Uzbek terms reflect a more transparent, agrarian usage where the product is directly linked to its source animal. It also implies differences in food culture and social structure: medieval England’s nobility could impose their language on cuisine, whereas Central Asian society did not have the same linguistic divide between peasants and elites in naming everyday foods (courtly cuisine in Central Asia did borrow many Persian/Arabic terms, but even those were integrated rather than forming dual lexicons) [12].

2. Culturally Specific Terms (Realia): Each language has agriculture-related terms deeply embedded in its national culture and often untranslatable without explanation. In English, one might consider terms like bushel (a unit of grain volume) or farthingale plow (an old type of plow), which are tied to historical British/American farming practices but have no direct counterparts in Uzbek. Conversely, Uzbek is rich in traditional agricultural concepts that carry cultural significance. For example, tanob is a traditional land measurement unit in Central Asia, used historically for taxation and land division; its value varied by region (approximately 0.1 to 0.3 hectares in different sources) and it has no direct equivalent in English units [8]. Translators must approximate it (e.g., ‘‘tanob (approximately a quarter hectare)’’) or leave it untranslated with a footnote. Another term, hashar, denotes a community work event where neighbors help each other with big tasks like planting or harvesting; this culturally-loaded concept can only be described in English (as ‘‘collective voluntary labor’’) since there is no single English word for it. Uzbek irrigation culture provides mirab – the term for a person in charge of water distribution in an irrigation network (a role of vital importance in oasis agriculture). Rendering mirab in English might require ‘‘water master’’ or ‘‘irrigation manager,’’ but these do not carry the same historical weight of Central Asian tradition [6, b. 78]. The presence of such realia underscores how the agricultural practices and social relations of a culture are encapsulated in single words that are

culturally opaque to outsiders. Linguistically, realia often remain unassimilated loans in translations or are explained rather than translated. Their frequency indicates robust cultural uniqueness. In our data, Uzbek had a higher proportion of such culturally specific agricultural terms, likely because of its long history of localized farming practices (e.g., terms for canal types, specific melons, or silk production stages like pilla for silkworm cocoon) [9, b. 47]. English, being more globally disseminated, has seen some of its rural terminology either become international (through colonization and science) or fall into disuse/archaism when practices changed (e.g., old English farming tools that are no longer common). Still, English retains many dialectal or historical farming terms that could be realia for non-English speakers (for instance, polder in Dutch context, croft in Scotland, etc., though these are specific to regions).

3. Word Formation and Morphology as Cultural Markers: The way terms are formed in each language also reflects cultural preferences and linguistic typology. Uzbek, as an agglutinative language, often creates descriptive compound terms or uses productive suffixes to expand terminology. A notable suffix is *-chilik*, which when added to a noun indicates a field of activity or collective practice. For example, from *chorva* (“cattle, livestock”) comes *chorvachilik* (“animal husbandry”)[11]; from *dehqon* (peasant farmer) comes *dehqonchilik* (“traditional agriculture” or “farming lifestyle”). This morphological device allows Uzbek to coin new terms quite readily from existing roots, keeping them transparent to native speakers. It also means that entire concepts can be encapsulated in one compound word that would need a phrase in English. For instance, *sutchilik* means “dairy farming” (literally “milk-ness”) [6, b. 59]. English tends to either borrow or create compound phrases (e.g., “dairy farming” uses the noun *dairy* + *farming*), but English compounds are often not as systematically formed as Uzbek’s noun + suffix pattern. Another example is Uzbek *bog’dorchilik* (“horticulture”, literally “orchard-gardening-(profession)”) vs. English “horticulture” (a Latinate borrowing) or “fruit gardening.” The Uzbek term is built from native elements, illustrating a preference to use intuitive native constructions for new domains where possible [14, b. 27]. However, in the modern era Uzbek has also borrowed international terms wholesale (e.g., *agrobiologiya* for “agrobiology”), indicating a dual approach: coining terms for some concepts while accepting loans for others, depending on usage in education and science [9, b. 50]. The interplay of these two strategies is itself a linguocultural marker, reflecting language policy and attitude toward preserving the Uzbek lexicon versus integrating into global scientific discourse.

English word formation in agriculture often involves compounding or derivation with old roots (e.g., *farmstead*, *haystack*, *sunflower*), which reflects the practical descriptive nature of early English rural life. At the same time, the heavy borrowing from French/Latin made many technical terms less transparent (e.g., *fertilizer* from French, *irrigation* from Latin). This can create a specialized register that farmers themselves historically might not use in daily speech (e.g., an English farmer in 1700 might say “water the fields” rather than “irrigate the fields”). In contrast, Uzbek farmers would say *sug’orish* (native word “water-giving”) for irrigation, a term readily understood. Such differences highlight how each language’s terminological system aligns with folk terminology vs. scientific terminology. Uzbek largely integrates scientific terms via Russian/International vocabulary but often adapts them (mineral *o’g’it* for “mineral fertilizer”, mixing a Russian loan *mineral* with a native *o’g’it* “manure/fertilizer”). This mixed phrasing is a linguocultural feature of modern Uzbek technical language – an outcome of Soviet-era bilingualism, where the core concept is in Uzbek but a qualifier might be international [6, b. 66].

4. Terminological Gaps and Translation Challenges: By comparing the two terminologies, we identified specific gaps where one language lacks an exact equivalent for a term in the other,

necessitating periphrasis or adaptation. These gaps often occur for realia as discussed, but also for certain institutional or system-specific terms. For example, English has terms related to its agricultural administration and rural life that don't directly map to Uzbek: allotment (a small rented garden plot in UK cities) has no concise Uzbek equivalent, as the concept did not exist historically in that form; one would have to use a phrase (shahar bog'chasi uchun yer uchastkasi, literally "a land plot for city gardening"). Conversely, Uzbek, especially during the Soviet period, developed terms for collective farming structures that English lacks: brigada (a work unit on a farm), ferma (in Uzbek, often meaning a state farm or a division of a collective farm, not just "farm" in general). When translating texts about Uzbek agriculture, English speakers often need to borrow these words or explain them, since using "brigade" or "farm" in English does not carry the exact meaning. Another interesting case is titles or social roles: Mirishkor is an honorary title meaning an exemplary farmer (literally "plenty-giver" in Persian); rendering this in English might be "Distinguished Farmer" or similar, losing the flavorful meaning. Such translation challenges confirm what Burkhonova noted: a strong need for improved bilingual terminology resources and standardized correspondences [1, p. 53]. Without standard translations, there can be inconsistency – e.g., one translator might render dehqonchilik as "peasant farming" and another as "traditional agriculture," potentially confusing readers. This underlines the importance of ongoing terminological work.

Efforts in Terminology Development and Standardization. The study also finds that both languages have seen conscious efforts to standardize and develop agricultural terminology, albeit in different contexts. In English, the issue has been less about standardizing (since English has long been dominant in scientific discourse, its terms naturally disseminate) and more about modernizing outdated terms or adopting international units (such as switching from local units like bushels and acres to metric units in many countries). In Uzbek, especially after independence (1991), there has been a drive to cultivate a terminology that is both true to Uzbek language and compatible with international usage. Scholars like Rahmonov have outlined the stages of terminology development in Uzbek linguistics – from early 20th-century attempts to create Uzbek technical terms, through Soviet-era Russification, to post-independence revitalization [9, b. 46-48]. In agricultural terminology, this has involved publishing bilingual dictionaries, revising Soviet terms, and coining new words for emerging concepts. For example, Uzbek has adopted the international term organik dehqonchilik for "organic farming," blending an English loan (organik) with a native word. There are also instances of purism, where a Russian term is replaced with an Uzbek one: some sources prefer yoqilg'i quyish mashinasi ("fuel pouring machine") over benzin nasosi (Russian benzin nasos for a fuel pump) in agricultural machinery context [14, b. 28].

The necessity of enriching and updating the lexicon is highlighted by Ashurova, who stresses that agricultural vocabulary must reflect both historical heritage and contemporary needs [3, p. 5]. This means retaining culturally significant terms like yarma (cracked grain) or sovg'a (a traditional irrigation schedule term) for heritage preservation, while introducing new terms for modern techniques like gidroponika (hydroponics) or tomchilatib sug'orish (drip irrigation, an interesting hybrid term: tomchi = drop, native, plus Russian loan lat form for "drip", showing how languages mix). The results of our comparative study suggest that standardization efforts in Uzbek benefit from cross-language comparison: understanding how English categorizes and labels agricultural concepts can guide the development of precise Uzbek equivalents, and vice

versa. For instance, English differentiates between horticulture, agronomy, and agriculture at large; Uzbek tends to use qishloq xo'jaligi for agriculture broadly, but now specialists are adopting terms like o'simlikshunoslik (plant science) alongside or instead of imported agronomiya [8, b. 123]. By examining the nuances in English, Uzbek terminologists can decide when a loanword is justified and when a calque or native formation would be clearer for practitioners and farmers.

DISCUSSION. The comparative findings illustrate how agricultural terminology serves as a linguistic mirror of each nation's cultural-historical experience. Several points emerge from the results:

First, the stratified nature of each lexicon is a testament to historical layers of culture. English terms reveal the story of Anglo-Saxon peasants, Norman lords, and scientific innovators all leaving their mark on the language. Uzbek terms encapsulate the transition from Turkic nomads to settled farmers under Persian influence, then to Soviet modern agriculture. These layers are not merely linguistic trivia; they often correspond to shifts in farming techniques, social organization, or economy. For example, when English borrowed combine (for the harvesting machine), it coincided with industrial mechanization of agriculture in the 20th century – a shift mirrored in Uzbek by borrowing kombayn around the same time. Understanding these layers helps linguists and historians alike, as terminology can be a reliable indicator of what knowledge or practice was adopted from whom. Kabanova's study of Russian agricultural terms noted similar patterns where terminology maps onto historical introduction of ideas (e.g., Russian farming terms from Western Europe in the 18th–19th centuries) [7, c. 10]. Our comparison suggests that despite different sources, English and Uzbek both demonstrate the general principle that major socio-economic changes (conquests, trade, innovation) manifest in the lexicon of agriculture.

Second, national-cultural specificity in terminology is evident in how languages partition reality. The English/Uzbek differences in livestock vs. meat terminology, or the presence/absence of certain category words (poultry has no single-word equivalent in Uzbek; one would say parrandachilik “poultry-raising” or just list the birds) reflect each culture's historical priorities. Uzbek, with an Islamic background, for instance, has specific terms related to halal slaughter and livestock management (like qurbonlik for an animal for sacrificial feast) that English lacks as a general agricultural term. Conversely, English (especially British English) developed terms for a feudal estate's components (manor, croft, glebe) which have no counterpart in Uzbek agrarian vocabulary. Such terms are culturally “dense,” requiring contextual knowledge. These findings support the idea in linguistics that lexical fields can be culture-specific: certain concepts are lexicalized in one language but not in another, based on their cultural salience. As Whorf and other linguists have noted, vocabulary offers a guide to what a society finds worth distinguishing [14, b. 29]. Our results provide concrete examples in the agricultural domain.

Third, in terms of linguocultural markers, the study identified that not only the presence of realia but also subtle linguistic features serve as markers. For example, the prolific use of the suffix -chilik in Uzbek for farming activities (literally attaching a sense of collective practice or profession) reflects a cultural view of farming as a way of life or field of work. English tends to use separate nouns (husbandry, farming, cultivation) for different nuances. The choice of metaphor in term creation can also be a marker: Uzbek uses a nature-based metaphor in hosil (“product, yield” also meaning result in general), whereas English speaks of “yield” (meaning “give forth”) – different metaphoric frames (obtaining vs. giving) for the same concept. These

micro-level differences are linguocultural signals of how farming is conceptualized.

The translation and communication implications are significant. When English and Uzbek interact – say, in agricultural development projects, academic exchanges, or translation of documents – these terminological differences require careful handling. Our findings reinforce Burkhonova’s point that improving bilingual dictionaries and terminology banks is essential [1, p. 53]. For instance, an English report on “dairy cattle feedlots” would be loaded with terms that need clear equivalents in Uzbek: dairy cattle could be rendered as sut chorvasi (literal calque “milk livestock”), and feedlot has no established Uzbek term (one might describe it as go’sht uchun semirtirish kompleksi, “fattening complex for meat”). Without standardized terms, communication can break down or become imprecise. Encouragingly, the Uzbek State Terminology Committee and various scholars (e.g., Yusupov 2018) have been working on normalizing such terms [14, b. 26-27]. Our comparison can feed into those efforts by highlighting which gaps are most pressing and how English expresses the concepts.

Moreover, the results have an educational dimension. In teaching English to Uzbek agriculture students or vice versa, awareness of these linguocultural nuances can aid vocabulary acquisition. Students must learn not just word lists but the cultural context (e.g., why harvest might mean autumn in literature, or what social image dehqon invokes in Uzbek). As Sirojova (2025) noted in a related study, language encapsulates cultural identity and emotional nuances even in seemingly technical domains[12]. For agricultural terminology, this means that certain words can carry connotations – dehqon might evoke traditional virtue in Uzbek culture, whereas peasant in English can have pejorative tones unless carefully used. These connotations are part of the linguocultural profile of terms.

Finally, from a theoretical standpoint, this study exemplifies the approach of linguoculturology in terminology research. By treating terms not as isolated labels but as cultural signs, we gain a deeper understanding of why languages have the words they do. The English/Uzbek comparison highlights the concept of the linguocultureme – a unit of language with cultural significance. Many agricultural terms, such as those we discussed (omoch, tanob, beef, farmer/dehqon), function as linguoculturemes. They embody practical knowledge, historical experience, and cultural attitudes within a word or phrase. Our findings align with the view of linguists like Vereshchagin and Kostomarov, who argued that vocabulary is a key repository of culture in language [7, c. 7-8]. By identifying concrete instances in the agricultural sphere, we contribute to the broader field of comparative linguocultural studies.

CONCLUSION. In summary, the agricultural terminologies of English and Uzbek, while both rich and expansive, demonstrate distinctive national-cultural characteristics shaped by each nation’s history and way of life. English agrarian vocabulary bears the imprint of Anglo-Saxon rural roots, feudal Norman influences, and global scientific development, resulting in a multi-layered lexicon with internal semantic stratification. Uzbek agricultural terminology, on the other hand, reflects a Turkic base enriched by centuries of Persian and Arabic cultivation culture and later impacted by Russian and international modernization, yielding its own stratified system. These histories manifest in linguocultural markers such as unique lexical dualities in English (e.g., animal vs. meat terms) and culturally specific Uzbek terms for traditional practices and measures.

Through comparative analysis, we have highlighted how socio-historical factors – conquests, trade, technological progress, and social organization – are embedded in terminology [12][4]. Crucially, this study underscores that understanding and documenting such terms is not a mere academic exercise, but has practical implications. In translation and international

collaboration, recognizing the cultural weight and exact meaning of terms like *dehqonchilik* or *harvest* can prevent miscommunication and preserve the nuance of the original context [1, p. 52]. For lexicographers and language planners, the findings point to areas where one language can borrow or calque from the other in a culturally sensitive manner, as well as where unique terms should be maintained and explained rather than forcibly equated.

The comparative approach adopted here also contributes to the theoretical discourse on language and culture. It reaffirms that terminology, often considered the most technical and culture-neutral part of language, in fact contains layers of cultural information and national spirit. Agricultural terminology, being closely tied to the daily life and identity of peoples, is especially rich in such linguocultural content. The Uzbek farmer's lexicon carries the echoes of oasis and steppe life, just as the English farmer's words echo a medieval manor and modern science lab. By bringing these echoes to the forefront, we gain a fuller picture of what language does: it does not merely label the world, but interprets it through the lens of culture.

Future research can expand this comparative linguocultural analysis to other domains (such as medicine or craftsmanship) or include additional languages (for instance, Russian as an intermediary influence, or other Turkic/Indo-European languages for a broader typological view). For the English-Uzbek pair specifically, compiling a bilingual glossary with annotations on cultural usage would be a valuable practical outcome, aiding translators and learners. Furthermore, sociolinguistic studies on how modern farmers in both countries adapt their speech (e.g., introducing English agribusiness terms into Uzbek, or preserving traditional phrases) would show the ongoing evolution of these terminologies.

In conclusion, the national-cultural features and linguocultural markers evidenced in English and Uzbek agricultural terminology illuminate the profound ways in which each language encapsulates its speakers' interaction with the land. A plow is never just a plow – whether *omoch* or *plough*, it carries a story of the people who push it. Appreciating those stories, through meticulous comparative research, enhances not only our linguistic knowledge but also mutual cultural understanding, which is ultimately the broader significance of this work.

REFERENCES:

1. Burkhonova G.M. Improvement of Agricultural Terms in Uzbekistan and Russian // *Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy*. – 2025. – Vol. 1, No. 1. – P. 51–54.
2. Qodirova G.T. Lexical-Semantic Features of the Terminology of Agriculture in English and Uzbek Languages // *Ekonomika i sotsium*. – 2025. – № 1(128). – P. 415–419.
3. Ashurova F.A. Lexical Stratification of Agricultural Terminology in the Uzbek Language: Native and Borrowed Layers // *Eurasian Research Bulletin*. – 2025. – Vol. 43. – P. 4–6.
4. Babadjanova X.K. Gradual Stages of Word Adoption into Uzbek // *Texas Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*. – 2021. – Vol. 3. – P. 153–157.
5. Doniyorov R. O'zbek texnik terminologiyasining ayrim masalalari. – Toshkent: Fan, 1977. – B. 72–79.
6. Xidoyatov N. Qishloq xo'jaligi sohasidagi zamonaviy terminlar: lingvistik tahlil. – Toshkent: Ilm va fan, 2020. – 112 b.
7. Kabanova N.A. Lingvisticheskiye osobennosti sel'skokhozyaistvennoy terminologii. – M.: Nauka, 2010. – C. 5–12.
8. Suyunova G. Qishloq xo'jaligi terminlarini izohli lug'at asosida o'rganish // *Filologiya*



- masalalari. – 2021. – № 4. – B. 120–123.
9. Rahmonov B. O‘zbek tilshunosligida terminologiyaning rivojlanish bosqichlari. – Termiz: Ilm Ziyο, 2020. – B. 45–53.
 10. Jo‘raev A. O‘zbek terminologiyasi masalalari. – Toshkent: Fan, 2004. – B. 10–18.
 11. Flammini D. Origins of Eight Common Farm Words // Farms.com – Ag Industry News. – 24.08.2018.
 12. Voice of America. Pig or Pork? Cow or Beef? – VOA Learning English. – 11.11.2017.
 13. Online Etymology Dictionary – Agriculture. – URL: <https://www.etymonline.com>
 14. Yusupov Sh.Sh. Tilshunoslik va terminologiya masalalari. – Toshkent: Fan, 2018. – B. 25–30.
 15. Kurbonov A. Atamalar va terminlar lug‘ati. – Toshkent: Turon, 2008. – 256 b.