

PRINCIPLES OF LEXICOGRAPHIC STANDARDIZATION OF LIVESTOCK TERMS IN THE UZBEK AND ENGLISH LANGUAGES

Mukhamadiev Sukhrob Bakhtiyor ugli

Senior Teacher, University of Economics and Pedagogy Karshi, Uzbekistan

E-mail: suhrobmuhammadiyev@gmail.com

Abstract

This article examines the principles of lexicographic standardization of livestock terms in the Uzbek and English languages. Livestock terminology is a significant component of agricultural, veterinary and zootechnical vocabulary, since it reflects the naming of animal species, age and sex categories, breeds, physiological states, diseases, products, technological processes and professional activities. In bilingual lexicography, the standardization of such terms is especially important because direct word-for-word translation does not always provide conceptual accuracy. The study analyzes the main lexicographic requirements for describing livestock terms: semantic precision, genus-differentia definition, indication of species, sex, age, reproductive status, functional role, register, field label, etymological information, interlingual equivalent and contextual example.

Keywords: Livestock terminology, lexicographic standardization, bilingual dictionary, Uzbek language, English language, terminology, lexicography, animal husbandry, semantic definition, translation equivalent.

Introduction

In the modern period, the development of agriculture, veterinary medicine, animal breeding and international cooperation has made terminological accuracy one of the most important requirements of professional communication. Livestock terminology plays a special role in this process because it names the main objects and processes of animal husbandry: domestic animals, breeds, age groups, reproductive categories, diseases, feeding systems, products, technologies and professional roles. If these terms are not standardized, scientific communication, translation, educational materials and practical instructions may become ambiguous.

The Uzbek and English languages have rich livestock vocabularies. Uzbek livestock terminology has developed under the influence of traditional animal husbandry, Turkic linguistic heritage, Persian-Arabic borrowings and Russian-European scientific terminology. English livestock terminology has been shaped by Germanic roots, Norman-

French food-related vocabulary and Latin-Greek scientific terminology. As a result, the two languages do not always organize livestock concepts in the same way. This creates serious challenges for bilingual lexicography. For example, the English term *cattle* is usually translated as *qoramol*, but the English word functions as a plural collective noun, while Uzbek *qoramol* may be used with counting constructions such as *ikki bosh qoramol*. The English terms *ox* and *steer* may both correspond to Uzbek *ho'kiz*, but in English they may differ according to function: *ox* is usually a working castrated male bovine, while *steer* is often a castrated male bovine raised for meat. Similarly, *breeding* may be translated as *naslchilik*, *ko'paytirish*, *urchitish*, or *zot yetishtirish* depending on context. These examples prove that bilingual lexicography cannot be based only on simple equivalence.

J.C. Sager considers terminology not simply as a vocabulary list but as a structured system of concepts used for special communication [3, p. 58]. According to him, terminological dictionaries must help specialists identify and use concepts correctly. This means that a bilingual livestock dictionary should not merely give *bull – buqa* or *cow – sigir*; it should clarify the conceptual boundaries of each term.

M.T. Cabré's communicative theory of terminology also supports this view. She notes that terms function in real communicative situations and must be described according to their field, users and contexts [4, p. 81]. In livestock terminology, this is especially relevant because the same term may be used differently by veterinarians, farmers, translators, students and researchers.

In lexicography, S. Landau points out that dictionaries should provide definitions, grammatical information, usage notes and examples, especially when the word belongs to a specialized domain [5, p. 144]. B.T. Atkins and M. Rundell also emphasize that a good dictionary entry should be based on real usage and should provide information that helps the user choose the correct word in context [6, p. 407].

For bilingual terminology, equivalence is a central issue. E. Nida states that translation must transfer meaning, not only linguistic form [7, p. 159]. P. Newmark notes that technical translation requires accuracy, consistency and conceptual clarity [8, p. 151]. Therefore, in livestock lexicography, translation equivalents should be checked through semantic and functional comparison.

Existing agricultural dictionaries, including L. Juraev's *English-Uzbek-Russian Dictionary of Agricultural Terms*, provide valuable material for bilingual agricultural terminology [9]. However, modern livestock lexicography needs further standardization: terms should be supplied with definitions, context labels, semantic parameters and cross-references. This is especially necessary for terms such as *heifer*, *steer*, *wether*, *farrowing*, *weaning*, *breeding value*, *dairy cattle* and *beef cattle*.

Lexicographic standardization is the process of establishing unified rules for the selection, definition, classification, translation and presentation of terms in dictionaries. In specialized bilingual lexicography, standardization is necessary to ensure that a term is used consistently in scientific, educational, professional and translation contexts.

For livestock terminology, lexicographic standardization includes the following tasks:

1. selecting the correct lemma;
2. defining the term according to its conceptual features;
3. identifying its semantic group;
4. indicating grammatical properties;
5. providing Uzbek or English equivalents;
6. marking the type of equivalence;
7. giving usage labels;
8. distinguishing synonyms and near-synonyms;
9. adding contextual examples;
10. showing cross-references to related terms.

Without these elements, a bilingual dictionary may create confusion. For example, if *heifer* is translated only as *yosh sigir*, the user may not understand that the term refers specifically to a young female bovine that has not yet calved. If *steer* and *ox* are both translated simply as *ho'kiz*, the difference between a meat-oriented animal and a working animal may be lost. If *livestock* is always translated as *chorva*, the translator may ignore contexts where *chorva mollari* or *chorva hayvonlari* is more appropriate. Thus, lexicographic standardization is not a purely technical process. It is a scientific procedure based on semantic, functional, grammatical and cultural analysis.

The first principle is conceptual accuracy. A livestock term must be defined according to the concept it represents. The definition should not be too broad or too narrow. It should include the genus and the distinctive features of the term. For example: *Bull* – an adult intact male bovine used mainly for breeding. *Buqa* – nasl berish uchun foydalaniladigan voyaga yetgan erkak qoramol. This definition is more accurate than simply “male cattle,” because it includes the reproductive and functional role of the animal. Similarly: *Heifer* – a young female bovine that has not yet calved. *G'unajin* – hali tug'magan yosh urg'ochi qoramol. This definition distinguishes *heifer* from *cow*. Conceptual accuracy is especially important in livestock terminology because small semantic differences may have practical consequences in breeding, veterinary documentation and agricultural management.

Every livestock term should be described according to its semantic components. The most important components are: species; sex; age; reproductive status; physiological condition; productive function; technological role; professional field. For example, the term *cow* includes the following components: species – cattle; sex – female; age – adult; reproductive status – calved; function – milk or breeding. The term *calf* includes: species – cattle; age – young; sex – not specified. The term *ox* includes: species – cattle; sex – male; reproductive status – castrated; function – working animal. This componential approach helps avoid false equivalence. It also allows dictionary users to understand why two similar terms are not identical.

In bilingual lexicography, terms must be classified according to the type of equivalence. Not all Uzbek and English livestock terms have full equivalents. Therefore, dictionary

entries should indicate whether the equivalent is full, partial, contextual or descriptive. Full equivalence: *bull* – *buqa*; *calf* – *buzoq*; *ram* – *qo'chqor*;

Partial equivalence: *livestock* – *chorva* / *chorva mollari*; *cattle* – *qoramol*; *herd* – *poda*;

Contextual equivalence: *breeding* – *naslchilik* / *ko'paytirish* / *zot yetishtirish*; *stock* – *chorva* / *poda* / *nasl materiali*; *animal husbandry* – *chorvachilik* / *chorva hayvonlarini parvarishlash sohasi*;

Descriptive equivalence: *farrowing* – *cho'chqaning bolalashi*; *weaning* – *yosh hayvonni*; *onadan ajratish*; *wether* – *bichilgan erkak qo'y yoki echki*. This principle is directly connected with translation practice. It helps translators select the correct equivalent according to context.

The English term *cattle* is one of the most important livestock terms. It denotes domesticated bovine animals kept for milk, meat or breeding. In Uzbek, it is usually translated as *qoramol*. However, this pair requires grammatical and semantic explanation. In English, *cattle* is a plural noun and has no regular singular form. In Uzbek, *qoramol* may function as a collective noun and may be used with counting words. Therefore, the dictionary entry should include grammatical information: **cattle** *n. pl.* – *qoramol*; *yirik shoxli qoramol*.

Note: English plural noun; Uzbek counting form: *bir bosh qoramol*, *ikki bosh qoramol*. Example: *dairy cattle* – *sut yo'nalishidagi qoramol*; *beef cattle* – *go'sht yo'nalishidagi qoramol*.

This entry should also include cross-references to *cow*, *bull*, *calf*, *heifer*, *ox* and *steer*.

The term *livestock* denotes farm animals kept for production. It may include cattle, sheep, goats, pigs, horses and poultry. Uzbek equivalents include *chorva*, *chorva mollari* and *chorva hayvonlari*. The choice depends on context. **livestock** *n.* – *chorva*; *chorva mollari*; *chorva hayvonlari*. Equivalence: partial/contextual. Example: *livestock production* – *chorvachilik mahsulotlari ishlab chiqarish*; *livestock disease* – *chorva hayvonlari kasalligi*. A dictionary should note that *livestock* is broader than *cattle*. This prevents the common mistake of translating *livestock* as *qoramol* in all contexts.

The pair *bull* – *buqa* is relatively stable. Both terms denote an adult intact male bovine used mainly for breeding. **bull** *n.* – *buqa*. Definition: an adult male bovine, especially one used for breeding. Semantic features: cattle; male; adult; intact; breeding function. Example: *breeding bull* – *nasldor buqa*. Cross-reference: *cow*, *steer*, *ox*, *calf*. This entry should clearly distinguish *bull* from *ox* and *steer*.

The terms *ox* and *steer* are difficult for Uzbek-English lexicography because both may correspond to *ho'kiz*, but they are not identical in English. **ox** *n.* – *ho'kiz*. Definition: a castrated male bovine, usually used as a working animal. Plural: *oxen*. Example: *ox-drawn cart* – *ho'kiz qo'shilgan arava*. **steer** *n.* – *go'sht uchun boqiladigan bichilgan erkak qoramol*; *ho'kiz*. Definition: a castrated male bovine, especially one raised for beef.

Equivalence: contextual/descriptive. Example: *fattening steer – go'sht uchun boqilayotgan bichilgan erkak qoramol*. These two entries should be cross-referenced. Otherwise, users may think that *ox* and *steer* are complete synonyms.

Several problems arise in the standardization of livestock terms.

Synonymy- Some Uzbek terms are close in meaning but not identical: *zotdor*, *naslli*, *sernasl*. They may all refer to good breeding quality, but their stylistic and professional usage differs. *Zotdor* is more formal and bookish, *naslli* is more general, while *sernasl* may emphasize productivity in reproduction. A dictionary should not treat them as complete synonyms without explanation.

Polysemy- The word *bosh* in Uzbek means “head” in general language, but in livestock terminology it functions as a counting unit: *ikki bosh qoramol*, *yuz bosh qo'y*. This special use should be included as a separate meaning in dictionaries. Similarly, English *stock* may mean animals, breeding material, supply or capital depending on context. In livestock terminology, *breeding stock* should be translated as *nasl materiali* or *nasldor hayvonlar*, not simply *zaxira*.

Uzbek livestock vocabulary includes dialectal and regional variants. Some animal names, age terms and professional expressions may differ from region to region. Such terms should be marked as *dialectal*, *regional*, *colloquial* or *obsolete*. This is important because folk livestock vocabulary is part of the historical basis of modern terminology.

Veterinary and genetic terminology includes many international terms: *mastitis*, *brucellosis*, *vaccine*, *genotype*, *genome*, *mutation*, *artificial insemination*. Some of them have adapted Uzbek forms: *mastit*, *brutsellyoz*, *vaksina*, *genotip*, *genom*, *mutatsiya*, *sun'iy urug'lantirish*. A standardized dictionary should show whether the term is borrowed, translated, calqued or adapted.

English makes a strong distinction between animals and meat products: *cow – beef*, *calf – veal*, *sheep – mutton*, *pig – pork*. Uzbek often uses descriptive equivalents: *mol go'shti*, *buzoq go'shti*, *qo'y go'shti*, *cho'chqa go'shti*. This difference should be systematically reflected in dictionary entries.

A bilingual livestock dictionary entry may follow this template:

Lemma: English or Uzbek term

Pronunciation: if necessary

Part of speech: noun, adjective, verb

Plural form: if irregular

Field label: livestock, veterinary, breeding, poultry, dairy, etc.

Definition: genus + distinctive feature

Equivalent: Uzbek or English equivalent

Equivalence type: full, partial, contextual, descriptive

Semantic components: species, sex, age, status, function

Example: professional sentence

Cross-reference: related terms

Note: cultural, dialectal or grammatical information

For example:

wether *n.*

Field: sheep/goat breeding.

Definition: a castrated male sheep or goat.

Uzbek equivalent: *bichilgan erkak qo'y yoki echki; serka* in goat-breeding contexts.

Equivalence type: descriptive/contextual.

Example: *Wethers are often kept for meat production – Bichilgan erkak qo'ylar ko'pincha go'sht yetishtirish uchun boqiladi.*

Cross-reference: *ram, buck, ewe, doe.*

This model may be used for both printed and electronic dictionaries.

The analysis demonstrates that lexicographic standardization of livestock terms in Uzbek and English should be based on conceptual, semantic and functional criteria. The main difficulty is that two languages do not always have the same degree of lexical differentiation. English often has compact one-word terms for specific concepts, while Uzbek may use descriptive phrases. Conversely, Uzbek has traditional terms that may require explanation in English.

A standardized bilingual dictionary should therefore perform three functions. First, it should provide a correct equivalent. Second, it should explain the meaning of the term. Third, it should guide the user in choosing the right equivalent in context.

For example, the dictionary should not simply give: *breeding – naslchilik*

It should show: *breeding – naslchilik; ko'paytirish; zot yetishtirish; urchitish* depending on context.

Similarly, it should not simply give: *steer – ho'kiz*

It should explain that *steer* is a castrated male bovine usually raised for beef, while *ox* is a castrated male bovine used for work. This distinction is essential for accurate translation.

Another important point is the need for cross-references. Terms in livestock terminology form systems, not isolated units. *Cow* should be connected with *heifer, calf, bull* and *beef*. *Sheep* should be connected with *ram, ewe, lamb, wether* and *mutton*. Such cross-references help users understand the structure of the terminological field.

Conclusion

The lexicographic standardization of livestock terms in Uzbek and English is an important task for terminology, bilingual lexicography, agricultural translation and professional education. Livestock terminology is not a random set of animal names; it is a structured conceptual system that includes species, sex, age, reproductive status, function, products, diseases and technological processes.

The analysis shows that a bilingual dictionary of livestock terms should not be limited to simple translation equivalents. Each entry should include definition, semantic

components, grammatical information, field label, equivalence type, contextual example and cross-reference. Such an approach makes it possible to avoid semantic confusion between terms such as *cow* and *heifer*, *ox* and *steer*, *livestock* and *cattle*, *breeding* and *animal husbandry*.

The proposed principles may serve as a theoretical and practical basis for creating standardized Uzbek-English and English-Uzbek livestock dictionaries. They may also be used in agricultural education, veterinary translation, scientific writing and digital terminological databases. Future research may focus on corpus-based verification of livestock terms, electronic lexicographic platforms and multilingual comparison involving Uzbek, English and Russian livestock terminology.

References

1. Lotte, D.S. Osnovy postroeniya nauchno-tekhnicheskoj terminologii [Foundations of Scientific and Technical Terminology]. Moscow: Academy of Sciences, 1961. – 158 p.
2. Superanskaya, A.V., Podolskaya, N.V., Vasilyeva, N.V. Obshchaya terminologiya: voprosy teorii [General Terminology: Issues of Theory]. Moscow: Nauka, 1989. – 246 p.
3. Sager, J.C. A Practical Course in Terminology Processing. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1990. – 254 p.
4. Cabré, M.T. Terminology: Theory, Methods and Applications. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1999. – 248 p.
5. Landau, S.I. Dictionaries: The Art and Craft of Lexicography. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. – 496 p.
6. Atkins, B.T.S., Rundell, M. The Oxford Guide to Practical Lexicography. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. – 552 p.
7. Nida, E.A. Toward a Science of Translating. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1964. – 331 p.
8. Newmark, P. A Textbook of Translation. New York: Prentice Hall, 1988. – 292 p.
9. Juraev, L. English-Uzbek-Russian Dictionary of Agricultural Terms. Tashkent: Universitet, 2020. – 540 p.
10. Grinev-Grinevich, S.V. Terminovedenie. Moscow: Akademiya, 2008. – 304 p.
11. Leychik, V.M. Terminovedenie: predmet, metody, struktura. Moscow: Librokom, 2009. – 256 p.
12. Mukhammadiyev, S.B. Semantic, Genetic and Lexicographic Study of the Lexicon of Animal Husbandry in the Uzbek and English Languages. PhD Dissertation Abstract. Karshi, 2026. – 64 p.
13. Russian-Uzbek Agricultural Dictionary. In 2 Volumes. Tashkent: Fan, 1983. – 600 p.
14. Temmerman, R. Towards New Ways of Terminology Description: The Sociocognitive Approach. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2000. – 258 p.