

*Abidova Azizakhon**Teacher, University of Economics and Pedagogy***BASIC PRINCIPLES OF PARADIGMATIC RELATIONS IN TERMINOLOGY**

Abstract. The article presents the author's approach to understanding paradigmatic relations in terminology. The structure of the terminological field and terminological system are differentiated, which makes it possible to use them in describing the processes of transterminologization and determinologization. Variation and synonymy are defined as zones of development of terminological systems. Homonymy and paronymy are assessed as certainly undesirable phenomena in terminology.

Key words: terminology systems, linguistic terminology, paradigmatic relations, polyparadigmaticity.

The heterogeneity of the elements of the terminological field creates the prerequisites for the dependence of the structuring of the field during its description on the choice of the initial basis: (a) genesis (originally Russian terms or xenotherms, i.e. borrowed from other languages); (b) the completeness of terminological properties (terms ↔ nomens), (c) the measure of terminology (terms, terminoids, etc.); (d) the degree of motivation and explanatory power.

Considering the terminological field of linguistics from the point of view of training a professional linguistic personality, the author does not exclude the allocation of basic terms of science (general linguistic terms, including the names of sections of science and the main methods of studying language) as the core of this field; the immediate periphery – terminological subfields of individual linguistic disciplines, which presupposes the inevitable parcellation of the mentioned part of the field; distant periphery – highly specialized terms, as well as zones of intersection with other terminological fields, which are formed by interscientific terms and general scientific vocabulary. All these are the author's arguments for the structure of the terminological field, but according to parameters other than the structure of the terminology system. And this gives terminologists the right to operate with this term, denoting the largest paradigmatically specified formation, correlated with the subject area of science, but under the condition of consistent adherence to the field methodology of description. Otherwise, the boundary between the oppositions "terminological field ↔ terminology system" and "terminology ↔ terminology system" is blurred. The author also proves the convenience of using this term when describing such processes as transterminologization (the transition of a term from one terminological field to another) and determinologization (the exit of a term from a terminological field beyond the framework of the language for special purposes).

The fact that the systematicity of language at all its levels is realized in paradigmatic and syntagmatic connections is an axiom in linguistic theory. The paradigmatic nature of a term with the weakening of its syntagmatic connections was first noted by A.A. Reformatsky. The syntagmatics of a term-word is born in metaspeech (for example, in newly created phrases: paradigmatic nature of a term, syntagmatics of a term, weakening of syntagmatic connections), but is easily transformed into syntactic derivation: paradigmatic connections/relations, syntagmatic connections/relations – these are already compound terms. In a condensed form, the specificity of terminological paradigmatics is represented by the statement that conceptual relations between terms prevail over all other relations in the terminological system and that specific linguistic connections - synonymous, antonymous, homonymous - are extremely limited in terminological systems, and word-formation connections are relatively narrow.

Considering the issues of hyper-hyponymous relations in terminology, the author turns to the idea of V.M. Leichik, according to which the basis of the terminological system as a "language model of

a certain special area" is a system of logically organized concepts of a given area of knowledge, or its "logical model". This allows the author to assert that of all the systemic relations inherent in the vocabulary of a natural language, terminology obviously has logical hyper-hyponymous relations, which is quite understandable: the overwhelming majority of scientific terms are associated with the classification of the phenomena under study. For example: morpheme → root and affixes, affixes → prefixes, infixes, transfixes, interfixes, suffixes, inflections, postfixes. This type of relations is also well represented in the system of non-specialized vocabulary (furniture → table, sofa, wardrobe...; birds → eagle, seagull, swift...), but, as the author proves, in terminology systems hyper-hyponymous relations push the actual linguistic connections: synonymy and homonymy, far into the background.

For the authors of numerous works on the antonymy of terms, the main theoretical premise is the position formulated by V.P. Danilenko, which is that antonymy is characteristic of the lexicon of the language of science no less, and rather more, than of the general literary one. In addition, according to researchers, in the rapidly developing terminology field of automated electric drive, "on average, every fifth English and every sixth Russian term has an antonym." Logical opposition as the essence of antonymous relations, which is in the vocabulary of the general language in the shadow of semantic opposition proper, "comes to light" in terminology, transforming into dichotomous relations, and antonymous pairs form, accordingly, "conceptual terminological oppositions." I fully agree with the author, who emphasizes the regularity of binary oppositions organized according to the feature "is – is not", which took "a special, leading place in the oppositional method of describing language, developed for phonology by N.S. Trubetskoy, and then extended to other levels of language structure". As a special type of terminological antonymy, I.S. Kulikova points to the dichotomy of compound terms with the first component – an adjective, which is the bearer of the opposed feature: hard ↔ soft (consonant), strong ↔ weak (position), simple ↔ complex (sentence), complete ↔ partial (assimilation), etc. At the same time, according to the author's observation, the specificity of the antonymy of terminological adjectives "is recognized as their strict, given, agreed upon correlation with the characterized scientific concept, realized in the close connection of the definition and the defined". Thus, the author convincingly argues his position, which consists in the fact that hyper-hyponymous and antonymous, or dichotomous, connections based on logic and not subject to the law of formal-content symmetry of the ideal term are highly constructive in relation to the terminology system, which is not at all characteristic, according to his own assertion, of synonymy and homonymy. The preference for one or another variant in the synchronic plan is, according to the researcher's assumption, purely a matter of "taste" (cf. morph in the textbooks on introduction to linguistics by A.A. Reformatsky, Yu.S. Stepanov and N.F. Alefirenko - morph in the textbook by V.I. Kodukhov). Undoubtedly, there must be serious reasons for preserving variability in meta-speech, such as the accentual variant of discourse with an orientation toward the French primary language and discourse with an orientation toward the English intermediary language (although the latter variant is considered the norm today, and, as the author notes, is constantly violated!).

Against the background of the development of the theory of terminological variability, it is precisely the reduction of synonymy of terms to doublets that is the reason for the different attitudes toward it. The given example (linguistics - linguistics) convincingly illustrates the idea of the incomplete identity of even classical doublets. Therefore, terminological synonymy does not disappear from the agenda of terminologists at all, but, on the contrary, receives further development.

In the terminology of homonyms, I.S. Kulikova discovers perspectives of consideration that differ from general linguistic perspectives, associated with the interaction of the metalanguage of a given science with the lexical system of the general language and the sublanguages of other sciences. The prevalence of interscientific homonymy, which is the result of parallel term formation or borrowing, has long been unanimously recognized. Scientists differ only in the methods of naming

it (cf. interdisciplinary homonymy (Tatarinov, 2006), interterminosystemic homonymy (Borisova, 2000)). But here one cannot fail to take into account the opinion of V.A. Tatarinov about the philological, and not terminological, nature of the problem of interdisciplinary homonymy, "since examples of the type reflex in a dog and reflexes in a language can be found not in a special subject text, but only on the pages of a textbook on linguistics" and, of course, in terminological works, as in this case.

Homonyms are sometimes called intersystemic and, more successfully, macrosystemic. In modern terminology, this aspect of homonymy is developed in connection with the phenomenon of consubstantiality of terms. The proposed types of homonymous connections of a term, although they represent a natural consequence of the formation of terminology, are external in relation to a specific terminology system. The author convinces that intra-scientific homonymy, recorded exclusively in terminological dictionaries, cannot be considered a desirable phenomenon, since this "is a violation of the law of the sign," a deviation from the tendency of a term to a one-to-one correspondence between form and content.

Conclusion. As a particular variety of intra-scientific homonymy, the most undesirable, in the opinion of the researcher, and therefore extremely rare intra-systemic homonymy is distinguished, which occurs between the terms of "one of the sections or subsections of one science": accent 1 (stress) and accent 2 (phonetic deviations in speech in a foreign language), however, within phonetics they still belong to different terminological microfields: prosody and articulatory phonetics. Paronyms as a special type of paradigmatic connections in vocabulary were identified by lexicologists and lexicographers, first of all, as sources of numerous speech errors. In scientific communication, they are also a source of interpretative errors and communication failures.

REFERENCES:

1. Leychik V.M. Terminovedenie: Predmet, metody, struktura [Terminology: Subject, Methods, Structure]. Moscow, 2009. 256 p.
2. Shumaylova M.S. Aktual'nye problemy razvitiya i funktsionirovaniya terminologii Internet v nemetskom yazyke [Current Issues of the Development and Functioning of Internet Terminology in the German Language: Diss.]. Omsk, 2005. 193 p.
3. Leonova S.A. Semanticheskie otnosheniya antonimii v tekhnicheskoy terminologii (na primere terminopolya "avtomatizirovannyy elektroprivod") [Semantic Antonymic Relations in Technical Terminology (Based on the Example of the Term-Field "Automatic Electric Drive")]. Vestnik MGOU: elektronnyy zhurnal, 2013, no. 3, p. 15. DOI: 10.18384/2224-0209-2013-3-699
4. Fedotova A.K. Antonyms in Terminology (Based on the Dictionary of the Russian Language of the 21st Century Edited by G. N. Sklyarevskaya). J. Appl. Linguist. Lexicogr., 2020, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 76–84. DOI: 10.33910/2687-0215-2020-2-1-76-84
5. Danilenko V.P. Russkaya terminologiya. Opyt lingvisticheskogo opisaniya [Russian Terminology: Experience of Linguistic Description]. Moscow, 1977. 246 p.
6. Tatarinov V.A. Obshchee terminovedenie [General Terminology]. Moscow, 2006. 528 p.