PROBLEMS OF MODERN TERMINOLOGY AND SYSTEMS OF LEGAL TERMS

Feruza Mukhammadjon kizi Vahidova

Teacher of Andizhan State University, Republic of Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT: In the article, problems of modern terminology and systems of legal terms are analyzed with the help of local scientific and foreign scientific literature as well.

Key words: interaction, modern terminology, problem, system, legal terms, language, study.

INTRODUCTION

Studies on the interaction of language and law show that in modern civilized countries, legal norms cannot be provided except in certain cases language forms - in contrast to non-linguistic signs: objects, gestures, images, actions [Gubaeva 2004: 13]. "Language in law is not only a matter of legal technique and stylistics, but also a constructive moment of the existence of law as a unique social phenomenon" (Alekseev 1983: 7). It is noted that the two sign systems that people have consciously created - language and law - have similar properties. Linguistic signs and methods of expressing legal norms have a certain material appearance, are widely used, are convenient for visual perception, are designed for general understanding and correctly convey the abstract normative meaning of legal concepts. has some degree of convention to convey.

RESEARCH METHODS

In all legal and philosophical schools of thought of the world, one thesis has always been common: "The legal issue is contingent and variable. It does not appear by itself, but seeks to organize its life created by a purposefully created person" [Gubaeva 2004: 3]. Language symbols have long been used to receive, store and transmit information, including legal information. In this work, the

language of law is considered as one of the types of language for special purposes. According to Leichik, legal terms "live" in certain functional styles from which special languages are born, that is, languages for special purposes (LSPs).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Languages for special purposes are functional languages that exist within the framework of a correspondingly developed national (ethnic) language and serve special areas of knowledge and activity [Leichik 1986: 28-43]. Those who learn English for a specific purpose say that in the second half of the 20th century, foreign languages began to be studied by specialists in various fields for specific, professional purposes: communicating with foreign colleagues, studying their experience, reading special literature. In addition, both static and dynamic aspects should be taken into account when studying the translation characteristics of English legal terms in ICL texts.

In accordance with the goals and objectives of the research, the concept of "national legal system" taken from the theory of jurisprudence was used in the work. The concept of "legal system" includes both legislation, which is a certain organic system, and other phenomena of legal reality: legal practice and public legal consciousness, that is, almost the entire range of existing legal phenomena [Russian legal encyclopedia 1999 : 890]. Thus, the ongoing research in this study examines the concept-meaning-term relationship. This problem is controversial in modern linguistics, logic and terminology. "Concept" is considered here as a logical category ("general concept") and a subject area category ("specific concept"). Based on these positions, the research distinguishes logical-conceptual (legal) classifications of terms.

It should be noted that law, as a subject area defined and expressed by the studied terms, is in many cases not the signs of objects and phenomena of the material world, but a set of ideal, abstract special concepts. This creates special difficulties in defining the symbols of ideal objects (legal concepts) with language symbols. Therefore, both legal terms and concepts themselves are the result of the

abstract thinking of the people who created the national language and law of their country.

As for "meaning", it is a linguistic category related to the semantic analysis of the semantic components of lexical units. The problem of the relationship between meaning and understanding is analyzed in this study based on the comparison of the views expressed by representatives of different fields of terminology. This field of knowledge is considered in various works both as a separate complex science and as a part of linguistics or sciences.

In this work, terminology is considered as a developing science that studies terms and their combinations: terminology and terminological systems. This term is understood as a lexical unit of a certain LSC, denoting a general (concrete or abstract) concept of a certain special field or theory of activity [Leichik 1989: 16-17]. A terminological system is considered as a set of ordered terms that describe not only the fields of knowledge (as lexical-semantic groups), but also the theory to which the corresponding LSC belongs. Moreover, terminological systems are not a linguistic phenomenon, but a purely terminological phenomenon. In contrast to the system of terms, terminology is self-formed terms and prepositions (lexical units that have not passed the "threshold of terminology") [Khayutin 2003: 17 - 21]. In order to adequately translate English legal terms into Uzbek, it is necessary to clearly distinguish legal terminology in English and national legal terminology systems in English of individual states and others. This study applies the theory of text terminology to the analysis of translated legal dictionaries. According to this theory, there are 3 types of texts: term generators (legal documents), term builders (dictionaries) and term users (textbooks). It is assumed that in term-forming texts, terms are presented in an "ideal" form without variations (synonymy, polysemy, etc.) and D.S. Lotte meets the "term requirements" developed by the school. However, in the studied lexicographic material, there is synonymy and polysemy of the legal vocabulary, which is caused by the peculiarities of the relevant national legal systems of the English language. Thus, the features of the linguistic substrate

(variants of the English language), the logical superstratum (legal concepts defined and expressed by terms) and their terminological essence (special concepts of international contract law) determine the uniqueness of the terms of international contract law as complex linguistic and legal symbols.

In the study, the main problems of terminology, which are of great importance for the study of legal terminology systems, are reflected and options for their solution are proposed. As V.M. Lejchik noted, "problems in terminology can be divided into resolved, controversial and unresolved; in turn, all of them can be divided into theoretical and practical" [Leichik 2000: 20-30]. In the history of terminology, different opinions about the essence of the term have been expressed; term and definition; the essence of the terminological system; changes in the field of terminology and its limits; fields of definition and fields of application of terms; term and text. As part of these problems, issues such as the requirements for the term for this work are of particular importance; the possibility of synonymy and polysemy of terms. In the ongoing research, the relationship between terms, terms and lexical units of the legal language representing reality is studied. It allows to determine the features of the English and Uzbek legal terminology systems, to determine the specific features of the semantics of English legal terms in terminological texts.

The school of local terminology made a great contribution to the development of the theory and practice of this branch of linguistics in the 20th century. Cooperation with foreign colleagues in the development of the main problems of terminology was not always equally intense. Nevertheless, until now, Russian linguistics has developed important theoretical foundations in the field of terminology. Active work is being carried out to translate the works of the leading terminologists of our country into European languages, which serves to exchange mutually beneficial experience in this field of knowledge and bring closer the positions of terminologists in Eastern Europe and experts from Western countries. Scientific and technical terminology 2004; Science of Russian Terminology 2004].

In many studies at the beginning of the 21st century, the stages of the development of terminology, the state of this field of knowledge are reviewed, new interpretations of the classic foundations of terminology and new paradigms are proposed [For example: Averbukh 2004(a) ; Alekseeva 2004; Leichik 2000; Mishlanova 2002; Shelov 2003 and others]. The history of terminology is a complex interdisciplinary knowledge, the concept of the lexical-semantic field in Russian linguistics and the problems of its classification, scientists such as G.Shur, A.Bondarko, A.V.Bogdanov, S.A.Gubanov, Ye.V.Titova, S.A.Moiseyeva, T.N.Kozyura, Ye.N.Podtelezhnikova those who have approached.

Study of field theory in Uzbek linguistics H. Hojiyeva, Sh. Nazirova, A. Sobirov, Sh. Iskandarova, A. Nurmonov, M. V. Ergasheva, comparative-typological analysis of phraseological units expressing human characteristics in languages of different systems G. M. Adashullayeva, Sh. I. Shokirov in his research, he revealed the lexical and semantic field of the concept of "eye" and typologically the linguistic units included in this field. However, the scientist does not consider the first four features as a criterion for extracting terms from the common language fund, and calls the fifth feature (systematicity) "basically unclear" [Shellov 2003: 22].

CONCLUSION

The identified doubts were related to the study of the question of the status of the term: whether the term has the characteristics of a simple word and lexical meaning, how it is related to the defined concept of a certain field of knowledge. If the term has some signs of a simple word and develops in accordance with the development of the system of concepts expressed by it, then the requirements of the lack of synonymy and unambiguity of the terms cannot always be followed. Linguists have interpreted the status of the term in different ways. Thus, the first and fourth approaches to the relationship between the concept and meaning of the term are called linguistic, and the second and third are terminological. It has been argued that the difficulties in solving this problem are related to "the difference

between a special concept and a non-special concept, rather than the relation between a term and a concept". The linguistic approach is aimed at solving the problem of polysemy in terminology, in which lexical units with different meanings are combined into one dictionary lexeme, and general scientific, interdisciplinary and special scientific terminology are distinguished. The terminological approach, on the other hand, considers the operation of the term only in a special field. A symbol unit is considered only in one (special) sense.

REFERENCES:

1.Gubaeva T.V. Til va huquq. Professional yuridik amaliyotda nutq san'ati. - M., 2004. - 160 p.

2. Leichik V.M. Termin va uning ta'rifi // Hind-evropa tillarida terminologiya va terminografiya: Sat. ilmiy tr. - Vladivostok, 1987. - p. 135 - 145.

3. Rus yuridik entsiklopediyasi - M .: INFRA nashriyoti, 1999. - 1110 p.

4. Shelov S.D. Terminning lingvistik tabiati to'g'risida // NTI. - 1982. - No 9.-p. 1-6.