

*Madina Nosirovna Musurmankulova –*

*Denau Institute of Entrepreneurship and Pedagogy, Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of Russian Language and Literature, Head of the Department of Educational Control. Address: 190500, Denau, Republic of Uzbekistan, st. Sh.Rashidov house 360 E-mail: madinanosirovna87@gmail.com. Tel.: (+998) 91-515-90-62.*

***Annatation:** The article examines the term as a necessary tool for professional thinking, professional mastery of objective reality, the most important tool for scientific communication and the problem of isolating a term from a text. Terms, or rather, their application and use by people, can be (and often are) the cause of partial, or even complete, mutual misunderstanding among scientists in the process of cognition and communication. The polysemy of a term not removed by the context, the hidden substitution of one meaning of a term for another, the vagueness of the conceptual boundaries of a term, the actual non-terminality of words functioning as a term - all these are quite common “terminological situations” of modern science, which certainly complicate scientific communication and reduce its effectiveness. That is why perhaps the most important task of terminology at the present stage can be considered to clarify the subject and conceptual relevance of basic terms in every science, including linguistics. It is necessary to clearly understand that the substantive relevance of a term arises due to its denotative connection with the reality it denotes (denotation), and it is impossible to successfully use a term if its substantive relevance is vague or multidirectional, i.e. it is unclear what phenomenon of reality, which aspects of it are designated one term or another. But the term not only denotes a certain reality, but also expresses and forms a scientific concept about it. The significative connection of a term, i.e. its*

*connection with a scientific concept, determines its conceptual relevance.*

**Key words:** *term, selection, text, thinking, form, process, tool, science, scientist, communication.*

Terms are usually called single words or phrases that name concepts and objects of some specialized field. The problem of automatic selection of terminological phrases is studied from the point of view of numerous applications - the creation of terminological dictionaries based on text corpora, automatic indexing of texts for information retrieval systems, categorization of texts and their thematic structuring, translation of texts from one language to another, extraction of knowledge from text sources. Characteristic of the term extraction software developed in this case is the consideration of only nominative terminology and a limited number of syntactic samples of nominal terms, the use of superficial syntactic analysis (as a rule, without relying on the dictionary of the problem area) together with taking into account the frequency of occurrence of the allocated units [1. P.979, 2, P.145].

In modern linguistic literature, the concept of a term is usually defined by semantic features, depending on the meaning, or function, of the corresponding linguistic units. Terminological vocabulary usually includes “special words, limited by their special purpose” [8, p. 80].

In linguistics, there are many different attempts to define terms. We present here only two definitions of terms that reflect and synthesize, in our opinion, different arguments regarding this, which complement each other [5, P.690]. Под термином традиционно понимается слово (словосочетание), означающее понятие специальной области знания или деятельности [5, С.690].

Terms can have different structures. According to the number of components, word terms or single-word terms are distinguished, less often called monolexic terms, which can also include complex terms formed by adding stems and having a continuous or hyphenated spelling; phrase terms, or compound, multicomponent terms.

L.V. Shcherba characterized compound terms as combinations of words that have structural and semantic unity and represent a dismembered terminated nomination [5, P.690]. The criterion for considering a phrase as one nominative terminological unit is its use to name one concept.

The definition of the term proposed by V. M. Ovcharenko, in principle, does not raise objections. However, in our opinion, the author understands the “semantic integrity of a linguistic unit” too narrowly, denoting a special concept. In his opinion, phrases such as electric motor are not terms on the grounds that an adjective serving as a definition supposedly retains the same meaning when combined with other nouns, for example, in the phrase electrical energy, and, therefore, I don't have semantic integrity [6, p. 146-147].

Compound terms are subject to another very significant grammatical (syntactic) requirement, namely, the presence of subordinating connections between the components of the phrase. Not every substantive term is considered a compound term. a phrase denoting a special concept, but only one that is formed on the basis of subordinate connections. In other words, “composite terms are a special type of subordinating phrases” [2, p. 9].

Taking into account the provisions discussed above, it seems to us that the definition of the term given by S.V. Grinev is exhaustive, in which he characterizes the term “as a nominative special lexical unit (word or phrase) of a special language, accepted for the exact name of special concepts” [10, P. 691].

Due to the active study of various terminologies, many definitions of the concept “term” have appeared. A considerable part of definitions is based on semantic features. At the same time, two trends in characterizing the term are outlined. According to the first, it is a separate word “with a strictly defined meaning” [10, P.691]; “a word that corresponds to one precisely defined concept from the field of science, technology, art” [10, P.692].

The difficult question of identifying words in a stream of connected speech, i.e. the boundaries between a word and a phrase, on the one hand, and a word and a morpheme, on the other, interested many scientists. This problem received the

most complete coverage in Soviet literature in the works of prof. A.I. Smirnitsky. As the main criterion A.I. Smirnitsky put forward the integral form of a word, opposed to the separately formed form of a phrase.

The integral design of a word should be understood as the presence of a common grammatical design for all elements that make up the word.

The separate design of a phrase, on the contrary, suggests that each component has a separate grammatical design [11, P.2].

The essence of the difference between the integral form of a word and the separate form of a phrase A.I. Smirnitsky shows by comparing the word shipwreck shipwreck, consisting of identical root elements, and the phrase (the) wreck of the ship. It is quite obvious that, without differing significantly in meaning, these formations are fundamentally different in their relation to the grammatical structure, i.e. differently decorated. In the word, grammatical design is carried out once ship-wrecks, in a phrase as many times as there are components in it: (the) wreck of (the) ships or (the) wrecks of (the) ships [11, P.3].

As a consequence, we consider the problem of selection more broadly. In addition to highlighting the actual terms that have a problem-oriented nature, it is necessary to find terminological phrases of general scientific vocabulary in the text. The ultimate goal of the selection is not only to check the consistency of the use of terms and to identify stylistic errors in the use of general scientific words, but also to “convolve” the selected multi-word combinations into complete units, which significantly reduces the multivariance of the full syntactic analysis that is then carried out.

#### **REFERENCES:**

1. Bourigault, D. (1992) Surface Grammatical Analysis for the Extraction of Terminological Noun Phrases. Proceedings of COLING-92, Nantes, France, p. 977-981.
2. Golovin B. N. On some problems of studying the term. - Bulletin of Moscow University. Series X. Philology. M., 1972. P.49-59.
3. Dowlagar S., Mamidi R. Unsupervised technical domain terms extraction using

term extractor. Proc. XVII ICON, 2020, pp. 5–8.

4. Dementyeva Y.Yu., Bruches E.P., Batura T.V. Extracting terms from the texts of scientific articles // Software products and systems. 2022. T. 35. No. 4. pp. 689–697. DOI: 10.15827/0236235X.140.689-697.

5. Kobrin R. Yu. Experience in linguistic analysis of terminology. Author's abstract. dis. for the job application scientist, Ph.D. Philol. Sci. Gorky, 1969.S. 121.

6. Ovcharenko V. M. Conceptual, semantic and semiotic integrity of the term. — In the book: Linguistic problems of scientific and technical terminology. M., 1970. P. 139-153.

7. Ovcharenko V. M. Term, analytical name and nominative definition. — In the book: Modern problems of terminology in science and technology. M., 1969.P.91-122.

8. Reformatsky A. A. Introduction to linguistics. M., 1955. P.536. Smadja, F. (1993) Retrieving Collocations from Text: Xtract. Computational Linguistics, 19(1), p. 143-177.

9. Smadja, F. (1993) Retrieving Collocations from Text: Xtract. Computational Linguistics, 19(1), p. 143-177.

10. <https://infopedia.su/3xca34.html>

11. <https://studfile.net/preview/4200604/page:10/>

12. <https://www.dialog-21.ru/digest/2001/articles/bolshakova/>