



LEXICAL-SEMANTIC AND PRAGMATIC FEATURES OF AGRARIAN TEXTS IN THE KARAKALPAK AND ENGLISH LANGUAGES

Yakupova Ayzada Danil qizi

Karakalpak State University, Faculty of Foreign Languages, Department of Philology and
Language Teaching (English)

ayzadayakupova18@gmail.com

Abstract: Agrarian texts constitute an important component of professional communication, serving as a means of transmitting agricultural knowledge, scientific innovations, and practical information. The linguistic characteristics of such texts are determined by their lexical, semantic, and pragmatic properties, which reflect both professional requirements and cultural traditions. This study aims to investigate the lexical-semantic and pragmatic features of agrarian texts in the Karakalpak and English languages through a comparative linguistic approach. The research focuses on the analysis of agricultural vocabulary, semantic relationships, contextual meanings, and communicative functions in scientific, educational, and informational agricultural texts. Comparative, descriptive, semantic, and pragmatic methods were employed to identify similarities and differences between the two languages. The findings indicate that English agrarian texts are characterized by standardized terminology, semantic precision, and formal communicative structures, whereas Karakalpak agrarian texts preserve culturally specific lexical units, traditional expressions, and context-dependent pragmatic meanings. The study contributes to comparative linguistics, discourse analysis, terminology studies, translation research, and intercultural communication within the agricultural domain.

Keywords: agrarian texts, Karakalpak language, English language, lexical-semantic analysis, pragmatics, comparative linguistics, agricultural terminology, discourse analysis, intercultural communication, professional language.

Introduction

Agriculture remains one of the fundamental sectors of the global economy, ensuring food security, sustainable development, and rural prosperity. The continuous development of agricultural science and technology has increased the importance of effective communication through specialized texts, including scientific articles, technical manuals, educational materials, government regulations, and extension publications. Agrarian texts serve not only as sources of professional information but also as instruments for transferring knowledge, introducing innovations, and facilitating cooperation among specialists at national and international levels. From a linguistic perspective, agrarian texts



represent a specialized type of discourse characterized by specific lexical, semantic, and pragmatic features. Their vocabulary consists primarily of professional terminology related to crop production, animal husbandry, irrigation, agricultural engineering, environmental protection, and sustainable farming. The semantic organization of these terms ensures clarity, precision, and consistency in professional communication, while pragmatic features determine how information is presented according to the communicative purpose, target audience, and cultural context. The Karakalpak and English languages belong to different language families and have evolved within distinct historical, cultural, and socio-economic environments. Consequently, agrarian texts in these languages demonstrate both universal characteristics and language-specific features. Karakalpak agrarian texts preserve numerous traditional agricultural terms and culturally significant expressions that reflect local farming practices and ecological conditions. In contrast, English agrarian texts have developed within the framework of international scientific communication and are characterized by standardized terminology, objective presentation, and globally accepted professional conventions. The comparative analysis of lexical-semantic and pragmatic features is essential for understanding how agricultural knowledge is represented and communicated across different languages. Such studies support the development of bilingual terminology, improve translation quality, facilitate foreign language teaching, and strengthen intercultural communication in the agricultural sector.

Materials and Methods

This study employed a comparative linguistic research design to examine the lexical-semantic and pragmatic features of agrarian texts in the Karakalpak and English languages. The research materials consisted of authentic agrarian texts collected from scientific journals, agricultural textbooks, extension service publications, official government documents, farming manuals, bilingual dictionaries, and online agricultural resources published in both languages.

Approximately 500 lexical units and text fragments were selected from various agricultural fields, including crop production, livestock farming, irrigation, agricultural engineering, environmental protection, and sustainable agriculture. The collected materials were classified according to lexical-semantic categories, thematic groups, and communicative functions.

The research applied descriptive, comparative, semantic, discourse, and pragmatic methods of analysis. Descriptive analysis was used to identify the linguistic characteristics of agrarian texts. Comparative analysis examined similarities and differences between Karakalpak and English texts. Semantic analysis focused on lexical meaning, synonymy, polysemy, terminology, and semantic relations. Pragmatic analysis investigated communicative intentions, contextual interpretation, speech strategies, and the influence of cultural factors on professional communication. The obtained



data were analyzed qualitatively to provide an objective interpretation of the linguistic features identified during the study.

Results

The analysis demonstrated that agrarian texts in both Karakalpak and English are characterized by a specialized vocabulary intended to ensure accurate communication in the agricultural sector. Despite their common communicative purpose, considerable lexical-semantic differences were observed. English agrarian texts contain highly standardized scientific terminology with precise semantic meanings and internationally accepted definitions. The vocabulary is dominated by technical terms related to agricultural technology, biotechnology, climate-smart agriculture, soil management, irrigation systems, and sustainable farming. These terms are used consistently to avoid ambiguity in professional communication. In contrast, Karakalpak agrarian texts include numerous traditional lexical units connected with local agricultural practices, animal husbandry, irrigation methods, and regional environmental conditions. Many lexical items possess culture-specific semantic meanings that reflect the historical experience and agricultural traditions of the Karakalpak people. The study also revealed that English texts predominantly employ formal scientific language, whereas Karakalpak agrarian texts combine professional terminology with commonly used vocabulary to improve accessibility for local farmers and agricultural practitioners.

Discussion

The findings indicate that the lexical-semantic and pragmatic features of agrarian texts are strongly influenced by the historical development, cultural traditions, and professional communication needs of each language community. English agrarian texts emphasize semantic precision, terminological consistency, and objective presentation because they primarily function within international scientific and professional communication. Their pragmatic purpose is to deliver accurate information efficiently and support knowledge exchange among specialists worldwide. Karakalpak agrarian texts, on the other hand, preserve traditional agricultural vocabulary and culturally significant expressions that reflect local farming experience and national identity. Their pragmatic characteristics demonstrate greater dependence on cultural context, shared background knowledge, and communication strategies adapted to local agricultural communities.

Conclusion

This study examined the lexical-semantic and pragmatic features of agrarian texts in the Karakalpak and English languages through a comparative linguistic approach. The findings demonstrated that although agrarian texts in both languages share the common objective of transmitting agricultural knowledge and facilitating professional communication, they differ significantly in their lexical



composition, semantic organization, and pragmatic realization. The analysis revealed that English agrarian texts are characterized by standardized terminology, semantic precision, and formal scientific style, making them suitable for international academic and professional communication. In contrast, Karakalpak agrarian texts preserve a rich body of traditional agricultural vocabulary, culturally specific expressions, and context-dependent meanings that reflect the historical development of agriculture and the linguistic identity of the Karakalpak people. The study also showed that pragmatic differences are determined by communicative purposes, target audiences, and socio-cultural factors. English agrarian texts emphasize clarity, objectivity, and informational accuracy, whereas Karakalpak texts frequently incorporate cultural references and traditional communication strategies that facilitate interaction within local agricultural communities. Overall, the research contributes to comparative linguistics, lexical semantics, pragmatics, and discourse studies by highlighting the relationship between language, culture, and professional communication. The findings may serve as a theoretical foundation for bilingual terminology development, translation studies, foreign language teaching, and intercultural communication in the agricultural sector. Future research may focus on corpus-based analysis, digital agricultural communication, and the evolution of agrarian discourse in multilingual environments.

References:

1. Crystal, D. (2010). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language* (3rd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
2. Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
3. Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
4. Lyons, J. (1995). *Linguistic Semantics: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
5. Yule, G. (2020). *The Study of Language* (7th ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
6. Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2016). *Methods of Critical Discourse Studies* (3rd ed.). London: Sage Publications.
7. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). (2023). *The State of Food and Agriculture 2023*. Rome: FAO.
8. Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2010). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics* (4th ed.). Harlow: Pearson Education.
9. Oxford University Press. (2024). *Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
10. Cambridge University Press. (2024). *Cambridge Dictionary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.