HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

THE STATE OF RESEARCH ON TERMS AND TERMINOLOGY IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Lola Mannobova
Lecturer, Department of English Language Teaching Methodology,
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages
doi:https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23552467

Abstract: This article examines the state of research on terms and terminology in English and Uzbek from historical, theoretical, and comparative-linguistic perspectives. It discusses the development of terminology as an academic discipline, major approaches to defining a term, and the relationship between terms and concepts. The study draws on the works of Eugen Wüster, Juan C. Sager, Maria Teresa Cabré, V. P. Danilenko, and Hamidulla Dadaboyev. It also considers the historical development of Uzbek specialized vocabulary, including ancient Turkic written sources, classical literary works, and the influence of language contact and globalization. The comparison reveals that English and Uzbek share general mechanisms of term formation, although their historical development and terminology-management priorities differ. The article highlights the need for further comparative research based on specialized corpora and authentic texts.

Keywords: term, terminology, terminology studies, English language, Uzbek language, specialized vocabulary, terminological system, terminologization, determinologization, comparative linguistics.

Аннотация: В статье рассматривается степень изученности терминов и терминологии в английском и узбекском языках с исторической, теоретической и сопоставительно-лингвистической точек зрения. Освещаются становление терминологии как самостоятельной научной дисциплины, основные подходы к определению термина и взаимосвязь между термином и понятием. Исследование опирается на труды Ойгена Вюстера, Хуана К. Сагера, Марии Терезы Кабре, В. П. Даниленко и Хамидуллы Дадабоева. Также рассматривается историческое развитие узбекской специальной лексики, включая древнетюркские письменные памятники, классические литературные произведения и влияние языковых контактов и глобализации. Сопоставительный анализ показывает, что английский и узбекский языки обладают общими механизмами образования терминов, однако различаются историческими особенностями развития и приоритетами управления терминологией. В статье подчёркивается необходимость дальнейших сопоставительных исследований на основе специализированных корпусов и аутентичных текстов.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

Ключевые слова: термин, терминология, терминоведение, английский язык, узбекский язык, специальная лексика, терминологическая система, терминологизация, детерминологизация, сопоставительное языкознание.

Annotatsiya: Maqolada ingliz va o‘zbek tillarida terminlar hamda terminologiyaning o‘rganilish darajasi tarixiy, nazariy va qiyosiy-lingvistik nuqtayi nazardan tahlil qilinadi. Terminologiyaning mustaqil ilmiy fan sifatida shakllanishi, terminni ta’riflashga doir asosiy yondashuvlar hamda termin va tushuncha o‘rtasidagi munosabat yoritiladi. Tadqiqotda Eugen Wüster, Juan C. Sager, Maria Teresa Cabré, V. P. Danilenko va Hamidulla Dadaboyevning ilmiy qarashlariga tayaniladi. Shuningdek, o‘zbek tilidagi maxsus leksikaning tarixiy taraqqiyoti, jumladan, qadimgi turkiy yozma manbalar, mumtoz adabiy asarlar, tillararo aloqalar va globallashuvning ta’siri ko‘rib chiqiladi. Qiyosiy tahlil ingliz va o‘zbek tillarida termin yasashning umumiy mexanizmlari mavjudligini, biroq ularning tarixiy rivojlanishi va terminologiyani tartibga solishdagi ustuvor yo‘nalishlari farqlanishini ko‘rsatadi. Maqolada maxsus korpuslar va asl matnlar asosida keyingi qiyosiy tadqiqotlarni olib borish zarurligi ta’kidlanadi.

Kalit so‘zlar: termin, terminologiya, terminshunoslik, ingliz tili, o‘zbek tili, maxsus leksika, terminologik tizim, terminlashuv, determinologizatsiya, qiyosiy tilshunoslik.

INTRODUCTION

In the context of globalization and rapid scientific and technological development, terminology plays an increasingly important role in academic, professional, and everyday communication. Advances in science, technology, medicine, economics, law, and information technology create new concepts that require accurate naming, definition, and communication. Consequently, terminology has become an important field of modern linguistics.

A term is generally understood as a linguistic unit used to designate a specialized concept within a particular field of knowledge or professional activity. The word terminology may refer to the collection of terms used in a specific field, the practical process of organizing those terms, or the academic discipline that investigates their structure, meaning, and functions (Sager, 1990).

The historical development of terminology is closely associated with the need to classify and name scientific concepts. In the eighteenth century, scientific nomenclature developed significantly in disciplines such as biology and chemistry. The classification work of Carl Linnaeus and the chemical nomenclature reforms associated with Antoine Lavoisier contributed to the development of systematic scientific naming. However, terminology as a more clearly defined theoretical discipline emerged later, particularly through twentieth-century scholarship.

Eugen Wüster made a major contribution to the systematic study of concepts and the standardization of terminology. Subsequently, Juan C. Sager examined the theoretical and practical

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

aspects of terminology processing, while Maria Teresa Cabré emphasized its linguistic, cognitive, and communicative dimensions (Sager, 1990; Cabré, 1999).

Uzbek terminology has also developed through a long historical process. Ancient Turkic inscriptions, medieval dictionaries, classical literary works, and modern scientific publications provide important evidence for the development of specialized vocabulary. Today, Uzbek terminology faces challenges related to the translation and adaptation of international terms, the development of national terminology, and the standardization of spelling and usage.

The purpose of this article is to examine the state of research on terms and terminology in English and Uzbek, identify the main theoretical approaches, and compare the historical and linguistic characteristics of the two terminological traditions.

Methods

This study employs a theoretical and descriptive approach based on selected scholarly publications concerning terminology theory, specialized vocabulary, terminology processing, and the historical development of Uzbek terminology.

The following methods were used:

- Descriptive method: to explain the concepts of term, terminology, and terminological system.
- Historical-analytical method: to examine the development of scientific naming practices and the historical sources of Uzbek specialized vocabulary.
- Comparative method: to identify similarities and differences between English and Uzbek terminology.
- Literature analysis: to synthesize selected theoretical contributions by Wüster, Sager, Cabré, Danilenko, and Dadaboyev.

The study does not employ statistical surveys or corpus-based measurements. Its findings therefore reflect tendencies identified in the selected literature rather than an exhaustive assessment of all research in English and Uzbek terminology.

Results and Discussion

Terminology developed in response to the need to name, classify, and distinguish specialized concepts. Although individual scientific disciplines had developed naming systems much earlier, the twentieth century witnessed the emergence of more systematic approaches to terminology as an academic field.

Eugen Wüster played a central role in the development of General Theory of Terminology. His approach emphasizes the relationship between concepts and their designations, the organization of conceptual systems, and the standardization of terms. From this perspective, effective terminology work requires the identification and clarification of concepts before appropriate terms are selected or standardized.

Juan C. Sager (1990) approaches terminology as both a theoretical discipline and a practical activity involving the collection, description, processing, and presentation of terminological

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

information. His work is particularly relevant to terminology processing and the compilation of specialized dictionaries.

Maria Teresa Cabré (1999, 2003) emphasizes the linguistic, cognitive, and communicative dimensions of terminology. Her approach demonstrates that terms should not be examined solely as labels for concepts. Their meaning and function must also be considered in the contexts in which specialists use them.

V. P. Danilenko (1977), in her study of Russian terminology, investigates the lexical-semantic and grammatical characteristics of terminological units. Her work contributes to the broader linguistic understanding of specialized vocabulary and its relationship with the general language system.

These approaches demonstrate that defining a term as an absolutely fixed and unambiguous unit does not fully account for actual language use. A term may have different meanings in different disciplines, display terminological variation, or become part of general vocabulary. Therefore, a term can be defined as a linguistic unit designating a specialized concept whose interpretation depends on its field, conceptual relationships, definition, and communicative context.

Research on Terminology in English

Research on English terminology encompasses scientific nomenclature, terminology theory, terminology management, specialized lexicography, and professional communication.

The historical background of English scientific terminology includes attempts to classify knowledge and develop systematic scientific language. John Wilkins's work on classification and universal language, together with William Whewell's contributions to scientific terminology, forms part of the intellectual history of scientific naming. These developments are important precursors, although they should not be equated directly with contemporary terminology theory.

During the twentieth century, terminology became a more clearly established theoretical and practical discipline. Wüster's conceptual approach influenced systematic terminology work, while Sager's A Practical Course in Terminology Processing (1990) provided an important account of terminological data management and specialized dictionary compilation.

Another relevant research area is Language for Specific Purposes (LSP). This approach examines how language is used to meet the communicative needs of particular academic disciplines and professions. It includes specialized vocabulary, professional genres, textual conventions, and discipline-specific communication.

John M. Swales's Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings (1990) is not a direct contribution to terminology theory, but it provides a useful framework for understanding the academic and professional contexts in which terms are used.

Overall, English terminology research combines conceptual analysis and standardization with practical concerns such as terminology processing, specialized dictionaries, and the use of terms in authentic professional communication.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

The Historical Development and Study of Uzbek Terminology

The history of Uzbek specialized vocabulary can be traced through ancient Turkic inscriptions, medieval lexicographical works, classical literature, and modern scientific and technical texts.

The Orkhon–Yenisey inscriptions contain words such as qağan, beg, el, bodun, and törü, which express political, social, or legal concepts within their historical contexts. These words are valuable sources for investigating the history of Turkic vocabulary. Nevertheless, their status as terms should be assessed according to their historical meanings and functions rather than automatically equated with modern technical terminology.

Mahmud al-Kashgari's Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk is a major source for the historical lexicon of Turkic languages. It documents vocabulary associated with social life, occupations, and various aspects of traditional culture.

The works of Alisher Navoi and Zahiriddin Muhammad Babur also contain vocabulary related to administration, warfare, geography, culture, and other fields. These literary sources help researchers investigate the development of specialized vocabulary and the lexical resources of the historical Uzbek literary language.

From the second half of the nineteenth century, contact between Uzbek and Russian intensified, introducing new administrative, political, technical, and scientific concepts. As a result, borrowing, translation, calquing, and the use of Uzbek word-formation patterns became important mechanisms for developing specialized vocabulary.

Following Uzbekistan's independence, the development of national terminology, the strengthening of the state language, and the adaptation of international terminology became increasingly significant. Contemporary globalization has further increased the influence of English on Uzbek terminology, particularly in information technology, economics, science, and business.

Hamidulla Dadaboyev's work on Uzbek terminology is an important resource for examining its historical development and the phonetic, lexical-semantic, and grammatical characteristics of terminological units. Research in this area includes historical lexicology, specialized dictionaries, the standardization of field-specific terms, and the adaptation of borrowed vocabulary.

Thus, Uzbek terminology has developed through the interaction of historical linguistic traditions, the language's internal word-formation resources, and social and interlingual influences.

A Comparative Analysis of English and Uzbek Terminology

A comparison of English and Uzbek terminology reveals both common linguistic mechanisms and differences resulting from their historical and sociolinguistic development.

First, terminology in both languages develops in response to scientific and professional progress. New concepts require new designations, while existing terms may acquire additional meanings or undergo semantic specialization.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

Second, both languages create terms through word formation, compounds or multiword expressions, semantic change, borrowing, and translation. However, the structural forms of corresponding terms may differ.

For example, the English term database corresponds to the Uzbek expression ma'lumotlar bazasi. The English term is a compound, whereas the Uzbek equivalent is a multiword expression. Despite their structural differences, both designate a comparable specialized concept.

Similarly, the English word network and the Uzbek word tarmoq can be used in general language and in specialized contexts, including information technology. Their specific meanings depend on the field and the context of use.

Third, both languages demonstrate interaction between specialized and general vocabulary. Terms may enter everyday communication, while ordinary words may acquire specialized meanings in particular disciplines. This process illustrates the dynamic relationship between terminology and the general lexicon.

However, the historical and practical priorities of the two traditions differ. English terminology research has developed extensive approaches to terminology processing, international scientific communication, specialized dictionaries, and Language for Specific Purposes. Uzbek terminology research also places considerable emphasis on historical lexical sources, the development of national terminology, the adaptation of borrowings, and the establishment of linguistic norms.

The principal comparative features are summarized below.

Criterion	**English**	**Uzbek**
Historical sources	Scientific nomenclature and international scholarly traditions	Ancient Turkic sources, classical literature, and modern terminology development
Research priorities	Terminology theory, LSP, terminography, and terminology management	Historical lexicology, national terminology, specialized vocabulary, and standardization
Term-formation methods	Word formation, compounds, semantic change, and borrowing	Word formation, multiword expressions, calques, borrowing, and semantic specialization
Current challenges	Terminology management, standardization, and professional communication	National and international terminology, spelling, translation equivalents, and standardization

The comparison indicates that English and Uzbek share general principles of term formation, although their historical trajectories and terminology-planning priorities are not identical. A balanced comparative approach should therefore apply common analytical criteria while taking account of each language's historical and social context.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

Research Findings and Future Directions

The analysis of the selected literature supports several conclusions.

First, terminology has developed from practical naming activities within individual disciplines into an academic field concerned with concepts, term formation, standardization, and terminology management.

Second, theoretical approaches to terms differ. Traditional concept-oriented approaches emphasize precision, conceptual relationships, and standardization, whereas communicative approaches also investigate the use of terms in authentic texts and professional interactions.

Third, Uzbek terminology reflects the interaction of historical vocabulary, internal linguistic resources, and language contact. Its development cannot be explained solely through borrowing because native word formation and semantic specialization also play important roles.

Fourth, meaningful comparison between English and Uzbek requires consistent criteria for examining term structure, meaning, domain, usage, and translation equivalence.

Future research could develop parallel English–Uzbek corpora for specific professional fields, investigate the frequency and context of terms in authentic texts, examine terminological synonymy and variation, and analyze the strategies used to adapt English terminology into Uzbek. These methods would strengthen the empirical basis of comparative terminology research and contribute to more consistent terminology planning.

Conclusion

This study has examined the state of research on terms and terminology in English and Uzbek from historical, theoretical, and comparative-linguistic perspectives. The findings demonstrate that terminology developed from the need to name specialized concepts into a field concerned with conceptual systems, linguistic analysis, standardization, and professional communication.

The works of Eugen Wüster, Juan C. Sager, and Maria Teresa Cabré provide complementary perspectives on concept-oriented terminology, practical terminology processing, and the linguistic and communicative functions of terms. The research of V. P. Danilenko and Hamidulla Dadaboyev contributes to the linguistic description of specialized vocabulary and the study of Uzbek terminology.

English and Uzbek share general mechanisms of terminology formation, including word formation, semantic specialization, borrowing, and the creation of multiword expressions. Nevertheless, their historical development and practical priorities differ. English terminology research places considerable emphasis on terminology management, specialized communication, and international scientific exchange. Uzbek terminology research also focuses on historical vocabulary, national terminology development, the adaptation of international terms, and linguistic standardization.

Further research should combine historical and theoretical analysis with corpus-based methods and empirical examination of specialized texts. Such an approach would clarify how terms are created, translated, adapted, and used in both languages, contributing to terminological precision and effective international communication.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

References

1. Cabré, M. T. (1999). Terminology: Theory, Methods and Applications. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
2. Cabré, M. T. (2003). Theories of terminology: Their description, prescription and explanation. Terminology, 9(2), 163–199. https://doi.org/10.1075/term.9.2.03cab
3. Danilenko, V. P. (1977). Русская терминология: Опыт лингвистического описания. Moscow: Nauka.
4. Dadaboyev, H. (2019). O‘zbek terminologiyasi: o‘quv qo‘llanma. Tashkent. Yoshlar nashriyot uyi.
5. Lola Mannobova. (2026).The function and influence of Terminology in science and professional communication. Международный научный журнал «Новости образования: исследование в XXI веке»
6. Sager, J. C. (1990). A Practical Course in Terminology Processing. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
7. Swales, J. M. (1990). Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
8. Wüster, E. (2004). The structure of the linguistic world of concepts and its representation in dictionaries. In J. C. Sager (Ed. and Trans.), Terminology, 10(2), 281–306. https://doi.org/10.1075/term.10.2.08sag