

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF TERM FORMATION IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK WITH REFERENCE TO MORPHOLOGICAL AND SEMANTIC FEATURES

Scientific Advisor: M. Suyarova

Lecturer, University of Economics and Pedagogy

Umarova Kamilla Bahodirovna

Master's Student, University of economics and Pedagogy

Abstract

This article presents a comparative analysis of term formation in English and Uzbek, focusing on morphological and semantic aspects. The study explores how each language constructs terminology in fields such as education, law, and science. Using a qualitative methodology and data from corpora, dictionaries, and academic texts, the research reveals that English primarily relies on compounding, affixation, and borrowing, while Uzbek favors agglutination and native derivation. Semantically, English terms often carry abstract or metaphorical meanings, whereas Uzbek terms tend to be concrete and culturally rooted. The findings contribute to a deeper understanding of the linguistic and cultural mechanisms underlying terminology formation in both languages, and offer valuable insights for translation, lexicography, and bilingual education.

Keywords: Term formation, Morphology, Semantics, English and Uzbek, Compounding, Agglutination, Lexical comparison, Terminology studies, Cultural linguistics, Language planning.

Introduction

Terminology constitutes a foundational element in professional, academic, and scientific communication, serving as a precise and standardized system of lexical units that encapsulate domain-specific knowledge. Terms enable effective transmission of specialized concepts and play a vital role in knowledge structuring, disciplinary identity, and intercultural academic exchange. As such, the formation

of terms is not merely a linguistic process but also a reflection of cognitive models and cultural frameworks embedded in a particular language.

The mechanisms of term formation vary significantly across languages, largely influenced by their **morphological typology** and **semantic conventions**. **English**, being an **analytic language** with limited inflection and a relatively fixed word order, tends to rely on processes such as **compounding** (e.g., *word processor*), **affixation** (e.g., *globalization*), **conversion** (e.g., *to email* from *email*)¹, and extensive **borrowing** from Latin, French, and Greek to create new terms. These strategies allow for the rapid generation and internationalization of scientific and technical vocabulary.

In contrast, **Uzbek**, as an **agglutinative Turkic language**, employs rich morphological resources, particularly **suffixation** and **derivational affixation**, to form new lexical items. Terms in Uzbek often originate from native roots, and the language exhibits a strong preference for **semantic transparency** through native derivation (e.g., *o'qituvchi* from *o'qit-* + *-uvchi*). Additionally, Uzbek increasingly uses **calquing** and **adapted loan translations** to integrate international terminology while maintaining linguistic identity.

Both languages aim to ensure clarity, precision, and systematic coherence in term creation. However, the linguistic and cultural differences between English and Uzbek influence not only how terms are formed, but also how they are understood, categorized, and utilized within professional discourse. This study seeks to conduct a **comparative analysis** of term formation strategies in English and Uzbek, with a particular emphasis on **morphological mechanisms** and **semantic characteristics**. The following research questions guide the investigation:

1. What are the main morphological processes involved in term formation in English and Uzbek?
2. How do the semantic structures and meaning patterns of terms reflect the cultural and cognitive specificities of each language?

By addressing these questions, the study aims to contribute to the broader field of comparative linguistics and terminology studies, providing insights that are particularly relevant for *translators, lexicographers, language policy makers, and bilingual educators*.

¹ Oxford English Dictionary (Online). <https://www.oed.com>

This study employs a **qualitative comparative methodology** based on **descriptive linguistic analysis** to examine the morphological and semantic aspects of term formation in English and Uzbek. The research design prioritizes **cross-linguistic comparison**, aiming to identify both shared and language-specific features in the structure and meaning of terminological units.

- **English and Uzbek terminological dictionaries**, which provided standardized definitions and morphological details of specialized terms across multiple domains.
- **Textbooks, institutional documents, and scholarly publications** from the fields of **education, law, medicine, and science**, which were analyzed to extract domain-specific terminology relevant to the research scope.

The analytical procedure was conducted in two main stages:

Morphological classification, collected terms were categorized according to their word-formation strategies. For English, these included compounding, affixation (prefixation and suffixation), conversion, and borrowing. For Uzbek, the analysis focused on agglutination, derivational suffixation, native root expansion, and loan translation (calquing). The goal was to identify the most productive morphological processes in each language and to determine the degree of structural regularity.

Semantic Grouping and Comparative Analysis. In the second stage, terms were grouped according to thematic domains such as education, law, and medicine. Each term was then analyzed for semantic transparency (i.e., the ease with which its meaning can be inferred from its components) or semantic opacity (i.e., idiomatic or non-transparent meanings). Comparative tables and charts were developed to illustrate structural similarities and divergences between the two languages, particularly in how complex concepts are lexicalized. By combining corpus data, lexicographic evidence, and descriptive analysis, this method ensures a balanced and systematic approach to understanding the linguistic mechanisms underlying term formation in English and Uzbek.

Morphological features. The comparative morphological analysis reveals that English and Uzbek employ different structural strategies in the formation of terms, shaped by their respective typological characteristics².

In **English**, term formation is predominantly carried out through **compounding, affixation, and borrowing**. Compounding allows for the creation of multi-word

² Nematov, S. O'zbek tilida terminlar yasashning morfologik xususiyatlari. TDPU Nashriyoti, 2015.

terms such as *e-learning* and *feedback*, where independent lexemes are combined to express a new concept. **Affixation**, particularly suffixation (e.g., *globalize*, *educationalist*), enables the derivation of technical and abstract terms. Additionally, English heavily incorporates **loanwords** from classical languages such as Latin, Greek, and French, contributing to the internationalization of its terminology.

In contrast, **Uzbek**, as an **agglutinative language**, relies on **suffixation and root-based agglutination** to build complex terms. Examples include *o'qituvchi* (*o'qit* + *-uvchi*) and *o'quvchilik*. The language also demonstrates strong **native derivational capacity**, producing terms such as *bilimdon* and *bilimdonlik*. Moreover, **calques or loan translations** are employed to adapt foreign concepts into native structures, preserving the internal morphological logic of the language.

Process	English Example	Uzbek Example
Compounding	<i>input device</i>	<i>axborot tizimi</i>
Affixation	<i>environmentalist</i>	<i>o'quvchi</i>
Loanword	<i>curriculum</i>	<i>ta'lim</i>
Agglutination	—	<i>o'qituvchilik</i>
Native Derivation	<i>teachability</i>	<i>bilimdonlik</i>

These patterns show that while English often employs lexical economy through compact compounding and borrowed roots, Uzbek prefers morphologically rich and syntactically native constructions.

Semantic features. From a semantic perspective, the study found distinct tendencies in the way specialized meanings are constructed and interpreted in English and Uzbek terminology.

English terms frequently demonstrate **abstraction**, **polysemy**, and **semantic layering**. For instance, the term *assessment* can refer to a wide range of meanings, including a formal test, a performance evaluation, or a diagnostic process—depending on the context. This flexibility allows English to adapt to interdisciplinary discourse but can also create challenges in translation and interpretation due to semantic ambiguity³.

³ Crystal, D. A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics. Blackwell Publishing, 2008.

By contrast, **Uzbek terms** are generally more **semantically transparent**, often reflecting **one-to-one correspondences** between the term and its referent. The term *baholash*, for example, specifically denotes the act of assigning a grade or mark, typically in educational contexts. This clarity and specificity are indicative of the language's preference for **concreteness and cultural alignment** in terminological expression.

Another notable difference is the use of **metaphorical and figurative language**. English terminology frequently incorporates metaphoric mappings and idiomatic expressions, especially in fields like education (e.g., *brainstorm*, *roadmap*) or technology (e.g., *cloud computing*). In contrast, **Uzbek maintains a literal and descriptive approach**, especially in formal or institutional settings, where figurative language may be perceived as ambiguous or stylistically inappropriate. The results confirm that while English prioritizes **efficiency, abstraction, and internationalization**, Uzbek emphasizes **clarity, morphological integrity, and cultural relevance** in term formation.

The findings of this study highlight fundamental morphological and semantic distinctions in the term formation strategies of English and Uzbek, despite the presence of structured and systematic approaches in both languages. These distinctions can be attributed to the **typological nature and linguistic evolution** of each language, which influence how specialized vocabulary is constructed, interpreted, and integrated into discourse.

From a **morphological standpoint**, English—characterized as an analytic language with relatively limited inflectional morphology—relies extensively on **compounding, affixation, and lexical borrowing** to expand its terminological inventory. These strategies enable the formation of compact, internationally recognizable terms, especially in globalized domains such as science, technology, and education. For instance, terms like *cybersecurity*, *microlearning*, and *biodiversity*⁴ demonstrate how English combines productive morphemes to generate precise and adaptable terminology.

In contrast, **Uzbek**, as an agglutinative language, possesses a highly productive **suffixation system**, allowing for the creation of complex yet grammatically and semantically transparent terms derived from native roots. This morphological

⁴ Oxford English Dictionary (Online). <https://www.oed.com>

richness supports the formation of terms that align closely with the syntactic and semantic norms of the Uzbek language, preserving its structural integrity and cultural coherence. Terms such as *o'qituvchilik* and *bilimdonlik*⁵ exemplify how Uzbek builds multi-layered meanings through regular morphological processes.

On a **semantic level**, English tends to favor **abstraction, polysemy, and metaphorical extension**. The same term may cover a range of related meanings across contexts, reflecting the interdisciplinary and idiomatic nature of English discourse. This flexibility enhances expressiveness but can also introduce semantic ambiguity, particularly in translation. Uzbek, conversely, maintains a more **literal, context-specific, and culturally grounded approach** to term formation. The preference for semantic clarity ensures that terms are easily interpretable and appropriately applied within localized discourse practices.

The increasing influence of **globalization and technological advancement** has led to growing **cross-linguistic borrowing**, especially from English into Uzbek. While Uzbek continues to preserve its native word-formation patterns, it is progressively integrating international terms through **loan adaptation** and **calquing**. This trend reflects a shift towards linguistic convergence in specialized domains, while also raising questions about the balance between innovation and linguistic preservation. These observed differences underscore the need for heightened **cultural and structural awareness** in areas such as **terminology translation, bilingual lexicography, language policy, and education**. Understanding how morphological systems and semantic values differ across languages is crucial for ensuring accurate, context-sensitive, and culturally appropriate communication. Furthermore, this study reaffirms the importance of comparative linguistic research in illuminating the mechanisms by which languages respond to global and domain-specific communicative demands.

Conclusion

This comparative investigation into the morphological and semantic aspects of term formation in English and Uzbek reveals that while the two languages utilize distinct linguistic strategies, their approaches are functionally complementary in

⁵ Nematov, S. O'zbek tilida terminlar yasashning morfologik xususiyatlari. TDPU Nashriyoti, 2015.

serving the goals of clarity, precision, and conceptual expression within specialized domains.

English exhibits a preference for **compounding**, **affixation**, and the **integration of loanwords**, particularly from classical and global sources, enabling it to rapidly generate concise, internationally comprehensible terminology. These processes facilitate flexibility and interdisciplinary adaptability, especially in the context of global scientific and academic discourse.

On the other hand, **Uzbek** capitalizes on its **agglutinative morphology**, extensively using **suffixation**, **native derivation**, and **descriptive calquing** to construct terms that are morphologically consistent with the language's internal grammar. This results in terminological expressions that are semantically transparent and culturally resonant, ensuring comprehensibility within the local sociolinguistic environment.

English tends toward **abstract generalization and metaphorical extension**, which supports conceptual innovation but may result in polysemy or ambiguity. In contrast, Uzbek maintains a commitment to **semantic clarity and specificity**, emphasizing one-to-one meaning correspondence, which contributes to interpretative stability in formal and educational contexts.

These findings underscore the importance of **understanding language-specific term formation mechanisms**, particularly for professionals engaged in **translation, lexicography, curriculum development, language planning, and intercultural communication**. Recognizing the interplay between morphology, semantics, and culture enhances the quality of terminological standardization and facilitates more accurate knowledge transfer between languages.

It is recommended that future studies expand this comparative framework by investigating the **syntactic integration and pragmatic usage** of terms in various discourse types, including academic writing, legal documents, and digital communication. Such research would provide a more holistic view of how terminology functions as a dynamic linguistic and cultural system across different language communities.



References

1. Bauer, L. Introducing Linguistic Morphology. Edinburgh University Press, 2003.
2. Kövecses, Z. Metaphor: A Practical Introduction. Oxford University Press, 2010.
3. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. Metaphors We Live By. University of Chicago Press, 1980.
4. Plag, I. Word-Formation in English. Cambridge University Press, 2003.
5. Crystal, D. A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics. Blackwell Publishing, 2008.
6. Nematov, S. O‘zbek tilida terminlar yasashning morfologik xususiyatlari. TDPU Nashriyoti, 2015.
7. Oxford English Dictionary (Online). <https://www.oed.com>