American Journal of Philological Sciences

The Theoretical Foundations Of The Concepts Of Term, Terminology, And Lexico-Semantic Analysis

Sultanova Dilfuza Kamalovna

2nd year doctoral student of Karakalpak State University, Uzbekistan

Abstract: Terminology, lexical meaning, and semantic analysis are central to linguistic science, as they enable a deep understanding of vocabulary structure and development. This article explores the nature of terms, their definitional and systemic functions, and their distinction from general vocabulary, with particular focus on pedagogical and scientific terminology. It highlights the principles of monosemy, context-bound usage, and systemic interrelations of terms, and examines examples from medicine, literature, linguistics, and pedagogy. Moreover, the study addresses the evolution of terms in response to social, technical, and scientific developments, the challenges of translation, synonymy, polysemy, and terminological standardization. The analysis emphasizes that lexical-semantic study of terms enhances conceptual clarity, supports interdisciplinary connections, and strengthens professional communication.

Introduction: Terminology, lexical meaning, and semantic analysis constitute fundamental concepts in linguistic science, and moreover, they play a crucial role in understanding the structure and development of a language's vocabulary. Since terminology forms the most dynamic layer of the lexicon, it becomes essential to examine the nature of terms, their definitional functions, and their systematic relations with other lexical units. Consequently, a term is understood as a word with a precise and specialized meaning belonging to a particular field of knowledge, while terminology represents the entire set of such specialized units within that field. Therefore, analyzing terms from a lexical-semantic perspective becomes necessary not only for identifying their meanings but also for understanding their unique functions, structural features, and contextual behavior within scientific communication. For example, in medicine the term cardiomyopathy has a strictly defined meaning referring to a specific heart muscle disorder, while in physics a specialized unit such as quantum entanglement denotes an entirely different type of conceptual phenomenon [2, 189-228].

Although all words perform a nominative function by naming objects, events, and relations, terms differ from general vocabulary because they additionally fulfill a definitional function, precisely identifying a specific concept within a discipline. For instance, while words such as child, morning, or red simply name general notions, specialized units like genre, elegy, or phoneme not only denote but also define concrete scholarly concepts. Likewise, the grammatical term morpheme specifies the smallest meaning-bearing unit in linguistic structure, unlike the general word piece, which has a broad, non-specialized meaning. Thus, their definiteness and context-bound meaning differentiate them from ordinary lexical items. In this regard, Karakalpak linguist E. Berdimuratov emphasizes that a term such as parody functions as a specialized linguistic unit because it names and simultaneously defines a specific literary phenomenon, thereby demonstrating the essential connection between terminological precision and conceptual clarity [5].

Since terminology reflects the needs of scientific, technical, and social development, it inevitably evolves together with society, which means that terms are

always under public and scholarly regulation. For example, artificially created or inaccurately translated terms in the Karakalpak language during the 1930–40s—such as revolyuciya, internacional, kommunist, partiya for awdarıspaq, báynálminal, ishtrakuuyon, pirxa —did not survive in practice because they failed to meet conceptual, systematic, and linguistic requirements. Similarly, English history provides examples of outdated scientific terms such as consumption for tuberculosis and phlogiston for a supposed fire-like element; both disappeared due to scientific advancement and terminological refinement. Hence, terminological systems tend toward unification, standardization, and conceptual accuracy. Nevertheless, despite the general principle that terms should be monosemantic, polysemy may occasionally appear, especially when a term functions in multiple domains. The word reaction, for instance, carries different meanings in medicine ("the body's response to a stimulus"), in chemistry ("interaction between substances"), and in political discourse ("opposition to change"), although within each field it remains strictly monosemantic. Likewise, the English term function is monosemantic in mathematics but polyfunctional across linguistics, biology, and sociology. This demonstrates that the monosemy of terms is not absolute across the entire language system but functions within individual conceptual domains.

Moreover, terms possess several distinctive characteristics that separate them from ordinary vocabulary. They are non-emotive, system-bound, and stylistically neutral; they carry no figurative or expressive coloring; they operate mostly in scientific, technical, administrative, and publicistic contexts; they form structured and interrelated systems; and they are among the most actively developing elements of the lexicon. For instance, the medical term hypertension remains neutral and system-bound, unlike the expressive word overstrain, which conveys emotional or evaluative meaning. Similarly, in linguistics the terms suffix, derivation, and allophone form a tightly connected conceptual system, each term gaining clarity only in relation to others. Since each term belongs to a conceptual network, its meaning becomes clear only in connection with related terms, which indicates the systemic nature of terminology and the need for consistent definitions [4].

In English linguistics, terminology studies also hold significant importance, as terms serve not only linguistic purposes but also broader scientific-communicative functions. A term is considered monosemantic, context-bound, systematic, and non-emotive, while English terminology is generally examined through several key directions such as general terminology, specialized terminology, computational terminology, and terminography. For example, computational linguistics uses terms like tokenization, stemming, and semantic parsing, each of which has a narrow technical definition. However, despite its advanced theoretical development, English terminology still encounters issues such as inaccurate translation into other languages, synonymic variation (e.g., learner autonomy vs. self-directed learning), inconsistent systematization, and the emergence of new polysemous or homonymous forms when everyday words acquire technical meanings, as in virus (biological vs. computer contexts) or cloud (meteorology vs. digital storage) [3].

Since pedagogical terminology operates at the intersection of linguistics and pedagogy, analyzing it from a lexical-semantic perspective becomes particularly important because it reveals not only the conceptual content of specialized units but also the processes of term formation, semantic change, and systematization. For instance, the pedagogical terms scaffolding, formative assessment, and competency-based learning carry precise methodological meanings that cannot be replaced by general vocabulary. Furthermore, such analysis facilitates the identification of denotative and connotative meanings, semantic relations like synonymy (aptitude vs. ability), antonymy (achievement vs. underachievement), and homonymy (e.g., testing in psychology vs. general usage), as well as etymological development and stylistic behavior. Consequently, understanding the lexical-semantic nature of pedagogical terms contributes to clearer conceptualization within educational sciences, improves translation accuracy, supports interdisciplinary connections, and strengthens the theoretical foundations for the creation of new terms. Ultimately, because terminology shapes the scientific worldview and ensures effective professional communication, its systematic and semantic analysis remains an indispensable component of linguistic research and pedagogical practice.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, terminology represents not only a system of specialized words but also a framework through which scientific, technical, and pedagogical knowledge is accurately communicated and conceptualized. Terms are distinguished from ordinary vocabulary by their monosemantic, context-bound, and systematic nature, and they play a critical role in defining concepts within specific domains. Their evolution reflects societal, technological, and scientific changes, while their lexical-semantic analysis ensures precision, clarity, and coherence in professional discourse. Moreover, pedagogical terminology

illustrates how interdisciplinary fields benefit from precise lexical tools, supporting translation, teaching, and research. Therefore, the study and analysis of terminology remain fundamental for advancing both linguistic theory and practical communication, ensuring that knowledge continues to be transmitted with accuracy and clarity.

REFERENCES

1. Bowker, L. (2019). Terminology. In Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies (pp. 579-583). Routledge.

2. Carayannis, E. G. (2010). Definition of terms and concepts. In Knowledge and the Family Business: The Governance and Management of Family Firms in the New Knowledge Economy (pp. 189-228). New York, NY: Springer New York.

3. Goddard, C. (2001). Lexico-semantic universals: A critical overview. Linguistic typology, 5(1).

4. Suonuuti, H. (1997). Guide to terminology. Helsinki: Tekniikan Sanastokeskus.

5. Бердимуратов Е. Қарақалпақ терминологиясы. – Нөкис: Қарақалпақстан, 1989. 13-бет.

6. Қосназаров Қ., Абипов Ғ., Пазылов А. Педагогика-психология терминлериниң орысша-қарақалпақша түсиндирме сөзлиги. – Нөкис: Билим, 1994.