

Biotechnology Terminology in Contemporary English: A Structural-Semantic and Cognitive Analysis of Term Formation, Conceptual Organization, And Specialized Meaning

Dr. Eleanor V. Markham

Department of Applied Linguistics, Westbridge University, United Kingdom

Received: 07 February 2026; **Accepted:** 05 March 2026; **Published:** 01 April 2026

Abstract: Background: Biotechnology has developed into one of the most conceptually dense and terminologically productive domains of contemporary scientific discourse. Its vocabulary evolves through ongoing interaction among scientific discovery, technological innovation, educational dissemination, and interdisciplinary borrowing. As a result, biotechnology terminology is not a static inventory of labels but a dynamic linguistic system shaped by morphology, semantics, conceptual hierarchies, metaphor, affixation, compounding, multiword construction, eponymy, and professional worldview. Despite the growth of biotechnology as a scientific field, the linguistic study of biotechnology terminology remains scattered across studies of word formation, terminology theory, discourse analysis, glossary construction, and branch-specific semantic description.

Objective: This article develops an original, publication-ready integrative analysis of biotechnology terminology in English, focusing on structural-semantic organization, mechanisms of term formation, conceptual categorization, and the role of cognitive and discourse-based processes in specialized lexical development.

Methods: A qualitative integrative methodology was applied using only the references provided. The source base included monographs on morphology and word formation, terminology studies, discourse- and concept-based investigations, encyclopedia and glossary resources, and recent studies on biotechnology, genomics, multiword expressions, metaphor, and semantic hierarchy. The analysis synthesized evidence across four major domains: morphological formation of biotechnology terms, semantic and conceptual organization, discourse-based and cognitive aspects of terminology, and lexicographic implications for specialized communication.

Results: The findings indicate that biotechnology terminology in English is structurally heterogeneous but systemically organized. Compounding, affixation, conversion, adjectival specialization, multi-component formation, and eponymic naming are central mechanisms in term creation. Semantically, biotechnology terms form conceptual networks structured by hypernym-hyponym relations, category systems, metaphorical projection, and contextual professional knowledge. Emerging terminology reflects both linguistic economy and conceptual precision, while glossary and encyclopedic sources reveal the pedagogical pressure toward standardization. The analysis also shows that biotechnology terminology increasingly exhibits traits associated with digital, clinical, and interdisciplinary language, including complex nominal sequences and semi-fixed multiword units.

Conclusion: Biotechnology terminology should be understood as a cognitively grounded and morphologically productive specialized language system. Its study requires integration of linguistic morphology, terminology science, cognitive semantics, discourse analysis, and lexicographic practice. Future research should move toward multilingual comparison, corpus-based tracking of terminological change, and more refined models of conceptual accessibility across expert and non-expert communities.

Keywords: Biotechnology terminology, word formation, cognitive terminology, semantic hierarchy, English for

science, genomics, specialized discourse.

Introduction: The contemporary language of biotechnology occupies a particularly important place in the study of terminology because it develops at the intersection of science, industry, education, and public communication. Unlike many older domains whose terminological cores stabilized over long periods, biotechnology continues to produce new lexical units at a high rate because the field itself remains epistemically expansive and technologically generative. Scientific advances in genomics, molecular processes, bioengineering, and applied laboratory systems do not merely add knowledge to an existing stable lexicon; they repeatedly reshape the naming needs of the field. Each innovation requires some degree of linguistic encoding, whether through entirely new words, adapted compounds, metaphorically extended expressions, affix-based derivations, adjectival specification, multiword constructions, or borrowed and standardized labels. Consequently, biotechnology terminology provides a rich site for examining how specialized vocabularies emerge, organize themselves, and interact with broader systems of language.

The linguistic importance of this topic lies in the fact that terminology is never merely nomenclatural. Terms are not simple tags externally attached to pre-existing ideas. Rather, they participate in knowledge structuring. A term determines not only how a concept is named but often how it is categorized, related to neighboring concepts, taught to learners, retrieved from textual environments, and stabilized within professional discourse. This is especially true in scientific language, where terminological precision shapes interpretation, classification, and operational practice. Matthews (2014) and Selivanova (2006) both contribute to the broader understanding that linguistic terminology is inseparable from conceptual organization. In specialized fields, the formation of a term is at once a lexical act and a cognitive act. A term compresses a conceptual model, often embedding relations of process, substance, hierarchy, function, or mechanism within a compact linguistic form.

Biotechnology offers an ideal domain in which to examine these issues because it is inherently interdisciplinary. The field draws upon biology, chemistry, genetics, medicine, engineering, computer-assisted analysis, and industrial application. Rajak (2018), in discussing the stages and applications of biotechnology, implicitly demonstrates that biotechnology is not a narrow or self-contained science. As its scope broadens, so does its vocabulary. This expansion creates a linguistic environment in

which terms must remain scientifically discriminating while also being adaptable across subdomains. A term used in academic biotechnology research may circulate into educational discourse, industrial documentation, public science communication, or clinical terminology. This movement across discourse types adds another layer of complexity: biotechnology terminology must function not only within expert-to-expert communication but also within mediated and pedagogical settings.

The references provided suggest that the study of biotechnology terminology can be approached from multiple complementary directions. One major direction concerns word formation. Booij (2005) and Plag (2018) provide foundational frameworks for understanding linguistic morphology and English word formation, both of which are indispensable for analyzing how biotechnology terms are constructed. Bauer and Renouf (2001), through a corpus-based study of compounding in English, further clarify one of the most productive mechanisms in specialized language formation. Junya (2017) contributes syntactic-morphological analysis of nominal compounds, while Bondarenko (2020) examines morphological methods for creating branch terms that denote linguistic concepts. These studies collectively show that specialized terminology cannot be analyzed without careful attention to morphological structure. In biotechnology, compounds, affixed forms, adjective-noun combinations, and multi-component constructions are not accidental surface patterns. They are organizing mechanisms that encode conceptual distinctions.

A second major direction concerns semantic and conceptual structure. Adambaeva (2025) studies semantic hierarchies in biotechnology terminology, specifically hypernym-hyponym relations in English and Uzbek, thereby revealing that biotechnology terms are arranged within systems of conceptual inclusion and differentiation. Syrotina (2022) addresses concept categories expressed in English terms of the biotechnology sphere, while Matvieieva and Torgovets (2022) examine cognitive terminological structure as a unit of the professional worldview. These works are especially important because they move beyond formal word shape and ask how terminology represents domain knowledge. A biotechnology term is valuable not only because it is morphologically well-formed but because it occupies a meaningful place within a conceptual network. In scientific language, relations such as general-to-specific classification, process-to-product linkage, and structure-to-function mapping are

often built into terminology itself.

A third direction concerns discourse and semantic adaptation. Almashadni and Jawad (2025) address semantic analysis of emerging terms in biotechnology in English linguistics, suggesting that new biotechnology vocabulary must be interpreted in light of both linguistic patterning and conceptual novelty. Molina-Plaza and Martínez-Sáez (2024), by exploring metaphors in biotechnology journals, demonstrate that even in highly specialized discourse, metaphor remains a significant mode of conceptualization. This observation challenges any overly rigid distinction between scientific exactness and figurative language. Scientific terminology often aspires to precision, but precision does not eliminate conceptual transfer. Indeed, metaphor may help structure emerging knowledge before more conventionalized terms become fully stabilized. Similarly, Adambaeva and Sadullayeva (2023) show that terms-eponyms remain part of biotechnological terminology, indicating that specialized language also carries traces of historical naming practices, professional prestige, and disciplinary memory.

A fourth direction concerns lexicographic and communicative infrastructure. Resources such as Encyclopedia of Biotechnology (n.d.), Genomics Glossary (n.d.), Glossary of Genomics Terms (n.d.), Merriam-Webster (n.d.), and National Human Genome Research Institute glossaries (n.d.a, n.d.b) show that biotechnology terminology is continually being curated for broader access. These resources do more than define words. They mediate between expert discourse and public understanding. Their existence points to an important sociolinguistic fact: biotechnology language has become sufficiently significant and sufficiently complex that institutional efforts are required to standardize, explain, and disseminate it. The proliferation of glossaries in genomics in particular shows that terminology is an active site of knowledge translation.

Yet despite these rich strands of research, the literature remains fragmented. Some studies emphasize morphology, some focus on semantic classification, some approach terminology cognitively, and others document specific subdomains or types such as eponyms, multi-component terms, or metaphorical expressions. There remains a need for an integrative article that brings these strands together into a coherent framework for understanding biotechnology terminology in contemporary English. The gap is not a complete absence of research but a lack of synthesis. Without synthesis, one risks treating biotechnology terminology as a scattered collection of lexical peculiarities rather than as a structured linguistic

system.

The present article addresses that gap by producing a publication-style integrative analysis based strictly on the provided references. The aim is not merely to describe biotechnology terms but to explain how they are formed, how they organize conceptual knowledge, how they function in discourse, and how they are stabilized or mediated through glossaries and reference works. The article argues that biotechnology terminology in English should be understood as a dynamic, cognitively grounded, structurally patterned, and communicatively stratified system. It is dynamic because it continuously evolves alongside scientific innovation (Almashadni & Jawad, 2025; Rajak, 2018). It is cognitively grounded because terms encode professional worldview and conceptual categorization (Matvieieva & Torgovets, 2022; Syrotina, 2022). It is structurally patterned because it relies on identifiable mechanisms such as affixation, compounding, and multiword formation (Booij, 2005; Bauer & Renouf, 2001; Plag, 2018; Syrotin, 2017). It is communicatively stratified because the same terminological system must serve expert knowledge, academic discourse, pedagogy, and public explanation through glossaries and institutional resources.

This article develops its argument through a conventional research structure. After the introduction, the methodology explains how the provided sources were analyzed and synthesized. The results section then identifies the main findings across structural, semantic, cognitive, and lexicographic dimensions. The discussion extends those findings into broader theoretical implications for terminology science, English morphology, cognitive linguistics, and science communication. The conclusion summarizes the central argument and proposes directions for future research, particularly in multilingual, corpus-based, and interdisciplinary terminology studies.

In sum, biotechnology terminology deserves sustained linguistic attention not only because it is scientifically important but because it illustrates, with unusual clarity, how specialized language emerges from the interaction of form, meaning, cognition, and discourse. Studying it reveals not just the vocabulary of a scientific field, but the mechanisms by which language organizes complex knowledge in the modern world.

METHODOLOGY

This study employs a qualitative integrative research methodology designed to generate an original scholarly synthesis using only the reference set supplied in the prompt. The choice of methodology was determined by the nature of the evidence base. The references include theoretical books on morphology and word formation,

terminology-oriented monographs, discourse and semantics studies, focused articles on biotechnology terminology, glossary resources, encyclopedia entries, and a doctoral thesis on term concepts in geological discourse. Because the material is conceptually rich but methodologically heterogeneous, a purely quantitative or narrowly systematic review design would not have been appropriate. Instead, an integrative qualitative method allows the study to examine how diverse strands of literature collectively illuminate the structure and functioning of biotechnology terminology.

The objective of the methodology is not to count terminological units or statistically aggregate corpus data from the supplied studies. Rather, the purpose is to identify recurrent principles, compare theoretical insights, and develop a coherent explanatory framework for understanding biotechnology terminology in English. This is especially suitable because terminology studies often draw from several linguistic traditions simultaneously, including morphology, lexical semantics, cognitive linguistics, discourse analysis, and lexicography. A methodology that isolates one dimension would distort the field. Biotechnology terminology is not fully understandable from word formation alone, nor from semantics alone, nor from glossary practice alone. The integrative design therefore treats the reference corpus as a multilayered body of evidence.

The evidence corpus consists strictly of the references provided by the user. No outside sources have been added. This constraint is methodologically important because it fixes the interpretive field and ensures that all major claims in the article are grounded within the designated literature. The corpus includes studies explicitly focused on biotechnology terminology and its semantic or structural properties, such as Adambaeva (2025), Adambaeva and Sadullayeva (2023), Almashadni and Jawad (2025), Myshak (2017), Striuk (2020), Syrotin (2017), and Syrotina (2022). It also includes broader linguistic foundations relevant to term formation and analysis, including Booij (2005), Bauer and Renouf (2001), Plag (2018), Matthews (2014), Bondarenko (2020), and Junya (2017). In addition, the corpus includes discourse, concept, and specialized terminology studies such as Brona (2023), Matvieieva and Torgovets (2022), Molina-Plaza and Martínez-Sáez (2024), and Remy et al. (2023). Finally, it includes lexicographic and reference resources such as Encyclopedia of Biotechnology (n.d.), Genomics Glossary (n.d.), Merriam-Webster (n.d.), and National Human Genome Research Institute glossaries (n.d.a, n.d.b), which are used here as evidence of terminological mediation and public-facing

standardization.

The analytical process proceeded in five stages. In the first stage, each source was classified according to its principal contribution: morphological theory, semantic hierarchy, conceptual terminology, discourse analysis, lexicographic resource, or biotechnology-specific terminology study. This classification helped prevent flattening the literature into a single undifferentiated body. For example, Booij (2005) was treated primarily as a foundational source on morphology; Adambaeva (2025) as a source on semantic hierarchy; Syrotin (2017) as evidence concerning multi-component biotechnology terms; and the National Human Genome Research Institute glossaries as evidence for applied terminological mediation.

In the second stage, recurring themes were identified across the sources. Four major themes emerged. The first was morphological productivity in biotechnology terminology, including affixation, compounding, and multi-component nominal formation. The second was semantic and conceptual structuring, including hypernym-hyponym relations, category formation, and terminological worldview. The third was discourse and cognitive framing, including metaphor, emerging semantic shifts, eponymy, and idiomatic or semi-fixed multiword constructions. The fourth was lexicographic stabilization and communicative accessibility, particularly through glossaries and encyclopedic resources.

In the third stage, cross-source comparison was conducted. This involved reading specialized biotechnology studies in light of broader morphology and terminology theory. For example, biotechnology-specific observations on affixation and compound terms were interpreted using the frameworks of Booij (2005), Bauer and Renouf (2001), and Plag (2018). Semantic hierarchy findings from Adambaeva (2025) were compared with cognitive-terminological views from Matvieieva and Torgovets (2022) and Syrotina (2022). Metaphorical studies in biotechnology journals were situated within the broader issue of conceptual transfer in specialized discourse. This stage allowed the study to move beyond mere listing of findings and toward systematic interpretation.

In the fourth stage, the study developed an original explanatory model in which biotechnology terminology is understood as operating across four interrelated levels: formal construction, conceptual organization, discourse adaptation, and reference stabilization. Formal construction refers to the morphological and syntactic means through which terms are built. Conceptual organization refers to the semantic relations and category structures terms inhabit.

Discourse adaptation refers to the ways terms function in journal discourse, interdisciplinary transfer, and emerging knowledge environments. Reference stabilization refers to how terms are codified, defined, and circulated through dictionaries, glossaries, and encyclopedia resources. This four-level model is the main original contribution of the article.

In the fifth stage, findings were arranged into a publication-style narrative structure matching the user's requested format. Because the article is framed as an original research paper, the Results and Discussion sections do not simply repeat source content; they interpret patterns across the literature and derive broader implications for terminology science and applied linguistics.

Methodological rigor in this study is grounded in transparency, conceptual consistency, and citation discipline. All major claims are anchored to one or more references from the provided list. Sources are not treated as equal in type, but each is used in a way appropriate to its genre. Monographs provide theoretical frameworks; articles provide focused analyses; glossaries provide evidence of applied terminological practice; and encyclopedic sources provide domain breadth. At the same time, the study acknowledges the limits of its evidence. Since the source set includes relatively few large-scale empirical corpus analyses focused exclusively on English biotechnology terminology, some of the article's conclusions are interpretive and theoretical rather than quantitatively exhaustive. That said, such an interpretive approach is appropriate for terminology research, where the organization of conceptual insight is often as important as raw frequency counts.

The study also recognizes that web-based glossary sources are different from peer-reviewed linguistic analyses. They are not used here as evidence for theoretical argument in the same way as scholarly publications. Instead, they are used as evidence of terminological institutionalization, public explanation, and lexicographic dissemination. This distinction is important for methodological integrity.

Overall, the chosen methodology allows the article to remain faithful to the supplied references while generating an original and coherent account of biotechnology terminology as a linguistic system. The resulting synthesis is intended not only to summarize the literature but to reorganize it into an analytically useful framework for future scholarship.

RESULTS

The analysis of the supplied references reveals that biotechnology terminology in English is both structurally varied and conceptually systematic. It

emerges from identifiable word-formation mechanisms, but it cannot be understood adequately through morphology alone. Its semantic behavior, discourse function, and lexicographic stabilization are equally significant. The major findings are presented below in interconnected thematic form.

Biotechnology Terminology Is Morphologically Productive and Structurally Heterogeneous

The first major finding is that biotechnology terminology exhibits high morphological productivity and notable structural diversity. The literature consistently indicates that biotechnology terms are not formed by a single dominant template but through multiple coexisting mechanisms including affixation, compounding, multi-component nominal construction, and other derivational patterns (Booij, 2005; Plag, 2018; Myshak, 2017). This structural variety reflects the conceptual demands of the field. Biotechnology is required to name substances, processes, methods, instruments, systems, organisms, applications, and analytical outcomes. Because these conceptual targets differ in complexity, terminology must remain flexible in form.

Compounding appears as one of the most important formal resources. Bauer and Renouf (2001) emphasize the productivity of compounding in English, and their findings are highly relevant for biotechnology terminology, where compact noun-noun and adjective-noun structures enable dense conceptual packaging. Junya (2017), through syntactic-morphological analysis of nominal compounds, reinforces the importance of compounding as a structural mechanism that balances economy with specificity. In biotechnology, compounds frequently allow experts to signal class, process, material, and functional relation within a single lexical unit or semi-fixed complex. A major result of this synthesis is therefore that compounding is not merely frequent in biotechnology terminology; it is functionally indispensable because it permits the rapid lexicalization of emerging scientific distinctions.

Affixation is equally significant. Garmash (2014, 2016) and Bondarenko (2020) show that affixal mechanisms remain central in specialized concept formation. When considered alongside Booij (2005) and Plag (2018), these studies suggest that affixation is especially valuable in scientific terminology because it allows recurring semantic schemas to be reused productively. Prefixes and suffixes in specialized language often do more than modify a base word; they anchor the new term within an established family of related concepts. This family effect is crucial in biotechnology, where terminological transparency can support inferability among expert users.

The literature also demonstrates the importance of multi-component terms. Syrotin (2017) specifically highlights multi-component English terms in the biotechnology sphere, showing that single-word terms are only one part of the terminological landscape. Biotechnology frequently relies on extended nominal strings because highly specific concepts require multiple semantic layers. Such constructions often encode substance, process, target, and context simultaneously. While long multi-component terms may appear cumbersome, the analysis suggests that they are a natural response to conceptual precision demands. Their persistence indicates that terminological economy in specialized language does not always mean brevity; it often means maximum informational density within acceptable structural constraints.

Another structural finding concerns adjectival terminology. Pitkänen-Heikkilä (2015) treats adjectives as terms, thereby reminding us that termhood is not restricted to nouns. In biotechnology discourse, adjectival forms often contribute indispensable classificatory information. They may distinguish types, states, origins, mechanisms, or methodological conditions. This means that terminology studies focused only on nominal units risk overlooking how adjectival specialization supports the architecture of scientific description. The present synthesis therefore finds that biotechnology terminology is best understood as a network of nominal, adjectival, and multiword elements rather than a list of noun labels.

Term Formation Reflects Conceptual Need Rather Than Purely Formal Preference

A second major finding is that term formation in biotechnology is driven less by abstract linguistic preference than by conceptual necessity. Myshak (2017) identifies main means of formation of biotechnological terms, and this work, read alongside Rajak (2018) and Striuk (2020), suggests that terminological growth follows the expansion of the field itself. In other words, biotechnology generates terms because it generates new conceptual distinctions that must be linguistically stabilized.

This finding has an important theoretical implication. Specialized language does not simply borrow general English morphological resources and apply them mechanically. Rather, biotechnology activates those resources selectively according to the epistemic demands of the domain. Compounding becomes productive because the field repeatedly needs to represent compound knowledge objects. Affixation becomes salient because related conceptual families must be marked efficiently. Multi-component

expressions emerge because the field needs high-resolution lexical specification. Thus, the morphology of biotechnology terminology is not arbitrary. It is functionally aligned with scientific conceptualization.

This alignment also explains why emerging terminology often appears hybrid. Almashadni and Jawad (2025) discuss semantic analysis of emerging biotechnology terms in English linguistics, and their work suggests that new terms often occupy transitional states before full standardization. A term may initially seem semantically loose, context-dependent, or structurally novel. Over time, however, usage patterns and professional consensus may stabilize it. The present analysis finds that biotechnology terminology is therefore both productive and provisional. It contains terms that are already conventionalized and others that remain emergent, with their final semantic range still under negotiation.

Semantic Hierarchies Organize Biotechnology Terminology into Conceptual Systems

The third major finding is that biotechnology terminology is semantically hierarchical rather than merely accumulative. Adambaeva (2025) demonstrates the role of hypernym-hyponym relations in biotechnology terminology, and this insight is fundamental. Specialized vocabularies are often imagined as lists of isolated units, but the evidence here shows that biotechnology terms are organized through relations of inclusion, subclassification, and semantic dependency. A general term anchors a set of more specific terms; those specific terms may in turn branch into narrower designations. Such hierarchical structure supports both expert communication and educational explanation.

This finding is reinforced by Syrotina (2022), who studies concept categories expressed in English biotechnology terms, and by Matvieieva and Torgovets (2022), who frame cognitive terminological structure as part of the professional worldview. Together, these works suggest that terminology reflects not only lexical creation but conceptual ordering. The field does not simply invent names; it organizes concepts into a worldview recognizable to specialists. This worldview is linguistic in the sense that terms provide access to it, but it is also epistemic because it reflects how professionals divide the field into meaningful categories.

One significant result of the present synthesis is that semantic hierarchy in biotechnology terminology performs three simultaneous functions. First, it supports classification by distinguishing broad domains from subdomains. Second, it supports inferential processing by allowing users to deduce relationships

among terms. Third, it supports pedagogy by creating ordered conceptual ladders for learners. This explains why glossaries and educational resources are so central in biotechnology and genomics: the complexity of the field requires hierarchical explanation, not just definition.

Biotechnology Terminology Is Cognitively Grounded and Encodes Professional Worldview

A fourth major finding is that biotechnology terminology should be interpreted cognitively, not only formally or referentially. Matvieieva and Torgovets (2022) argue that cognitive terminological structure functions as a unit of the professional worldview, and this claim resonates strongly with the rest of the corpus. Terms do not merely identify external entities; they reflect how professionals conceptualize their field. In this sense, terminology is not passive storage but active modeling.

Syrotina (2022) and Striuk (2020) further support this perspective by examining concept categories and the concept of biotechnology in modern English. Their work suggests that the term biotechnology itself is not semantically flat. It acts as a conceptual center from which related categories radiate. This means that biotechnology terminology contains internal logic. It is shaped by domain-specific cognitive priorities such as process, function, innovation, manipulation, application, and system relation.

The consequence of this finding is significant for terminology studies. It means that lexical analysis detached from conceptual structure is insufficient. A biotechnology term must be studied not only in terms of its morphological composition but in terms of the conceptual schema it activates. A complex term may encode hierarchy, process sequence, function, origin, and evaluative framing all at once. This layered meaning helps explain why expert terminology often appears difficult to non-experts: the challenge is not just unfamiliar vocabulary but compressed conceptual architecture.

Metaphor and Eponymy Remain Active in a Specialized Scientific Domain

A fifth major finding is that biotechnology terminology, despite its scientific orientation, retains forms of semantic creativity traditionally associated with broader language use. Molina-Plaza and Martínez-Sáez (2024) show that metaphors are present in biotechnology journals, demonstrating that scientific discourse does not eliminate figurative cognition. Instead, metaphor may assist in conceptualizing complex or emerging phenomena. This is especially likely when new discoveries require linguistic models that ordinary literal terminology has not yet fully

stabilized.

This finding challenges a common misconception that scientific terminology is entirely literal, neutral, and denotatively closed. The present analysis suggests a more nuanced view. While biotechnology aims at precision, it sometimes achieves communicative effectiveness through controlled conceptual transfer. Metaphor can help relate unfamiliar processes to more familiar cognitive frames. Over time, such metaphorical terms may become conventionalized to the point that their figurative origin becomes less salient. This process helps explain why terminology often contains historically metaphorical expressions that are no longer perceived as such by expert users.

Eponymy provides a related but distinct result. Adambaeva and Sadullayeva (2023) analyze terms-eponyms as part of biotechnological terminology, showing that specialized scientific vocabulary continues to preserve personal-name-based formations. Eponymic terms demonstrate that terminology is not purely structural or semantic; it is also historical and social. A field remembers its figures, discoveries, and traditions through naming. Eponyms may sometimes complicate transparency because their internal meaning is not morphologically inferable, yet they endure because they carry disciplinary memory and authority.

Together, metaphor and eponymy show that biotechnology terminology is more culturally textured than a purely formalist account would suggest. Even highly specialized vocabularies retain traces of historical naming, conceptual analogy, and discourse adaptation.

Emerging Biotechnology Terms Reflect Interdisciplinary Contact and Semantic Expansion

A sixth major finding is that biotechnology terminology increasingly develops under conditions of interdisciplinary contact. Biotechnology does not exist in isolation; it intersects with genomics, clinical discourse, digital analysis, computational systems, and public science communication. Bogachyk and Bihunov (2020), though focused on computer terms in English, are relevant because their work highlights structural-semantic features that resemble developments in other technical domains. Specialized languages increasingly share strategies such as compound density, abstraction through nominalization, and context-sensitive semantic narrowing.

Remy, Khabibullina, and Demeester (2023) add another important dimension by studying idiomatic multiword expressions in clinical terminology using representation learning. Although the study is not exclusively about biotechnology, it contributes to the

present analysis by showing that specialized terminology may include semi-fixed or idiomatic multiword structures that resist simple compositional interpretation. This is highly relevant in biotechnology, where multiword expressions may appear transparent at first glance but carry meanings shaped by disciplinary convention. The result is that terminology cannot always be decoded by ordinary lexical composition alone; professional use patterns matter.

This interdisciplinary expansion is also visible in genomics-related reference resources. The repeated presence of genomics glossaries in the supplied references indicates that biotechnology terminology increasingly overlaps with genomic discourse. This overlap expands the conceptual and lexical reach of biotechnology while also increasing the need for standardization and pedagogical clarity.

Lexicographic and Glossary Resources Function as Instruments of Terminological Stabilization

A seventh major finding is that glossaries, dictionaries, and encyclopedia resources play an active role in shaping biotechnology terminology. Resources such as Kimball (2002), Encyclopedia of Biotechnology (n.d.), Merriam-Webster (n.d.), Genomics Glossary (n.d.), Glossary of Genomics Terms (n.d.), and National Human Genome Research Institute glossaries (n.d.a, n.d.b) show that biotechnology vocabulary is continually curated, explained, and standardized. These sources should not be treated as passive repositories. Their existence indicates that biotechnology terminology requires institutional mediation because the field is expanding faster than ordinary language competence can absorb.

One result of the present synthesis is that lexicographic resources perform at least four functions in biotechnology terminology. First, they provide definitional stabilization, reducing ambiguity and inconsistency. Second, they assist in educational access for students and general audiences. Third, they support interdisciplinary translation by clarifying terms across adjacent domains. Fourth, they reinforce legitimacy by signaling which terms have become sufficiently important to warrant formal documentation.

This finding also suggests that terminology research should pay more attention to applied lexicography. The movement from expert term usage to glossary inclusion is part of terminological life, not an external afterthought. A term becomes fully operational in a field not only when experts use it, but when it enters systems of formal explanation and public knowledge mediation.

Biotechnology Terminology Balances Precision, Density, and Accessibility

An eighth major finding is that biotechnology terminology continually negotiates tension among precision, informational density, and accessibility. Specialized discourse demands exactness, but exactness often produces structurally dense terms. Syrotin (2017), Myshak (2017), and Adambaeva (2025) all point to organizational and structural complexity within the field. At the same time, glossary resources demonstrate institutional pressure toward accessibility. The same field therefore demands both terminological specificity for experts and terminological explainability for broader audiences.

This tension has linguistic consequences. Terms may become longer, more compound-heavy, and more morphologically layered in expert discourse, while simplified paraphrases circulate in public-facing explanation. The coexistence of these two modes indicates that biotechnology terminology is stratified across communicative contexts. A single concept may have a formal term, a glossary definition, and a pedagogically simplified description. The present analysis therefore finds that terminology in biotechnology should be studied across levels of discourse, not only within journal articles or expert texts.

DISCUSSION

The results of this study indicate that biotechnology terminology in English is best understood as an organized specialized language system shaped simultaneously by morphology, conceptual hierarchy, cognition, discourse, and institutional mediation. This conclusion matters because terminology is often studied through relatively narrow lenses. Some approaches emphasize word formation, some prioritize concept systems, and others focus on applied lexicography. The present synthesis suggests that biotechnology terminology cannot be adequately captured by any one of these approaches alone. Its richness lies precisely in the interaction among them.

A first major implication concerns morphology. The literature shows that biotechnology terminology makes extensive use of derivational and compounding mechanisms, but the meaning of this fact extends beyond descriptive formalism. Compounding, affixation, and multi-component construction are not simply frequent because English permits them. They are frequent because biotechnology, as a rapidly evolving scientific domain, requires lexical mechanisms capable of packaging large amounts of conceptual information efficiently (Bauer & Renouf, 2001; Booij, 2005; Plag, 2018). This suggests that specialized language develops structural preferences in response to epistemic pressures. In other words, the science

shapes the morphology indirectly by shaping what must be named.

This insight opens a broader theoretical point: terminology is functionally adaptive. Specialized lexical systems do not evolve as decorative extensions of general language; they evolve because professional communities need reproducible, precise, and relational labels for increasingly fine-grained distinctions. Biotechnology terminology therefore supports the view that morphology is not independent of knowledge structure. A complex term is often complex because the concept it encodes has multiple relational properties that the speech community finds necessary to preserve linguistically.

At the same time, morphology alone cannot explain the functioning of biotechnology terminology. The findings on hypernym-hyponym relations, concept categories, and professional worldview show that terminology also performs classificatory work (Adambaeva, 2025; Matvieieva & Torgovets, 2022; Syrotina, 2022). This is especially important for understanding why terminology becomes indispensable in science. Scientific progress depends not merely on discovering phenomena but on organizing them into stable conceptual orders. Terminology allows such ordering to be externalized in language. A term may name an entity, but it also positions that entity within a broader field of relations: broader class, narrower subtype, associated function, method of generation, or domain of application.

This conceptual dimension explains why biotechnology terminology should be treated as a cognitive system. The professional worldview described by Matvieieva and Torgovets (2022) is not an abstract philosophical addition to terminology. It is visible in how terms cluster, subclassify, and guide interpretation. A novice entering the field does not merely memorize isolated words; the novice gradually acquires a conceptual map. This map is partly delivered by terminology itself. Terms act as coordinates within that map. Thus, biotechnology terminology is both a linguistic object and a pedagogical instrument.

The pedagogical significance of terminology becomes even more apparent when glossary and encyclopedia resources are considered. The repeated documentation of biotechnology and genomics terms across public or semi-public resources indicates that specialized language has moved beyond closed expert circles and now requires broader social translation. This is a decisive feature of contemporary scientific language. Biotechnology is no longer confined to laboratories and highly technical journals. It appears in education, policy, media, healthcare, and public

debate. Consequently, terminology must be stabilized not only for expert precision but also for social intelligibility. Glossaries, institutional definitions, and dictionary entries become part of the terminological ecosystem because they mediate between expert knowledge and broader communicative needs.

This mediation has significant implications for science communication. One might assume that terminological precision and public accessibility stand in simple opposition: the more precise the term, the less accessible it becomes. The literature reviewed here suggests a more complex dynamic. Biotechnology terminology does often become dense and specialized, but glossary practices demonstrate that accessibility can be improved through definitional support rather than through abandonment of technical vocabulary. In other words, the solution to complex terminology is not necessarily simplification at the lexical level; it may be structured explanation at the metalinguistic level. This supports the importance of lexicographic infrastructure in modern scientific domains.

Another important implication concerns semantic creativity. The presence of metaphor in biotechnology journals, as discussed by Molina-Plaza and Martínez-Sáez (2024), shows that scientific terminology does not operate under purely literal principles. This should not be seen as a failure of rigor. Rather, it reflects the fact that novel scientific domains often require analogical thinking to become linguistically manageable. Metaphor can aid conceptual emergence by projecting known structures onto new phenomena. Over time, these metaphorical expressions may become conventionalized, losing their sense of novelty but retaining their terminological value.

This raises an interesting tension within terminology theory. Traditional terminology models often prioritize univocity, stability, and conceptual clarity. Cognitive approaches, by contrast, allow greater room for semantic flexibility, metaphor, and contextual framing. Biotechnology terminology seems to confirm that both perspectives are necessary. On the one hand, the field requires standardization and precision. On the other, it evolves through discourse processes that include semantic extension, metaphorical transfer, and contextual adaptation. A fully adequate theory of biotechnology terminology must therefore balance normative and dynamic perspectives.

Eponymy offers another example of this tension. From a purely transparency-centered perspective, eponyms might seem suboptimal because they do not encode conceptual content directly. Yet Adambaeva and Sadullayeva (2023) show that eponyms persist in biotechnological terminology. Their persistence

suggests that terminology is not governed only by ideal structural efficiency. Historical continuity, disciplinary identity, and recognition practices also influence naming. This is an important reminder that scientific language, though highly specialized, remains a human and social product. It reflects institutions, histories, and communities as well as abstract concepts.

The presence of multi-component expressions and semi-fixed term-like units introduces a further theoretical issue: the boundary between term and phrase. Syrotin (2017) and Remy et al. (2023) imply that specialized language often relies on units larger than the single word. This means that terminology studies must resist an overly lexicalist bias. A domain may store much of its operational meaning in recurring multiword units whose structure is syntactically open but pragmatically stabilized. In biotechnology, where specificity is paramount, such units are especially valuable. They allow speakers to maintain high conceptual resolution without requiring entirely new monolexic forms for every emergent distinction.

A particularly important outcome of this study is the recognition that biotechnology terminology is increasingly interdisciplinary and therefore increasingly hybrid. The overlap with genomics, clinical terminology, digital science, and public education creates a layered terminological environment. Terms must travel across subfields, and in doing so they may acquire slightly different framing or emphasis. This interdisciplinary mobility complicates the dream of a perfectly fixed terminology. It does not eliminate the need for standardization, but it means that standardization must coexist with contextual flexibility.

There are, however, important limitations to the present study. The first is that the reference set, while rich, is heterogeneous in genre and not uniformly empirical. Some sources are theoretical monographs, some are focused journal articles, some are web-based glossaries, and one is a doctoral thesis. This diversity is useful for integrative synthesis but limits the possibility of making narrowly quantitative claims. The second limitation is that the literature base does not provide a single large corpus study dedicated exclusively to present-day English biotechnology terminology across all subdomains. As a result, some conclusions are interpretive rather than statistically exhaustive. The third limitation is that several references engage adjacent fields such as genomics, geological discourse, or computer terminology. Their inclusion is analytically productive, but transfer from adjacent domains must be handled cautiously. The fourth limitation is that the study is restricted to the provided references and therefore does not incorporate broader international corpus work or more recent computational

terminology studies that may further refine the argument.

These limitations, however, do not diminish the value of the present analysis. On the contrary, they help define its contribution. The article offers an integrative framework that brings together morphology, terminology science, cognitive semantics, discourse analysis, and lexicographic mediation into a single model for understanding biotechnology terminology. Such a model is useful precisely because the field is fragmented. By identifying recurring principles across diverse sources, the study clarifies what future research should investigate more systematically.

Several directions emerge for future scholarship. First, biotechnology terminology would benefit from larger corpus-based studies tracing the frequency, stabilization, and semantic drift of key terms across journals, textbooks, glossaries, and public science communication. Bauer and Renouf (2001) demonstrate the value of corpus-based work for compounding, and similar methods could be expanded within biotechnology. Second, multilingual studies deserve greater development. Adambaeva (2025) already points in this direction through English-Uzbek comparison. Since biotechnology is an international domain, cross-linguistic comparison could reveal which term-formation patterns are language-specific and which reflect global scientific naming pressures. Third, more research is needed on expert versus non-expert term interpretation, particularly in genomic and biotechnology public communication environments. The glossary resources cited in this study show the practical relevance of this issue. Fourth, computational approaches to multiword term detection and semantic representation, such as those exemplified by Remy et al. (2023), should be extended specifically to biotechnology discourse.

Finally, terminology pedagogy should become a more visible area of inquiry. If biotechnology terminology encodes professional worldview, then learning the field involves more than memorizing vocabulary. It involves acquiring classification systems, conceptual relations, and discourse expectations. Applied linguistics, English for Specific Purposes, and science education scholars could collaborate more closely on this question. The challenge is not simply to define biotechnology terms, but to help learners internalize the conceptual order they represent.

Overall, the discussion confirms that biotechnology terminology is not a peripheral subset of English vocabulary. It is a sophisticated linguistic response to the needs of a rapidly changing scientific domain. Its terms are formally shaped, semantically layered,

cognitively organized, historically textured, and institutionally mediated. To study them is therefore to study how language adapts to modern science itself.

CONCLUSION

This article has argued that biotechnology terminology in contemporary English should be understood as a dynamic and systematically organized specialized language system rather than as a random accumulation of technical labels. The reference base consistently shows that biotechnology terms are formed through productive morphological processes such as compounding, affixation, and multi-component construction, but that these formal mechanisms are inseparable from the conceptual needs of the field (Booij, 2005; Bauer & Renouf, 2001; Plag, 2018; Myshak, 2017). Term formation in biotechnology is therefore best interpreted as functionally motivated and epistemically responsive.

At the semantic level, the findings demonstrate that biotechnology terminology is structured through hierarchies, conceptual categories, and worldview-oriented relations rather than mere lexical juxtaposition (Adambaeva, 2025; Matvieieva & Torgovets, 2022; Syrotina, 2022). Terms classify, differentiate, and stabilize knowledge. At the discourse level, biotechnology terminology reveals ongoing semantic adaptation through metaphor, eponymy, and context-sensitive multiword structures, showing that scientific language remains historically and cognitively textured rather than perfectly literal and static (Adambaeva & Sadullayeva, 2023; Molina-Plaza & Martínez-Sáez, 2024; Remy et al., 2023). At the applied level, glossaries, encyclopedic resources, and institutional definitions function as important instruments of terminological stabilization and public accessibility, especially in genomics-related communication.

Taken together, these findings support a four-level interpretation of biotechnology terminology: it is formally constructed, conceptually organized, discourse-shaped, and lexicographically mediated. This integrative perspective is essential because no single linguistic approach adequately captures the complexity of the field. Biotechnology terminology must be studied at once as morphology, semantics, cognition, discourse, and communication practice.

The broader significance of this conclusion extends beyond biotechnology. The field serves as an exemplary case of how contemporary scientific language evolves under pressure from innovation, interdisciplinarity, and public dissemination. Future research should therefore expand multilingual comparison, corpus-based monitoring of term

emergence, and pedagogical investigation of how specialized conceptual systems are learned. Such work would deepen understanding not only of biotechnology terminology itself but of the wider linguistic mechanisms through which science becomes thinkable, teachable, and communicable.

REFERENCES

1. Adambaeva, F. R. (2025). Semantic hierarchies in biotechnology terminology: A study of hyperhyponymic relations in English and Uzbek. *Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy*, 1(3), 826–833.
2. Adambaeva, F. R., & Sadullayeva, N. A. (2023). Terms-eponyms as a part of biotechnological terminology. *European Journal of Literature and Linguistics*, 4, 40–44. <https://doi.org/10.29013/EJLL-234-40-44>
3. Almashadni, T. M. S., & Jawad, A. S. (2025). Semantic analysis of emerging terms in biotechnology in English linguistics. *Saudi Journal of Educational and Psychological Studies*, 6(1), 1–20.
4. Bauer, L., & Renouf, A. (2001). A corpus-based study of compounding in English. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 29(2), 101–123. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00754240122005251>
5. Bogachyk, M., & Bihunov, D. (2020). The structural-semantic features of computer terms in English. *Cognitive Studies | Études Cognitives*, 20, Article 2262. <https://doi.org/10.11649/cs.2262>
6. Bondarenko, G. P. (2020). Morphological methods of creating branch terms to denote linguistic concepts. *Scientific Notes of the V. I. Vernadsky TNU. Series: Philology. Social Communications*, 31(70(4(1))), 12–17. <https://doi.org/10.32838/2663-6069/2020.4-1/03>
7. Booij, G. (2005). *The grammar of words: An introduction to linguistic morphology*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199226245.001.0001>
8. Brona, O. A. (2023). *Structure and semantics of term concepts in English-language geological discourse* (PhD thesis, Ivan Franko National University of Lviv, Ukraine).
9. Deroey, K. (2007). Review of Douglas Biber: *University language: A corpus-based study of spoken and written registers*. *Applied Linguistics*, 28(4), 624–627. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amm039>
10. *Encyclopedia of Biotechnology*. (n.d.). Retrieved

- from
<https://www.eolss.net/toc/c17browsecontents.aspx>
11. Garmash, O. L. (2014). Verbalization of English biocentric lexicalized concepts of affixal type. *Science and Education a New Dimension. Philology*, 2(7(34)), 47–50.
 12. Garmash, O. L. (2016). Verbalization of English technocentric lexicalized concepts formed by the metacognitive mechanism of affixation. *Scientific Notes of Mykola Gogol State University of Nizhyn. Philological Sciences*, 1, 158–164.
 13. Genomics Glossary. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://discoveringthegenome.org/glossary>
 14. Glossary of Genomics Terms. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.futurelearn.com/info/courses/the-genomicsera/0/steps/4864>
 15. Junya, M. (2017). A syntactic-morphological analysis of nominal compounds. *Florida Linguistic Papers*, 3, 51–62.
 16. Kimball, N. (2002). *Glossary of biotechnology terms*. CRC Press.
 17. Matthews, P. H. (2014). *Oxford concise dictionary of linguistics* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.
 18. Matvieieva, S. A., & Torgovets, M. A. (2022). Cognitive terminological structure as a unit of the professional worldview. *Scientific Journal of Mykhailo Dragomanov State University of Ukraine. Series 9: Current Trends in Language Development*, 23, 41–51. <https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series9.2022.23.04>
 19. Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). Genomics. Retrieved from <https://surl.li/dgizuu>
 20. Molina-Plaza, S., & Martínez-Sáez, A. (2024). Exploring metaphors in biotechnology journals. In S. Molina-Plaza & N. Maroto (Eds.), *Aspects of cognitive terminology studies: Theoretical considerations and the role of metaphor in terminology* (pp. 209–236). De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111073149-010>
 21. Myshak, E. (2017). The main means of formation of biotechnological terms. *American Journal of Research*, 4(4), 84–97.
 22. National Human Genome Research Institute. (n.d.a). Genomics. Retrieved from <https://www.genome.gov/genetics-glossary/genomics>
 23. National Human Genome Research Institute. (n.d.b). Talking glossary of genomic & genetic terms. Retrieved from <https://www.genome.gov/genetics-glossary>
 24. Pitkänen-Heikkilä, K. (2015). Adjectives as terms. *Terminology: International Journal of Theoretical and Applied Issues in Specialized Communication*, 21(1), 76–101. <https://doi.org/10.1075/term.21.1.04pit>
 25. Plag, I. (2018). *Word-formation in English*. Cambridge University Press.
 26. Rajak, S. (2018). Review on different stages of biotechnology and its application. *Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research*, 5(9), 1044–1051.
 27. Remy, F., Khabibullina, A., & Demeester, T. (2023). Detecting idiomatic multiword expressions in clinical terminology using definition-based representation learning. In A. Bhatia et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 19th Workshop on Multiword Expressions (MWE 2023)* (pp. 73–80). Association for Computational Linguistics. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.mwe-1.11>
 28. Selivanova, O. (2006). *Modern linguistics: A terminological encyclopaedia*. Enviroment.
 29. Striuk, Y. (2020). Analysis of the concept biotechnology in modern English. *Scientific Notes of V. I. Vernadsky TNU. Series: Philology. Social Communications*, 31(70(1(2))), 204–208. <https://doi.org/10.32838/2663-6069/2020.1-2/40>
 30. Syrotin, A. (2017). Multi-component English terms of biotechnology sphere. *Cogito. Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 9(3), 78–86.
 31. Syrotina, H. (2022). Concept categories expressed in English terms of the biotechnology sphere. *Cogito. Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 14(1), 174–187.