



SCIENTIFIC VIEWS ON THE GENERAL LINGUISTIC STATUS OF THE TERM

Ergashev Muhammadjon Rakhmonovich,

Doctor of philosophy in philological sciences (PhD),
associate professor; Kokand university.

MAQOLA HAQIDA

Qabul qilindi: 9-fevral 2026-yil

Tasdiqlandi: 11-fevral 2026-yil

Jurnal soni: 17-B

Maqola raqami: 24

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54613/ku.v17i.1454>

**KALIT SO'ZLAR/ КЛЮЧЕВЫЕ СЛОВА/
KEYWORDS**

term, terminology, general linguistic status, systematicity, semantic precision, monosemy, determinologization, reterminologization, literary language lexicon, epistemological function.

ANNOTATION

This article examines the general linguistic status of the term, its place within the lexical system of the literary language, and its distinctive features compared to ordinary vocabulary. The key characteristics of terminology — such as systematicity, semantic precision, monosemy, the requirement for definition, and epistemological function — are analyzed from a theoretical perspective. Drawing on the views of Uzbek and international linguists (H. Dadaboyev, E. Wüster, D.S. Lotte, A.V. Superanskaya, S.V. Grinev-Grinevich, and others), the study discusses the boundaries between terms and common lexical units, as well as the processes of determinologization and reterminologization. The findings indicate that terminology constitutes an integral yet distinctive layer of the literary language, governed by specific normative requirements and systemic relations. These properties play a crucial role in ensuring precision and stability in scientific discourse.

Introduction. In an era of rapid advancement across all domains of knowledge, science and technology continuously evolve, giving rise to specialized vocabulary that reflects new concepts and realities. Scholars have offered various characterizations of what constitutes a term. One widely accepted view describes it as a word or word combination that precisely denotes a concept specific to a field of science, technology, or other specialized area, with its usage strictly confined to that domain¹. Among early contributors, the Russian linguist G.O. Vinokur characterized terms as words fulfilling a distinct specialized function².

Literature review. The notion of terminology itself has been interpreted in diverse ways across the literature. In Russian linguistics, the discipline gained formal recognition in 1969 during a scholarly conference held at Moscow State University named after M.V. Lomonosov³.

The emergence of terminology as an independent scientific field owes much to pioneering work in the early twentieth century, particularly by the Austrian scholar Eugen Wüster and the Russian specialist D.S. Lotte⁴. Their investigations laid crucial groundwork by exploring the standardization, systematic organization, and semantic properties of terms—principles that continue to underpin contemporary terminological theory. Lotte's contributions, in particular, provided essential methodological foundations for the creation, systematization, and analysis of terms' logical and semantic features. Wüster, in his seminal monograph *Internationale Sprachnormung in der Technik, besonders in der Elektrotechnik*, argued compellingly for the necessity of unified, international standards in scientific and technical terminology⁵. He conceptualized terms as precise, systematic, and logically coherent units, sharply distinguished from the ambiguities of everyday technical language.

Building on the foundational insights of Wüster and Lotte, later researchers—including A.A. Reformatsky, V.M. Leychik, T.L. Kandelaki, and R.A. Budagov—further developed and refined these ideas, shaping the contours of modern terminological theory⁶.

The contributions of Wüster and Lotte represent pivotal milestones in the historical development of terminology as a discipline. They played a decisive role in clarifying the place of terms within scientific thought, differentiating them from general-language units, and establishing core principles of systematicity.

Within linguistics, the concepts of **term** (or “term”) and **terminology** hold significant importance. Terminology is commonly regarded as the theoretical discipline concerned with the system of

terms employed within a particular field, discipline, or sphere of activity, as well as with their analysis. Notably, the term “terminology” carries a dual sense: on one hand, it refers to the actual collection of specialized terms used in a given domain; on the other, it denotes the scholarly field dedicated to studying those terms⁷.

This inherent duality makes terminology a distinctive phenomenon in linguistic scholarship. In its first capacity, it encompasses the structured set of specialized designations found in fields such as science, technology, arts, or culture. In its second capacity, it functions as an autonomous discipline investigating the origins, structure, semantic characteristics, and patterns of usage governing such terms. These two dimensions are inextricably linked: theoretical study of terminology supplies the scientific basis for forming, refining, and standardizing practical term systems. Viewed in this light, terminology transcends mere description of a lexical layer; it serves as a vital bridge connecting the theoretical and applied dimensions of linguistics.

V.P. Danilenko offered a distinctive perspective on the concept, asserting that terms form an integral part of the vocabulary and serve as precise definers of objects and phenomena within scientific and specialized domains⁸.

Many Uzbek linguists define a **term** in a consistent manner: it is a word or phrase that precisely captures a concept related to objects or phenomena in science, technology, or other specialized domains, with its application limited exclusively to those fields⁹. Terms stand apart from ordinary vocabulary through key characteristics such as **monosemy** (univocality), the absence of expressiveness, and lack of emotional coloring. Illustrative examples include linguistic terms like *gap* (sentence), *ega* (subject), *ot* (noun), *son* (number), and *tovush* (sound); geometric terms such as *aylana* (circle) and *uchburchak* (triangle); physics terms like *jism* (body), *bosim* (pressure), *harakat* (motion), and *maydon* (field); as well as chemistry terms including *suv* (water), *kumush* (silver), *ishqor* (alkali), and *tuqlar* (salts).

O.S. Ahmedov, after synthesizing theoretical perspectives on terms and terminology, arrived at the following formulation: a term, by its origin and in line with contemporary conceptual principles, constitutes a word or word combination that denotes a precise concept, performs a specialized function, remains semantically bounded within a particular domain, and serves as a lexical unit representing concepts specific to that domain¹⁰. Aligning with this view, the present approach defines a term similarly: it is a lexical unit—whether a single word or a multi-word expression—semantically restricted to a specialized field and functioning to designate concepts belonging to that field.

¹ Mahkamov N., Ermatov I. Tilshunoslik terminlarining izohli lug'ati. – Toshkent: Fan, 2013. – 58 b.

² Винокур Г.О. О некоторых явлениях словообразования в русской технической терминологии // Труды Московского Института истории, философии литературы. – Т. 5. – М., 1939. – С. 4.

³ Петушков В.П. Лингвистика и терминоведение // Терминология и норма. – М., 1972. – С. 90.

⁴ Лотте Д.С. Основы построения научно-технической терминологии. Вопросы теории и методики. – М.: Изд-во АН СССР, 1961. – 160 с.

⁵ Wüster E. Internationale Sprachnormung in der Technik, besonders in der Elektrotechnik (Die nationale Sprachnormung und ihre Verallgemeinerung). – Berlin: VDI Verlag, 1931. – 431 S.

⁶ Канделаки Т.Л. Семантика терминов. – М.: Наука, 1977. – 220 с.; Лейчик В.М. Терминоведение: Предмет, методы, структура. – М.: Наука, 1989. – 256 с.; Будагов Р.А. Сравнительное изучение языков и лингвистическая типология. – М.: Наука, 1985. – 310 с.

⁷ Hjørland B. Terminology // ISKO Encyclopedia of Knowledge Organization. – [Electronic resource]. – URL: <https://www.isko.org/cyclo/terminology> (accessed: 27.09.2025).

⁸ Даниленко В.П. Русская терминология. Опыт лингвистического описания. – М.: Наука, 1977. – 15 с.

⁹ Yo'ldoshev I., Muhamedova S., Sharipova O., Majidova R. Tilshunoslik asoslari. – Toshkent, 2013. – 183 b.

¹⁰ Ahmedov O.S. Ingliz va o'zbek tillarida soliq-bojxona terminlarining lingvistik tahlili va tarjima nuqumollari: Filol. fan. doktori... diss. – Toshkent, 2016. – 56 b.

The complexity of studying terms arises not only from the multifaceted and multidimensional nature of concepts themselves but also from the significant differences that exist among terminologies across various domains. Consequently, **terminology** emerges as a central object of investigation: it is understood as the aggregate of designations employed within a specific branch of knowledge. A.V. Superanskaya regards terminology as a **special functional variety** of the general scientific language, forming the core, central, and information-rich segment of the lexical inventory¹¹. According to M. Alixonova, one of the primary objectives of terminology is to define and describe terms; by providing clear and unambiguous definitions, terminology enables precise identification and characterization of terms, thereby facilitating the establishment of a common professional language and mutual understanding among specialists in a given field¹².

Methodology. This study is grounded in a qualitative, theoretical-analytical approach aimed at identifying and substantiating the general linguistic status of the term within the lexical system of the literary language. The research proceeds from the understanding that terminology represents a functionally specialized yet structurally integrated layer of the national literary language, governed by specific semantic, systemic, and normative principles.

The research employs descriptive and analytical procedures to examine the essential features of terms, including monosemy, definitional clarity, semantic boundedness, and epistemological function. Through comparative analysis, terminological units are examined in relation to common lexical units in order to clarify their similarities and differences at the semantic, functional, and stylistic levels. A system-structural perspective is applied to demonstrate that terminology functions as an internally organized subsystem characterized by hierarchical relations and conceptual interdependence. In addition, elements of conceptual and componential analysis are utilized to clarify the semantic structure of terms and to determine how definitional features ensure precision and stability in scientific discourse.

Attention is also given to the dynamic aspects of terminology, particularly the processes of determinologization and reterminologization, which illustrate the interaction between specialized and general vocabulary. This dimension allows the study to account for both the stability and the evolutionary nature of terminological systems.

The empirical basis of the research consists of theoretical sources in linguistics and terminology studies, explanatory and specialized dictionaries, and examples drawn from scientific texts across various fields. The selection of materials follows the principle of representativeness and reflects both national and international scholarly traditions.

The reliability of the research is ensured through systematic engagement with authoritative academic sources and consistent application of analytical principles. The validity of the conclusions derives from the integration of theoretical synthesis and linguistic analysis, enabling a comprehensive and coherent account of the term's general linguistic status within the literary language.

Results. Effective standardization of terms in any language therefore requires thorough knowledge of their distinctive functional-semantic and pragmalinguistic properties, along with a scholarly-practical description of the terminological units involved and the development of their functional classification. Structural-categorical features, semantics, methods of terminological nomination, and other attributes of domain-specific terms are grounded in clearly defined criteria. When analyzing pre-existing terms in a language, it is essential to account for their **functional-semantic dynamics**, since terms reflect

the developmental trajectory and particularities of the discipline they serve.

In the relatively recent sublanguage of programming in Uzbek, a substantial portion of the terminology consists of transliterated or calqued items borrowed from English. This predominance stems from the rapid, dynamic emergence of new referents and concepts in this field, which originated and evolved primarily in English-speaking environments. At the same time, as previously noted, terminological borrowing is not confined to foreign languages; terms can also be adopted and adapted from other subsystems within the native language. The interplay between the studied lexical subsystem and terminologies or lexical layers from other languages and domains thus presents a compelling area for research. Superanskaya observes that the division of sciences in modern society is merely conditional, representing a continuum rather than rigid boundaries¹³. Similarly, T.V. Triterenko points out that numerous psychological terms are rooted in reinterpreted mythologemes¹⁴. Moreover, this lexical layer frequently acts as a productive donor for other disciplines.

In light of these insights from Superanskaya and Triterenko, boundaries between scientific fields remain relative, and lexical units actively circulate and exchange across domains within the language system. Psychological terminology, for instance, often draws on mythological sources and, in turn, supplies rich lexical material to other sciences. A clear example is the mythologeme *gidra* (hydra), which functions as a term in zoology (referring to a freshwater polyp), programming (denoting a fast bidirectional data transfer protocol), and astronomy (as a constellation, Hydra).

Evidently, the quantitative volume of terminological vocabulary generally far exceeds that of neutral everyday words within the overall lexicon. Owing to the distinctive features of usage scope—repeatedly emphasized by linguists and terminologists—no equality can be posited between these lexical strata.

Contemporary specialized terminologies continue to expand rapidly within their respective professional domains, accompanied by a growing body of scholarly research dedicated to this phenomenon. In the context of Uzbek linguistics, numerous studies have examined various aspects of terminology in the Uzbek language.

For instance, Sh. Abdullayeva's candidate dissertation conducted a comparative analysis of financial-economic terms used in the treasury (*gazzachilik*) field across English, Uzbek, and Russian¹⁵. Kh. Paluanova's doctoral work focused on the derivational-semantic principles underlying ecological terminology in English, Uzbek, Russian, and Karakalpak¹⁶. O.S. Ahmedov's doctoral research centered primarily on a derivational approach to the linguistic analysis of tax and customs terminology in English and Uzbek, alongside issues of standardization in these terminologies across languages¹⁷. P. Nishonov's dissertation explored the typological comparison of legal terminology in French and Uzbek, highlighting similarities and differences between the two systems¹⁸. D. Kadirbekova carried out a contrastive examination of information technology terms in English and Uzbek, detailing their linguistic features¹⁹. The lexical layer related to food in Uzbek has been analyzed in the works of M. Xudayarova, G. Odilova, D. Mamatova, and N. Ikramova²⁰.

A substantial number of investigations have addressed agricultural terminology in particular. T. No'monov and B. Mirsanov explored the lexical-semantic and grammatical properties of terms in melon cultivation (*polizchilik*), as well as naming conventions in this subfield²¹. A. Hasanov investigated certain peasant farming terms as they appear in Uzbek dialects²². G.I. Samandarova examined the structural components of agricultural linguistic terminology²³. G. Xidirova and G. Tilovova studied the lexicographic foundations of agricultural terminology in Uzbek and German²⁴. M. Xamidov

¹¹ Суперанская А.В., Подольская Н.В., Васильева Н.В. Общая терминология: Вопросы теории. – Москва: Наука, 1989. – 246 с. (Birinchilik nashri 1989 yilda chiqqan, keyingi qayta nashrlar mavjud).

¹² Alixonova M. Ingliz va o'zbek tillaridagi oziq-ovqat texnologiyasiga oid terminlarning lisoniy va tarjimaiy xususiyatlari: Filol. fan. bo'yicha falsafa doktori diss. avtoreferati. – Namangan, 2025. – 11 b.

¹³ Суперанская А.В. Теоретические основы практической транскрипции. Издание 2-е. – Москва: ЛЕНАНД, 2018. – 288 с.

¹⁴ Тритенко Т.В. Гигиена: Мифология и наука. – 2016. – С. 276–278.

¹⁵ Абдуллаева Ш.Н. Газначилик соҳасида қўлланиладиган молиявий-иқтисодий терминларнинг чоғиштирма тадқиқи (инглиз, ўзбек ва рус тиллари мисолида): филол. фан. фалс. док. дисс. – Тошкент, 2018. – 181 б.

¹⁶ Палуанова Х.Д. Инглиз, ўзбек, рус ва қоракалпоқ тилларида экологик терминларнинг деривацион-семантик принциплари: филол. фан. док. дисс. – Тошкент, 2016. – 230 б.

¹⁷ Ахмедов О.С. Инглиз ва ўзбек тилларида солиқ-божхона терминларининг лингвистик таҳлили ва таржима муаммолари: филол. фан. док. дисс. – Тошкент, 2016. – 255 б.

¹⁸ Нишонов П.П. Француз ва ўзбек тиллари юридик терминологиясининг қиёсий типологик тадқиқи: Филол. фан. ном. дисс. автореф. – Тошкент, 2009. – 25 б.

¹⁹ Кадирбекова Д.Х. Инглиз ва ўзбек тилларида ахборот технологиялари терминологиясининг лингвистик хусусиятлари. Монография. – Тошкент: Фан ва технология, 2016. – 128 б.

²⁰ Xudayarova M. O'zbek tilidagi taom nomlarining lingvistik tahlili: Filol. fan. nom. diss. – Toshkent, 2009. – 135 b.; Ikramova N. Uzbekskaya kulinarная лексика: diss. kan. filol. nauk. – Tashkent, 1983. – 168 s.; Odilova G. Xususiy diskurslar lingvomasaniy talqinining nazariyasi va amaliyoti (glottotnik diskurs misolida): Filol. fan. dok. ... – Toshkent, 2020. – 273 b.; Mamatova D. M. Taom diskursiga oid sifatlar tarjimasining lingvokulturologik muammolari (xitoy-o'zbek tillari misolida): filol. fan. bo'y. fals. dok.-ri. diss. – Andijon, 2024. – 134 b.

²¹ No'monov T. Polizchilik terminlarining leksik-semantik va grammatik xususiyatlari haqida. – Namangan, 2017. – 32 b.; Mirsanov B. Ayrim qovun navlarining nomlanishi haqida. O'zbek tili va adabiyoti. – Toshkent, 2017, №2. – B. 110–115.

²² Xasanov A. Shevalardagi ayrim dehqonchilik terminlari xususida. O'zbek tili va adabiyoti. – Toshkent, 2020. №6. – B. 107–110.

²³ Samandarova G.I. Component part of agricultural linguistic terminology // WEB of scientist: international scientific research journal. Volume 4, Issue 3, Mar., 2023. – P. 257–260.

²⁴ Xidirova G., Tilovova G. Lexicographic foundations of agricultural terminology in German and Uzbek languages // E3S Web of Conferences 497, 03056 (2024). 5th International

discussed synonymy phenomena within agricultural terms in a scholarly article²⁵, while D. Mahmudova addressed the aestheticization (“badiylashuv”) of agricultural terminology²⁶, and J. Bo’riyev analyzed the conceptual relationships among agrarian and farming terms²⁷. Z.K. Saidova researched synonymy and antonymy in agricultural terminology²⁸, and Sh. Babakhodjayeva investigated the sources of formation, along with the lexical and grammatical structure, of agricultural terms²⁹.

According to A.V. Superanskaya, the primary distinction between specialized vocabulary and general-purpose lexicon lies in the fact that specialized terms are not employed in everyday communication; they exist solely for experts within a particular branch of knowledge and function as communicative tools not in the general language but within a distinct sublanguage³⁰. This perspective appears well-founded when one considers the ongoing processes of exchange between specialized and everyday vocabulary, the occasional use of terms from one sublanguage in discourse types where they do not properly belong, and the incorporation of general-language words into scientific discourse.

Discussion. These developments underscore the dynamic interplay between domain-specific terminologies and broader lexical systems, highlighting the need for continued rigorous investigation into their formation, standardization, and interaction.

This observation inevitably leads back to the longstanding debate concerning the opposition—or, alternatively, the affinity—between **terms** and ordinary words. One scholarly perspective sharply contrasts the two, while another highlights their similarities³¹.

Prominent contemporary terminologists, including V.M. Leychik and S.V. Grinev-Grinevich, among others, have identified a series of distinctive features that allow us to trace the logical derivation of terms from general lexical units and to recognize the process of specialization that lexical items undergo in discourse. Throughout the historical development of terminology as a discipline, these differing viewpoints have sparked intense scholarly debates.

Advocates of the first approach maintain that the defining characteristic separating terms from the general lexicon is their performance of one or more specialized functions not inherent to everyday words. Many linguists emphasize the **definitional** (or explanatory) role of terms, viewing them as linguistic elements that precisely designate concepts within a specific domain of specialized knowledge. Others, however, regard the term primarily as an instrument of scientific cognition, thereby attributing to it a distinct **epistemological** (gnoseological) function.

Aligning with S.V. Grinev-Grinevich’s assertion that ordinary root words and terms reflect phenomena at different levels of intellectual activity—namely, simple notions versus scientific concepts—we acknowledge that this contrast becomes particularly evident when comparing the interpretation of neutral everyday words with the definition of terms. Regrettably, this crucial distinction is still frequently overlooked in current practice. As A.D. Shmelev has pointed out, lexicographers often conflate interpretation with definition, resulting in undesirable consequences³².

Accurate delineation of the differences between terms and general-language words, along with clear demarcation of their semantic boundaries, remains essential for terminological research. In the compilation of terminological dictionaries, it is imperative to express the meaning of each unit with maximum precision.

Conclusion. It becomes apparent that the **substantial** (content-oriented) and **functional** approaches do not necessarily contradict one another; rather, they complement or even overlap to a significant degree. For example, one widely recognized property of a term is the presence of a **definition** (definitsiya). Efforts to identify and validate the substantial characteristics that underpin a term’s existence and functional activity have ultimately stimulated the formation of views regarding the distinction between its essential features and the normative requirements imposed upon it. Recent studies in this area have contributed to the emergence of criteria specifying the necessary attributes that words belonging to this category must possess. L.V. Ivina, for instance, has drawn attention to the polysemy observable in

many terms—even within the same field of knowledge—and has argued that **monosemy** cannot serve as an absolute foundational property but rather constitutes one of the normative demands placed on terms.

Numerous scholars have advocated for the precise identification of the functional characteristics that distinguish terms from ordinary polysemous lexical units, as well as for the establishment of corresponding normative requirements. The very existence of such requirements underscores the absence of rigid boundaries between terms and general words, since ordinary vocabulary is not subject to similarly strict prescriptive norms³³.

In essence, the clearly articulated normative requirements imposed on terms serve to differentiate them from everyday language, thereby ensuring the precision and stability characteristic of scientific discourse.

According to the linguist H. Dadaboyev, modern literary Uzbek occupies a distinctive and prominent position precisely because of the role played by **terminology** in its construction. He identifies two fundamentally different conceptual approaches to the place of terminology within the lexical composition of a literary language. The first perspective recognizes terminology as an **independent stratum** of the literary lexicon; the second treats it as something **detached** from the general word stock of the literary language—regarded as a separate object and equated in status with varieties of speech such as dialects, jargons, or everyday colloquial language³⁴.

Building on Dadaboyev’s position, the present analysis regards terminology as a relatively autonomous layer within the literary lexicon. This autonomy arises because terms collectively form a specialized set of lexical units that function within clearly delimited domains of knowledge or activity. As such, terminology manifests itself as a distinct category of lexical items that sets itself apart from the broader literary language.

A significant number of linguists maintain that one of the most essential properties of a term is its **systemic belonging**—that is, its existence and meaning are intrinsically tied to a network of other specialized units within the same conceptual field. In this view, a term is properly understood only through its interrelations with other terms in the system. At the same time, certain scholars emphasize what they call the “specificity of usage” (often understood in thematic terms) as the decisive characteristic of terminological units.

The systemic perspective appears more convincing. As numerous researchers have pointed out, a term verbalizes a precisely delimited scientific concept within an organized body of knowledge, whereas an ordinary word tends to reflect only selected features of an object or phenomenon. Consequently, general-language words produce relatively vague, generalized mental images and exhibit lower degrees of conceptual integration³⁵.

Alongside the properties already discussed, the **semantic precision** (or content-related exactness) of a term constitutes another fundamental trait. This characteristic is essential because the emergence of any term is directly linked to the identification and isolation of a new conceptual fragment within a given system of scientific knowledge.

Etymologically, the very lexeme “termin” carries the meaning of “boundary” or “limit,” which itself signals the intrinsic boundedness and precision that define terminological units. The absence or loss of this delimiting quality can undermine a unit’s status as a genuine term.

Thus, the semantic precision of a term ultimately derives from its **systemic** nature. The parameter of precision—so vital to the ontology of terminological units—largely depends on and yields to systematic organization. When systematicity is lost, precision is likewise compromised. This is most clearly observed when a former term passes into the general lexicon: its specialized semantic content fades or disappears entirely. In some cases, even after such a transition, the word may retain a residue of its original neutral meaning while no longer functioning terminologically.

Some scholars conceptualize the term itself as a **compressed functional-semantic definition** of a particular scientific concept. From

Conference on Energetics, Civil and Agricultural Engineering. <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202449703056>.

²⁵ Xamidov M. Qishloq xo’jaligi terminlarda sinonimiya hodisasi. <https://in-academy.uz/index.php/ekar/article/view/1710>

²⁶ Mahmudova D. Qishloq xo’jaligi terminlarining badiylashuvi. Filologiyaning dolzarb masalalari. – Qo’qon, 2023. – B. 250–252.

²⁷ Bo’riyev J. Agrar soha va dehqonchilik terminlarining konseptual munosabati. – Toshkent: Central Asian journal of education and innovation, 2023. – B. 306–310.

²⁸ Saidova Z.K. Agricultural terms and the lexical expression of antonymy and synonym occurrence in these terms // American Journal Of Philological Sciences, March 16, 2023. Volume 3, Issue 3. – P. 5–12.

²⁹ Babakhodjaeva Shakhlo. Sources of formation and lexical-grammatical structure of agricultural terms // International Journal of Applied Research 2019; 5(11). – P. 165–167.

³⁰ Суперанская А.В. Теоретические основы практической транскрипции. Издание 2-е. – Москва: ЛЕНАНД, 2018. – 288 с. (С. 25).

³¹ Кузмин М.А. Статьи и материалы. – М.: Новое литературное обозрение, 1995. – 367 с.

³² Шмелев А.Д. Лексический состав русского языка как отражение “русской души” // Русский язык в школе. – 1996. – № 4. – С. 83–90.

³³ Гринев-Гриневиц С.В., Сорокина Э.А., Викулова Л.Г. Теория языка: антропологическая: учебное пособие. – М.: ИД ВКН, 2021. – 256 с.

³⁴ Dadaboyev H. O’zbek terminologiyasi. – Toshkent, 2019. – 4 b.

³⁵ Павлова М.Г. Английская терминология электронной-вычислительной техники: Дис. ... канд. филол. наук. – М., 1986. – 177 с.

this standpoint, establishing the exact semantic boundaries of a term becomes inseparable from formulating its proper definition.

Furthermore, specialized terminological dictionaries serve as repositories of accumulated experience, material achievements, and the collective cognitive results of individual nations and humanity as a whole. This vast body of knowledge places a particularly acute demand on terminology: the need for **determinologization** (or **determinologization**). Determinologization refers to the process whereby a term gradually loses its characteristic terminological properties and

REFERENCES

1. Ahmedov O.S. Ingliz va o'zbek tillarida soliq-bojxona terminlarining lingvistik tahlili va tarjima muammolari: Filol. fan. doktori... diss. – Toshkent, 2016. – 56 b.
2. Alixonova M. Ingliz va o'zbek tillaridagi oziq-ovqat texnologiyasiga oid terminlarning lisoniy va tarjimaviy xususiyatlari: Filol. fan. bo'yicha falsafa doktori diss. avtoreferati. – Namangan, 2025. – 11 b.
3. Babakhodjaeva Shakhlo. Sources of formation and lexical-grammatical structure of agricultural terms // International Journal of Applied Research 2019; 5(11). – P. 165–167.
4. Bo'riyev J. Agrar soha va dehqonchilik terminlarining konseptual munosabati. – Toshkent: Central Asian journal of education and innovation, 2023. – B. 306–310.
5. Dadaboyev H. O'zbek terminologiyasi. – Toshkent, 2019. – 4 b.
6. Hjørland B. Terminology // ISKO Encyclopedia of Knowledge Organization. – [Electronic resource]. – URL: <https://www.isko.org/cyclo/terminology> (accessed: 27.09.2025).
7. Mahkamov N., Ermatov I. Tilshunoslik terminlarining izohli lug'ati. – Toshkent: Fan, 2013. – 58 b.
8. Mahmudova D. Qishloq xo'jaligi terminlarining badiylashuvi. Filologiyaning dolzarb masalalari. – Qo'qon, 2023. – B. 250–252.
9. Saidova Z.K. Agricultural terms and the lexical expression of antonymy and synonym occurrence in these terms // American Journal Of Philological Sciences. March 16, 2023. Volume 3. Issue 3. – P. 5–12.
10. Samandarova G.I. Component part of agricultural linguistic terminology // WEB of scientist: international scientific research journal. Volume 4, Issue 3, Mar., 2023. – P. 257–260.
11. Wüster E. Internationale Sprachnormung in der Technik, besonders in der Elektrotechnik (Die nationale Sprachnormung und ihre Verallgemeinerung). – Berlin: VDI Verlag, 1931. – 431 S.
12. Xamidov M. Qishloq xo'jaligi terminlarda sinonimiya hodisasi. <https://in-academy.uz/index.php/ejar/article/view/1710>
13. Xasanov A. Shevalardagi ayrim dehqonchilik terminlari xususida. O'zbek tili va adabiyoti. – Toshkent, 2020. №6. – B. 107–110.
14. Xidirova G., Tilovova G. Lexicographic foundations of agricultural terminology in German and Uzbek languages // E3S Web of Conferences 497, 03056 (2024). 5th International Conference on Energetics, Civil and Agricultural Engineering. <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202449703056>.
15. Yo'ldoshev I., Muhamedova S., Sharipova O., Majidova R. Tilshunoslik asoslari. – Toshkent, 2013. – 183 b.

shifts into the common lexical stock of the language, often accompanied by a transformation or broadening of its original specialized meaning.

In the course of determinologization, a term typically relinquishes its precision, conceptual rigor, systematic coherence, and monosemy. At the same time, its sphere of application expands considerably. A term may migrate from one field of science or technology to another, becoming a term in a different domain—a process known as **reterminologization**. This phenomenon itself encompasses several subtypes, including secondary, parallel, progressive, and regressive forms.

16. Абдуллаева Ш.Н. Фазначилик соҳасида қўлланиладиган молиявий-иктисодий терминларнинг чоғиштирма тадқиқи (инглиз, ўзбек ва рус тиллари мисолида): филол. фан. фалс. док...дисс. – Toshkent, 2018. – 181 б.
17. Ахмедов О.С. Инглиз ва ўзбек тилларида солиқ-божхона терминларининг лингвистик таҳлили ва таржима муаммолари: филол. фан. док... дисс. – Toshkent, 2016. – 255 б.
18. Винокур Г.О. О некоторых явлениях словообразования в русской технической терминологии // Труды Московского Института истории, философии литературы. – Т. 5. – М., 1939. – С. 4.
19. Гринев-Гриневиц С.В., Сорокина Э.А., Викулова Л.Г. Теория языка: антропологистика: учебное пособие. – М.: ИД ВКН, 2021. – 256 с.
20. Даниленко В.П. Русская терминология. Опыт лингвистического описания. – М.: Наука, 1977. – 15 с.
21. Кадирбекова Д.Х. Инглиз ва ўзбек тилларида ахборот технологиялари терминологиясининг лингвистик хусусиятлари. Монография. – Toshkent: Fan va texnologiya, 2016. – 128 б.
22. Кузмин М.А. Статьи и материалы. – М.: Новое литературное обозрение, 1995. – 367 с.
23. Лотте Д.С. Основы построения научно-технической терминологии. Вопросы теории и методики. – М.: Изд-во АН СССР, 1961. – 160 с.
24. Нишонов П.П. Француз ва ўзбек тиллари юридик терминологиясининг қиёсий типологик тадқиқи: Филол. фан. ном. ... дисс. автореф. – Toshkent, 2009. – 25 б.
25. Павлова М.Г. Английская терминология электронно-вычислительной техники: Дис. ... канд. филол. наук. – М., 1986. – 177 с.
26. Палуанова Х.Д. Инглиз, ўзбек, рус ва коракалпоқ тилларида экологик терминларнинг деривацион-семантик принциплари: филол. фан. док...дисс. – Toshkent, 2016. – 230 б.
27. Петушков В.П. Лингвистика и терминоведение // Терминология и норма. – М., 1972. – С. 90.
28. Суперанская А.В. Теоретические основы практической транскрипции. Издание 2-е. – Москва: ЛЕНАНД, 2018. – 288 с.
29. Тритенко Т.В. Гигиена: Мифология и наука. – 2016. – С. 276–278.
30. Шмелев А.Д. Лексический состав русского языка как отражение “русской души” // Русский язык в школе. – 1996. – № 4. – С. 83–90.