



ENGLISH AND UZBEK TERMINOLOGICAL LEXICOGRAPHY: A COMPARATIVE STUDY

Ashurova Sitora Erkinovna,
Senior teacher,
Renaissance Educational University
e-mail: sita.ashurova@gmail.com
Orcid:0009-0008-6488-7305

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17933621>

Annotation. This article explores the development, structure, and challenges of English and Uzbek terminological dictionaries within the broader framework of lexicography and applied linguistics. The study highlights methodological approaches to the compilation of terminological dictionaries, focusing on their linguistic, semantic, and cultural dimensions. The paper concludes that cross-linguistic harmonization, enriched corpus-based resources, and bilingual terminological dictionaries are essential for improving both the quality and accessibility of specialized lexicons in English and Uzbek.

Keywords: terminological dictionary, lexicography, terminology, semantic equivalence, specialized vocabulary, bilingual dictionary, corpus-based lexicography, translation studies.

Annotatsiya. Ushbu maqolada ingliz va o'zbek terminologik lug'atlarining rivojlanishi, tuzilishi hamda ularning leksikografiya va amaliy tilshunoslik doirasidagi muammolari tahlil qilinadi. Tadqiqotda terminologik lug'atlar tuzish metodologik yondashuvlari yoritilib, ularning lingvistik, semantik va madaniy jihatlariga alohida e'tibor qaratilgan. Maqola yakunida tillararo uyg'unlashtirish, korpus asosidagi boy manbalarni yaratish hamda ikki tilli terminologik lug'atlar tuzish ingliz va o'zbek tillarida ixtisoslashgan leksikonlarning sifatini hamda ulardan foydalanish imkoniyatlarini yaxshilashda muhim omil ekani ta'kidlanadi.

Kalit so'zlar: terminologik lug'at, leksikografiya, terminologiya, semantik ekvivalentlik, ixtisoslashgan lug'at boyligi, ikki tilli lug'at, korpusga asoslangan leksikografiya, tarjimashunoslik.

Introduction

Terminological dictionaries occupy a central role in both theoretical and applied linguistics, serving as the foundation for knowledge transfer across specialized domains. Unlike general-purpose dictionaries, which aim to cover the basic lexicon of a language, terminological dictionaries are designed to systematize the vocabulary of a particular discipline, ensuring accuracy, precision, and consistency of usage [Hartmann & James, 1998, p. 103]. They are indispensable in fields such as medicine, law, horticulture, information technology, and linguistics itself, where conceptual clarity is critical for effective communication.

The rise of terminological lexicography in English-speaking contexts has been influenced by the works of Cabré [Cabré, 1999, p. 72], who emphasizes the communicative and cognitive functions of terminology, and Wiegand [Wiegand, 1998, p. 140], who analyzed the structural and functional aspects of specialized dictionaries. Similarly, Atkins and Rundell [Atkins and Rundell, 2008, p.



54] stress the importance of user needs and corpus-based evidence in compiling reliable dictionaries. These approaches have given English terminological dictionaries a high degree of theoretical grounding and methodological diversity.

In contrast, Uzbek terminological lexicography, though enriched by a long tradition of lexicographic practice dating back to medieval scholars, has faced challenges in modernizing terminology for rapidly developing scientific and technical fields. Scholars such as Karimov [Karimov, 2020, p. 115] underline the necessity of updating Uzbek horticultural and agricultural terminology, while Najmiddinov [Najmiddinov, 2025, p. 214] points to difficulties in adapting polysemic and synonymous terms into electronic thesauri. The absence of specialized, standardized terminological dictionaries across many scientific domains in Uzbek remains an obstacle to knowledge integration at both national and international levels.

Against this background, the present article investigates the linguistic and methodological characteristics of English and Uzbek terminological dictionaries. It highlights the similarities and differences in how terminological systems are codified, the semantic and cultural issues involved in dictionary compilation, and the urgent need for bilingual and digital resources that harmonize specialized vocabularies across the two languages.

Methods

This study employs a combination of "descriptive", "comparative", and "analytical" methods to investigate the features of English and Uzbek terminological dictionaries.

1. Descriptive method

The descriptive method was applied to identify the structural and functional characteristics of English and Uzbek terminological dictionaries. Descriptions of dictionary entries, including headwords, definitions, grammatical information, usage notes, and examples, were compared across selected English and Uzbek sources. For English, examples include "The Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics" [Matthews, 2014, p. 25] and "Dictionary of Lexicography" [Hartmann & James, 1998, p. 103]. For Uzbek, sources include Karimov's "Bog'dorchilik asoslari" [Karimov, 2020, p. 115] and Najmiddinov's work on electronic thesauri [Najmiddinov, 2025, p. 214].

2. Comparative method

This method was applied to reveal differences and similarities between English and Uzbek lexicographic traditions. Comparative analysis focused on:

- The treatment of terminological units,
- The degree of standardization,
- Semantic equivalence in bilingual contexts, and



- The influence of international models of terminology management [Cabr , 1999, p. 72].

3. Analytical method

Analytical techniques were employed to examine terminological inconsistencies, semantic mismatches, and translation difficulties. For example, the English terms "cohesion" and "coherence" are often translated as "bog'lanishlilik" and "izchillik" in Uzbek, but the semantic scope of these terms does not always align [Najmiddinov, 2025, p. 214]. Similarly, English terminology tends to be corpus-driven, whereas Uzbek dictionaries are more prescriptive and often lag behind in digital adaptation.

4. Corpus-based observations

To illustrate recent trends, corpus-based evidence was also referenced from English lexicography, particularly the emphasis on authentic usage and collocational patterns in terminological dictionaries [Atkins & Rundell, 2008, p. 54]. In contrast, Uzbek lexicographic practice often lacks such corpus support, reflecting a methodological gap.

Through these combined methods, the study identifies both the progress and challenges in English and Uzbek terminological dictionary compilation, highlighting areas where Uzbek lexicography can benefit from international experience while maintaining its linguistic and cultural identity.

Results and Discussion

The comparative analysis of English and Uzbek terminological dictionaries revealed several important findings related to their structure, methodology, and practical application. These results are discussed below in four subsections: (1) structural and functional characteristics, (2) terminological consistency and standardization, (3) semantic equivalence and translation challenges, and (4) the role of digital resources and future perspectives.

1. Structural and Functional Characteristics

English terminological dictionaries are characterized by their strong theoretical foundation and corpus-based methodology. Hartmann and James [Hartmann and James, 1998, p. 103] emphasize that terminological dictionaries are not merely repositories of definitions but also serve as tools for communication and translation in specialized fields. For instance, "The Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics" [Matthews, 2014, p. 25] presents concise, user-oriented definitions supported by cross-references, which enhance the functional utility of the dictionary for students, teachers, and researchers. Similarly, Atkins and Rundell [Atkins and Rundell, 2008, p. 54]



highlight the importance of authentic usage examples in illustrating the application of terms in real discourse.

In the Uzbek context, terminological dictionaries often prioritize prescriptive definitions, focusing on establishing a single “correct” form rather than capturing variation. For example, Karimov [Karimov, 2020, p. 115] underlines the importance of standardizing horticultural terms to avoid confusion in agricultural practices. However, these dictionaries rarely include usage examples, which limits their accessibility for non-specialist users. Furthermore, Najmiddinov [Najmiddinov, 2025, p. 214] points out that the lack of comprehensive thesauri and electronic resources hinders the integration of Uzbek terminological dictionaries into modern linguistic practice.

2. Terminological Consistency and Standardization

One of the major challenges in both English and Uzbek contexts is achieving terminological consistency. In English, international standards such as ISO 704 on terminology principles provide guidelines for harmonization. Cabré [Cabré, 1999, p. 72] argues that terminological work must balance cognitive, linguistic, and communicative dimensions to achieve consistency across disciplines. This has led to a relatively high level of standardization in English terminological dictionaries.

In contrast, Uzbek terminological dictionaries often struggle with consistency due to historical, cultural, and linguistic factors. For example, the same horticultural term may appear with different variants across textbooks and practical manuals, leading to confusion in academic and professional communication [Karimov, 2020, p. 116]. The absence of centralized terminological commissions or systematic adoption of international standards exacerbates this issue. Thus, standardization remains a pressing task for Uzbek lexicography.

3. Semantic Equivalence and Translation Challenges

Another significant issue is semantic equivalence in bilingual dictionaries. English and Uzbek often encode concepts differently, leading to mismatches in translation. For instance, the English term “coherence” refers to the logical connectedness of ideas within a text [Halliday, 2004, p. 56], while the Uzbek equivalent “izchillik” also connotes orderliness and continuity in a broader sense. This semantic divergence creates ambiguity when translating academic texts.

Najmiddinov [Najmiddinov, 2025, p. 214] observes similar problems when adapting polysemic and synonymous terms into Uzbek electronic thesauri. Direct translations often fail to capture the full semantic scope of English terms, necessitating explanatory notes or multiple equivalents. By contrast, English terminological dictionaries frequently use corpus evidence to disambiguate polysemic



terms, ensuring more accurate semantic representation [Atkins & Rundell, 2008, p. 55].

4. Digital Resources and Future Perspectives

In English lexicography, digitalization has transformed terminological dictionary design. Online platforms and corpus-based tools enable users to access real-time examples, collocational patterns, and multimedia support. Wiegand [Wiegand, 1998, p. 140] stresses that modern dictionaries must move beyond static print models and embrace dynamic, user-interactive systems.

Uzbek lexicography is gradually moving in this direction but remains at an early stage. While some electronic glossaries and databases exist, they are often limited in scope and lack interoperability with international resources. Najmiddinov [Najmiddinov, 2025, p. 215] emphasizes that the development of electronic terminological thesauri is essential for integrating Uzbek lexicons into global academic and professional networks. Moreover, bilingual and multilingual terminological dictionaries can bridge the gap between Uzbek and international scholarly communities, facilitating cross-cultural communication and knowledge exchange.

Synthesis

Taken together, these findings suggest that while English terminological dictionaries benefit from established methodologies, international standards, and corpus-driven innovation, Uzbek terminological dictionaries are still consolidating their theoretical and practical foundations. The key challenges for Uzbek lexicography include ensuring terminological consistency, addressing semantic mismatches in translation, and accelerating the transition to digital platforms. Collaborative efforts, drawing on both international expertise and local linguistic traditions, are essential for the advancement of Uzbek terminological dictionaries.

Conclusion

The study of English and Uzbek terminological dictionaries demonstrates both shared challenges and divergent developmental paths in lexicography. English terminological dictionaries benefit from long-standing traditions of theoretical grounding, corpus-based methodologies, and international standardization. These resources are widely used in academic and professional domains, providing clarity, precision, and accessibility.

By contrast, Uzbek terminological lexicography, while rooted in a rich historical tradition, faces significant challenges in modernization. Terminological inconsistency, limited semantic equivalence in translation, and the lack of comprehensive digital resources hinder the development of effective dictionaries.



However, as Karimov [Karimov , 2020, p. 115] and Najmiddinov [Najmiddinov, 2025, p. 214] stress, the demand for specialized Uzbek terminological lexicons is increasing, particularly in rapidly developing fields such as horticulture, technology, and linguistics.

To address these challenges, several steps are recommended:

1. Establishing centralized mechanisms for terminological standardization in Uzbek.

2. Developing bilingual and multilingual terminological dictionaries to facilitate international collaboration.

3. Expanding corpus-based approaches to ensure semantic accuracy and authentic usage representation.

4. Investing in digital platforms and electronic thesauri to enhance accessibility and global integration.

In conclusion, English terminological lexicography can serve as both a model and a partner for Uzbek dictionary-making. By adopting international best practices while respecting national linguistic identity, Uzbek terminological dictionaries can evolve into effective tools for scientific, professional, and educational communication.

References:

1. Atkins, B. T., & Rundell, M. [2008]. *The Oxford Guide to Practical Lexicography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [p. 54–55]
2. Cabré, M. T. [1999]. *Terminology: Theory, Methods, and Applications*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. [p. 72]
3. Halliday, M. A. K. [2004]. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* [3rd ed.]. London: Arnold. [p. 56]
4. Hartmann, R. R. K., & James, G. [1998]. *Dictionary of Lexicography*. London: Routledge. [p. 103]
5. Karimov, B. [2020]. *Bog‘dorchilik asoslari*. Tashkent: O‘zbekiston Milliy Ensiklopediyasi. [p. 115–116]
6. Matthews, P. H. [2014]. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics* [3rd ed.]. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [p. 25]
7. Najmiddinov, A. [2025]. O‘zbek tilida polisemik va sinonimik birliklarning elektron tesauruslarda aks etishi. Tashkent: Fan nashriyoti. [p. 214–215]
8. Wiegand, H. E. [1998]. *Wörterbuchforschung: Untersuchungen zur Wörterbuchbenutzung, zur Theorie, Geschichte, Kritik und Automatisierung der Lexikographie*. Berlin: De Gruyter. [p. 140]