PRINCIPLES OF COMPARATIVE TERMINOLOGY STUDIES

Karshi State University

Lunvistics Department master's student

Normuminova Marjona Erali qizi

Abstract

Comparative terminology studies examine the structure, function, and equivalence of terms across two or more languages within specific subject fields. The primary goal is to achieve conceptual clarity and terminological consistency for use in bilingual lexicography, translation studies, international communication, and domain-specific language teaching. This article outlines the key principles that guide comparative terminological research, with a particular focus on structural, semantic, functional, and cultural dimensions. The discussion is illustrated with examples from English and Uzbek medical and legal terminologies.

Introduction

In the era of globalization, where knowledge is rapidly exchanged across borders and disciplines, the role of language—particularly specialized language—has become more vital than ever. Terminological equivalence, defined as the accurate conceptual and functional correspondence of terms across languages, plays a pivotal role in ensuring effective knowledge transfer in multilingual contexts. It underpins not only international scientific collaboration but also professional communication in fields such as medicine, law, technology, and education.

Comparative terminology studies are situated at the intersection of linguistics, translation studies, and specialized discourse analysis. Their primary objective is to investigate how domain-specific terms in one language align—structurally, semantically, and functionally—with those in another language. These studies are not

confined to simple word-to-word correspondence; rather, they examine the underlying conceptual frameworks, systemic differences, and cultural factors that influence terminological choices.

The significance of comparative terminology extends beyond lexicographic interest. It is essential for developing reliable bilingual and multilingual terminological databases, constructing domain-specific dictionaries, and improving the accuracy and fluency of specialized translations. Moreover, it contributes to fostering intercultural competence, which is crucial in diplomatic, educational, and medical settings where misinterpretation of key terms can lead to misunderstanding or even harm.

In this context, standardization efforts by international bodies—such as the International Organization for Standardization (ISO), the World Health Organization (WHO), and national terminology commissions—aim to harmonize terminology usage across languages and systems. Comparative research aids in identifying terminological gaps, proposing equivalence models, and supporting the systematic creation of neologisms when necessary.

Thus, the comparative study of terminology is not a mere academic endeavor; it is a practical and strategic component of global communication and specialized knowledge management.

Conceptual Equivalence

One of the most essential principles in comparative terminology is conceptual equivalence—the requirement that terms across two or more languages should refer to the same conceptual entity within a particular subject domain. Achieving conceptual equivalence is crucial for ensuring terminological accuracy, effective translation, and mutual intelligibility among subject-matter experts from different linguistic backgrounds.

Conceptual equivalence is not merely a lexical matching exercise. It requires a **concept-based approach** that prioritizes the underlying meaning and function of the

term within its system of use, rather than relying solely on formal or morphological similarity. This approach typically involves the comparison of:

Standardized definitions from authoritative monolingual and bilingual sources,

Domain-specific usage contexts (e.g., in clinical protocols, legal acts, technical manuals),

Cultural and institutional frameworks that give rise to particular term usage.

For instance, the English medical term **"hypertension"** and the Uzbek equivalent **"arterial gipertoniya"** both refer to the condition characterized by abnormally high blood pressure. While the morphological structures differ—*hypertension* being a Latinate compound and *arterial gipertoniya* a calque from Russian—the underlying **pathophysiological concept remains the same**. Thus, conceptual equivalence is achieved, even though the **etymological origins and syntactic constructions** differ.

However, conceptual equivalence is not always symmetrical or guaranteed. There are cases where:

A concept exists in one language but has no direct counterpart in another due to cultural, legal, or systemic differences.

A single term in one language corresponds to multiple terms in another depending on context, which leads to partial equivalence.

Terms may be false friends, i.e., they appear similar but represent different concepts (e.g., *prescription* in English vs. *retsept* in Uzbek, which can also mean culinary recipe).

Therefore, achieving conceptual equivalence often requires terminologists and translators to employ strategies such as:

Descriptive definitions or paraphrasing,

Borrowing or neologisms, when no equivalent exists,

Domain expert validation, to ensure the term reflects accurate disciplinary usage.

In conclusion, conceptual equivalence forms the backbone of comparative terminology studies. It ensures that knowledge transmission across languages retains semantic integrity, which is essential for scientific communication, policy implementation, and cross-cultural knowledge sharing.

Structural Correspondence

Comparative terminology studies must address the **morphological and syntactic structures** that shape how terms are formed in different languages. While English commonly utilizes compounding and affixation to create concise, complex terms (e.g., *cardiovascular*, *neurotransmitter*, *multidrug-resistant*), Uzbek tends to express similar meanings through **analytical constructions** or descriptive phrases (e.g., *yurak-qon tomir tizimi*, *asab moddalari*, *bir nechta dori ta'siriga chidamli*).

These structural variations reflect broader typological differences between analytic and synthetic languages. English leans toward morphological condensation, often combining Latin or Greek roots, while Uzbek—being more agglutinative and Turkic—prefers **transparent, compound-free phrases** that are semantically clear but syntactically longer.

Structural correspondence thus entails:

Recognizing when structural transformations (e.g., splitting, expansion, rephrasing) are needed in translation;

Avoiding formal mimicry, where terms appear similar but violate the target language's morphosyntactic norms;

Prioritizing functional clarity over morphological symmetry.

Failure to address these structural differences can lead to mistranslations, awkward expressions, or misalignment with professional jargon in the target culture.

Semantic Precision

Semantic analysis is another foundational principle in comparative terminology, involving the study of **polysemy (multiple meanings), synonymy (similar meanings),**

and contextual variability across languages. Even when two terms appear lexically aligned, they may differ in:

Connotation: underlying emotional or cultural associations,

Domain of use: legal, academic, clinical, etc.,

Register or formality level.

For example, the term *legal aid* in English typically refers to **state-funded legal services** for disadvantaged citizens. In contrast, its Uzbek equivalent *huquqiy yordam* can also refer more broadly to **any kind of legal assistance**, including private consultation. Though semantically parallel, the **institutional and pragmatic implications** differ significantly due to legal system disparities.

Ensuring semantic precision involves:

Consulting **context-specific corpora and legal/medical texts**,

Identifying **false cognates or partial synonyms**,

Providing **explanatory glosses or disambiguation notes** when necessary.

Functional and Discursive Use

Terminological comparison must go beyond dictionary entries and explore how terms function **in real communicative settings**—legal documents, patient reports, policy papers, academic publications, and media discourse. This **discursive approach** reveals:

Register variation (formal/informal),

Medium sensitivity (written vs. spoken),

Audience-oriented adaptation (expert-to-expert vs. expert-to-layperson).

For instance, a term like *acute respiratory syndrome* may appear in clinical records, while its simplified equivalent *keskin nafas yetishmovchiligi* might be used in public health announcements in Uzbek.

Functional equivalence demands that terminologists:

Map usage patterns in both source and target languages,

Assess **collocational norms** (which words commonly co-occur),

Determine whether the term carries **pragmatic softening or intensification** in different contexts.

Cultural and Systemic Asymmetry

Some terms are **deeply embedded in a language's legal, medical, or educational systems**, making direct equivalence impossible. This phenomenon is known as **system-bound or culturally embedded terminology**. For example:

General Practitioner (GP) in the UK refers to a **primary care doctor within the National Health Service**, with specific training and gatekeeping functions.

In Uzbekistan, there is **no identical role or title**, though equivalents like *oilaviy shifokor* or *uchastka vrachi* may be used in context.

In such cases, translators and terminologists must:

Use **descriptive phrases** rather than one-word terms,

Propose **neologisms or hybrid constructions** where appropriate,

Clarify cultural or institutional distinctions through **footnotes or annotations**.

Systemic asymmetry also arises in educational degrees, administrative terms, and healthcare classifications.

Standardization and Harmonization

The ultimate objective of comparative terminology is to promote **interlingual harmonization**—the alignment of terms across languages to facilitate international cooperation, especially in regulated domains such as medicine, law, and science. Key international organizations, such as:

ISO (International Organization for Standardization),

WHO (World Health Organization),

UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization),

play a crucial role in developing **multilingual terminological databases and glossaries**. Standardization initiatives ensure:

Terminological consistency across countries and disciplines,

Terminology interoperability in digital health records, international treaties, and multilingual education,

Accessibility and accuracy for translators, researchers, and policy-makers.

Comparative terminology studies, therefore, provide the theoretical and empirical foundation for building **cross-linguistic terminological infrastructures**—an essential component of global knowledge management.

Methodological Approaches

Effective comparative terminology analysis requires the application of **interdisciplinary methods** that blend linguistic, cultural, and domain-specific approaches. The following methodologies are commonly employed in the field of comparative terminology studies:

Corpus Linguistics

Corpus linguistics involves the systematic extraction of **terms and their contextual usage** from **domain-specific corpora** in both source and target languages. These corpora can include:

Medical texts (e.g., research articles, clinical guidelines),

Legal documents (e.g., constitutions, international treaties),

Technical manuals (e.g., engineering specifications),

Educational resources (e.g., textbooks, pedagogical materials).

By analyzing large corpora, terminologists can identify how terms are used across different contexts and understand **their frequency, variation, and connotations** in both languages.

Another important approach is the **comparison of dictionary entries and expert definitions**. This method involves:

Analyzing **monolingual dictionaries** to see how terms are defined in both languages,

Comparing **bilingual dictionaries** to examine how terms are translated and the nuances of those translations,

Engaging with **specialist literature** (e.g., medical, legal, or technological references) to understand how experts in the field define and use terms.

This analysis helps identify **semantic shifts**, **gaps in meaning**, and **discrepancies in conceptualization** across languages.

Engaging with **subject specialists**—such as medical professionals, legal experts, or engineers—is critical for validating terminological equivalence. Specialists bring **pragmatic knowledge** of how terms are used in real-world contexts and can help ensure that the term in the target language accurately reflects the **conceptual, functional**, and **cultural aspects** of the original term. This consultation also helps identify potential **misunderstandings** or **untranslated nuances** that may arise when terms are directly translated without attention to their **field-specific application**.

Contrastive translation involves examining the **shifts, adaptations, and losses** that occur when terms are translated between languages. This method looks at:

Lexical equivalence (whether there is a one-to-one translation),

Syntactic adjustments (how sentence structure affects term use),

Pragmatic shifts (how the translation fits the social or institutional context of the target language),

Cultural implications (how the concept behind the term is understood differently across cultures).

The aim is to **document** and **analyze** the **linguistic and cultural adaptations** that occur when terms are transferred between languages.

Case Study: Medical Terminology (English–Uzbek)

Term: Diabetes mellitus

English: The term *diabetes mellitus* originates from **Latin**. *Diabetes* comes from the Greek word meaning "to pass through" (due to the frequent urination associated with the condition), and *mellitus* is Latin for "honeyed" or "sweet" (describing the sweet taste of urine due to high glucose content). The term is globally used and widely recognized in **medical practice**.

Uzbek: In Uzbek, the term used is *qandli diabet*, which is a **semi-calque** of the Russian term *сахарный диабет* (sakharny diabet). While *diabet* is a direct transliteration of the word, *qandli* translates to "sugary" or "sweet", reflecting the condition's association with high blood sugar levels.

Analysis:

Structural Equivalence: There is clear **structural equivalence** between the two terms. While the **English term is a compound** formed from Latin roots, the **Uzbek term uses an analytical phrase**. Both structures convey the same medical concept, though the form differs.

Semantic Alignment: The **semantic alignment** is strong. Both terms accurately describe the same medical condition, focusing on the issue of elevated blood sugar levels. However, while the **English term is more rooted in classical medical language**, the **Uzbek version** employs more **locally understandable** language, reflecting the **local conceptualization** of the disease.

Functional Usage: In terms of **functional usage**, there is a **difference in register**. The **English term** *diabetes mellitus* is commonly used in **clinical settings, medical publications**, and formal medical discourse. On the other hand, **qandli diabet** is more commonly used in **everyday language** and in **general medical discussions** in Uzbekistan, making it more accessible to the general public but less formal in its usage within technical or specialized medical contexts.

Comparative terminology is essential in bridging linguistic and conceptual gaps between languages. The principles of conceptual equivalence, structural analysis, semantic precision, and cultural awareness form the backbone of terminological comparison. By applying these principles, researchers and practitioners can ensure that specialized terms retain their intended meaning across languages, thereby enhancing international communication, translation quality, and knowledge accessibility.

References

1. Cabré, M. T. *Terminology: Theory, Methods and Applications*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1999.
2. Sager, J. C. *A Practical Course in Terminology Processing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1990.
3. ISO 704. *Terminology work — Principles and methods*. International Organization for Standardization, 2009.
4. Picht, H., & Draskau, J. *Terminology: An Introduction*. Guildford: University of Surrey, 1985.
5. Temmerman, R. *Towards New Ways of Terminology Description: The Sociocognitive Approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2000.
6. Faber, P. (Ed.). *Theory and Applications of Ontology in Terminology*. Dordrecht: Springer, 2012.
7. Ahmad, K. (Ed.). *Terminology in Everyday Life*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2007.
8. Mahmudov, N. *Zamonaviy o‘zbek adabiy tili*. Toshkent: Fan nashriyoti, 2005.
9. Xaitov, A. *O‘zbek tilining ilmiy uslubi*. Toshkent: Fan, 1990.
10. Dorofeeva, N.N. *Lingvistika i meditsina: Vzaimosvyaz’ terminov i praktik*. Moskva: Flinta, 2020.

11. Nizomova, M.B. *Tibbiy terminlarning madaniyatlararo tarjimadagi sotsiolingvistik moslashuvi*. Qarshi DU Ilmiy maqolalar to‘plami, 2-son, 110–117, 2023.
12. Kudashev, M. & Alimova, M. *Tarjimashunoslikka kirish*. Toshkent: O‘zbekiston milliy ensiklopediyasi, 2016.
13. Aghbar, A. A. *Lexical borrowing in medical English: An analysis of neologisms*. English for Specific Purposes Journal, 9(1), 23–41, 1990.
14. Pearson, J. *Terms in Context*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1998.
15. Bowker, L. & Hawkins, S. *Computational Approaches to Terminology*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2006.