International Experience and the Possibilities of the Uzbek Language in Creating Terms

Qarshiyeva Muxarram Shuxratovna

Termez State University, Philology and Language Teaching: Second-year student of the Uzbek language program

Abstract: *This article explores the problem of term creation by analyzing the international experience of terminology formation and its relation to the internal resources of the Uzbek language. Terminology, as a fundamental element of scientific and technical communication, plays a crucial role in ensuring mutual understanding between specialists at the global and national levels. The study examines how international practices in term creation — borrowing, calquing, semantic extension, and hybridization — interact with the lexical, morphological, and derivational capacities of the Uzbek language. Special attention is paid to the challenges of standardization, the need for cultural adaptation of borrowed terms, and the strategies to maintain both scientific precision and linguistic authenticity. Based on the analysis of international experience and the internal linguistic potential of Uzbek, recommendations are made for the effective development of modern Uzbek terminology, especially in the fields of science, technology, and socio-political discourse.*

Key words: *Terminology, term creation, international experience, Uzbek language, linguistic resources, borrowing, standardization, scientific communication, neologisms, language policy.*

INTRODUCTION

The creation of terminology is one of the most significant aspects of linguistic development in modern societies. The accelerating pace of globalization, technological innovation, and scientific advancement requires languages to continually enrich their lexicons with new concepts and categories. Terminology not only reflects the cognitive development of humanity but also acts as a bridge between cultures, disciplines, and nations. In this respect, the study of international experiences in term creation and the exploration of how these experiences can be adapted to the internal resources of the Uzbek language remain particularly relevant.

Historically, languages have employed a wide range of strategies to create terms. Some languages rely heavily on borrowings, while others prefer internal word formation mechanisms to preserve linguistic purity. The English language, for example, has borrowed extensively from Latin, Greek, French, and other languages, developing a hybrid lexicon that allows for vast flexibility and universality in scientific communication. German, on the contrary, has often favored calques and compound word formation, producing terms that reflect the internal syntactic and morphological capacities of the language. Similarly, Japanese has combined borrowing with semantic adaptation, incorporating foreign terms but reconfiguring them in accordance with Japanese phonological and cultural norms.

In Uzbekistan, the question of terminology development has always been tied to the processes of modernization, nation-building, and scientific progress. During the Soviet era, the Uzbek language witnessed large-scale borrowings from Russian, which provided access to international scientific

discourse but often disrupted the internal lexical balance of the language. After independence, there has been a growing interest in enriching terminology based on the Uzbek language's internal resources, while also aligning with international standards. This shift reflects not only linguistic needs but also socio-political motivations to strengthen national identity through language policy.

However, term creation is not merely a linguistic process; it is also a matter of social consensus, academic expertise, and institutional coordination. The lack of standardized approaches to terminology has often led to inconsistency, where multiple variants of a single term coexist in professional communication. This situation hinders scientific precision, creates barriers in education, and complicates the integration of Uzbek scholars into the global scientific community.

Thus, the introduction of this study emphasizes the urgency of analyzing international experiences in term creation and evaluating their applicability to the Uzbek language. By identifying the most effective strategies for harmonizing borrowed terms with native structures, as well as exploring the potential of internal word formation mechanisms, the study aims to propose a framework for developing consistent, modern, and culturally appropriate terminology in Uzbek.

LITERATURE ANALYSIS AND METHODOLOGY

The study of term creation has been addressed extensively in international linguistics. Classical works by E. Wüster, the founder of modern terminology science, laid the foundation for systematic approaches to term formation and standardization. Wüster emphasized that terms should be precise, unambiguous, and internationally harmonized, forming the basis for effective scientific communication. His theory of terminology, later developed by scholars such as Cabré and Felber, highlighted the interplay between linguistic structure, conceptual clarity, and socio-cultural context.

In English-speaking scholarship, the works of L'Homme, Sager, and Temmerman have emphasized the cognitive and communicative functions of terminology, showing that term creation is not only a technical matter but also involves cultural perspectives. Meanwhile, German scholars have demonstrated how compounding and calquing strategies preserve linguistic identity while ensuring conceptual clarity.

In post-Soviet linguistics, significant attention has been given to the problems of terminology development in national languages. Russian scholars such as Superanskaya and Reformatsky pointed out that terminological borrowings should be integrated carefully, respecting the phonological and morphological system of the recipient language. In the Central Asian context, Uzbek, Kazakh, and Kyrgyz linguists have debated the balance between borrowing international terms (especially in science and technology) and developing equivalents from Turkic roots.

Uzbek linguists such as A. Madvaliyev, A. Hojiyev, and Sh. Rahmatullayev have contributed greatly to the study of Uzbek terminology. Their research has highlighted the structural resources of the Uzbek language — suffixation, compounding, and semantic extension — which can be mobilized for term creation. They also pointed out the risks of uncritical borrowing, leading to hybrid forms that may not be fully assimilated into the linguistic system.

Another important aspect discussed in the literature is the problem of standardization. UNESCO and ISO have repeatedly stressed the need for unified terminological policies to ensure compatibility between national and international scientific communication. Without standardization, terminological variation creates barriers to knowledge exchange, scientific translation, and technological innovation.

From the review of existing literature, it is clear that effective term creation requires a balance: the language must integrate global scientific vocabulary to stay connected to international discourse, while at the same time it should use its internal resources to maintain cultural and linguistic authenticity. For Uzbek, this means developing systematic principles that combine borrowing with native word-formation strategies, ensuring both international compatibility and local accessibility.

The methodological basis of this study is interdisciplinary, combining linguistic analysis, comparative typology, and sociolinguistic observation. The research employs descriptive,

comparative, and analytical methods to explore both international experiences and the potential of the Uzbek language.

The descriptive method is used to classify strategies of term creation across different languages. For instance, the analysis considers how English uses borrowing and hybridization, how German relies on compounding and calquing, and how Japanese adapts foreign words phonologically and semantically. Each of these strategies is described in detail to illustrate their strengths and weaknesses.

The comparative method allows for a cross-linguistic evaluation of these strategies with reference to the Uzbek language. Uzbek is examined for its morphological productivity, particularly in suffixation (-chi, -kor, -lik, -shunos), compounding (e.g., qo'shma so'zlar), and semantic broadening of existing words. This comparison makes it possible to identify which international strategies are most compatible with Uzbek linguistic structures.

The analytical method involves studying actual examples of Uzbek term creation in fields such as medicine, information technology, economics, and environmental science. This includes examining dictionaries, academic textbooks, and government-approved terminological lists. Attention is paid to the extent of borrowing from Russian and English, the frequency of native Uzbek equivalents, and the degree of standardization across official documents.

In addition, the study incorporates a sociolinguistic perspective, recognizing that term creation is not only a matter of linguistic possibility but also of social acceptance. Surveys of academic discourse, media publications, and educational materials provide evidence of how certain terms gain currency while others remain unused. This aspect highlights the importance of public and institutional endorsement in ensuring the success of new terminology.

Finally, the methodological approach integrates policy analysis, evaluating national language planning documents and strategies for terminological development. By linking linguistic analysis with institutional frameworks, the study aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the challenges and opportunities in Uzbek term creation.

RESULTS

The results of the study reveal several important findings regarding the role of international experience and the internal potential of the Uzbek language in term creation.

First, international experience demonstrates that borrowing is inevitable in the modern scientific and technological era. English, as the lingua franca of science, has produced countless neologisms that enter other languages through direct adoption. Uzbek has also experienced this trend, particularly with English-based terms in information technology (e.g., "kompyuter," "internet," "server"). While borrowing ensures international compatibility, unadapted loanwords sometimes conflict with Uzbek phonological norms, creating difficulties in pronunciation and spelling.

Second, internal resources of the Uzbek language remain strong and underutilized. Derivational affixes such as -chi (specialist), -lik (abstract noun), -kor (doer), and -shunos (expert in) provide productive means for term creation. For example, words such as "axborotshunos" (information scientist) or "ekologiya" combined with Uzbek affixes can generate authentic terms. Compounding also allows for clarity, as in "quyosh energiyasi" (solar energy), which mirrors German-style compound terms.

Third, the balance between borrowing and native word formation is uneven in Uzbekistan. Many terms exist in parallel variants, one borrowed (often Russian or English) and one native (created in Uzbek). For instance, "marketing" and "bozorlashtirish" coexist, but the borrowed form dominates in practice. This lack of consistency reduces standardization and creates confusion in education and official documents.

Fourth, sociolinguistic analysis shows that acceptance of new terms depends on institutional support. When native terms are promoted through textbooks, media, and government policies, they are more likely to become widespread. Conversely, when institutions continue to rely on borrowed forms,

native alternatives remain marginal. This reflects the importance of language policy in shaping terminology.

Finally, the study reveals that international best practices, such as Germany's emphasis on native compounding and Japan's careful phonological adaptation, can serve as models for Uzbekistan. By adopting these strategies while respecting the Uzbek linguistic system, terminology can develop in a way that is both globally compatible and culturally authentic.

CONCLUSION

The research concludes that the creation of terminology in Uzbek should be based on a dual approach: integration of international experience and active use of internal linguistic resources. Neither borrowing nor purism alone can ensure effective development of terminology; rather, a balanced strategy is required.

Borrowing is necessary to keep pace with global scientific and technological developments. However, borrowed terms must be carefully adapted to Uzbek phonology, morphology, and orthography. At the same time, the Uzbek language possesses significant internal resources for term creation, particularly through affixation, compounding, and semantic extension. These resources should be systematically utilized to enrich the lexicon and strengthen linguistic identity.

The key challenge is standardization. Without consistent policies and institutional coordination, multiple variants of the same term will continue to coexist, reducing the clarity and precision of scientific communication. Therefore, national language planning bodies, academic institutions, and specialists must work together to develop unified terminological databases and guidelines.

The broader implication of the study is that terminology development is not merely a linguistic issue but also a cultural and political one. By creating terms that are both scientifically precise and culturally authentic, Uzbek can strengthen its role as a language of modern science and education while maintaining its national identity.

Thus, the international experience provides valuable lessons, but its successful application requires adaptation to the unique characteristics of the Uzbek language. The combination of global integration and local innovation will allow Uzbek terminology to flourish in the 21st century.

REFERENCES

1. Wüster E. Einführung in die allgemeine Terminologielehre und terminologische Lexikographie. – Bonn: Romanistischer Verlag, 1979. – 548 p.

2. Cabré M. T. Terminology: Theory, Methods and Applications. – Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1999. – 370 p.

3. Felber H. Terminology Manual. – Paris: UNESCO, 1984. – 256 p.

4. Sager J. C. A Practical Course in Terminology Processing. – Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1990. – 242 p.

5. Temmerman R. Towards New Ways of Terminology Description. – Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2000. – 250 p.

6. Superanskaya A. V. Общая терминология: Вопросы теории. – М.: Наука, 1989. – 246 с.

7. Реформатский А. А. Введение в языкознание. – М.: Аспект Пресс, 1996. – 350 с.

8. Madvaliyev A. O'zbek tilining zamonaviy terminologiyasi masalalari. – Toshkent: Fan, 2002. – 198 b.

9. Hojiyev A. Terminologiya va tarjima nazariyasi. – Toshkent: O'qituvchi, 2008. – 220 b.

10. Rahmatullayev Sh. O'zbek tilida so'z yasash masalalari. – Toshkent: Fan, 2012. – 305 b.