

**COMPARATIVE STUDY OF PHILOSOPHICAL TERMINOLOGY
IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH: SEMANTIC AND STRUCTURAL
PERSPECTIVES**

Boynazarov Islom

Termiz davlat universiteti islom.boynazarov@gmail.com

Abstract: *The comparative study of philosophical terminology in Uzbek and English languages offers valuable insights into how national thought, linguistic structure, and cultural worldview shape philosophical concepts. This paper explores the semantic and morphological mechanisms through which philosophical terms are formed, borrowed, and conceptualized in both languages. The research identifies the processes of semantic expansion, borrowing, and calquing, and examines how such mechanisms reflect cognitive and cultural distinctions. The findings contribute to the broader field of comparative linguistics, showing how language functions as a cognitive framework for philosophical reflection.*

Keywords: *philosophical terminology, semantical features, structure of the philosophical terms, comparative linguistics.*

1. Introduction

Philosophical terminology represents a distinctive lexical layer that embodies the intellectual and conceptual worldview of a given culture. Its study has gained increasing relevance in comparative linguistics and terminology studies, as terms are not merely linguistic signs but epistemological constructs that encode systems of thought¹.

In Uzbek and English philosophical traditions, the development of terminology has followed divergent trajectories: the former was influenced by Arabic-Persian rationalism and Islamic scholasticism, while the latter evolved under

¹Вюстер Э. Общая терминология: вопросы теории. — Вена: Springer, 1931. — 212 с; Лотте Д. С. Основы построения научно-технической терминологии. — М.: Изд-во АН СССР, 1961. — 156 с; Виноградов В. В. Русский язык. Грамматическое учение о слове. — М.: Наука, 1977. — 614 с

the impact of ancient Greek philosophy, medieval scholasticism, and Enlightenment empiricism. Despite their distinct origins, both languages demonstrate comparable mechanisms of term formation—semantic broadening, metaphorization, and borrowing.

2. Research Objective and Methods

The objective of this research is to analyze the **semantic and morphological features** of philosophical terminology in Uzbek and English, focusing on:

1. Mechanisms of semantic change (narrowing, broadening, metaphorization);
2. Processes of borrowing and calquing;
3. Conceptual correspondences and divergences revealing cognitive and cultural specificity.

The study employs **componential analysis**, **morphological-derivational analysis**, and **contrastive semantic analysis**, integrating principles of **cognitive linguistics** to reveal how philosophical meaning structures are linguistically represented in both languages.

3. Theoretical Framework

The theoretical foundation of this study rests upon both classical and contemporary perspectives in terminology theory, linguistics, and the philosophy of language. The evolution of terminological theory shows how language, thought, and conceptual organization are interlinked in shaping disciplinary knowledge — a notion that becomes particularly salient in the domain of philosophy, where the meaning of terms often determines the very framework of thought.

Early terminological theory emerged in the works of Eugen Wüster, who is widely recognized as the founder of modern terminology science². Wüster viewed terminology as a systematic and standardized component of specialized communication, arguing that each term functions as a precise linguistic sign that denotes a specific concept within a clearly defined conceptual system. His General Theory of Terminology (GTT) proposed that terms are not arbitrary but systematically constructed linguistic entities, whose accuracy and consistency

² Вюстер Э. Общая терминология: вопросы теории. — Вена: Springer, 1931. — 212 с.

ensure the clarity of scientific and philosophical reasoning. Thus, for Wüster, the term is both a linguistic and epistemological instrument — a unit that bridges language and knowledge.

Dmitry Lotte further refined Wüster's ideas within the Soviet linguistic tradition, developing the notion that terminology is a functional subsystem of language governed by its own internal laws. Lotte emphasized the derivational and morphological mechanisms of term formation, which reflect the conceptual structure of a given discipline³. His approach connected terminological precision with linguistic creativity — showing how new concepts in science and philosophy emerge through semantic derivation, analogy, and metaphorical extension. Lotte's work thus laid the groundwork for studying the dynamic and evolving nature of terms rather than viewing them as static or purely technical labels.

In the same intellectual context, Viktor Vinogradov and Alexander Reformatskiy expanded the theoretical framework of terminology by situating it within the broader lexical and grammatical system of language. Vinogradov, in particular, introduced the concept of the “semantic structure of the word”, arguing that the meaning of a term must be analyzed not only within the scientific system but also within the lexical-semantic field of the language as a whole. This idea brought terminology closer to semantic theory and stylistics, making it possible to analyze philosophical terms as part of the national linguistic consciousness⁴. Reformatskiy, on the other hand, underscored the semiotic and systemic nature of language, suggesting that terms function as signs in a self-regulating system — where their stability and variation depend on communicative and cognitive contexts. These insights made it possible to understand philosophical terminology not merely as nomenclature, but as a linguistically embedded conceptual network⁵.

In more recent scholarship, the focus of terminology studies has shifted from structural and normative descriptions to cognitive and epistemological dimensions.

³ Лотте Д. С. Основы построения научно-технической терминологии. — М.: Изд-во АН СССР, 1961. — 156 с.

⁴ Виноградов В. В. Русский язык. Грамматическое учение о слове. — М.: Наука, 1977. — 614 с.

⁵ Реформатский А. А. Введение в языкознание. — М.: Наука, 1967. — 447 с.

Larisa Alekseeva proposed a reconceptualization of terminology through the notion of the “philosophy of terminology”, which regards terminological systems as forms of knowledge representation⁶. According to Alekseeva, terms encapsulate not only definitions but also conceptual models and cultural meanings, functioning as mediators between language, thought, and reality. Her view emphasizes that philosophical terminology, unlike technical terminology, operates at the intersection of conceptual cognition and linguistic creativity — expressing abstract categories that cannot always be reduced to precise definitions.

Similarly, Gerhard Budin developed a meta-theoretical perspective by situating terminology within epistemology and philosophy of science⁷. He described terminology as a “knowledge system” that reflects both the structure of reality and the modes of human understanding. Budin’s model introduces a dual notion of truth — correspondent (truth as alignment with reality) and coherent (truth as internal consistency of concepts) — and shows how terminological structures embody these philosophical principles. This approach allows terminology to be studied not merely as linguistic data, but as a cognitive architecture of knowledge.

Building upon these foundations, Yuri Rozhkov advanced a linguocognitive interpretation of terminology, defining it as a mechanism that links linguistic forms with mental models and conceptual maps. His research integrates cognitive linguistics, semantics, and philosophy of mind, illustrating how terminological systems encode the cognitive models that structure human understanding of abstract phenomena⁸. From this standpoint, each term acts as a node in a conceptual network, reflecting the processes of categorization, generalization, and metaphorization inherent in philosophical thought.

Collectively, these approaches demonstrate that philosophical terminology is a dynamic semiotic system that mirrors both linguistic and intellectual evolution. It is not a passive record of concepts but an active agent of conceptualization,

⁶ Алексеева Л. Б. Interaction of Terminology and Philosophy // IITF Journal. — 2003. — Vol. 14. — P. 61–70.

⁷ Будин Г. Prospects of a Philosophy of Terminology // IITF Journal. — 2003. — Vol. 14. — P. 71–79.

⁸ Рожков Ю. Terminology Studies: Linguocognitive Paradigm // International Journal of Philology. — 2022. — T. 26, № 1. — С. 24–33.

continuously adapting to new paradigms of thought and cultural change.

4. Results and Discussion

The study reveals that borrowing and calquing serve as primary channels for conceptual transfer between philosophical traditions. In Uzbek, Arabic and Persian sources contributed key terms such as *aql* (reason), *nafs* (soul), and *haqiqat* (truth), while English absorbed Greek and Latin philosophical lexemes such as *logos*, *substance*, and *essence*.

Semantic expansion demonstrates the evolution of concepts across cultural contexts. For instance, *haqiqat* in Uzbek philosophy expanded from its theological meaning (“divine truth”) to a broader epistemological sense (“objective reality”). Similarly, the English term *reason* evolved from a logical faculty to a moral and aesthetic principle in Enlightenment discourse.

Morphologically, Uzbek demonstrates agglutinative transparency—the formation of philosophical terms through derivational affixes (*-lik*, *-iy*, *-chi*), while English favors lexical condensation and affixation (*-ism*, *-ity*, *-ness*). These typological contrasts show how linguistic structure constrains the expression of philosophical abstraction.

Comparative findings indicate that the conceptual worldview of each language community influences its terminological development. English tends to emphasize empirical abstraction and individual reasoning, while Uzbek philosophical lexicon retains elements of collective spiritual and ethical cognition, rooted in classical Islamic thought.

5. Conclusion

The comparative analysis demonstrates that philosophical terminology is not a static collection of words but a **cognitive system** reflecting historical and cultural evolution. Borrowing, calquing, and semantic transformation are key mechanisms that shape philosophical discourse in Uzbek and English. Each linguistic system reconstructs abstract concepts according to its cultural logic, contributing to global philosophical dialogue and enriching terminological standardization in comparative linguistics.

References

1. Вюстер Э. Общая терминология: вопросы теории. — Вена: Springer, 1931. — 212 с.
2. Лотте Д. С. Основы построения научно-технической терминологии. — М.: Изд-во АН СССР, 1961. — 156 с.
3. Виноградов В. В. Русский язык. Грамматическое учение о слове. — М.: Наука, 1977. — 614 с.
4. Реформатский А. А. Введение в языкознание. — М.: Наука, 1967. — 447 с.
5. Алексеева Л. В. Interaction of Terminology and Philosophy // IITF Journal. — 2003. — Vol. 14. — P. 61–70.
6. Будин Г. Prospects of a Philosophy of Terminology // IITF Journal. — 2003. — Vol. 14. — P. 71–79.
7. Рожков Ю. Terminology Studies: Linguocognitive Paradigm // International Journal of Philology. — 2022. — Т. 26, № 1. — С. 24–33.
8. Козловская Н. В. Философская терминология в сочинениях русских мыслителей второй половины XIX – начала XX в. — СПб., 2019. — 37 с.
9. Витальевна К. Н. Типы авторских терминов в русской философии // Сибирский филологический журнал. — 2016. — № 1. — С. 185–192.
10. Дониш А. Наводир ул-вакоэ. — Бухоро, 1895 (рукопись).