



THE COMMON LEXICAL STOCK OF RELATED LANGUAGES AND ITS ROLE IN IMPROVING THE TERMINOLOGICAL SYSTEM

Rzamuratova Zlikha Kuatbaevna

(Senior Researcher, Institute of Humanities, Karakalpak Branch of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan, PhD in Philological Sciences, Nukus;
zlixarzamuratova@gmail.com)

Abstract. *This article examines the issues of unification, systematization, and standardization of the terminological systems of the Kyrgyz, Kazakh, and Karakalpak languages—which belong to the Kipchak group of Turkic languages—from scientific-theoretical, onomasiological, and semasiological perspectives. It analyzes the effective utilization of the common lexical stock and internal derivational models of related languages when nominating scientific and technical concepts, as opposed to direct international borrowings. Drawing upon examples from socio-cultural, medical, biological, technical, economic, and socio-political domains, the article substantiates the role of cognitive unity and lexico-semantic resonance in forming a unified pan-Turkic scientific-terminological space.*

Keywords: *terminology, unification, common lexical stock, derivation, semasiology, onomasiology, lexicology.*

In contemporary linguistics and scientific terminography, the unification of national terminological systems, their systematization, and the standardization of domain-specific vocabulary represent highly relevant theoretical and practical challenges. Specifically, in the context of the Kyrgyz, Kazakh, and Karakalpak languages—which develop within the shared framework of the Kipchak language group and are closely linked genetically and typologically—this process acquires particular onomasiological and semasiological significance.

Language is not merely a means of communication, but a complex semiotic system that embodies a nation's cognitive model of world perception and its patterns

of human and national thought. For this reason, when nominating scientific and technical concepts, the most appropriate scientific-methodological strategy is not direct calquing or the mechanical borrowing of ready-made terms from external languages, but rather relying on the internal derivational (word-building) and semantic capacities of the native language, as well as accessing the shared lexico-semantic pool of related languages [2].

According to the onomasiological approach in linguistic theory, every concept and object is nominated based on specific features and properties. In related Turkic languages, the principles of perceiving reality and reflecting it in linguistic units possess a shared nature and cognitive unity. However, as a result of sociolinguistic processes, alphabet shifts, external lexical influences, and intensive extralinguistic factors occurring during the 19th and 20th centuries, a degree of lexical divergence emerged within the terminological and lexical domains of the Kyrgyz, Kazakh, and Karakalpak languages [1]. Consequently, many concepts sharing a single root and semantic base came to be expressed through disparate nominative forms across the three languages, or ready-made words from the native core vocabulary transitioned into passive vocabulary as archaisms, being superseded by international terms and foreign borrowings.

Today, the theoretical and methodological foundations for standardizing and unifying terminology are comprehensively reflected in the scholarly works of Uzbek, Kyrgyz, Kazakh, and Karakalpak linguists.

As emphasized by the prominent scholars and enlighteners A. Baitursynov and K.Tynystanov, who laid the foundation of Turkic philology, the process of coining terms and shaping a national scientific language must primarily rely on existing derivational patterns, rich internal linguistic resources, and the nation's linguistic picture of the world. This methodological direction was subsequently pursued by E. Berdimuratov [3], who thoroughly investigated the theoretical and practical aspects of Karakalpak terminology and lexicography, as well as by Academicians A. Kaidar and R. Syzdykova, who conducted fruitful research on the

fundamental principles of the pan-Turkic terminological corpus and lexicology. A consistent and firm conclusion emerges across all these academic schools: the refinement of domain-specific and scientific terminology is defined not by the volume of international borrowings, but by the internal semantico-morphonological potential of the language and the degree of its unification with related languages.

A comparative analysis of the terminological systems of Kyrgyz, Kazakh, and Karakalpak from cognitive and semasiological viewpoints demonstrates a high degree of semantic correspondence and word-building parallelism among the three languages. However, in certain fields where theoretical and empirical research remains insufficient, instances of terminological synonymy, polysemy, and blurred semantic boundaries persist.

From the standpoint of theoretical linguistics, a term by its very nature should be monosemous (unambiguous), devoid of expressiveness, systematic, and clearly differentiated from other concepts. For instance, when analyzing the semantic structure of the words *konok* / *qonaq* and *miyman* used in socio-cultural and conceptual vocabulary, the conceptual differentiation between these two units appears exceptionally distinct and logical from an onomasiological perspective: the unit *konok* / *qonaq* retains the sememe "overnight stay" (to spend the night, to stop over) [6]. Consequently, from a cognitive-methodological viewpoint, the compound *qonaq úyi* / *qonaq úy* in Kazakh and Karakalpak is deemed semantically fully proportional and precisely nominated for the concept of "hotel."

The principle of objective nomination and conceptual differentiation (demarcation) in medicine, biology, and botany requires an even deeper theoretical approach. The broad and overarching nature of the concept "disease" (болезнь/disease) gives rise to semantic ambiguity across various scientific disciplines. Thus, in relation to human pathology, *ooru/aypy* and *науқас/awrıw* are employed, whereas in veterinary medicine and zoology, the term *ылаң* / *ilań* is utilized for diseases affecting livestock and animals.

Term-formation and unification processes in technical and economic spheres likewise conform to specific theoretical and methodological principles. In this regard, selecting the unit *dirildew* instead of the numerous variants (*silkiniw*, *titireu*, *qaltıraw*) used for the concept of "vibration" holds particular significance.

The successful integration of majority neologisms and unified terms into the lexical systems of Kyrgyz and Karakalpak attests to the presence of mutual derivational and semantic resonance among the languages of the Kipchak group.

Furthermore, the process of coining terms, unifying them, and building a national terminological stock in Kyrgyz, Kazakh, and Karakalpak must be grounded in rigorous scientific-theoretical, onomasiological, and sociolinguistic principles. The scholarly and systematic application of a shared lexical stock not only guarantees semantic precision and eliminates conceptual confusion in academic and domain-specific texts, but also fosters the linguistic convergence of the state languages of related nations, building a cohesive pan-Turkic scientific-terminological space.

When adopting new scientific and technical neologisms, it is essential to move away from the practice of each language independently resorting to international borrowings. Priority should instead be given to studying equivalents in related languages and establishing a unified principle of semantic calquing.

In conclusion, the scientific and systematic utilization of the common lexical stock of the Kyrgyz, Kazakh, and Karakalpak languages not only ensures semantic accuracy and logical consistency in domain-specific texts, but also brings the state languages of related peoples closer together in linguistic terms, contributing to the formation of a unified and competitive pan-Turkic scientific-terminological space.

References:

1. Абдиев М. Соҳавий лексиканинг систем таҳлили (Самарқанд вилояти касб-хунарлари материаллари асосида). –Тошкент: Абдулла Қодирий номидаги “Халқ мероси “ нашриёти, 2004.
2. Абдиев М. Термин ва терминология масалаларининг ўрганилиши\\

Терминология ва терминография маслаларию Илмий анжуман материаллари.
2011 йил, 23- 24 февраль. –Самарқанд: СамДУ, 2011, 35 -39 бетлар.

3. Бердимуратов Е.Қарақалпақ тили терминлери. -Нөкис:Билим.1999.-
Б.11.
4. Даль В. Толковый словарь. М.:1978;
5. Орусча-кыргызча сөздүк. Түзүүчү К.К.Юдахин. – Бишкек, 2019.
6. Кыргыз тилинин түшүндүрмө сөздүгү. – Бишкек, 1-том. – 800 б. 2-том.
– 800 б. 2016;
7. Ожегов С., Шведова Н. Толковый словарь русского языка. М.: 1999;
8. Отаров И.М. Очерки карачаево-балкарской терминологии, –Нальчик,
1987. – 96 б.