Philology Matters / ISSN: 1994 – 4233 / E-ISSN: 2181–1237
Uzbekistan State World Languages University
2026 Vol. 1 No. M 2/1
LINGUISTICS
MAXSUS SON

Gulasal Nuraliyeva – researcher

Termez State University (Surkhandarya, Uzbekistan)
E-mail: gulasalnuralieva@gmail.com
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9410-8650

A COMPARATIVE LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL TERMINOLOGY IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Abstract. This study investigates archaeological terminology in English and Uzbek languages, focusing on its linguistic features, translation challenges, and role in scientific discourse. Archaeological terminology is viewed as a system of specialized lexical units that ensures precision, clarity, and consistency in describing historical artifacts, processes, and discoveries. The research aims to analyze how these terms function within different linguistic and communicative contexts and to identify key differences between the two languages. The methodology includes comparative, semantic, and terminological analysis based on data collected from academic texts, dictionaries, and archaeological reports. The findings reveal that English archaeological terminology is highly standardized and internationally recognized, which facilitates effective communication and interdisciplinary collaboration. In contrast, Uzbek terminology is actively developing, incorporating both native and borrowed elements, which may lead to variability in usage. It concludes that while English terminology tends to be concise and structurally compact, Uzbek equivalents are often more descriptive and flexible.

Keywords: archaeology, terminology, linguistics, comparative analysis, semantics, translation, English, Uzbek, discourse

Gulasal Nuraliyeva – tadqiqotchi
Tezmiz davlat universiteti (Surxondaryo, O‘zbekiston)

INGLIZ VA O‘ZBEK TILLARIDA ARXEOLOGIK TERMINOLOGIYANING QIYOSIY LINGVISTIK TAHLILI

Annotatsiya. Mazkur tadqiqot ingliz va o‘zbek tillaridagi arxeologik terminologiyani tahlil qilishga bag‘ishlangan bo‘lib, uning lingvistik xususiyatlari, tarjima muammolari hamda ilmiy diskursdagi o‘rni yoritiladi. Arxeologik terminologiya tarixiy artefaktlar, jarayonlar va kashfiyotlarni tasvirlashda aniqlik, ravshanlik va bir ma’nolilikni ta’minlovchi maxsus leksik birliklar tizimi sifatida qaraladi. Tadqiqotning maqsadi terminlarning turli til va kommunikativ kontekstlarda qanday ishlatilishini tahlil qilish hamda ikki til o‘rtasidagi asosiy farqlarni aniqlashdan iborat. Metodologiya sifatida ilmiy matnlar, lug‘atlar va arxeologik hisobotlarga asoslangan qiyosiy, semantik va terminologik tahlil qo‘llanildi. Natijalar shuni ko‘rsatadiki, ingliz tilidagi arxeologik terminologiya yuqori darajada standartlashgan va xalqaro miqyosda tan olingan bo‘lib, bu samarali ilmiy muloqot va fanlararo hamkorlikni ta’minlaydi. O‘zbek tilidagi terminologiya esa faol rivojlanish bosqichida bo‘lib, o‘zlashma va milliy birliklarni o‘z ichiga oladi, bu esa ayrim hollarda qo‘llanishda variativlikni keltirib chiqaradi. Xulosa sifatida aytiladiki, ingliz tilidagi terminlar odatda ixcham va strukturaviy jihatdan sodda bo‘lsa, o‘zbek tilidagi ekvivalentlar ko‘proq tavsifiy va moslashuvchan hisoblanadi.

Kalit so‘zlar: arxeologiya, terminologiya, lingvistika, qiyosiy tahlil, semantika, tarjima, ingliz tili, o‘zbek tili, diskurs

Гуласал Нуралиева – соискатель
Термезский государственный университет (Сурхандарья, Узбекистан)

СРАВНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКИЙ АНАЛИЗ АРХЕОЛОГИЧЕСКОЙ ТЕРМИНОЛОГИИ В АНГЛИЙСКОМ И УЗБЕКСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ

Аннотация. Данное исследование посвящено анализу археологической терминологии в английском и узбекском языках с акцентом на её лингвистические особенности, переводческие трудности и роль в научном дискурсе. Археологическая терминология рассматривается как система специализированных лексических единиц, обеспечивающих точность, ясность и однозначность при описании исторических артефактов, процессов и открытий. Цель исследования — проанализировать функционирование терминов в различных языковых и коммуникативных контекстах, а также выявить основные различия между двумя языками. Методология включает сравнительный, семантический и терминологический анализ на основе данных из научных текстов, словарей и археологических отчетов. Результаты показывают, что английская археологическая терминология отличается высокой степенью стандартизации и международного признания, что способствует эффективной научной коммуникации и междисциплинарному сотрудничеству. В то же время узбекская терминология находится в стадии активного развития, включая как собственные, так и заимствованные элементы, что может приводить к вариативности в употреблении. Делается вывод, что английские термины, как правило, более краткие и структурно компактные, тогда как узбекские эквиваленты отличаются большей описательностью и гибкостью.

Ключевые слова: археология, терминология, лингвистика, сравнительный анализ, семантика, перевод, английский язык, узбекский язык, дискурс.

INTRODUCTION

Archaeological terminology plays a crucial role in scientific communication, ensuring precision, clarity, and consistency when describing historical artifacts, processes, and discoveries (Dalton-Puffer, 2007). In modern linguistics, the study of specialized terminology has become increasingly important due to the expansion of interdisciplinary research and international collaboration. English, as a global scientific language, has a well-developed system of archaeological terminology. Uzbek, on the other hand, has been actively developing its scientific lexicon, incorporating both native and borrowed terms.

The purpose of this study is to analyze archaeological terminology in English and Uzbek languages, focusing on their linguistic features, translation issues, and discourse functions.

Archaeological terminology functions not only as a system of specialized lexical units but also as an essential component of scientific discourse. Its role extends beyond simple naming, contributing to the organization, interpretation, and communication of knowledge within the academic community.

From a pragmatic perspective, archaeological terms are highly context-dependent. Their meaning is often shaped by the specific communicative situation, including the purpose of the research, the audience, and the medium of communication. For example, in academic articles, terms such as “artifact,” “stratigraphy,” and “excavation layer” are used in a precise and standardized manner to ensure clarity and avoid ambiguity. However, in popular science texts or museum descriptions, the same terms may be simplified or explained in more accessible language. This variation highlights the importance of pragmatic competence in using archaeological terminology. Researchers and translators must be aware of the audience’s level of expertise and adjust their language accordingly. In English, this often involves the use of concise and well-established terms, while in Uzbek, explanatory phrases are frequently employed to convey the same meaning (Richards& Rodgers, 2001). Discursively, archaeological terminology contributes to the construction of scientific narratives. It helps structure descriptions of historical processes, excavation findings, and interpretations

of material culture. For instance, terms such as "cultural layer," "burial complex," and "chronological sequence" are not only descriptive but also serve to organize information logically within the text.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND METHODOLOGY

In English scientific discourse, archaeological terminology is characterized by a high degree of standardization and consistency. This allows researchers from different countries to communicate effectively and share knowledge without misunderstandings. The use of internationally recognized terms also facilitates interdisciplinary research. In Uzbek scientific discourse, archaeological terminology is still developing and often reflects a combination of native and borrowed elements. While this enriches the language, it may also lead to variability in usage. For example, different authors may use alternative expressions for the same concept, which can affect the consistency of scientific communication. Another important aspect is the role of translation in shaping archaeological terminology. Since much of the scientific literature is produced in English, Uzbek researchers frequently rely on translation. This process requires careful consideration of semantic equivalence and cultural context. Direct translation may not always be appropriate, especially when the concept does not exist in the target language. Archaeological terms are specialized lexical units used to describe artifacts, excavation processes, and historical periods. They are characterized by the following features: precision, standardization, and context-specific meaning.

Examples include:

English	Uzbek
excavation	qazish ishlari
artifact	topilma
stratigraphy	qatlamlar tahlili
excavation site	qazish maydoni

In English, archaeological terminology is highly standardized due to international scientific collaboration. In Uzbek, terms are often translated or adapted.

The study of archaeological terminology has been addressed in linguistic and scientific literature. Researchers emphasize the importance of standardization and clarity in scientific communication. This research uses comparative analysis, semantic analysis, and terminological analysis.

The data is collected from academic texts, dictionaries, and archaeological reports. From a structural perspective, English archaeological terms often include compound words (e.g., "burial site") and technical phrases (e.g., "carbon dating"). In Uzbek, descriptive phrases are common, and terms are often longer. For example, "carbon dating" → "radiokarbon usuli bilan aniqlash". This reflects differences in linguistic economy.

DISCUSSION

Furthermore, the analysis confirms that discourse context strongly influences the meaning and interpretation of archaeological terms. In academic discourse, terms are used in a precise and technical sense, while in educational or popular science contexts, they may be simplified or adapted for a broader audience. This variation highlights the importance of pragmatic competence in both the use and translation of terminology.

The findings also indicate that English terms tend to be more concise and morphologically compact, whereas Uzbek equivalents are often more descriptive and syntactically complex. This difference reflects broader typological distinctions between the two languages and affects how information is processed and communicated.

In addition, the study reveals that the increasing influence of globalization and digital communication contributes to the rapid dissemination and adaptation of archaeological terminology. International collaboration and access to online academic resources accelerate the integration of new terms into the Uzbek language.

The comparison reveals key differences. English terms are concise and standardized, while Uzbek terms are descriptive and flexible. Translation challenges arise due to a lack of direct equivalents, cultural differences, and technical complexity (Ellis, 2008).

Archaeological discourse requires precision, and incorrect translation may lead to misunderstanding.

RESULTS

The results of the study demonstrate that archaeological terminology in English and Uzbek languages reflects both global standardization and local linguistic development. The findings reveal several important tendencies related to structure, semantics, translation, and discourse usage.

Firstly, English archaeological terminology is highly standardized at the international level. Due to the dominant role of English in global scientific communication, most archaeological terms are unified and widely recognized across different academic contexts. This standardization ensures precision, clarity, and consistency in scholarly discourse, facilitating effective knowledge exchange among researchers worldwide.

Secondly, Uzbek archaeological terminology is in the process of active development and enrichment. It incorporates both native lexical resources and borrowed terms, particularly from English and Russian. This dynamic evolution reflects the growing need to adapt global scientific concepts to the national linguistic system. However, this process sometimes leads to variability and inconsistency in the usage of terms, as different authors may employ alternative equivalents for the same concept.

Another significant finding is that translation plays a key role in shaping Uzbek archaeological terminology. Since a large portion of scientific literature is produced in English, translation becomes a primary mechanism for introducing new terms. The study shows that translators often face challenges in achieving semantic equivalence, especially when dealing with culture-specific or highly technical concepts. As a result, descriptive translations and explanatory phrases are frequently used in Uzbek, which may increase clarity but reduce linguistic economy.

CONCLUSION

The study shows that English archaeological terminology is globally standardized. Uzbek terminology is evolving, translation plays a key role, and discourse context influences meaning

Archaeological terminology in English and Uzbek languages reflects both linguistic and cultural differences. The comparative analysis demonstrates the need for standardization and careful translation to ensure effective scientific communication.

REFERENCES

1. Dalton-Puffer, C. (2007). *Discourse in CLIL classrooms*. John Benjamins.
2. Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
3. Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press.