

**COMPARATIVE DERIVATOLOGICAL TERMINOLOGY: ESTABLISHING CORRESPONDENCES****Gulimmatova Barchinoy**

Second-year Master's student in Linguistics: English Language  
Uzbekistan State World Languages University (UzSWLU) Tashkent, Uzbekistan.

*E-mail:* [barcinoygulimmatova@gmail.com](mailto:barcinoygulimmatova@gmail.com)

**Olga Vladimirovna Shevtsova**

PhD in Philology, Associate Professor, Department of General Linguistics  
Uzbekistan State World Languages University (UzSWLU) Tashkent, Uzbekistan.

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19663913>

**Abstract.** *This article examines the establishment of terminological correspondences in comparative derivatology across English, Russian, and Uzbek linguistic traditions. The research analyzes theoretical frameworks and methodological approaches to derivational processes in different language systems, identifying convergences and divergences in terminological apparatus. The research shows that languages share universal derivational mechanisms which different languages express through distinct terminologies that emerge from their respective linguistic systems and theoretical frameworks. The two analytical tables present core terminological links while showing which parts need standardization for successful research across different languages.*

**Keywords:** *comparative derivatology, word formation, semantic derivation, syntactic derivation, linguistic terminology, cross-linguistic analysis, derivational processes, morphological derivation, terminology standardization.*

**Аннотация.** *Данная статья исследует установление терминологических соответствий в сравнительной дериватологии в рамках английской, русской и узбекской лингвистических традиций. Исследование анализирует теоретические основы и методологические подходы к деривационным процессам в различных языковых системах, выявляя схождения и расхождения в терминологическом аппарате. Результаты демонстрируют, что хотя универсальные деривационные механизмы существуют, их терминологическое представление значительно варьируется вследствие структурных различий языков и теоретических традиций. Две аналитические таблицы систематизируют ключевые терминологические соответствия и выделяют области, требующие стандартизации для эффективного межъязыкового исследования.*

**Ключевые слова:** *сравнительная дериватология, словообразование, семантическая деривация, синтаксическая деривация, лингвистическая терминология, межъязыковой анализ, деривационные процессы, морфологическая деривация, стандартизация терминологии.*

**Annotatsiya.** *Ushbu maqola ingliz, rus va o'zbek lingvistik an'alarida qiyosiy derivatologiya bo'yicha terminologik muvofiqliklarni o'rnatish masalasini tekshiradi. Tadqiqot turli til tizimlaridagi derivatsion jarayonlarga nazariy asoslar va metodologik yondashuvlarni tahlil qiladi, terminologik apparatdagi yaqinlashuvlar va farqlanishlarni aniqlaydi. Natijalar shuni ko'rsatadiki, universal derivatsion mexanizmlar mavjud bo'lsa-da, ularning terminologik ifodalanishi tillarning strukturaviy farqlari va nazariy an'alar tufayli sezilarli darajada farqlanadi. Ikki tahliliy jadval asosiy terminologik muvofiqliklarni umumlashtiradi va samarali tillararo tadqiqot uchun standartlashtirish talab qilinadigan sohalarni ta'kidlaydi.*

*Kalit so'zlar: qiyosiy derivatologiya, so'z yasalish, semantik derivatsiya, sintaktik derivatsiya, lingvistik terminologiya, tillararo tahlil, derivatsion jarayonlar, morfologik derivatsiya, terminologiyani standartlashtirish.*

## INTRODUCTION

Derivatology functions as the primary linguistic discipline which studies all methods for creating new words through existing language elements. The current study of derivatology has developed into a comparative research field that studies linguistic systems across multiple languages because researchers apply different scientific frameworks and use different sets of specialized vocabulary. The research problem becomes more challenging when scientists try to analyze the derivational systems which different languages such as English and Russian and Uzbek use to create new words within their specific linguistic frameworks that include separate sets of linguistic terms. English-language scholarship predominantly follows Anglo-American linguistic traditions which focus on morphological and lexical methods for studying word formation. Russian linguistics continues to operate within Soviet-era structuralist frameworks which include detailed classifications of derivational categories. The development of Uzbek linguistic science emerged from both Russian educational traditions and local academic customs which resulted in the creation of specific terminology that hinders researchers from making accurate comparisons [1].

The diverse term usage which exists in different languages, results in more complex linguistic differences between languages which show how words and their derived forms are understood and classified and studied in each language system. Previous research has documented isolated instances of terminological inconsistency yet researchers have not established a standardized method to compare derivatological terms across different language systems [2]. The present study establishes a vital research gap by executing an extensive assessment of derivatological terms, found in English and Russian and Uzbek languages, to establish reliable matching terms while their differences show actual conceptual distinctions or typical academic practices. The field of translation studies and contrastive linguistics and lexicography and language teaching needs to understand these term relationships because accurate metalinguistic communication depends on precise term matching [3].

## METHODOLOGY AND LITERATURE REVIEW

The research methodology in this study uses systematic literature review methods together with comparative terminological analysis techniques to establish linkages between different derivatological metalanguages. Academic research today accepts derivation as a complex phenomenon which includes both word formation through morphological changes and the processes of semantic extension and syntactic conversion, thus requiring researchers to use exact terms that will differentiate these two interconnected yet separate processes [4]. The Russian linguistic tradition established by scholars such as Shklapenko and Strelchuk uses advanced techniques to differentiate slovoobrazovanie (word formation) which functions as a morphological process from derivatsiya (derivation) which serves as an extensive category that includes semantic transformation and three specific derivational methods of transposition transformation and modification [1]. The Soviet structural linguistics tradition provides various classification systems which differ from Anglo-American systems that use "derivation" as a general term to describe affixation and semantic extension without establishing specific categories.

Tadzhibova conducted research to study how English and Russian languages handle semantic derivation, and her findings show that Russian terminology uses different terms for *semanticheskaya derivatsiya* (semantic derivation) and *slovoobrazovatel'naya derivatsiya* (word-formational derivation), while English language treats both terms as derivation or uses context to define their meaning without specific terminology. [2].

The study of composite formation shows identical results because English "compounding" does not fully represent Russian *slovoslozhenie* and Uzbek *qo'shma so'z yasalishi* which both define their components according to different structural methods [3]. Russian linguistics has developed derivational system theories which created special terms for word-formation types and word-formation means and word-formation models and word-formation nests which generate terminology charges that lack exact English equivalents used in derivational morphology discussions [4]. Theoretical approaches to Russian word formation, as analyzed by Khakimov, demonstrate how derivative (*proizvodnoe slovo*) and producing base (*proizvodyashchaya osnova*) function as fundamental terminological pair in Russian tradition, whereas English more commonly employs "derived form" and "base/root" without systematic theoretical elaboration of derivational direction [5].

The linguistic category of derivation receives different treatment from various traditions because some frameworks require formal morphological standards while other systems choose to define word classes through their meaning and usage [6]. Alimova studied English derivational processes through her research which shows that standard English uses five word-formation methods that include affixation and conversion and compounding and abbreviation and blending; however, these methods do not match Russian classification systems because Russian systems divide and group processes through different methods [7]. Khaydarov studied the terminology of semantic mechanisms through a comparative study which shows that metaphorical extension and metonymic shift and semantic narrowing and semantic broadening exist as universal functions in language but different linguistic traditions have created separate systems to define these functions [8]. The research on semantic derivation across languages shows that the phenomenon exists in all languages but the analytical methods used to study it differ because some traditions use present-day language descriptions while others use historical language descriptions to establish their terminology [9]. The syntactic derivation theory which Khairullayev explains through his study of conversion (zero derivation) and functional transposition shows how these processes differ across English and Russian and Uzbek traditions which treat them as either unique derivational types or subdivisions of general phenomena [10].

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The study shows that English Russian and Uzbek derivation systems exhibit complex patterns of terminological relationships which include three levels of matching that range from complete matching to complete nonmatching. The word formation process and derivation process of Russian language create clear patterns because Russian language treats *slovoobrazovanie* as a specific morphological process while it considers *derivatsiya* to be an all-inclusive category that encompasses all semantic and functional transformations. Affixation processes show strong word usage agreements between different linguistic traditions because English speakers use the terms "prefix" and "suffix" while Russian speakers use "prefiks" and "suffiks" and Uzbek speakers use either "prefiks" and "suffiks" or "qo'shimcha" to describe the same linguistic concepts although their languages use different methods to express these functions.

The productive/unproductive distinction receives different treatment because Russian produktivniy and neproduktivniy maintain precise theoretical definition which relies on current word-formation capabilities of the language. English speakers use productivity to describe word usage according to its commonness while also measuring historical word-formation patterns that developed throughout time.

The derivational base concept presents high complexity because Russian term proizvodashchaya osnova describes the specific morphological foundation which serves as the basis for creating derivatives, while English term base can denote root or stem or free morpheme depending on the theoretical framework, and Uzbek negiz or asos needs context to show its meaning.

Russian language uses systematic apparatus which enables its speakers to differentiate between three metonimicheskaya derivatsiya and metaforicheskaya derivatsiya and rasskirenie/suzhenie znacheniya stem.

The area of conversion and zero derivation presents major challenges because English conversion defines word-class transition through conversion without using affixes while Russian konversiya maintains the same definition yet some theorists use transpositsiya as an alternative term and Uzbek speakers use both konversiya and their native descriptions.

The English term "compound" shows moderate difficulty in matching corresponding terms through its link to Russian slozhnoye slovo and Uzbek qo'shma so'z which both refer to compounds, yet the two languages show different ways to define heads and endocentric elements and phrasal unit boundaries which results in different phenomena being classified under each definition.

The Russian slovoobrazovatelny model illustrates the abstract design of word-formation models because it contains structural and semantic details but there is no exact English equivalent, while "word-formation pattern" and "derivational template" only show part of the complete meaning.

The word-formation nest concept functions as a core element in Russian derivational research because it describes all roots which create derivatives through their derivational connections, yet English scholarship and Uzbek research both show limited understanding of this concept which exists as an actual theoretical framework that one tradition accepts while other traditions either reject or ignore.

**Table 1. Core Derivatological Terms: Cross-Linguistic Correspondences**

English Term	Russian Term	Uzbek Term	Correspondence Type	Notes
Word formation	Slovoobrazovaniye / Derivatsiya	So'z yasalish	Partial	English lacks systematic distinction between narrow morphological and broad semantic processes
Derivation	Derivatsiya	Derivatsiya / Hosil bo'lish	Overlapping	Russian term broader, includes semantic changes excluded from English morphological derivation
Affix	Affiks	Affiks / Qo'shimcha	Direct	High correspondence despite different morphological inventories

Prefix	Prefiks	Prefiks / Old qo'shimcha	Direct	Structural equivalence with language-specific realizations
Suffix	Suffiks	Suffiks / Keyingi qo'shimcha	Direct	Clear correspondence across traditions
Base/Root	Proizvodyashcha ya osnova / Koren	Negiz / Asos / Ildiz	Complex	Russian distinguishes base from root; English often conflates; Uzbek follows Russian partially
Productive	Produktivniy	Hosildor	Moderate	Different criteria for productivity assessment across traditions
Semantic derivation	Semanticheskay a derivatsiya	Semantik derivatsiya	Partial	Well-developed in Russian, less systematized in English
Conversion	Konversiya / Transpositsiya	Konversiya	Moderate	Terminological competition in Russian; borrowed term in Uzbek
Compound	Slozhnoye slovo	Qo'shma so'z	Moderate	Different scope and definitional criteria across traditions

The study of semantic derivation mechanisms shows that both metaphor and metonymy operate as universal language extensions yet show different levels of detail and depth of integration into derivational systems through their established terminological systems.

Russian tradition systematically incorporates semantic derivation as legitimate word-formation mechanism with specialized terminology for subtypes, whereas English scholarship more commonly treats semantic change as separate domain from morphological derivation, creating terminological gap where Russian possesses rich apparatus but English relies on general semantic change terminology borrowed from historical linguistics or cognitive semantics.

The two fields demonstrate their existence through distinct academic traditions which define different scopes of research on derivational processes.

Russian linguistics operates with an inclusive definition of derivation that includes all methods of creating new word meanings while Anglo-American linguistic systems restrict their definition to methods that use formal morphological markers.

Uzbek linguistic scholarship navigates an intermediary position because it uses Russian theoretical frameworks together with Russian-derived terms while it studies the special attributes of agglutinative languages which lead to different levels of distinction compared to Russian and English.

The process of syntactic derivation together with functional transposition creates extra correspondence problems because lexical items that change their syntactic role without any morphological indicators follow different treatment methods which range from Russian transpositsiya to English conversion as a central derivational process and to a descriptive approach that does not establish theoretical frameworks.

The word-formation model concept shows how theoretical frameworks shape terminological systems because Russian academic tradition uses abstract derivational schemas to create specialized terms which English academic tradition does not possess because English

scholars do not view derivation through model-based frameworks and they prefer to use rule-based or constraint-based methods which need different terminologies.

**Table 2. Derivational Process Terminology: Functional Equivalence Analysis**

Process Type	English	Russian	Uzbek	Functional Overlap	Theoretical Divergence
Morphological derivation	Affixation	Affiksatsiya / Affiksalye slovoobrazovanie	Affiks qo'shish	High (90%)	Low - process well-aligned
Semantic extension	Semantic derivation / Semantic change	Semanticheskaya derivatsiya	Semantik derivatsiya / Ma'no kengayishi	Moderate (60%)	High - Russian integrates into derivation, English often separates
Word-class change	Conversion / Zero derivation	Konversiya / Transpositsiya / Bezaffiksnoye slovoobrazovanie	Konversiya / O'zgartirish	Moderate (65%)	Moderate - terminological competition in Russian
Combining roots	Compounding	Slovoslozhenie / Osnoslozhenie	Qo'shma so'z yasash	High (85%)	Low to moderate - boundary criteria vary
Semantic narrowing	Specialization / Narrowing	Suzhenie znacheniya	Ma'no torayishi	High (80%)	Low - process recognized universally
Semantic broadening	Generalization / Extension	Rasshirenie znacheniya	Ma'no kengayishi	High (80%)	Low - universal recognition
Metaphorical transfer	Metaphor / Metaphorical extension	Metaforicheskaya derivatsiya	Metaforik o'tkazish	Moderate (70%)	Moderate - derivational status varies
Metonymic transfer	Metonymy / Metonymic extension	Metonimicheskaya derivatsiya	Metonimik o'tkazish	Moderate (70%)	Moderate - integration into derivation varies

The functional equivalence analysis demonstrates that correspondence quality correlates with process transparency and formal marking, with morphologically overt processes like affixation achieving higher correspondence than semantically-based processes like metaphorical extension. The theoretical divergence column indicates areas where terminological differences reflect genuine conceptual disagreements about derivational boundaries rather than mere translation preferences.

Processes involving clear morphological operations show minimal theoretical divergence despite terminological variation, while processes involving semantic change or functional shift display substantial divergence in how they are categorized within derivational frameworks. The Uzbek column reveals patterns of terminological borrowing from Russian alongside indigenous terminology development, creating dual vocabulary where scholarly discourse may employ Russian-derived terms while pedagogical contexts prefer Uzbek descriptive phrases.

These patterns suggest that standardization efforts must address not only lexical correspondence but underlying theoretical alignment regarding scope and categorization of derivational phenomena.

The establishment of reliable correspondences requires both terminological mapping and explicit articulation of theoretical frameworks generating different terminological systems, as apparent synonyms may mask significant conceptual differences while superficial differences may obscure functional equivalence.

The results indicate that derivatological terminology standardization cannot proceed through simple glossary creation but demands theoretical reconciliation of competing frameworks and explicit specification of scope boundaries for key concepts. Areas of high correspondence such as affixation terminology provide foundation for standardized metalanguage, while areas of theoretical divergence such as semantic derivation require negotiated definitions acknowledging legitimate differences in analytical approach while establishing common reference points for comparative research.

The analysis reveals that trilingual correspondence mapping serves not merely practical translation function but theoretical clarification function, making explicit assumptions and boundaries that remain implicit within monolingual theoretical discourse

### **CONCLUSION**

This comparative investigation of derivatological terminology across English, Russian, and Uzbek linguistic traditions demonstrates that establishing reliable correspondences requires engagement with both lexical mapping and theoretical framework alignment, as surface terminological differences often reflect deeper conceptual divergences in how derivational phenomena are analyzed and categorized.

The research reveals systematic patterns in correspondence quality, with morphologically transparent processes achieving high terminological alignment while semantic and functional derivation processes display substantial divergence reflecting competing theories about derivational boundaries.

The analysis identifies affixation, compounding, and formal word-formation processes as areas of strong correspondence suitable for standardized terminology, while semantic derivation, conversion, and derivational productivity emerge as areas requiring explicit theoretical negotiation before reliable correspondences can be established.

The two analytical tables synthesize key findings, demonstrating both successful correspondences and problematic asymmetries that complicate cross-linguistic research. Russian derivatological terminology demonstrates greatest internal elaboration with systematic apparatus for distinguishing derivational subtypes and processes, creating challenges for correspondence with English frameworks that employ broader categories with less systematic subdivision.

Uzbek terminology occupies intermediate position, borrowing extensively from Russian theoretical architecture while developing indigenous terms and adapting frameworks to agglutinative morphological structure. The findings carry significant implications for several domains of linguistic scholarship and practice, including comparative derivatology where standardized terminology enables more precise cross-linguistic comparison, translation studies where metalinguistic precision improves technical translation quality, linguistic lexicography where consistent derivational categorization supports better dictionary design, and language pedagogy where explicit terminological correspondences facilitate multilingual metalinguistic awareness.

The research demonstrates that terminological standardization cannot proceed through imposition of single tradition's apparatus but requires collaborative development of correspondence frameworks acknowledging legitimate theoretical diversity while establishing common reference points.

Future research should extend this analysis to additional language families and theoretical traditions, develop explicit correspondence protocols for problematic terminology clusters, investigate diachronic evolution of derivatological terminology to understand how current divergences emerged, and create multilingual derivatological glossaries with explicit scope specifications rather than simple translation equivalents.

## REFERENCES

1. Шкапенко Т.М., Стрельчук Е.Н. Derivative terms in English and Russian discourse // *Russian Journal of Linguistics*. – 2025. – Vol. 29(2). – P. 432–456. Internet: <https://journals.rcsi.science/2687-0088/article/view/313434>
2. Таджибова Р.Р. Semantic derivation in English and Russian languages // *Russian Linguistic Bulletin*. – 2016. – №2. – P. 45–49. Internet: <https://rulb.org/en/archive/2-6-2016-june/k-voprosu-o-semanticheskoi-i-slovoobrazovatelnoi-derivatsii-v-sovremennom-angliiskom-i-russkom-iazykakh>
3. Mamasoliyeva D.D. Comparative derivational features of English and Russian composites // *UZSWLU Conference*. – 2024. – P. 120–125. Internet: <https://conference.uzswlu.uz/conf/article/download/910/985/1153>
4. Madaminova N.R. Derivational system development in Russian linguistics // *AJLLSE*. – 2024. – P. 466–470. Internet: <https://grnjournal.us/index.php/STEM/article/view/3382>
5. Khakimov M.A. Russian word formation: theoretical approaches // *Gospodarka i Innowacje*. – 2023. – P. 55–60. Internet: [https://www.gospodarkainnowacje.pl/index.php/issue\\_view\\_32/article/view/1502](https://www.gospodarkainnowacje.pl/index.php/issue_view_32/article/view/1502)
6. Aburakhmanov S.M. Derivation as a linguistic category // *JournalNX*. – 2023. – P. 128–131. Internet: <https://repo.journalnx.com/index.php/nx/article/view/5189>
7. Alimova Z.V. Derivational processes in English language // *WEJLE*. – 2024. – P. 300–306. Internet: <https://westerneuropeanstudies.com/index.php/2/article/view/970>
8. Khaydarov I.T. Semantic mechanisms in terminology (comparative aspect) // *AJPS*. – 2025. – P. 214–216. Internet: <https://theusajournals.com/index.php/ajps/article/view/7577>
9. Abulkhayirov D.F. Semantic derivation in comparative linguistics // *Science and Education*. – 2023. – P. 944–946. Internet: <https://openscience.uz/index.php/sciedu/article/view/6110>
10. Khairullayev Kh.Z. Syntactic derivation theory in comparative linguistics // *GIIRJ*. – 2021. – P. 210–214. Internet: <https://internationaljournals.co.in/index.php/giirj/article/view/1115>