pISSN:2349-5707 Volume:13,Issue 4, April -2026 eISSN:2349-5715

LEXICAL-SEMANTIC FEATURES OF ECONOMIC TERMS

Oydinoy Zoidjonova
Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies
Email: oydinoyzoidjonova@gmail.com

Abstract

This article examines the lexical-semantic features of economic terminology as a structured subsystem of language used in specialized scientific communication. The study investigates how economic terms function within a conceptual system and how semantic relations such as monosemy, polysemy, synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, hypernymy, and meronymy contribute to their organization. A qualitative linguistic approach was applied, including descriptive, semantic, componential, and systemic analysis methods. The results show that economic terminology is predominantly monosemantic, ensuring precision and clarity in professional discourse, although certain terms demonstrate contextual polysemy. The presence of relative synonymy reflects parallel usage of international and national lexical variants, while antonymic relations structure conceptual oppositions within economic processes. In addition, hierarchical and part–whole relationships reveal the systematic and interconnected nature of economic knowledge representation. The study concludes that economic terminology forms a coherent semantic network that plays a significant role in scientific communication and terminology standardization. These findings are useful for developing terminological resources such as thesauri and specialized economic databases

Keywords: Economic terminology; lexical semantics; monosemy; polysemy; synonymy; antonymy; hyponymy; meronymy; terminological system; semantic relations; economic discourse.

Introduction

Terminological lexis constitutes a distinct layer of the language system, serving to express specialized concepts formed within a particular scientific or professional domain. The theoretical foundations of terminology have been extensively studied by numerous scholars, among whom the nature of terms, their functions, and semantic characteristics have been analyzed from various perspectives (Wüster, 1979; Cabré, 1999; Temmerman, 2000). In these studies, terms are interpreted as the primary means of scientific communication. The formation and development of terminological lexis are closely interconnected with the general lexical system of a language, as emphasized in many linguistic studies (Lyons, 1995; Crystal, 2018). In particular, terms are distinguished from general vocabulary by their precision, systematic nature, and monosemantic character (Sager, 1990; Felber, 1984). At the same time, contemporary research indicates that terminology is also dynamic, meaning that terms may undergo semantic changes over time (Temmerman, 2000; Kageura, 2002). Economic terminology represents a complex system studied at the intersection of linguistics and economics. As the field of economics develops, its terminological system continues to expand (Tapscott et al., 2016; Mankiw, 2014). Processes of international economic integration contribute to the global standardization of terms (Bowker, 2015). The study of semantic features of terms is grounded in semantic theory. Issues related to the meaning structure of linguistic units have been thoroughly examined by scholars such as Lyons (1995), Cruse (2000), and Hurford (2007). Their research highlights semantic relations—such as synonymy, antonymy, and hyponymy—as fundamental components of the language system.

The lexical-semantic characteristics of economic terminology have also been the focus of numerous studies (Cabré, 1999; Pavel & Nolet, 2001; Faber, 2012). These works analyze the systematic nature of terms, their hierarchical organization, and conceptual relationships. In particular, Faber (2012) views terminology as a conceptual system and emphasizes the importance of semantic relations within it.

pISSN:2349-5707 Volume:13,Issue 4, April -2026 eISSN:2349-5715

In Uzbek linguistics, issues of terminology have also received considerable attention. Ikramovna (2023) analyzed the role of terms within professional language systems. Furthermore, other studies have explored the stages of formation and development of economic terminology.

Modern economic terminology is increasingly shaped by global processes. In particular, terms related to the digital economy, financial technologies, and cryptocurrencies have introduced a new semantic layer (Tapscott, 2016; Narayanan et al., 2016). This, in turn, contributes to the growing complexity of the semantic system of terminology. From this perspective, the study of the lexical-semantic characteristics of economic terms is of both theoretical and practical significance.

The aim of this article is to systematically analyze the lexical-semantic features of economic terms and to determine their role within the terminological system.

Methods

A comprehensive and integrative approach was employed in this study to investigate the lexical-semantic features of economic terminology. The research is based on a combination of qualitative linguistic analysis methods, which made it possible to examine terms both as individual lexical units and as elements of a broader conceptual system.

First, the descriptive method was applied to identify and characterize the general features of economic terms. This method allowed for the systematic description of terminological units and their role within the economic discourse. It also helped to distinguish terminological lexis from general vocabulary based on criteria such as precision, stability, and functional specificity.

Second, semantic analysis was used to explore the meaning structures of terms and the relationships between them. Through this approach, key semantic properties such as monosemy, polysemy, synonymy, and antonymy were identified and examined in the context of economic terminology.

In addition, the componential analysis method was employed to reveal the internal semantic structure of terms. This method made it possible to break down complex meanings into smaller semantic components and to identify the distinctive features that differentiate one term from another within the same conceptual field.

Furthermore, a systemic approach was adopted to analyze economic terms as part of an interconnected terminological system. This approach emphasized the hierarchical and relational organization of terms, including hyponymic, hyperonymic, and part-whole (meronymic) relationships, thereby highlighting the conceptual structure underlying economic terminology.

The research material consisted of a selected corpus of economic terms drawn from various subfields, including finance, banking, and general economics. These terms were analyzed in terms of their linguistic form, semantic properties, and functional usage within professional communication.

Results

The analysis made it possible to identify a set of key lexical-semantic features characteristic of economic terminology. These features reflect both the linguistic nature of terms and their functional role within the conceptual system of economics.

First, economic terms are predominantly characterized by monosemy, meaning that each term ideally denotes a single, clearly defined concept. This property ensures precision and unambiguity in scientific communication. Terms such as *futures*, *parity*, and *blockchain* illustrate this feature, as they refer to specific economic or financial concepts with well-established definitions. Monosemy plays a crucial role in maintaining consistency and clarity in professional discourse.

Second, despite the tendency toward monosemy, certain terms exhibit polysemy, particularly when used across different subfields or contexts. For example, the term *asset* may refer to a company's resources in accounting, while in finance it may denote income-generating instruments. Similarly, *balance* can describe a financial statement in accounting or a broader

pISSN:2349-5707 Volume:13,Issue 4, April -2026 eISSN:2349-5715

equilibrium concept in economics, and *rate* may refer to exchange rates, interest rates, or growth rates. This indicates that economic terminology, while striving for precision, is also influenced by contextual variability.

Third, the study revealed the presence of terminological synonymy, which is generally relative rather than absolute. Synonymous pairs such as *credit – loan*, *deposit – savings*, and *investment – capital* express closely related concepts but may differ in usage, stylistic nuance, or domain specificity. In many cases, one term may be of international origin, while the other represents a localized or adapted equivalent. This type of synonymy reflects the dynamic and evolving nature of economic terminology.

Fourth, antonymic relations constitute an essential component of the terminological system. Oppositional pairs such as *profit – loss*, *export – import*, and *assets – liabilities* help to structure economic knowledge by defining conceptual boundaries. These contrasts are fundamental in analyzing economic processes, as they highlight opposing states, directions, or outcomes within financial and economic activities.

Fifth, hyponymic and hypernymic relations play a significant role in organizing economic terminology into hierarchical structures. A general concept (hypernym) encompasses more specific subcategories (hyponyms). For instance, the term *financial instrument* serves as a hypernym that includes *stocks*, *bonds*, and *derivatives* as its hyponyms. Such hierarchical organization facilitates the classification of concepts and contributes to the systematic nature of economic knowledge representation.

Sixth, the analysis demonstrated the importance of meronymic (part–whole) relations in economic terminology. These relations reflect the structural composition of complex economic systems. For example, the concept of a *balance sheet* consists of components such as *assets*, *liabilities*, and *equity*, each representing a part of the overall structure. Similarly, broader systems like financial markets or payment systems can be analyzed in terms of their constituent elements. This structural perspective is essential for understanding the internal organization of economic concepts.

Overall, the findings indicate that economic terminology is not merely a collection of isolated terms, but a highly organized semantic system characterized by multiple types of relationships. These lexical-semantic features ensure both the precision of individual terms and the coherence of the terminological system as a whole.

Discussion

The results show that economic terminology forms a well-structured and systematic lexical system in which semantic relations play a key role. The predominance of monosemy confirms the need for precision and clarity in scientific communication. At the same time, the presence of polysemy indicates that terminology is not entirely fixed but can vary depending on context. The existence of relative synonymy reflects the influence of different linguistic sources and the parallel use of international and national terms. While this enriches the terminology, it may also create ambiguity, making standardization important. Antonymic relations help define clear conceptual boundaries, especially in expressing opposite economic processes such as profit and loss or export and import. Hierarchical relations, such as hyponymy and hypernymy, demonstrate that economic terms are organized from general to specific concepts, contributing to a systematic classification. Similarly, meronymic relations reveal the structural complexity of economic concepts by showing part–whole connections. Overall, these lexical-semantic features confirm that economic terminology is a coherent and interconnected system. The findings are important for developing terminological resources, such as thesauri, and for improving clarity and effectiveness in scientific communication.

Conclusion

pISSN:2349-5707 Volume:13,Issue 4, April -2026 eISSN:2349-5715

This study analyzed the lexical-semantic features of economic terminology and demonstrated that it functions as a highly organized and structured system. The findings show that economic terms are predominantly monosemantic, which ensures clarity and precision in scientific communication. However, in some cases polysemy occurs, reflecting contextual variation in meaning. The research also revealed the presence of relative synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, hypernymy, and meronymy relations within economic terminology. These semantic relations contribute to the systematic organization of terms and help establish conceptual coherence within the field. In particular, hierarchical and part–whole relations play an important role in structuring economic knowledge. Overall, the study confirms that economic terminology is not a random collection of words but a logically structured semantic system. These findings are significant for terminology standardization, lexicographic work, and the development of specialized resources such as economic thesauri and databases.

References

1. Cabré, M. T. (1999). *Terminology: Theory, methods and applications* (J. C. Sager, Ed.; J. A. DeCesaris, Trans.). John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/tlrp.1
2. Crystal, D. (2018). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of the English language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
3. Cruse, D. A. (2000). *Meaning in language: An introduction to semantics and pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.
4. Faber, P. (Ed.). (2012). *A cognitive linguistics view of terminology and specialized language*. De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110277203
5. Felber, H. (1984). *Terminology manual*. UNESCO & INFOTERM.
6. Hurford, J. R. (2007). *The origins of meaning*. Oxford University Press.
7. Kageura, K. (2002). *The dynamics of terminology: A descriptive theory of term formation and terminological growth*. John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/tlrp.5
8. Ikramovna Firuza Andapulatova (2023). TERMINLARINING TILDAGI O‘RNI VA AHAMIYATI. Scientific progress, 4 (1), 62-66.
9. Lyons, J. (1995). *Linguistic semantics: An introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
10. Mankiw, N. G. (2014). *Principles of economics* (7th ed.). Cengage Learning.
11. Narayanan, A., Bonneau, J., Felten, E., Miller, A., & Goldfeder, S. (2016). *Bitcoin and cryptocurrency technologies: A comprehensive introduction*. Princeton University Press. ISBN: 978-0-691-17169-2
12. Pavel, S., & Nolet, D. (2001). *Handbook of terminology*. Translation Bureau, Public Works and Government Services Canada.
13. Sager, J.C. (1990) A Practical Course in Terminology Processing. John Benjamins, Armsterdam. https://doi.org/10.1075/z.44
14. Tapscott, D., & Tapscott, A. (2016). Blockchain Revolution: How the Technology behind Bitcoin Is Changing Money, Business, and the World. Penguin.
15. Temmerman, R. (2000). *Towards new ways of terminology description: The sociocognitive approach*. John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/tlrp.3
16. Wüster, E. (1979). *Einführung in die allgemeine Terminologielehre und terminologische Lexikographie*. Springer. ISBN: 978-3-211-81542-7