

THE PLACE OF UNITS WITH PRIVATE COMBINABILITY IN THE TERMINOLOGICAL SYSTEM

Ernazarova Gulnoza Turayevna
Teacher of school № 30, Karshi district

Annotation The article offers a comprehensive examination of the place and functional role of units with private combinability within the terminological system. Special attention is paid to their intermediate status between free terminological phrases and fully idiomatic units, their contribution to the systemic organization, hierarchical coherence and precision of terminology, as well as their nominative, systematizing, didactic and translational functions. The study relies on the theoretical foundations of terminology science, Russian phraseology and modern collocation theory.

Keywords: private combinability, restricted combinability, terminological system, multi-component terms, terminological phrases, systemic organization, nominative function, phraseological combinations.

Annotatsiya Maqolada xususiy birikuvchili birikmalarning terminologik tizimdagi o'rni va funksional roli batafsil yoritiladi. Asosiy e'tibor ularning erkin terminologik iboralar bilan to'liq idiomatik birliklar o'rtasidagi oraliq maqomiga, terminologiyaning tizimli tashkil etilishi, iyerarxik bog'liqligi va aniqliligiga qo'shgan hissasiga, shuningdek nominativ, tizimlashtiruvchi, didaktik va tarjimaviy funksiyalariga qaratiladi. Tadqiqot terminologiya fanining nazariy asoslari, rus frazeologiyasi va zamonaviy kollokatsiya nazariyasiga tayanadi.

Kalit so'zlar: xususiy birikuvchilik, cheklangan birikuvchilik, terminologik tizim, ko'p komponentli terminlar, terminologik birikmalar, tizimli tashkil etilganlik, nominativ funksiya, frazeologik birikmalar.

Аннотация В статье подробно рассматриваются место и функциональная роль единиц с частной сочетаемостью в терминологической системе. Особое внимание уделяется их промежуточному статусу между свободными терминологическими словосочетаниями и полностью идиоматическими единицами, их вкладу в системную организацию, иерархическую связность и точность терминологии, а также номинативной, систематизирующей, дидактической и переводческой функциям. Исследование опирается на теоретические основы терминоведения, русской фразеологии и современной теории коллокаций.

Ключевые слова: частная сочетаемость, ограниченная сочетаемость, терминологическая система, многокомпонентные термины, терминологические сочетания, системная организация, номинативная функция, фразеологические сочетания.

The terminological system of any specialized domain constitutes a hierarchically organized and systematically interrelated set of special designations that serve to name, classify and structure the concepts of a given field of knowledge. Within this system multi-word units occupy a particularly prominent position, since a considerable proportion of scientific, technical and professional concepts cannot be adequately expressed by single-word terms alone. Among multi-word terminological units a distinct and theoretically significant category is formed by those combinations that possess private (restricted) combinability. These units represent an intermediate type situated between free terminological phrases, on the one hand, and fully idiomatic (phraseological) terms, on the other, and they play a crucial role in ensuring the coherence, precision and functional efficiency of the terminological system as a whole.

Following the classical classification of phraseological units proposed by V.V.Vinogradov, units with private combinability correspond to the type of phraseological combinations in which one of the components retains its free lexical meaning while the other is limited in its combinatorial possibilities yet

Scottish International Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation – SICMRI 2026

remains semantically motivated and transparent. In the metalanguage of terminology science such units are regarded as partially fixed designations that preserve a high degree of semantic motivation while exhibiting clear restrictions on lexical choice. This dual nature allows them to function both as analytically transparent names and as conventionally established elements of the terminological inventory.

The theoretical foundations for the study of these units were laid by the founders of Russian terminology science. D.S.Lotte emphasized the necessity of the systematic organization of terminology and the importance of multi-component designations for the precise expression of complex concepts; he repeatedly stressed that the internal structure of terms must reflect the logical relations existing among the corresponding concepts [1]. A.A.Reformatsky drew attention to the structural diversity of terms and to the role of restricted combinations in maintaining the internal coherence of terminological fields [2]. Subsequent works by A.V.Superanskaya, V.M.Leichik and S.V.Grinev-Grinevich further developed the understanding of terminological systems as open yet highly organized structures in which units of different degrees of fixedness perform complementary functions [3,4,5]. Parallel insights have been offered by international scholars of terminology, notably M.T.Cabre and J.C.Sager, who underline the significance of multi-word units and restricted collocations for the conceptual architecture of specialized languages [9,10].

From the standpoint of semantic and structural analysis, units with private combinability are characterized by a set of distinctive features. First, they exhibit limited lexical selection: one component (usually the base) may combine with only a restricted set of partners, while the other remains relatively free. Second, the overall meaning of the combination remains motivated and largely predictable from the meanings of its constituents, which distinguishes these units from fully idiomatic terms. Third, they display a high degree of systemicity: they regularly form series and paradigms that mirror the hierarchical and associative relations within the conceptual system of the domain. Fourth, they tend to follow a limited number of syntactic models typical of terminological nomination (most frequently Adj+N, N+N in the genitive, N+Prep+N). These features collectively ensure that units with private combinability contribute both to the analytic transparency and to the conventional stability of the terminological system [4,7].

The place of such units within the terminological system can be described in several interrelated dimensions. At the structural level they form intermediate links that connect free descriptive phrases with highly conventionalized terms, thereby ensuring the continuity and openness of the system. At the hierarchical level they frequently encode generic-specific or whole-part relations, allowing the terminological field to reflect the logical architecture of the corresponding conceptual system. At the functional level they perform a complex of roles that are essential for the practical functioning of terminology. The nominative function consists in providing precise and relatively stable designations for complex concepts that cannot be named by single words. The systematizing function lies in the capacity of these units to organize knowledge by establishing regular paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations among terms. The didactic function is manifested in the relative ease with which motivated combinations can be learned and retained, as opposed to completely arbitrary designations. Finally, the translational function facilitates the search for and verification of equivalents across languages, since the internal semantic structure of the combination remains accessible to analysis [3,5,11].

It is important to distinguish units with private combinability both from free terminological phrases and from fully idiomatic terms. Free phrases are completely open in their combinatorial potential and are formed according to the general syntactic rules of the language; they lack the degree of conventionalization required of true terms. Fully idiomatic terms, by contrast, exhibit a high degree of semantic opacity and combinatorial fixedness, often approaching the status of single lexical units. Units with private combinability occupy the middle zone of this continuum: they are sufficiently fixed to function as stable elements of the terminological system, yet sufficiently motivated to remain analytically transparent and productive. This intermediate status makes them particularly valuable for the dynamic

Scottish International Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation – SICMRI 2026

development of terminology, since new designations can be formed by extending existing restricted patterns without destroying the systemic coherence of the field [6, 8].

The same intermediate character is reflected in modern collocation theory and in the theory of lexical functions developed by I.A.Melcuk. Restricted collocations of the type examined here correspond to a significant subset of lexical functions that operate within specialized languages, ensuring the idiomatic yet systematic realization of meaning [8]. Corpus-based studies of specialized discourse further confirm that units with private combinability constitute a quantitatively substantial and functionally indispensable part of terminological usage; their systematic description is therefore a necessary component of any comprehensive terminographic project [10,12].

In lexicographic practice units with private combinability are treated either as independent entries or as specialized collocations within the entries of their base components. Specialized dictionaries and term banks increasingly register such combinations, recognizing that the systemic value of a term is fully realized only in the network of its restricted partners. The inclusion of these units in terminographic descriptions enhances both the theoretical adequacy and the practical utility of terminological resources for translators, subject specialists and language learners.

Thus, units with private combinability occupy a central and functionally indispensable place in the terminological system. They constitute an intermediate yet highly productive class of multi-word designations that combine semantic motivation with combinatorial restriction, thereby ensuring the balance between analytic transparency and conventional stability. Their contribution to the hierarchical organization, conceptual coherence and communicative efficiency of terminology is fundamental. The systematic study of these units deepens our understanding of the internal architecture of terminological systems and provides essential material for terminography, specialized translation and the teaching of languages for special purposes.

Further research may productively combine traditional component and systemic analysis with corpus methods and with cognitive approaches that investigate the conceptual models underlying restricted terminological combinations. Such an interdisciplinary perspective will further clarify how specialized languages achieve the necessary equilibrium between motivation and conventionality – one of the central requirements of any efficient terminological system [4,9].

REFERENCES:

1. Лотте Д.С. Основы построения научно-технической терминологии. Вопросы теории и методики. Москва: Изд-во АН СССР, 1961. – 158 с.
2. Реформатский А.А. Что такое термин и терминология // Вопросы терминологии. Москва: Изд-во АН СССР, 1961. – С. 46–54.
3. Суперанская А.В., Подольская Н.В., Васильева Н.В. Общая терминология: Вопросы теории. Москва: Наука, 1989. – 246 с.
4. Лейчик В.М. Терминоведение: предмет, методы, структура. 4-е изд. Москва: Либроком, 2009. – 256 с.
5. Гринев-Гриневич С.В. Терминоведение: учеб. пособие. Москва: Академия, 2008. – 304 с.
6. Виноградов В.В. Об основных типах фразеологических единиц в русском языке // Лексикология и лексикография: Избранные труды. Москва: Наука, 1977. – С. 140–161.

**Scottish International Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and
Innovation – SICMRI 2026**

7. Апресян Ю.Д. Лексическая семантика. Синонимические средства языка. Москва: Наука, 1974. – 367 с.
8. Мельчук И.А. Опыт теории лингвистических моделей «Смысл ↔ Текст». Москва: Наука, 1974. – 314 с.
9. Cabré M.T. Terminology: Theory, Methods and Applications. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1999. – 247 p.
10. Sager J.C. A Practical Course in Terminology Processing. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1990. – 258 p.
11. Felber H. Terminology Manual. Paris: Infoterm / UNESCO, 1984. – 426 p.
12. Даниленко В.П. Русская терминология: Опыт лингвистического описания. Москва: Наука, 1977. – 246 с.