SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 4 | April 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

CROSS-LINGUISTIC AND CULTURAL VARIATION IN THEATRE TERMINOLOGY: A CORPUS-BASED COMPARATIVE STUDY OF UZBEK AND ENGLISH

Zulaykho Usmanova
PhD Student, Interfaculty Department of Foreign Languages, Urgench State University named after Abu Rayhon Beruni, Urgench, 220100, Uzbekistan
ORCID ID: 0009-0001-3367-3020

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.36713/epra27179
DOI No: 10.36713/epra27179

ABSTRACT

This study presents comparative analysis of theatre terminology in Uzbek and English, aiming to explore structural, semantic, and cultural divergences in term formation. Using a mixed-methods approach combining corpus linguistics, descriptive analysis, sociocognitive terminology theory, the research investigates authentic texts, lexicons, and performative discourse to identify patterns in theatrical vocabulary across both languages.

The findings reveal that English theatre terminology tends to employ compounding (37%) and metaphorical extensions, reflecting institutional standardization and academic codification. In contrast, Uzbek terminology is marked by derivational morphology (44%), oral tradition, and loanwords from Russian, highlighting legacy of historical language contact and post-Soviet linguistic practices. The study also identifies substantial cross-linguistic gaps in culturally bound terms (28%), which pose challenges for direct translation and require adaptive strategies like functional equivalence and explicitation.

This study contributes to broader understanding of terminology as a culturally embedded system rather than a set of one-to-one lexical correspondences. It underscores need for updated bilingual terminological resources and corpus-driven tools to support theatre translation, education, and documentation. It also emphasizes importance of integrating linguistic, cultural, and historical perspectives in terminology research, especially in under-resourced languages. Ultimately, the study supports ongoing efforts toward linguistic equity and cultural preservation in multilingual contexts.

KEYWORDS: *Theatre terminology; comparative linguistics; Uzbek and English; culturally bound terms; term equivalence; corpus-based analysis; language and culture.*

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Relevance of Theatre Terminology in Global and Local Contexts

Theatre has long served as a reflection of society's collective consciousness, cultural expression, and linguistic creativity. As a multidisciplinary art form, it integrates language, gesture, symbolism, and scenography to communicate meaning. Within this framework, theatre terminology—defined as the specialized lexicon used in the practice, study, and critique of theatrical performance—serves as a vital conduit for conceptual clarity, artistic direction, and pedagogical precision (Pavis, 2016).

In the global context, particularly in English-speaking countries, theatre terminology has been gradually formalized and codified over centuries, beginning with classical antiquity and evolving through Elizabethan, Restoration, and modern periods (Carlson, 2014; Zarrilli et al., 2013). Terms like monologue, blocking, proscenium, and method acting have become internationally recognized through academic literature and theatrical education systems (Bennett, 2012).

In contrast, Uzbek theatre terminology remains a relatively under-researched area. While Uzbekistan possesses a rich theatrical heritage—from Bukhara palace performances to Jadid enlightenment theatre, and later Soviet-influenced institutions—its terminology has evolved through Turkic roots, Persian influences, Arabic borrowings, and Russian transliterations. As a result, the Uzbek theatrical lexicon is characterized by a hybrid structure comprising both native Uzbek terms and borrowings from Russian and other European languages. This lexical interplay mirrors the complex sociolinguistic history of Uzbekistan's performing arts, particularly during the Soviet period, when Russian functioned as the dominant medium for institutional and artistic discourse (Kozimova, 2022). Borrowed terms such as rejissyor, pyesa, and dekoratsiya remain widely used alongside native derivations, illustrating the sustained influence of Russian on the Uzbek performance lexicon (Kozimova, 2024). While some terminological units have undergone partial localization, many remain unstandardized or contextually inconsistent across academic, pedagogical, and practical theatre platforms. The terminological inconsistency is further exacerbated by the lack of a centralized lexicographic effort specific to performing arts, leading to divergent usages in university syllabi, script translation, and stage direction. Temmerman (2015) argues that terminology in such domains is not merely a matter of definition, but is shaped by socio-cognitive factors, including institutional norms, audience expectations, and interlingual mediation. In the Uzbek context, these dynamics have

SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 4 | April 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

produced a lexicon in flux—semantically rich but operationally unstable—underscoring the need for a unified framework for theatrical terminology development and pedagogical dissemination. This imbalance limits cross-cultural academic dialogue, complicates translation practices, and restricts access to international scholarship. Recent literature in terminology studies emphasizes the interplay between language, culture, and social identity, advocating for inclusivity and equity within specialized discourse communities. Cabré (2003) foregrounds the importance of cultural factors in terminological work, while Kageura (2002) elaborates on how terminology evolves within social frameworks. Temmerman (2015) further argues for a sociocognitive perspective that ensures terminologies account for diverse cultural realities and communicative practices.

1.2. Gaps in Current Literature

1.2.1. Terminology Studies in General

Although terminology studies have expanded considerably—particularly within scientific, technical, and legal disciplines - there remains a significant gap in the systematic study of terminology in the arts and humanities. Theatre terminology, especially in under-researched languages such as Uzbek, has received limited scholarly attention. Existing models and frameworks tend to prioritize domains with high standardization needs, such as medicine, law, and engineering, where terminological precision is tightly regulated. In contrast, the arts often involve more fluid, context-dependent terms that resist fixed definitions, calling for more adaptive and culturally sensitive terminological approaches.

1.2.2. English-Language Research on Theatre Terminology

In English-language scholarship, researchers such as Bennett (2012), McAuley (2009), and Zarrilli et al. (2013) have proposed comprehensive frameworks for analyzing theatrical discourse and performance terminology. Bennett's audience-centered model emphasizes reception theory and the dynamics between stage and spectator, while McAuley (2009) explores the spatial and semiotic dimensions of performance. Zarrilli et al. (2013) provide a historical and intercultural survey of theatrical traditions. However, these models are primarily grounded in Western theatrical paradigms and may fall short when applied to cross-cultural, non-Western, or post-Soviet contexts, where different ontologies of performance and culturally specific lexicons prevail. This epistemological gap highlights the need for more inclusive, context-sensitive frameworks tailored to languages and performance traditions like those in Uzbekistan.

1.2.3. Uzbek-Language Scholarship

In recent Uzbek linguistic and cultural studies, scholars have increasingly focused on the classification and historical development of terminology. Thematic categorization of Uzbek stage terms—grouped according to semantic fields such as performance roles, stage equipment, and dramatic genres—has emerged as a foundational method for analyzing terminological structure (Pardayev, 2020). This approach enables a clearer understanding of how terms function in specific theatrical contexts. Furthermore, diachronic studies have examined the evolution of performance-related vocabulary across different historical epochs in Uzbekistan. In particular, the Soviet era introduced a significant layer of Russian linguistic influence, which profoundly shaped theatrical discourse, terminology, and formal stage practice (Kozimova, 2023). Russian served not only as the medium of institutional and artistic communication, but also as the primary source of specialized theatrical vocabulary, leading to the adoption of terms such as *yashik*, *pardakalash*, and *tayyorlovchi;* these terms reflect their origin yet were morphologically adapted into Uzbek. Post-independence theatre, on the other hand, has seen an emerging emphasis on national identity, accompanied by efforts to reintegrate native terminology and decolonize artistic language. Such dual-method research aligns with broader theories of terminology development and lexical dynamics as discussed by Kageura (2002) and Temmerman (2015), who emphasize the socio-cognitive and descriptive dimensions of term formation. Taken together, these analytical approaches provide valuable insights into the cultural and linguistic underpinnings of Uzbek theatrical language. Yet these studies often lack in-depth semantic or contrastive perspectives, particularly with English counterparts. Recent translation studies, such as Sayfiddinova (2023), have discussed issues of equivalence between English and Uzbek in the arts domain, but do not focus specifically on theatre nor delve into lexical structures.

1.2.4. Lack of Corpus-Based Applications in Uzbek

While corpus-based methodologies are increasingly considered standard practice in terminological research (L'Homme, 2020), their application to Uzbek-language data - particularly in specialized domains such as performing arts - remains extremely limited or altogether absent. This lacuna reflects a broader digital divide in linguistic resource development between widely studied and under-resourced languages, and significantly hampers the ability to conduct empirical, data-driven analyses. The lack of annotated corpora, digitized scripts, and standardized lexical databases for Uzbek theatre terminology restricts comparative and descriptive research, as well as the development of translation tools and pedagogical materials.

This study aims to conduct a comparative analysis of Uzbek and English theatre terminology, focusing on term formation, semantic equivalence, and cultural-linguistic specificity. It addresses the following research questions:
What are the predominant strategies of term formation in Uzbek and English theatre discourse?

SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 4 | April 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

This study contributes to the following domains.

First, it advances theoretical terminology research by extending comparative analysis to an underrepresented language pair - Uzbek and English - and a domain that has received limited scholarly attention: theatre studies. By doing so, it challenges the dominance of scientific and technical fields in terminological theory and promotes greater linguistic inclusivity.

Second, the study informs pedagogical practice by offering terminological clarity and cross-linguistic insight for educators designing bilingual theatre curricula, especially in post-Soviet educational contexts. For example, institutions such as the Uzbekistan State Institute of Arts and Culture increasingly rely on multilingual resources when teaching stage direction, dramaturgy, and scenography. Yet, many foundational terms - such as rejissyorlik (directing), pyesa (play), or epizod (scene) - are inconsistently defined across textbooks, syllabi and performance practice. This inconsistency complicates translation, teaching, and script development processes.

Furthermore, the growing international collaboration in theatre education, including exchange programs with Russian, Korean, and Western European institutions, demands a more standardized, culturally sensitive, and pedagogically coherent theatrical lexicon in both Uzbek and English. This study addresses this need by mapping terminological correspondences, highlighting translation gaps, and proposing context-aware solutions.

Next, translation studies, by identifying equivalence gaps between Uzbek and English theatrical terminology and proposing culturally informed strategies to bridge them. As Pym (2010) emphasizes, translation equivalence is not merely about linguistic matching but involves socio-cultural negotiation and context-sensitive rendering. Furthermore, Baker (2018) highlights the role of conceptual and pragmatic equivalence in preserving meaning and function across languages, especially in specialized domains like theatre.

Sociolinguistic inquiry, by revealing how identity and ideology influence lexical choices in the post-Soviet linguistic landscape. In multilingual contexts such as Uzbekistan, vocabulary selection is often shaped not merely by communicative need, but by socio-political orientation, symbolic association, and institutional language policy.

METHODOLOGY

2.1. Research Design

This study adopts a qualitative comparative approach supported by descriptive and corpus-based analysis to investigate theatre-related terminology in Uzbek and English. Given the cultural and linguistic complexity of theatrical lexicons, the research relies on linguistic typology, contrastive terminology, and translation theory as interdisciplinary frameworks (Temmerman, 2015; L'Homme, 2020).

The design includes both synchronic and diachronic perspectives to analyze the development and usage of theatre terms. Synchronic analysis focuses on current terminological usage in contemporary academic and performance settings, while diachronic analysis explores historical trajectories and semantic shifts, particularly in Uzbek, influenced by Persian, Arabic, Russian, and English lexical layers (Kageura, 2002).

2.2. Data Collection

Data were collected from two main sources:

Primary data: Authentic texts such as theatre scripts, performance reviews, educational syllabi, and theatre lexicons in both English and Uzbek. English corpora included digital databases like the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) and British National Corpus (BNC). For Uzbek, data were manually compiled from official glossaries, dictionaries, and theatrical publications published between 1950 and 2023.

The secondary data consisted of peer-reviewed academic articles, monographs, and specialized translation dictionaries focusing on performance studies, cultural linguistics, and terminology. To ensure academic rigor and traceability, Scopus-indexed publications were prioritized, in line with established scholarly standards for data validity (Biber, 2020; Granger, Gilquin, & Meunier, 2015).

A total of 799 distinct terms (574 English, 225 Uzbek) were selected using purposive sampling, ensuring representation across genres (drama, comedy, tragedy), theatrical components (acting, staging, directing), and stylistic register (technical vs colloquial).

2.3. Analytical Framework and Methods

The study adopts a mixed-methods approach by integrating qualitative semantic analysis, contrastive terminological comparison, and descriptive statistical techniques. This triangulated methodology enables a multidimensional understanding of term usage, formation patterns, and cross-linguistic equivalence within the domain of Uzbek and English theatre discourse. In addition to textual analysis, data were drawn from bilingual theatre scripts, terminology databases, and expert interviews, thereby enhancing both the validity and cultural contextualization of the results.

SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 4 | April 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

2.3.1. Semantic Field Analysis

Theatre-related terms were systematically categorized into semantic fields, including performance, scenography, and dramaturgy. Each term was then analyzed in terms of denotation, connotation, and cultural referents, following terminological analysis frameworks outlined by Wüster (1991) and refined in recent sociocognitive models. Special attention was given to polysemy and metaphorical extensions within performative language. Terms such as blocking, fourth wall, and sahna orasi demonstrate how metaphor and specialized usage evolve within domain-specific discourse, requiring both semantic precision and cultural contextualization for accurate translation and pedagogical clarity.

2.3.2. Morphological Typology

Term formation processes were systematically compared across Uzbek and English, with attention to morphological and lexical mechanisms. In Uzbek, derivation and affixation are the primary strategies, particularly through the use of profession-related suffixes (e.g., aktyorlik, rejissyorlik). In contrast, English often employs compounding (stage manager) and conversion (stand-in) to coin new theatrical terms. Additionally, Uzbek exhibits significant lexical borrowing from Russian and English, either as direct loanwords (rol, dekoratsiya) or as semantic calques. These patterns reflect not only structural differences between the two languages but also historical and sociolinguistic influences on theatre discourse. As noted by Kageura (2002), term formation strategies are often shaped by sociopolitical and cultural forces, especially in postcolonial and post-Soviet linguistic environments. In the Uzbek context, the Soviet legacy continues to inform lexical choices in formal artistic discourse.

2.3.3. Translation and Equivalence Analysis

Drawing on translation theory frameworks, particularly Baker's (2018) model, the study assessed term-level equivalence across three dimensions: formal equivalence (a direct 1:1 lexical match), dynamic equivalence (functional or contextual approximation), and cultural substitution or semantic voids - instances where no clear target-language equivalent exists.

For example, in the Uzbek translation of Chekhov's "The Seagull", the term rejissyor is used consistently to render director, which reflects formal equivalence. In contrast, dynamic equivalence is observed in the translation of "method acting" in Stanislavsky-inspired performances, where ichki holatga kirish ("entering the internal state") is used - a functional but culturally mediated approximation.

More complex are culturally embedded terms such as doston and maqom, frequently appearing in Uzbek plays like Abdulla Qahhor's "O'tgan kunlar" or Erkin Vohidov's poetic dramas. These have no direct equivalents in English, and require paratextual strategies (e.g., footnotes or in-text explanation) to convey both their semantic and cultural weight.

This typology, applied to real-world theatre texts, facilitates a nuanced evaluation of translational asymmetry and underscores the limitations of conventional bilingual glossaries. It further reveals how theatrical translation must mediate between textual fidelity and cultural intelligibility in post-Soviet multilingual contexts.

2.5. Ethical Considerations

All textual sources used are in the public domain or were cited according to academic norms. No personal data were collected. This study complies with institutional research ethics standards and follows the principles of fair use and citation integrity.

RESULTS

This section presents the findings from the comparative analysis of Uzbek and English theatre terminology across lexical, semantic, morphological, and translational dimensions. The analysis draws upon 740 terms, extracted from both primary and secondary sources, and analyzed within a multilingual, multicultural framework.

3.1. Term Formation Patterns

A major result of this study reveals distinctive patterns in term formation between the two languages:
English terms heavily utilize compounding (37%) and conversion (22%), such as stage direction, run-through, or understudy. These structures often combine verbs and nouns or adjectives and nouns in flexible, concise formations. This supports previous findings on English's productive compounding capacity.

In the Uzbek theatrical lexicon, a significant proportion of terms are formed via morphological derivation using native suffixes - constituting approximately 44% - while loanwords, many of them from Russian, account for roughly 33% of the terminology. Examples include rejissyorlik, aktyorlik, dekoratsiya, and pyesa, which are either direct borrowings or semantic calques reflecting the pervasive linguistic influence of Russian during the Soviet era.

Interestingly, both languages occasionally apply metaphorical extensions (e.g., fourth wall in English, sahna orasi in Uzbek), but such figurative uses are more established and normalized in English discourse.

SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 4 | April 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

3.2. Semantic Equivalence and Disparity

Out of the 225 Uzbek terms analyzed:
61 terms (approximately 27%) had direct English equivalents with near-total semantic overlap (e.g., aktyor – actor, replika – replique/line).

52 terms (about 22%) exhibited partial or context-dependent equivalence, such as rejissyor vs director, where pragmatic usage in English may refer to both film and theatre, while Uzbek maintains more domain-specificity.

44 terms (19 %) revealed no clear English equivalents due to cultural or stylistic specificity (e.g., maqom, doston, lapar). These terms resist direct translation and often require descriptive or adaptive strategies, as per Baker's dynamic equivalence model (Baker, 2018).

The concept of cultural untranslatability defined as the inherent impossibility of achieving full equivalence between source and target languages due to culture-bound meanings is particularly salient in culturally embedded theatrical terms. This limitation is well documented in terminology scholarship (Temmerman, 2015; Pym, 2010) and underscores the constraints of conventional bilingual glossaries that prioritize linguistic over cultural fidelity.

3.3. Morphological Productivity and Borrowing Trends

Morphological analysis indicated that:
In Uzbek, derivational suffixes like -lik, -chi, -kor are highly productive (e.g., aktyorlik, rejissyorlik, dekorator), confirming previous observations in Uzbek linguistic morphology.

Loanwords in Uzbek showed both semantic convergence and shift. For example, dekoratsiya in Uzbek includes both scenic design and decoration, while in English decoration has a broader, non-theatrical sense.

Some borrowed theatrical terms in Uzbek have undergone phonological or morphological adaptation, for example, pauza from Russian пауза, which aligns with Uzbek phonotactic norms. Others, such as dekoratsiya or pyesa, remain virtually unchanged, reflecting an uneven process of linguistic domestication. This asymmetry is consistent with the translation procedures outlined by Vinay and Darbelnet (1995), who differentiate between "adaptation" and "borrowing" as distinct strategies in interlingual transfer. The selective domestication observed in Uzbek theatre terminology illustrates a hybridization process, where certain lexemes are nativized, while others retain their original foreign structure for perceived prestige or precision.

3.5. Challenges in Terminological Standardization

The study identified three key challenges:
Lack of consistent bilingual resources: Many Uzbek theatre glossaries are outdated or lack English equivalents, making them insufficient for academic or pedagogical use.

Cultural embeddedness of terms: Traditional performance genres (e.g., maqom, doston) challenge translatability and require paratextual support or explanatory footnotes.

Overlap and ambiguity in English terms: Terms like director, production, or stage are polysemous and vary across English dialects, complicating one-to-one mapping.

These findings echo broader terminological studies (Temmerman, 2015; L'Homme, 2020) that emphasize the need for domain-specific, multilingual ontologies rather than flat lists of equivalents.

DISCUSSION

The results of this study provide crucial insights into the structural, semantic, and cultural complexities underlying theatre terminology in both Uzbek and English. This section aims to contextualize the findings, compare them with existing literature, and outline the broader implications for terminological studies, translation practice, and intercultural communication.

4.1. Divergence in Terminological Systems

One of the most prominent findings is the systemic divergence in term formation and usage across the two languages. English, characterized by its high compounding productivity and syntactic flexibility (Bauer, 2003; Plag, 2018), favors brevity and modularity in theatrical terminology. In contrast, "Diachronic and thematic classification studies in Uzbek theatrical terminology have been empirically substantiated in recent decades. For instance, Kozimova (2024) provides a detailed thematic taxonomy of Uzbek theatre terms, organizing them by semantic fields and functional roles (e.g., performance roles, equipment, and genre). Earlier, Kozimova (2022) investigated the historical evolution of stage vocabulary across XV–XX centuries, paying particular attention to etymological origins and the adaptation of foreign terms in theatrical discourse. These differences are not merely linguistic but are deeply rooted in historical, sociopolitical, and educational factors that shaped each language's theatrical discourse.

SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 4 | April 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

This disparity resonates with observations made in other cross-linguistic terminological research. Temmerman (2015) emphasized that terminological variation is often embedded in local cognitive models, which reflect a community's knowledge organization and conceptualization practices. In the case of Uzbek, Soviet-era standardization and the dominance of Russian in formal domains have left a strong imprint on term formation, while English terminology evolved in tandem with institutionalized drama education and globalized media.

4.2. Equivalence and Untranslatability

The study confirms that exact equivalence between terms is the exception rather than the rule, especially when moving across languages with distinct cultural heritages. As seen in the findings, only 27% of Uzbek theatre terms had full semantic equivalents in English. The remaining terms exhibited either partial equivalence or cultural untranslatability, a phenomenon widely discussed in translation studies (Baker, 2018; Pym, 2010).

The category of culturally bound terms, such as *maqom*, *doston*, and *lapar*, underscores the limits of conventional bilingual glossaries and highlights the need for paratextual strategies, such as annotations, footnotes, or explicitation in theatre translation. Terminological and translation studies scholars have emphasized that paratexts play a critical role in mediating culture-specific items (Genette, 1997; Batchelor, 2018), serving as "thresholds of interpretation" that guide audiences through culturally embedded meanings.

For instance, in the Uzbek translation of "A Midsummer Night's Dream", the term *"fairy"* was rendered not with a direct equivalent but contextualized through the phrase *"pari, ruh"*, often supplemented by a footnote to clarify the folkloric differences. Similarly, when the term *maqom* appears in a translated script intended for English speaking audiences, it is frequently left untranslated and explained in a glossary or program note to preserve its deep cultural resonance and musical specificity. In the Russian-to-Uzbek stage adaptation of "The Cherry Orchard", the word *usad'ba* was translated as *asarli bog'li hovli*, and further clarified through set design and stage direction rather than direct lexical substitution. These examples illustrate how theatre translation must balance linguistic accuracy with cultural intelligibility, often through creative or multimodal paratextual solutions.

Moreover, dynamic equivalence strategies (e.g., adapting rejissyor as stage director rather than the generic director) are crucial in preventing semantic loss. These strategies also reaffirm the notion that functional adequacy, rather than formal symmetry, should be the primary goal in cross-linguistic terminology transfer.

4.3. Implications for Terminological Standardization

The inconsistencies and ambiguities identified in both languages, especially in Uzbek, highlight the need for updated, discipline-specific, multilingual terminological resources. Many existing Uzbek theatre glossaries are outdated, lack systematic classification, and often fail to include English equivalents.

Building domain-specific terminological ontologies, as proposed by L'Homme (2020) and Cabré (2003), could significantly enhance standardization efforts. These ontologies should be informed by corpus data and validated by domain experts, ensuring both linguistic accuracy and cultural appropriateness.

In addition, this study supports a move away from viewing terminology as static or universally fixed. Rather, following sociocognitive approaches (Temmerman, 2015), terminology should be seen as dynamically negotiated within specific discourse communities, especially in fields such as performing arts, where terminology intersects with aesthetics, tradition, and performance culture.

4.4. Corpus Methodology and Data Representation

The integration of corpus-based methods into this study offered significant advantages in identifying actual usage patterns, frequency, and collocational behavior of theatre terms. As McEnery and Hardie (2012) point out, corpus linguistics allows researchers to ground terminology analysis in empirical data, rather than relying solely on prescriptive sources.

However, challenges arose in compiling a balanced corpus for Uzbek due to the limited availability of digitized theatrical texts, which remains a barrier for computational linguistic research in under-resourced languages. This observation aligns with findings by Biber (2020), who emphasizes the disparity in corpus infrastructure across languages, and by Bird (2020), who highlights the digital marginalization of minority and low-resource languages in NLP contexts.

The discrepancies in term frequency and category distribution across the two corpora highlight broader questions about the institutionalization of theatrical discourse. English, supported by academic journals, standardized curricula, and online archives, offers more terminological stability and textual representation. Uzbek, while rich in oral traditions and cultural expressions, lacks centralized documentation, complicating terminological analysis and standardization efforts.

SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 4 | April 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

4.5. Interdisciplinary Contributions and Pedagogical Relevance

This study contributes not only to contrastive linguistics and terminology but also to translation studies, theatre pedagogy, and intercultural communication. By mapping linguistic and cultural asymmetries in theatrical discourse, it opens avenues for:
Designing bilingual educational materials for theatre departments in Uzbek universities.
Developing training modules for theatre translators and cultural mediators.
As emphasized by Granger et al. (2015), interdisciplinary studies are essential for capturing the complex interplay between language, culture, and cognition, particularly in domains with strong cultural embeddedness like theatre.

CONCLUSION

This study undertook a detailed comparative examination of theatre terminology in Uzbek and English, aiming to identify key structural, semantic, and cultural differences that influence term formation, usage, and translation. Utilizing corpus-based analysis, terminological theory, and interdisciplinary perspectives from translation and cultural studies, the research addressed both linguistic and extralinguistic factors that shape the theatrical lexicon in each language.

The analysis revealed that English theatre terminology is primarily characterized by syntactic economy and morphological productivity, especially through compounding, conversion, and metaphorical extension. In contrast, Uzbek theatre terms are shaped by derivational morphology, historical borrowing from Russian, and a strong influence of oral, folkloric, and traditional genres. These differences underscore the role of historical language contact, institutional traditions, and educational models in the development and stabilization of terminological systems.

One of the most important conclusions drawn from this research is the complexity of achieving cross-linguistic equivalence in specialized domains like theatre. While some terms exhibit near-perfect alignment (e.g., *actor – aktyor*), many others, particularly those tied to indigenous performance traditions, resist direct translation and instead demand contextual, functional, or descriptive strategies. This supports previous scholarship emphasizing that terminology cannot be viewed in isolation from culture and discourse.

Additionally, the study uncovered substantial terminological gaps and inconsistencies within existing Uzbek-language theatrical resources, highlighting an urgent need for updated bilingual glossaries and corpus-driven terminological databases. One of the most critical barriers is the lack of digitized theatrical texts in Uzbek, which significantly impedes corpus-based linguistic inquiry. This issue reflects broader concerns in digital linguistics about the uneven distribution of language resources and digital infrastructure. Such challenges align with global debates on the marginalization of under-resourced languages, which frequently face structural barriers in technological integration, lexicographic development, and the advancement of machine translation systems (Blokland & Cennamo, 2021). Addressing these disparities necessitates not only robust digitization initiatives but also targeted corpus-building and terminological standardization efforts specifically adapted to the nuances of Uzbek theatrical discourse.

From a theoretical standpoint, the findings validate the relevance of sociocognitive and functionalist approaches to terminology, which view terms as dynamic elements embedded in professional practice, cultural context, and social interaction. The study also demonstrates the value of interdisciplinary methodologies, combining linguistic analysis with insights from theatre studies, translation theory, and digital humanities.

Practically, this research offers valuable implications for:

1. The development of multilingual theatre education materials in Uzbek and English.
2. Training programs for translators and cultural mediators, particularly those working with dramatic and performative texts.
3. Policy initiatives aimed at preserving intangible cultural heritage through terminological documentation and translation.

Looking forward, future research might expand the present study by incorporating additional Turkic languages, exploring diachronic changes in theatrical terminology, or applying computational methods (e.g., term extraction and alignment algorithms) to build more robust cross-linguistic terminological corpora.

In sum, this research contributes to the broader fields of terminology studies, translation, and intercultural communication by revealing how deeply language, identity, and performance are intertwined in the lexicon of theatre. It affirms the need for linguistic equity, documentation, and accessibility in the global exchange of artistic and cultural knowledge.

Declaration of Interests Statement

☒ The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Data Availability Statement

The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article/supplementary material; further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author. Corresponding author is Zulaykho Usmanova.

SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 4 | April 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

REFERENCES

1. *Baker, M. (2018). In other words: A coursebook on translation (3rd ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315619187*
2. *Batchelor, K. (2018). Translation and Paratexts: Strategies for Theatre and Performance. Routledge/Taylor & Francis. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351110112*
3. *Bauer, L. (2003). Introducing linguistic morphology (2nd ed.). Edinburgh University Press.*
4. *Bennett, S. (2012). Theatre audiences: A theory of production and reception. Routledge. http://doi.org/10.1017/S0307883319000403*
5. *Berez-Kroeker, A. L., Gawne, L., Kung, S. S., Kelly, B. F., Heston, T., Holton, G., & Woodbury, A. C. (2018). Reproducible research in linguistics: A position statement on data citation and attribution in our field. Linguistics, 56(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1515/ling-2017-0032*
6. *Berez-Kroeker, A. L., McDonnell, B., & Koller, D. (2018). The state of language documentation at the intersection of digital technology and community engagement. Language Documentation & Conservation, 12, 1–15. https://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/handle/10125/24857*
7. *Biber, D., & Conrad, S. (2019). Register, genre, and style (2-nd edition). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108686136*
8. *Bird, S. (2020). Decolonising speech and language technology. Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics, 3504-3519.https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.coling-main.313*
9. *Blokland, R., & Cennamo, M. (2021). Linguistic minorities and the digital challenge: Language resources, visibility and viability. In M. Filppula, J. Klemola, & A. Nurmi (Eds.), Minority Languages in the Digital Age (pp. 45–67). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-59553-9_3*
10. *Cabré, M. T. (2003). Theories of terminology: Their description, prescription and explanation. Terminology, 9(2), 163–199. https://doi.org/10.1075/term.9.2.03cab*
11. *Carlson, M. (2014). Theories of the theatre: A historical and critical survey from the Greeks to the present. Cornell University Press.*
12. *Fishman, J. A. (1999). Handbook of language and ethnic identity. Oxford University Press.*
13. *Genette, G. (1997). Paratexts: Thresholds of interpretation. Cambridge University Press.*
14. *Granger, S., Gilquin, G., & Meunier, F. (2015). The Cambridge handbook of learner corpus research. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139649414*
15. *Himmelmann, N. P. (2018). Linguistic data types and the interface between language documentation and description. Language Documentation & Conservation, 12, 19–40. https://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/handle/10125/24797*
16. *Kageura, K. (2002). The dynamics of terminology: A descriptive theory of term formation and terminological growth. John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/tlrp.5*
17. *Kozimova, Z. I. (2022). Uzbek theatrical terms of the XVIII–XX centuries. Spectrum Journal of Innovation, Reforms and Development, 3, 11–14.*
18. *Kozimova, Z. I. (2023). The development of Uzbek theatre terminology in the 20th century. American Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Sciences, 13, 70–73. Retrieved from https://americanjournal.org/index.php/ajrhss/article/view/974*
19. *Kozimova, Z. I. (2024). Classification of terms related to Uzbek theater. Texas Journal of Philology, Culture and History, 37, 63–68. https://doi.org/10.62480/tjpch.2024.vol37.pp63-68*
20. *Laitin, D. (1998). Identity in Formation: The Russian-Speaking Populations in the Near Abroad. Cornell University Press.*
21. *L'Homme, M.-C. (2020). Lexical semantics for terminology: An introduction. John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/tlrp.20*
22. *McAuley, G. (2000). Space in performance: Making meaning in the theatre. University of Michigan Press.*
23. *McEnery, T., & Hardie, A. (2012). Corpus linguistics: Method, theory and practice. Cambridge University Press. www.cambridge.org/9780521547369*
24. *Pavis, P. (1998). Dictionary of the theatre: terms, concepts, and analysis. Toronto; Buffalo: University of Toronto Press.*
25. *Pavlenko, A. (2008). Multilingualism in post-Soviet countries: Language revival, language removal, and sociolinguistic theory. International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050802271517*
26. *Plag, I. (2018). Word-formation in English (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316771402*
27. *Pym, A. (2010). Exploring translation theories. Routledge. http://doi.org/10.4324/9780203869291*
28. *Sayfiddinova, K. (2023). Linguocultural analysis of translation of art terminology (in English and Uzbek languages). International Journal of Social Science & Interdisciplinary Research, 12(Special Issue: April), 96–97.*
29. *Temmerman, R. (2015). Towards new ways of terminology description: The sociocognitive approach. John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/tlrp.3*
30. *Vinay, J. P., & Darbelnet, J. (1995). Comparative stylistics of French and English: A methodology for translation. John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.11*
31. *Wüster, E. (1991). Einführung in die allgemeine Terminologielehre und terminologische Lexikographie. UNESCO.*
32. *Zarrilli, P. B., McConachie, B., Williams, G. J., & Sorgenfrei, C. F. (2013). Theatre histories: An introduction. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203879177*