

Article

Typological Groups of Terminology in Applied Art: A Comparative and Structural Analysis

Urazova Madina Safarboyevna*¹

1. GulSU

* Correspondence: madinaurazova79@gmail.com

Abstract: Terminology in applied art represents a complex and multilayered system shaped by historical development, cultural traditions, material technologies, and artistic practices. The present study explores the typological groups of applied art terminology from structural, semantic, and functional perspectives. The research aims to classify applied art terms into systematic typological categories and to identify their linguistic and conceptual characteristics. The study applies comparative, structural, and descriptive methods to analyze terminological units related to materials, techniques, ornamentation, tools, and stylistic features. The findings demonstrate that applied art terminology forms an organized system where typological grouping reflects both linguistic structure and professional conceptualization. The article contributes to the development of terminological studies in applied art and provides a framework for further interdisciplinary research.

Keywords: applied art terminology, typology, classification, semantic structure, professional lexicon, comparative analysis.

1. Introduction

Applied art occupies a special position within artistic and cultural studies because it combines aesthetic value with practical function. Unlike purely decorative fine arts, applied art integrates utility, craftsmanship, and artistic expression. As a result, its terminology reflects both material production processes and symbolic cultural meanings[1].

The study of terminology in applied art is particularly important in the context of globalization, where traditional craft vocabulary interacts with international professional discourse. A systematic typological classification of applied art terms allows researchers to understand how linguistic structures represent artistic knowledge[2].

This article seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. What typological groups can be identified within applied art terminology?
2. How are these groups structured semantically and functionally?
3. What linguistic features distinguish applied art terms from general vocabulary?

Terminology as a scientific discipline has been widely studied in linguistic theory. Scholars such as laid the foundations of General Terminology Theory, emphasizing systematic classification and conceptual precision. Later developments in socioterminology and cognitive terminology expanded this approach by considering contextual and cultural factors[3].

Citation: Safarboyevna U. M. Typological Groups of Terminology in Applied Art: A Comparative and Structural Analysis. International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics 2026, 5(2), 16-20.

Received: 10th Nov 2025

Revised: 11th Dec 2025

Accepted: 14th Jan 2026

Published: 23th Feb 2026



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

In art studies, terminology has been examined in relation to stylistic periods, techniques, and materials. However, applied art terminology remains less systematized compared to other specialized domains such as medicine or law. This gap highlights the necessity of typological analysis[4].

The research is based on:

1. Descriptive linguistic analysis
2. Comparative terminological classification
3. Structural-semantic grouping
4. Contextual analysis of professional discourse

The corpus includes terminological units related to ceramics, textile art, wood carving, metalwork, embroidery, and ornamental design. Terms were analyzed according to structural form (simple, compound, derived), semantic field, and professional function[5].

Theoretical Framework of Typological Classification

Typology in terminology refers to grouping lexical units according to shared structural or semantic features. In applied art, typological grouping reflects:

1. Material-based classification
2. Technique-based classification
3. Tool-related terminology
4. Ornament and design terminology
5. Functional and stylistic terminology

These categories form interconnected subsystems within the broader terminological field.

2. Research Methodology

The study adopts a qualitative and interdisciplinary research design aimed at identifying and systematizing typological groups within applied art terminology. The methodological framework combines structural-linguistic, semantic, and comparative approaches to ensure a comprehensive analysis of terminological units.

The empirical material consists of terminological items collected from academic publications in art studies, glossaries of applied art, museum catalogues, and professional craft descriptions. The corpus includes terms related to ceramics, textile production, wood carving, metalwork, embroidery, and ornamental design.

A structural analysis was conducted to classify terms according to their morphological formation (simple, derived, compound, and multi-component units). Semantic grouping was applied to determine conceptual fields such as material, technique, tools, ornamentation, and stylistic function. Comparative analysis allowed the identification of cross-category relationships and functional overlaps between terminological groups.

The descriptive method was used to interpret how terminological units operate within professional discourse and reflect cognitive structuring of artistic knowledge. The research ensures conceptual consistency and analytical clarity through systematic classification procedures.

3. Results and discussion

One of the most fundamental typological groups includes terms derived from materials. Materials determine both technique and aesthetic characteristics.

Examples include:

1. clay-based terminology (ceramic, terracotta, porcelain)

2. textile-based terminology (silk, cotton weave, tapestry)
3. wood-based terminology (oak carving, lacquered wood)
4. metal-based terminology (bronze casting, engraving)

Material-based terms often function as primary classifiers in professional discourse. Structurally, they are frequently compound or attributive constructions (e.g., “hand-woven silk”, “glazed ceramic surface”)[6].

Technique-Based Terminological Groups

Technique-based terminology reflects procedural knowledge. This group includes:

1. weaving
2. carving
3. casting
4. glazing
5. embossing
6. dyeing
7. engraving

These terms are predominantly verbal nouns and process-oriented lexemes. They represent dynamic aspects of applied art production. From a typological perspective, technique-based terms form a productive derivational group. Many are formed through suffixation (-ing, -tion) or through compound constructions (hand-carved, machine-embroidered)[7].

4. Tool-Related Terminology

Tool terminology constitutes another typological group. Tools are mediators between material and technique.

Examples include:

1. loom
2. chisel
3. spindle
4. mold
5. needle
6. carving knife

This group typically consists of concrete nouns with stable semantic reference. Unlike abstract stylistic terms, tool terminology demonstrates low polysemy and high referential precision[8].

5. Ornament and Design Terminology

Ornament-related terminology is semantically rich and culturally marked.

It includes:

1. geometric pattern
2. floral motif
3. arabesque
4. medallion design
5. border composition

These terms often function symbolically and may reflect national traditions. Ornament terminology frequently intersects with cultural semiotics[9].

Functional and Stylistic Terminology

This group includes terms that describe purpose and artistic style:

1. decorative
2. utilitarian
3. traditional

4. contemporary
5. minimalist
6. folk-inspired

Stylistic terms are evaluative and may demonstrate semantic flexibility depending on cultural context[10].

6. Structural Typology of Applied Art Terms

From a linguistic perspective, applied art terminology may be classified into:

1. Simple terms (loom, clay)
2. Derived terms (ornamental, decorative)
3. Compound terms (wood carving, metal casting)
4. Terminological phrases (handcrafted ceramic bowl)

Compound and multi-component terms dominate professional discourse due to their descriptive precision[11].

7. Comparative Perspective

In comparative analysis, applied art terminology shows[12]:

1. High correlation between material and technique
2. Frequent metaphorical extensions in ornament terminology
3. International borrowings (e.g., “arabesque”, “lacquer”)

Globalization encourages standardization, yet local traditions preserve culturally specific terms[13].

The typological grouping of applied art terminology demonstrates that the system is not random but conceptually organized. Each typological group corresponds to a particular cognitive domain: material knowledge, procedural knowledge, instrumental knowledge, or aesthetic categorization[14].

The interconnection between groups confirms the systemic nature of applied art terminology. For example, a single artifact may combine material-based, technique-based, and stylistic terms simultaneously[15].

8. Conclusion

Applied art terminology forms a structured and multi-layered system that can be classified into clear typological groups: material-based, technique-based, tool-related, ornament-related, and stylistic-functional terminology. Each group reflects a specific aspect of artistic production and professional knowledge.

The study confirms that typological classification enhances terminological clarity and supports interdisciplinary research in linguistics and art studies. Further research may focus on cross-linguistic comparison and digital terminological databases.

REFERENCES

1. E. Wüster, Introduction to the General Theory of Terminology and Terminological Lexicography. Vienna, Austria: Springer, 1979.
2. M. T. Cabré, Terminology: Theory, Methods and Applications. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins, 1999.
3. J. C. Sager, A Practical Course in Terminology Processing. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins, 1990.
4. E. Wüster, Introduction to the General Theory of Terminology and Terminological Lexicography. Vienna, Austria: Springer, 1999.

5. M. T. Cabré, *Terminology: Theory, Methods and Applications*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins, 1990.
6. J. C. Sager, *A Practical Course in Terminology Processing*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins, 2000.
7. R. Temmerman, *Towards New Ways of Terminology Description: The Sociocognitive Approach*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins, 2007.
8. R. Temmerman, "Terminology and specialized communication," *Terminology*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 145–167, 2005.
9. T. van Leeuwen, *Introducing Social Semiotics*. London, U.K.: Routledge, 2010.
10. G. Kress, *Multimodality: A Social Semiotic Approach to Contemporary Communication*. London, U.K.: Routledge, 2010.
11. H. E. Felber, *Terminology Manual*. Paris, France: UNESCO, 1984.
12. S. E. Wright and G. Budin, *Handbook of Terminology Management*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins, 1997.
13. K. Ahmad, "Terminology and knowledge engineering," *Computers and the Humanities*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 215–231, 1999.
14. J. Humbley, "New trends in terminology," *Terminology*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 1–15, 2001.
15. D. Faber, *A Cognitive Linguistics View of Terminology and Specialized Language*. Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter, 2012.