YANGI RENESSANS

ILMIY JURNALI

2026/2

YANGI RENESSANS

ILMIY JURNALI
TO'PLAMI

3 - JILD, 2 - SON
2026

Google Scholar · doi digital object identifier · zenodo

ADVANCED SCIENCE INDEX · OpenAIRE · Academic Resource Index ResearchBib

www.innoworld.net

O'ZBEKISTON-2026

Comparative Typological Classification of Applied Art Terminology:
The Case of English and Uzbek

Urazova Madina Safarboyevna
GulSU, +998972484634, madinaurazova79@gmail.com

Abstract. This article examines the comparative typological classification of applied art terminology in English and Uzbek. The study analyzes terminological units according to their semantic, structural, etymological, and functional characteristics. By comparing the linguistic mechanisms used in both languages, the research highlights similarities and differences in word formation, borrowing processes, and cultural specificity within applied art vocabulary. The findings demonstrate that Uzbek terminology largely relies on affixation and historical lexical layers, while English tends to employ compound structures and internationally standardized terms.

Keywords: applied art, terminology, comparative linguistics, typology, Uzbek language, English language, word formation.

Introduction. Applied art represents a sphere of artistic activity that combines aesthetic value with practical function. As a specialized domain, it possesses a distinct terminological system reflecting cultural traditions, material practices, and historical development. Comparative typological analysis of terminology allows us to identify structural patterns and linguistic strategies in different languages.

This article focuses on applied art terminology in English and Uzbek, aiming to classify terms according to semantic, morphological, etymological, and functional criteria.

Methodology

The research employs comparative, descriptive, and typological methods. Terminological units related to crafts, decorative arts, materials, techniques, and design principles were selected from dictionaries and academic sources in both languages. The analysis is conducted according to the following criteria:

1. Semantic classification
2. Structural (morphological) classification
3. Etymological classification
4. Functional classification

1. Semantic Classification
1.1 Terms Denoting Materials

In both languages, a significant group of terms refers to the materials used in applied arts.

Uzbek	English
kulolchilik	ceramics
zargarlik	jewelry
yogʻoch oʻymakorligi	wood carving
kashtachilik	embroidery

In Uzbek, material-based terms are often derived using suffixes such as -chilik* and *-garlik*, indicating profession or activity. In English, independent lexical units or compound constructions are typically used.

1.2 Terms Denoting Techniques and Processes

Uzbek	English
o'yma	carving
quyma	casting
to'qish	weaving
naqsh solish	ornamentation

English frequently uses gerunds (*-ing* forms) to denote artistic processes, whereas Uzbek often forms deverbal nouns through affixation.

 1.3 Terms Denoting Products

Some applied art terms refer directly to objects:

Uzbek	English Equivalent
do'ppi	traditional Uzbek skullcap
ko'za	jug / ceramic vessel
bilaguzuk	bracelet

These units often reflect national-cultural specificity and may lack exact equivalents in English.

 2. Structural (Morphological) Classification

2.1 Simple Terms

* Uzbek: naqsh (ornament), rang (color)

* English: art, glaze, form

 2.2 Derived Terms

Uzbek frequently uses derivational suffixes:

* kulol + chilik → kulolchilik

* zargar + lik → zargarlik

English derivation involves suffixes such as:

* decorate → decoration

* create → creation

2.3 Compound Terms

English widely uses compound constructions:

* applied arts

* decorative art

* folk crafts

Uzbek also forms compound expressions:

* amaliy san'at

* badiiy bezak

Typologically, English shows a stronger tendency toward nominal compounds, while Uzbek relies more on affixation.

3. Etymological Classification

3.1 Native Layer

Uzbek:

* o'yma (carving)

* to'qish (weaving)

English:

* craft

* wood

* clay

3.2 Borrowed Terminology

Uzbek contains several borrowed layers:

* Arabic: san'at (art), naqqosh (painter)

* Persian: zargar (jeweler), rang (color)

* International (European): dizayn (design), ornament

English terminology includes:

* French borrowings: design, jewelry

* Latin origin: ornament, composition

* Greek origin: ceramics

This demonstrates that both languages have developed applied art terminology through historical borrowing processes.

4. Functional Classification

4.1 Theoretical Terms

* composition

* symmetry

* proportion

* rhythm

These are largely international terms shared by both languages.

4.2 Practical (Professional) Terms

Uzbek:

* qolip (mold)

* sir berish (glazing)

* pardozlash (finishing)

English:

* molding

* glazing

* polishing

4.3 Ethnocultural Terms

Uzbek:

* islimiy (floral ornament)

* girih (geometric pattern)

* atlas (traditional silk fabric)

* adras (ikat fabric)

Such terms often require descriptive translation in English.

Discussion. The comparative typological analysis reveals several important distinctions:

1. Uzbek terminology primarily develops through affixation and reflects strong historical lexical layering.

2. English terminology relies more heavily on compounding and internationally standardized vocabulary.

3. English often uses gerund forms to denote processes, while Uzbek uses nominal derivation.

4. Many Uzbek applied art terms are culturally specific and lack direct equivalents in English.

5. Both languages incorporate significant borrowed terminology from classical languages.

Conclusion. Applied art terminology in English and Uzbek demonstrates both universal and language-specific typological features. While English shows structural compactness through compounds and international vocabulary, Uzbek reflects agglutinative morphology and rich historical stratification. Comparative analysis enhances understanding of terminological systems and contributes to cross-cultural studies in art and linguistics.

Future research may focus on corpus-based analysis, translation challenges, and terminological standardization in applied art discourse.

REFERENCE

1. Comrie, Bernard (1989). Language Universals and Linguistic Typology: Syntax and Morphology. University of Chicago Press.
2. Croft, William (2003). Typology and Universals (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
3. Wüster, Eugen (1979). Introduction to the General Theory of Terminology and Terminological Lexicography. Springer.
4. Sager, Juan C. (1990). A Practical Course in Terminology Processing. John Benjamins.
5. Crystal, David (2008). A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics (6th ed.). Blackwell. English Linguistics & Word Formation
6. Bauer, Laurie (1983). English Word-Formation. Cambridge University Press.
7. Uzbek Linguistics & Typology Reshetov, V. V. (1966). The Uzbek Language. Moscow: Nauka. Sodiqov, A. (1980). Hozirgi o'zbek tili leksikologiyasi. Tashkent. Abdurahmonov, F. (1996). O'zbek tili grammatikasi. Tashkent.
   12. Applied Arts & Art Terminology The Oxford Dictionary of Art and Artists (2015). Oxford University Press. UNESCO (2003). Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage.
13. The Grove Encyclopedia of Decorative Arts (2006). Oxford University Press. Denny, Walter B. (2004). Islamic Art. Laurence King Publishing.
14. Uzbek Applied Arts & Cultural Studies Pugachenkova, Galina (1987). The Art of Uzbekistan. Tashkent. Academy of Arts of Uzbekistan (various publications on traditional crafts). O'zbek xalq amaliy san'ati (Various editions). Tashkent. National Institute of Art and Design named after Kamoliddin Behzod – Academic publications on applied arts terminology.
15. Madina, U. (2022). Linguacultural peculiarities of phraseological units denoting to human character and appearance in English and uzbek languages.