BG Pulse Journal USA
ISSN:1947-2536 http://www.bgpulseusa.com/index.php/bg

THE FORMATION AND ROLE OF OCCUPATIONAL AND CRAFT TERMINOLOGY IN UZBEK DIALECTS

To‘ychiyeva Marjona Javlon qizi
Shahrisabz State Pedagogical Institute
Department of Uzbek Language and Literature
E-mail: javlonovnamarjona24@gamil.com
doi:https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24028680

Abstract: This article examines how occupational and craft terminology has developed in Uzbek dialects, with particular attention to its lexical and semantic properties, historical evolution, and place in regional speech. It considers the emergence of vocabulary associated with traditional crafts, farming, animal husbandry, pottery, blacksmithing, carpentry, and weaving, as well as potential differences across dialects and connections with local social and cultural life. The discussion shows how historical practices, everyday work, ethnocultural contacts, and regional linguistic features have shaped this vocabulary. It also considers the relationship between occupational terminology and the literary language, and the contribution of such terminology to the preservation of material and intangible cultural heritage.

Key words: Uzbek dialects; occupational and craft terminology; dialect vocabulary; term formation; lexical-semantic features.

INTRODUCTION

The language of any community develops in close connection with its history, social life, everyday practices, and forms of work. Its vocabulary is more than a means of daily communication: it also preserves knowledge of the past, cultural customs, and accumulated occupational experience. Regional dialects are particularly valuable in this respect. They often retain words and expressions that are uncommon in present-day standard usage but remain meaningful in the lives of local speakers. Occupational and craft terms form a distinctive part of this lexical heritage. The long history of farming, livestock breeding, pottery, jewellery making, blacksmithing, carpentry, embroidery, and weaving among Uzbek communities has left a recognizable imprint on the language. Names for tools, raw materials, production processes, finished goods, and practitioners gradually developed into a specialized lexical layer. Some became widely known throughout the speech community; others remained associated with particular localities or groups of artisans.

Uzbek dialects differ in their historical development, geographical distribution, and phonetic, grammatical, and lexical characteristics. Differences may also be found in occupational terminology: a tool or craft product may be known by one name in one locality and by another elsewhere. In other cases, the same word may have different pronunciations or meanings across regions. S. Ashirboyev’s theoretical work on Uzbek dialect vocabulary provides a useful basis for examining these differences [1]. As traditional crafts adopt new technologies and new occupations emerge, occupational vocabulary continues to change. At the same time, the names of older tools and work processes may gradually disappear from everyday speech. This makes the documentation, explanation, and linguistic study of local occupational terms increasingly important.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Within Uzbek linguistics, the study of dialects and occupational vocabulary draws on dialectology, lexicology, terminology studies, and ethnolinguistics. Two important theoretical

points of reference are S. Ashirboyev's Uzbekdialektologiyasi (Uzbek Dialectology) and H. Dadaboyev's Uzbekterminologiyasi (Uzbek Terminology).

Ashirboyev discusses the emergence, classification, geographical distribution, and phonetic, grammatical, and lexical features of Uzbek dialects. A notable feature of his approach is that dialects are treated not simply as alternative pronunciations of the literary language but as linguistic varieties with their own histories and structures. This perspective provides a foundation for investigating the territorial distribution of local words, their differences from standard usage, and their historical layers. Applied to craft vocabulary, it suggests that occupational naming practices are linked to the kinds of work carried out in particular communities. Areas with established pottery traditions, for example, may maintain a rich vocabulary for ceramic objects, production techniques, and tools; comparable patterns may occur in regions where livestock breeding or agriculture has been especially important.

Ashirboyev's work is useful here because it offers geographical and linguistic criteria for the analysis of dialect material. Its broad dialectological scope also points to the need for more focused research on the terminology of individual crafts.

In Uzbek terminology, Dadaboyev examines the emergence, development, lexical-semantic properties, and organization of terminological systems. He relates their historical development to the language's internal resources, word formation, borrowing, and social needs [2]. His approach helps distinguish specialized occupational terms from ordinary words and identify the sources of their formation. When analysing a term, it is necessary to consider the occupational field in which it is used, the concept it denotes, and the extent to which its meaning is specialized. Bringing Dadaboyev's work together with Ashirboyev's dialectological perspective makes it possible to consider craft vocabulary from two related angles: its function in expressing occupational concepts and its particular forms and meanings in regional speech.

V. V. Reshetov and Sh. Shoabdurahmonov's Uzbekdialektologiyasi also addresses the comparative study of phonetic, morphological, and lexical features of vernacular varieties. It is a relevant source for identifying distinctions among Uzbek dialects and investigating their relationship with the literary language [3].

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Studying the development and use of occupational and craft terminology in Uzbek dialects requires several complementary linguistic approaches. This article uses descriptive, comparative, lexical-semantic, historical-etymological, and linguocultural analysis. Its theoretical foundation is a synthesis of scholarly discussions in Uzbek dialectology and terminology studies.

The descriptive approach is used to examine the meanings, structures, and usage of occupational words. Comparative analysis provides a framework for identifying similarities and differences between occupational names in the literary language and those encountered in regional speech. The work of Sh. Shoabdurahmonov on the relationship between the literary language and vernacular dialects is particularly relevant to this approach [4].

For lexical-semantic analysis, occupational terms are grouped according to their referents: practitioners, work tools, production processes, raw materials, and finished products. This classification clarifies the internal composition of occupational vocabulary and helps reveal how its constituent groups are related.

The historical-etymological approach considers the structure of selected occupational names, their derivational patterns, and the role of historical borrowing. Linguocultural interpretation, meanwhile, focuses on the links between occupational words, local ways of life, traditional crafts, and the transmission of practical knowledge between generations. The study is theoretical and

analytical; it does not report new dialectological fieldwork or survey statistics. Accordingly, the general occupational words discussed below are illustrative examples of lexical structure and meaning, not independently verified dialectisms belonging to specific localities.

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Occupational and craft terms in Uzbek developed in connection with the historical organization of work, economic relations, and local cultural practices. As occupations and crafts evolved, they generated their own tools, production techniques, and finished products. The need to name these objects and activities contributed to the growth of specialized vocabulary. A defining feature of such vocabulary is its direct connection with practical work. In pottery, for instance, charx (potter's wheel), xum (large storage jar), ko'za (jug), and tandir (clay oven) denote objects associated with craft production. Weaving uses urchuq (spindle), tanda (warp), arqoq (weft), and dastgoh (loom or work apparatus), while agriculture includes omoch (plough), ketmon (hoe), and egat (furrow). Some of these words are also familiar in ordinary speech. Within occupational communication, however, their meanings are often more precise and refer to particular tools, objects, or stages of production.

Local dictionaries are essential for investigating the territorial features of occupational vocabulary. T. Nafasov's "Qashqadaryo O'zbek xalq so'zlari" (Folk Words of the Uzbek Speech of Qashqadaryo), for example, provides material relevant to the vocabulary of the Qashqadaryo region. Such dictionaries help researchers identify locally preserved words, clarify their meanings, and compare them with equivalents in the literary language [5]. Consulting regional sources is especially valuable when studying craft-related vocabulary in Shahrisabz, Kitob, and neighbouring areas.

Word formation is another important aspect of occupational terminology. Many Uzbek names of practitioners are derived forms: temirchi (blacksmith), etikchi (shoemaker), bo'yoqchi (dyer), misgar (coppersmith), and etikdo'z (shoemaker), for example. Their structure reflects the contribution of Turkic derivational patterns alongside historically borrowed elements. Occupational vocabulary is also shaped by semantic transfer, narrowing, and specialization. An everyday word can acquire a technical meaning in a particular craft. The Uzbek word tish, for instance, ordinarily denotes a human or animal tooth but is also used for the cutting projections of a saw or the tooth-like parts of a mechanism. This illustrates the extension of an existing word to a specialized domain through perceived similarity.

The main lexical-semantic groups discussed in the article can be summarized as follows. The table is a descriptive classification of the examples in the text rather than a statistical account or a claim that every item is restricted to a particular dialect.

Table 1.

Illustrative classification of occupational and craft vocabulary[1]

Semantic group	Uzbek examples	Meaning or occupational function
Craft practitioners	temirchi; misgar; etikdo'z	Blacksmith; coppersmith; shoemaker
Tools and equipment	charx; urchuq; ketmon	Potter's wheel; spindle; hoe
Materials / components	tanda; arqoq	Warp and weft in weaving

[1] Compiled by the author based on the theoretical approaches to Uzbek dialectology and terminology presented in S. Ashirboyev's O'zbek dialektologiyasi (2016) and H. Dadaboyev's O'zbek terminologiyasi (2020). The classification is illustrative and does not represent findings from an independent field survey.

Products and objects	xum; ko‘za; tandir	Storage jar; jug; clay oven
Work-related forms	egat; tish	Furrow; “tooth” in a technical sense

M. Mirzayev’s studies in Uzbek dialectology likewise emphasize the linguistic properties of vernacular speech. This line of scholarship is relevant to comparing regional forms, describing their lexical features, and establishing their relationship with the standard language [6]. For occupational terminology, analysis must therefore extend beyond dictionary definitions to include where a word is used, how it is pronounced, and the working context in which it occurs.

Historical language contact also influenced the formation of craft terminology. Words such as zargar (jeweller), duradgor (carpenter), misgar (coppersmith), and etikdo‘z (shoemaker) reflect patterns of word formation that arose or spread at different periods. They indicate that occupational vocabulary developed not only through local practices but also through economic and cultural contact with other communities. Some historically borrowed forms have become so well established that speakers now regard them as ordinary parts of Uzbek vocabulary. Classification of the dialects is equally important when examining geographical distribution. X. Doniyorov’s work on the classification of Uzbek dialects provides one theoretical basis for identifying similarities and distinctions among them [7]. The conventional differentiation of Karluk, Kipchak, and Oghuz dialect groupings should also be considered in lexical comparison. Nevertheless, determining whether a particular occupational word belongs to a specific dialect requires documented regional evidence and examples of actual speech.

Occupational vocabulary also carries cultural meaning. Some words associated with traditional crafts convey more than the name of an object or activity; they evoke forms of expertise, inherited practices, and social values. In a workshop, for example, ustoz (master or mentor), shogird (apprentice), hunar (craft or skill), and dastgoh (work equipment) form part of a connected set of concepts. Together they express relationships involved in teaching a craft, passing on knowledge, and maintaining a culture of work.

Technological change is altering the ways in which a number of traditional occupations are practised. Consequently, the names of once-common tools may fall out of use, while new technical expressions become widespread. This reinforces the need to record occupational vocabulary in regional speech, explain its meanings, and preserve it in dictionaries and other linguistic resources.

Several conclusions follow from the theoretical analysis. First, occupational and craft vocabulary constitutes a historically developed lexical layer closely connected with the working lives of Uzbek communities. Second, word formation, semantic specialization, and historical borrowing all contribute to its development. Third, geographical research on this vocabulary must distinguish widely used occupational expressions from genuine dialectisms. Fourth, craft terms are an important linguistic resource for studying cultural heritage and traditional economic activity. Recording a term’s form and meaning is therefore not sufficient: its regional distribution, occupational function, historical usage, and relationship with the literary language should also be considered. The lexicological framework presented in H. Jamolxonov’s Hozirgi uzbekadabiy tili (Modern Uzbek Literary Language) provides a theoretical basis for considering word meaning, domain of use, and position within the lexicon [8].

CONCLUSION

This study has examined the close relationship between occupational terminology in Uzbek dialects and the historical development, traditional livelihoods, and sociocultural experience of Uzbek communities. Craft vocabulary forms an important part of the lexicon because it reflects accumulated practical knowledge, inherited techniques, and everyday ways of life. The analysis

suggests that internal linguistic processes, particularly derivation and semantic development, have worked alongside historical borrowing and local occupational needs in shaping this terminology. Some expressions are widespread across Uzbek, whereas others may remain associated with individual regions or professional settings.

Research into the geographical characteristics of occupational vocabulary must carefully distinguish everyday words, specialized terms, and dialectisms. It would be misleading to classify every craft expression as dialect-specific without supporting evidence. Reliable attribution requires regional speech material, comparative dictionaries, and direct observation. Moreover, as production technologies change, the range of use of certain traditional terms may contract. This makes systematic documentation increasingly urgent. Future studies would benefit from region-by-region surveys, explanatory dictionaries of occupational vocabulary, and more detailed ethnolinguistic investigation.

In short, occupational and craft terminology in Uzbek dialects forms a valuable lexical record of the language's historical memory, the population's working culture, and the distinctive features of regional speech. Studied with appropriate linguistic evidence, these expressions can contribute both to Uzbek dialectology and terminology studies and to the preservation of cultural heritage.

REFERENCES

1. Ashirboyev, S. (2016). Uzbek dialectology. Tashkent: Navro‘z. 136 pp.
2. Dadaboyev, H. (2020). Uzbek terminology. Tashkent: Yoshlar nashriyot uyi. 136 pp.
3. Reshetov, V. V., & Shoabdurahmonov, Sh. (1978).Uzbek dialectology Tashkent: O‘qituvchi. 232 pp.
4. Shoabdurahmonov, Sh. (1962). The Uzbek literary language and Uzbek folk dialects. Tashkent: Fan.
5. Nafasov, T. (2011). Folk words of Qashqadaryo Uzbek, Vol. 1. Tashkent: Muharrir. 468 pp.
6. Mirzayev, M. (1977Dialectology of the Uzbek language. Tashkent: O‘qituvchi.
7. Doniyorov, X. (1979). Classification of Uzbek folk dialects. Tashkent: Fan.
8. Jamolxonov, H. (2005). Modern Uzbek literary language. Tashkent: Talqin.