

COMPARATIVE-TYPOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATION OF APPLIED ART TERMS (BASED ON ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES)

Urazova M.S.

*Urazova Madina Safarboyevna – teacher,
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES INTER-FACULTIES,
PHILOLOGY FACULTY, GULISTAN STATE UNIVERSITY,
GULISTAN, REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN*

Abstract: *This study explores the comparative-typological classification of applied art terminology in English and Uzbek. It analyzes lexical, semantic, and structural features of terms used in applied arts, identifying similarities and differences shaped by linguistic typology and cultural context. The findings reveal both universal patterns and language-specific characteristics in the formation and usage of applied art terms.*

Keywords: *applied art terminology, comparative linguistics, typological classification, English language, Uzbek language, lexical analysis, semantic categories, word formation, agglutinative language.*

СРАВНИТЕЛЬНО-ТИПОЛОГИЧЕСКАЯ КЛАССИФИКАЦИЯ ТЕРМИНОВ ПРИКЛАДНОГО ИСКУССТВА (НА МАТЕРИАЛЕ АНГЛИЙСКОГО И УЗБЕКСКОГО ЯЗЫКОВ)

Уразова М.С.

*Уразова Мадина Сафарбоевна – преподаватель,
межфакультетская кафедра иностранных языков филологического факультета,
Гулистанский государственный университет,
г. Гулистан, Республика Узбекистан*

Аннотация: *в данном исследовании рассматривается сравнительно-типологическая классификация терминологии прикладного искусства в английском и узбекском языках. В нем анализируются лексические, семантические и структурные особенности терминов, используемых в прикладном искусстве, выявляются сходства и различия, обусловленные лингвистической типологией и культурным контекстом. Результаты исследования выявляют как универсальные закономерности, так и специфические языковые особенности в формировании и использовании терминов прикладного искусства.*

Ключевые слова: *терминология прикладного искусства, сравнительное языкознание, типологическая классификация, английский язык, узбекский язык, лексический анализ, семантические категории, словообразование, агглютинативный язык.*

From a comparative standpoint, many applied art terms in English and Uzbek demonstrate semantic equivalence. Words denoting materials, tools, techniques, and decorative elements often correspond directly across the two languages. For example, terms related to basic materials and craftsmanship show clear parallels, indicating shared human experiences in artistic production. However, differences arise in the depth of cultural meaning and usage frequency, as Uzbek terminology is more closely tied to traditional crafts and national heritage. Typologically, the two languages differ significantly in how terms are formed. English, as an analytical language, frequently uses compounding and borrowing from Latin, French, and Greek to create specialized vocabulary. In contrast, Uzbek, an agglutinative language, forms terms through suffixation and descriptive constructions, allowing for more transparent and systematic word formation. This results in longer but more semantically explicit terms in Uzbek.

Another important distinction lies in etymology. English applied art terminology reflects a history of European artistic traditions and industrial development, while Uzbek terminology incorporates elements from Persian, Arabic, and Russian, alongside native Turkic roots. These influences highlight the cultural and historical interactions that have shaped each language's artistic lexicon [1]. The classification of applied art terms can be organized into several categories: materials, techniques, tools, and decorative elements. While these categories are universal, their linguistic representation differs. English tends to favor concise and standardized terminology, whereas Uzbek often encodes additional descriptive or cultural information within the term itself [2].

The field of applied art encompasses a wide range of terminology that reflects both artistic practice and cultural context. This study investigates the comparative-typological classification of applied art terms in English and Uzbek, aiming to identify structural, semantic, and functional correspondences between the two languages. Using a corpus-based approach, terms were analyzed according to semantic fields, morphological patterns, and usage frequency. Results indicate significant differences in term formation, especially in borrowing, calquing,

and native derivational strategies, while certain universal categories, such as tools, techniques, and materials, exhibit cross-linguistic similarities. The findings provide a framework for lexicographers, translators, and applied art educators, enhancing cross-cultural understanding and accurate terminological usage [3].

Applied art, encompassing crafts, decorative design, and functional artistry, has a distinct vocabulary shaped by historical, cultural, and technological factors. The increasing interaction between English-speaking and Uzbek-speaking artistic communities highlights the need for systematic terminology studies. Previous research has often focused on general art vocabulary or monolingual glossaries, leaving comparative and typological aspects underexplored. A typological approach enables identification of language-specific mechanisms for term creation and semantic organization, while comparative analysis reveals universal and culture-specific features. This study addresses the gap by analyzing applied art terms in English and Uzbek, classifying them according to semantic type, morphological structure, and cross-linguistic equivalence [4].

The study employed a corpus-based comparative methodology. A bilingual corpus of applied art terms was compiled from academic publications, museum catalogs, online glossaries, and educational materials, yielding 1,200 entries (600 English, 600 Uzbek). Terms were categorized by semantic field (materials, techniques, tools, decorative styles), morphological type (derivation, compounding, borrowing), and functional usage (technical, descriptive, artistic). Comparative analysis focused on equivalence relations, term formation strategies, and frequency patterns. Data were processed using frequency counts, semantic mapping, and cross-linguistic alignment charts, ensuring systematic typological classification [5].

The analysis revealed several typological patterns in applied art terminology. In English, compound nouns and borrowings from French, Italian, and Latin are prevalent (e.g., *filigree*, *marquetry*, *papier-mâché*). Uzbek relies more heavily on native derivational processes, including suffixation and agglutination (e.g., *o'ymakorlik* – woodcarving, *naqshinkorlik* – ornamentation). Cross-linguistic equivalence is strongest in categories representing universal tools and materials, such as *paintbrush* – *bo'yoq cho'tkasi*, *clay* – *loy*. Certain technique-specific terms exhibit partial equivalence or require descriptive paraphrasing, reflecting cultural and historical differences. Semantic mapping shows overlapping conceptual clusters, but with language-specific lexical gaps filled through borrowing or neologisms. The frequency analysis indicates that practical, material-related terms are used more consistently across both languages than abstract or stylistic descriptors [6].

The comparative-typological classification highlights both universal and language-specific features in applied art terminology. English demonstrates greater lexical borrowing and compounding, while Uzbek exhibits productive native derivation. Semantic gaps in Uzbek often necessitate periphrastic translations, illustrating the influence of cultural context on term formation. These findings have implications for translators, art educators, and lexicographers, suggesting that bilingual glossaries should integrate typological information and cultural notes. Furthermore, cross-linguistic alignment of terms can aid in curriculum design for art instruction, facilitate accurate translation of museum catalogs, and enhance international collaboration in applied arts research.

Applied art terminology in English and Uzbek exhibits distinct typological and semantic characteristics while sharing universal conceptual domains. Comparative classification reveals differences in morphological strategies, term formation, and lexical gaps. The study contributes to bilingual lexicography, translation studies, and art education by providing a systematic framework for understanding, organizing, and applying applied art terms in cross-linguistic contexts. Future research may extend to other Turkic languages, explore historical evolution of terms, or integrate digital corpus tools for dynamic terminological analysis.

References / Список литературы

1. *Safarboyevna U.M.* "Comparative Typological Classification of Applied Art Terminology: The Case of English and Uzbek." *YANGI RENESSANS* 3.2 (2026): 54-57.
2. *Sobirova D., Mukhiddinova S., and Urazova M.* "Translatory features denoting to human appearance and character in English, Russian and Uzbek languages." *Универсальная индексная библиотека Евразийского журнала технологий и инноваций* 1.6 Part 2 (2023): 65-71.
3. *Sobirova D., Mukhiddinova S., and Urazova M.* "Using videos to learn English in ESL lessons." *Универсальная индексная библиотека Евразийского журнала технологий и инноваций* 1.6 Part 2 (2023): 72-75.
4. *Sobirova D., Mukhiddinova S., and Urazova M.* "Utilizing grammar translation during the English lessons." *Универсальная индексная библиотека Евразийского журнала технологий и инноваций* 1.6 Part 2 (2023): 76-84.
5. *Urazova M.* "Linguacultural peculiarities of phraseological units denoting to human character and appearance in English and uzbek languages." (2022).
6. *Saydalievna U.D.* (2019). Group dynamics and the role play activities to raise awareness on social issues in the ESL classes. *Проблемы педагогики*, (2 (41)), 65-66.
7. *Saydalievna U.D.* (2018). Culture specific preferences of teaching English for the students of non-philological faculties. *Вопросы науки и образования*, (5 (17)), 70-72.

8. *Saydalievna U.D.* (2021). The Importance of Teaching Grammar in Context. *Thematics Journal of Education*, 6, 11-24.
9. *Saydalievna U.D.* (2017). The main ideas done by different scholars on accordance of second language acquisition and their role in linguistics. *Проблемы педагогики*, (5 (28)), 36-37.
10. *Kuziev S.A.* (2017). THE ROLE OF AUDIENCE AND CONTEXT IN THE SPEECH. In *Наука и образование: сохраняя прошлое, создаём будущее* (pp. 76-78).
11. *Abdumuratovich K.S.* (2018). The role of multimedia technology in teaching the English language. *Достижения науки и образования*, 2(7 (29)), 57-60.
12. *Abdumuratovich K.S.* (2018). Progress in language teaching via picture stories. *Вопросы науки и образования*, (2 (14)), 60-62.