

THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF CRAFTSMANSHIP LEXICON IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH LANGUAGES

Vakhidova Fatima Saidovna

Bukhara State University, associate professor of English Linguistics Department, PhD, e-mail:

f.s.vakhidova@buxdu.uz

Urunova Iroda Nurulloyevna

2 st year Master's student

Abstract: *This article analyzes the theoretical foundations of lexical units related to craftsmanship in both Uzbek and English languages. It explores how linguistic disciplines such as lexicology, semasiology, etymology, and cognitive–frame semantics contribute to studying this vocabulary layer across two cultures. The comparative analysis reveals that craft terminology not only designates tools and processes but also reflects aesthetic ideals, social values, and national identity. The research emphasizes the cultural parallels and linguistic divergences that shape how each language conceptualizes the art of craftsmanship.*

Key words: *craftsmanship lexicon, lexicology, semasiology, etymology, cognitive linguistics, frame semantics, cultural identity, Uzbek and English languages.*

INTRODUCTION

Language and culture are inseparable; both evolve through human labor, creativity, and shared experience. The vocabulary of craftsmanship — encompassing embroidery, weaving, carpentry, pottery, and other traditional arts — captures the essence of artistic creation and cultural symbolism.

In the Uzbek language, craft terminology often reflects ancient traditions rooted in the Silk Road civilization, emphasizing beauty (*go'zallik*), harmony (*uyg'unlik*), and patience (*sabr*). Meanwhile, in English, craft-related vocabulary emerged from the Anglo-Saxon and Medieval guild systems, emphasizing skill, utility, and artistry (*craft, workmanship, embroidery, needlework*).

This article aims to reveal the linguistic and cultural mechanisms underlying craftsmanship vocabulary in both languages. Drawing on the works of Jo'rayev (2012), Hojiev (2007), Fillmore (1982), and Lakoff (1987), it examines how the lexical, semantic, and cognitive structures of this terminology convey the worldview and heritage of their respective cultures.

1. Lexicological Perspective

Lexicology examines the structure and thematic organization of a language's vocabulary. In Uzbek, as noted by Jo'rayev (2012), craft-related terms form a coherent lexical–semantic field: *ip* (thread), *igna* (needle), *mato* (cloth), *chok* (stitch), *kashta* (embroidery), *naqsh* (pattern), *suzani* (decorative textile). These words are semantically linked through a shared thematic domain of manual creativity and ornamentation.

In English, a similar lexical network exists: *thread, needle, fabric, stitch, embroidery, pattern, tapestry*. The English term *craft* itself derives from Old English *cræft*, meaning

“strength” or “skill.” This etymological root emphasizes competence and artistry, while in Uzbek, equivalent concepts such as *hunar* (skill) and *mehnat* (labor) highlight patience and dedication.

Thus, lexicological comparison shows that both languages organize their craft vocabularies around human creativity but differ in cultural emphasis: Uzbek lexis focuses on aesthetic beauty and symbolic harmony, while English emphasizes skill, precision, and utility.

2. Semasiological Approach

Semasiology, the study of meaning, uncovers how words express not only denotative but also connotative and metaphorical values (Hojiev, 2007). In Uzbek, craft terms carry emotional and moral connotations. For instance, *ipak* (silk) suggests gentleness and refinement, while *kashta* symbolizes patience and inner beauty.

In English, semasiological extension occurs in metaphorical expressions like “a finely woven story”, “a thread of hope”, or “fabric of society”. These metaphors show how material processes of weaving and sewing have entered abstract thought. Uzbek uses similar metaphors — for example, *taqdir ipi* (“thread of destiny”) — demonstrating a shared human tendency to connect textile imagery with fate, order, and continuity.

Comparative semasiology therefore reveals a universal metaphorical system rooted in craft experience, even though each culture applies its own moral and aesthetic filters.

3. Etymological Analysis

Etymology provides historical insight into how craftsmanship terms emerged and transformed. Xudoyberganova (2020) identifies multiple sources for Uzbek craft vocabulary: ancient Turkic (*ip*, *chok*), Persian (*kashta* from *keshidan* – “to sew”), and Arabic (*naqsh* – “ornament”). This reflects Central Asia’s intercultural exchange through trade and art.

English craft terms also derive from diverse sources: embroidery from French *broderie*, needle from Old English *nædl*, textile from Latin *textilis*. The etymological layering in both languages shows how trade, colonization, and technological evolution enriched their craft vocabularies.

The comparative study reveals that while Uzbek terminology emphasizes tradition and artistry, English craft vocabulary evolved through industrial and artistic innovation — mirroring the socio-economic histories of each culture.

4. Cognitive and Frame–Semantic Approach

Cognitive linguistics, pioneered by Fillmore (1982) and Lakoff (1987), interprets language as a reflection of conceptual structures and cultural models. Frame semantics explains how meaning is organized within knowledge frameworks or “frames.”

In both Uzbek and English, the “craft” frame includes elements such as tools, materials, processes, and purpose. For example:

Uzbek frame: *igna* (needle) → *ip* (thread) → *kashta* (embroidery) → *go‘zallik* (beauty) → *sabr* (patience).

English frame: needle → thread → stitch → design → artistry.

While both frames encode creativity and manual labor, Uzbek emphasizes spiritual and moral endurance, and English highlights individual artistry and precision. This difference reflects broader cognitive and cultural orientations: the Uzbek worldview associates craftsmanship with collective identity and heritage, whereas English discourse tends toward individual skill and innovation.

Hence, the frame–semantic approach demonstrates how both linguistic systems encapsulate distinct yet parallel conceptualizations of art, labor, and beauty.

Conclusion. The comparative study of craftsmanship lexicon in Uzbek and English shows that language is not merely a means of communication but a repository of cultural values. Lexicology explains structural organization; semasiology reveals metaphorical richness; etymology uncovers historical interconnections; and cognitive semantics shows how meaning reflects thought and identity.

Uzbek craft vocabulary embodies collective aesthetics, patience, and moral virtue, while English craft terminology reflects technical mastery and creative individuality. Despite cultural differences, both languages elevate craftsmanship as a symbol of human artistry and endurance.

Integrating traditional linguistic methods with cognitive approaches enables a comprehensive understanding of how artistic labor shapes linguistic and cultural expression in diverse societies.

REFERENCES:

1. Fillmore, C. J. (1982). Frame semantics. In *Linguistics in the Morning Calm* (pp. 111–137). Seoul: Hanshin.
2. Hojiev, A. (2007). *Semasiologiya masalalari*. Toshkent: O‘zbekiston Milliy Ensiklopediyasi.
3. Jo‘rayev, O. (2012). *O‘zbek tili leksikologiyasi*. Toshkent: Noshir.
4. Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. University of Chicago Press.
5. Xudoyberganova, D. (2020). *O‘zbek tilining tarixiy leksikologiyasi*. Toshkent: Fan va texnologiya.