ISSN:2828-6235
Impact factor:13.77

International Journal of Literature and Language Studies(IJLLS)

A SYNCHRONIC STRUCTURAL-SEMANTIC FRAMEWORK FOR UZBEK CRAFT VOCABULARY: DO‘PPIDO‘ZLIK, KOSIBCHILIK, AND POTTERY

Muhayyo Abdug‘opporovna Xolmatova
Department of Language Teaching in Medicine,
Andijan Branch of Kokand University, Uzbekistan
1. mail: xolmatova1904@gmail.com | ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0006-8174-1194
2. Doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24138735

Abstract: This extended abstract proposes a synchronic structural-semantic framework for describing occupational vocabulary associated with three traditional Uzbek craft domains: do‘ppido‘zlik (skullcap-making), kosibchilik (a craft category provisionally restricted here to leatherwork and shoemaking), and kulolchilik (pottery). The study addresses a methodological problem: craft vocabulary is often described through separate lists of object names, whereas the relations among practitioners, materials, tools, operations, techniques, and finished products are less consistently represented within one analytical model. The paper therefore treats occupational vocabulary as a functionally organised lexical subsystem rather than as an inventory of isolated terms. A qualitative, theory-oriented design is adopted, combining descriptive, thematic-classificatory, structural, componential, and comparative analysis of lexical examples and previous studies. The proposed framework distinguishes six thematic categories: craft practitioners, raw materials, tools and equipment, technological processes, professional techniques, and finished products. It also examines word structure, semantic specialisation, synonymy, regional variation, and the relationship between specialised terms and common words. The analysis suggests that the three domains share a common nominative architecture, while their distinctive profiles are shaped by the materials processed, the tools employed, and the sequences of production. The paper does not claim to present a statistically representative corpus or newly collected interview data. Instead, it offers a transparent analytical model for subsequent fieldwork, corpus compilation, comparative research, and the development of a specialised Uzbek craft dictionary.

Keywords: occupational vocabulary; craft terminology; Uzbek language; synchronic analysis; structural semantics; do‘ppido‘zlik; kosibchilik; pottery; lexicography.

INTRODUCTION

Language preserves and organises knowledge of work. In traditional crafts, words name not only finished objects but also the people who make them, the materials they handle, the instruments they use, and the operations through which raw materials become products. Such vocabulary is closely connected with practical knowledge and the social transmission of skills. In Uzbek, craft-related lexical units form a culturally significant part of the vocabulary because they encode both material practices and locally developed ways of categorising the world.

Do‘ppido‘zlik, kosibchilik, and kulolchilik provide a useful basis for examining this relationship. Skullcap-making involves the selection and preparation of textiles, cutting, stitching, ornamentation, and the assembly of a finished headwear item. Pottery involves the preparation of clay, shaping, drying, decorating, glazing, and firing. In this paper, kosibchilik is used provisionally for leatherwork and shoemaking, including the preparation of leather, cutting, stitching, finishing, and the production of footwear. This restriction is analytical rather than definitive: the term kosibchilik may have broader or different meanings in regional and historical usage, and its semantic boundaries require confirmation through local professional speech.

The main research problem is how to compare the lexical resources of these crafts without reducing them to disconnected word lists or imposing identical meanings on formally similar

words. A synchronic perspective is useful because it focuses on the organisation and use of lexical units within a defined contemporary period. Historical and etymological information may clarify a word's background, but it should not replace evidence about its current meaning and function.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND RESEARCH GAP

Research on Uzbek occupational vocabulary has a substantial descriptive tradition. Ibrohimov's multi-volume study of the occupational vocabulary of Fergana dialects is important for documenting professional words in regional speech and for treating craft vocabulary as a distinct object of linguistic description (Ibrohimov, 1956–1959). Its methodological relevance lies in the attention paid to local usage and to the meanings of words as used by speakers engaged in particular occupations.

More recent studies have examined individual craft domains and the formation of specialised vocabulary. Mamatkulova's work on Rishton pottery vocabulary addresses thematic grouping, structural types, lexical-semantic relations, and word-formation processes in pottery terminology (Mamatkulova, 2024a, 2024b). Mamatova (2026) examines factors involved in the formation of do‘ppido‘zlik vocabulary and identifies categories relating to tools, materials, techniques, products, and craft processes. Bahodirova (2025), focusing on embroidery, skullcap-making, and gold embroidery, discusses derivational processes, semantic change, and dialectal variation in Uzbek craft terminology. Ravshanova (2025) likewise emphasises the theoretical importance of studying the formation of craft-related lexical units.

These studies provide valuable foundations, but the present paper addresses a more narrowly defined task: it brings three craft domains into one synchronic comparative framework and applies the same thematic and structural questions to each. The intended contribution is not the claim that these crafts have never been studied, nor that the examples presented constitute a complete inventory. Rather, it is the proposal of a common descriptive architecture that can make findings from separate craft studies more comparable.

AIM, RESEARCH QUESTIONS, AND METHODOLOGY

The aim is to formulate a theoretical framework for the synchronic structural-semantic description of occupational vocabulary in do‘ppido‘zlik, kosibchilik, and pottery. The analysis is guided by four questions: (1) Which thematic categories can organise lexical units consistently across the three domains? (2) How do the units differ in morphological structure and semantic relations? (3) How does professional context specialise the meanings of words that also occur in general language? (4) What information should be recorded for a future regional craft lexicon or digital database?

The paper is qualitative and theoretical-analytical. It draws on the Uzbek-language source article and the scholarly works identified in its literature review. Descriptive analysis explains the functions of selected lexical examples. Thematic classification groups items by their role in the craft process. Structural analysis distinguishes simple, derived, compound, and phrase-based forms where the available examples permit such description. Componential analysis focuses on semantic features that differentiate a general-language meaning from a specialised occupational meaning. Comparative analysis identifies shared categories and domain-specific distinctions.

To avoid over-classification, a lexical item should be included in a craft vocabulary set only when its occupational relevance can be supported by a specialised dictionary or scholarly source, a documented craft-related text, or direct evidence from practitioners' speech. Its meaning should also be interpreted in context. The examples in this paper are illustrative classification examples drawn from the source text; they are not presented as the results of a new field survey, a frequency count, or a representative corpus.

ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK AND THEMATIC CLASSIFICATION

The proposed framework organises craft vocabulary into six interconnected categories. The first comprises names of practitioners and occupational roles, such as do‘ppido‘z, kosib, kulol, usta

(master craftsperson), and shogird (apprentice). The second includes raw materials and processed substances: textile and decorative materials in skullcap-making, leather and sole materials in the restricted shoemaking domain, and clay, engobe, and glaze in pottery. The third category covers tools and equipment. The fourth names technological processes and actions. The fifth includes professional techniques and methods, while the sixth covers finished products and their components.

Category	Do‘ppido‘zlik	Kosibchilik*	Pottery
Practitioners	do‘ppido‘z; usta	kosib; usta; shogird	kulol; usta
Materials	baxmal; ipak; ip; mato	charm; teri; tagcharm	loy; gil; angob; sir
Tools	igna; qaychi; chambarak	bigiz; pichoq; qolip	charx; qolip; mo‘yqalam; pech
Processes	bichish; tikish; bezash	kesish; tikish; pardozlash	loy qorish; shakl berish; sirlash; pishirish
Products	do‘ppi	etik; kavush; mahsi	kosa; ko‘za; lagan; piyola

In this paper, kosibchilik is provisionally restricted to leatherwork and shoemaking; the regional scope of the term requires further field verification.

The table illustrates a shared nominative architecture. Each domain contains vocabulary for practitioners, materials, tools, processes, and products. The categories are comparable, but their lexical contents are not interchangeable. For example, baxmal and ipak belong to the textile domain, charm and tagcharm to leatherwork and footwear production, and loy, gil, angob, and sir to pottery. The production verbs describe different operations even when they occupy the same classificatory slot.

A useful way to represent these relations is the following process-oriented sequence: practitioner → raw material → tool or equipment → technological process and technique → finished product. This sequence should not be understood as a rigid linear model. In actual production, stages may recur, tools may serve several operations, and one product may require multiple materials and techniques. Nevertheless, the model provides a consistent starting point for comparing the lexical systems.

STRUCTURAL AND SEMANTIC FEATURES

From a structural perspective, craft vocabulary may include simple lexical items, derived forms, compounds, and multiword expressions. The distinction matters because a craft lexicon should record not only what a unit denotes but also how it is formed. For instance, do‘ppido‘z is an occupational designation, whereas expressions such as do‘ppi tikish and loy qorish are multiword process names. Their morphological and syntactic status should be established through analysis of actual usage rather than assumed from spelling alone.

Semantic relations are equally important. Synonymy may occur where different names refer to similar objects or operations; regional variants may designate the same item in different local speech communities; and hyponymy may organise specific products under broader categories. Polysemy and semantic specialisation are especially relevant when a common word acquires a narrower meaning in professional communication. The word qolip, for example, can refer generally to a mould or shaping form, while in footwear production it may designate a tool used to determine the shape of a shoe. The precise interpretation depends on the craft context.

These observations support a context-sensitive approach to terminology. A lexical form should not be labelled a technical term solely because it appears in a craft-related list. Its status depends on its degree of conventionalisation within the professional community, the precision of its meaning, and the stability of its use. Some units may function as standardised terms, others as professional colloquialisms, regional names, or general words with specialised meanings. Treating

all of them as one undifferentiated category would obscure important sociolinguistic and functional distinctions.

DISCUSSION AND PROPOSED LEXICOGRAPHIC MODEL

The framework has two principal implications. First, it makes craft vocabularies comparable without erasing their cultural and technological specificity. A common set of categories allows researchers to ask the same questions of different crafts, while local terminology and production practices remain visible. Second, it provides a practical basis for lexicographic work. A specialised dictionary should not merely translate or define isolated words; it should record their professional domain, regional distribution, structural features, semantic relations, and usage context.

Each dictionary entry may include: (1) headword; (2) pronunciation and spelling variants; (3) craft-domain label; (4) thematic category; (5) concise definition; (6) morphological or phraseological structure; (7) regional or stylistic label; (8) example from documented professional speech; and (9) source reference. Where etymological information is available, it can be added as a separate field. Etymological claims should be supported by reliable dictionaries or historical evidence; resemblance to a word in another language is not sufficient.

The model also identifies the next empirical steps. Researchers should compile a lexical card index for each craft, record speech from practitioners in more than one region, compare oral forms with specialised and explanatory dictionaries, and document variation in pronunciation, spelling, and meaning. A balanced dataset should distinguish elicited responses from naturally occurring speech and record the location, speaker role, date, and context of each item. Only after such documentation can researchers responsibly analyse frequency, productivity, lexical loss, or the active and passive status of individual terms.

CONCLUSION

This paper has proposed a synchronic structural-semantic framework for the study of Uzbek craft vocabulary through the domains of do‘ppido‘zlik, kosibchilik, and pottery. The analysis indicates that these domains can be compared through shared nominative categories—practitioners, materials, tools, processes, techniques, and products—while their distinctive lexical profiles reflect differences in materials, instruments, and production procedures. Structural description should be combined with contextual semantic analysis, since general-language words may acquire specialised meanings in craft communication and similar forms may refer to different objects or operations across domains.

The principal contribution is a reusable theoretical and lexicographic model, not a claim of completed empirical coverage. The current examples are illustrative and require verification against regional speech, craft documentation, and dictionary sources. Further research should clarify the regional meanings of kosibchilik, expand the lexical inventory for all three domains, and develop a searchable digital database. Such work can contribute to Uzbek lexicology, terminology studies, dialectology, and the documentation of intangible cultural heritage.

REFERENCES

1. Bahodirova, G. (2025). Terminological processes in the field of crafts: Formation of specialized vocabulary. Transactions of Telavi State University, 1(38), 72–75. https://doi.org/10.52340/tuw.2025.38.01.09
2. Ibrohimov, S. (1956–1959). Farg‘ona shevalarining kasb-hunar leksikasi [Occupational vocabulary of the Fergana dialects] (Books 1–3). Tashkent: Academy of Sciences of the Uzbek SSR.

3. Mamatkulova, Z. R. (2024a). Kasb-hunar leksikasi va terminning differensial va integral xususiyatlari [Differential and integral features of occupational vocabulary and terms]. Scientific Approach to the Modern Education System, 3(31). https://interoncof.com/index.php/france/article/view/6219
4. Mamatkulova, Z. R. (2024b). Rishton kulolchilik maktabi kasb-hunar leksikasining struktur tasnifi [Structural classification of the occupational vocabulary of the Rishton pottery school]. Ijtimoiy-gumanitar fanlarning dolzarb muammolari, Special Issue S/2(4), 245–250. https://doi.org/10.47390/SPR1342V4SI2Y2024N35
5. Mamatova, D. (2026). O‘zbek tilida do‘ppido‘zlik leksikasining vujudga kelish omillari va sabablari [Factors and causes behind the formation of do‘ppido‘zlik vocabulary in Uzbek]. Qo‘qon universiteti xabarnomasi, 19(A), 193–198. https://doi.org/10.54613/ku.v19iA.1808
6. Ravshanova, M. (2025). Theoretical foundations of the formation of lexical units related to crafts. Acta NUUz, 1(1.4), 303–305. https://doi.org/10.69617/nuuz.v1i1.4.7268