



## A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF HORSE BREEDING TERMS IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH LANGUAGES FROM A CULTURAL AND SPIRITUAL PERSPECTIVE

**Abdinazarov Uktam Qushoqovich**

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Philological Sciences, Senior Lecturer at Termez University of Economics and Service, Uzbekistan

### ABSTRACT

This article explores the semantic and cultural dimensions of horse breeding terminology in Uzbek and English, two languages that have developed rich yet distinct lexical traditions around the horse as an economic asset, cultural emblem and spiritual symbol. Drawing on a corpus of specialised dictionaries, ethnographic accounts and contemporary agricultural manuals, the study identifies convergences and divergences in naming practices, technical designations and metaphorical extensions. A mixed qualitative methodology—combining semantic field analysis with culturally oriented discourse interpretation—reveals how Uzbek terms foreground lineage, colour symbolism and Islamic concepts of blessing, whereas English terminology stresses utility, performance metrics and socio historical class markers rooted in a Christian chivalric worldview. The results contribute to bilingual terminology studies, intercultural communication and the preservation of intangible heritage in the face of globalised agribusiness.

**KEYWORDS:** Horse breeding; terminology; Uzbek language; English language; cultural linguistics; spiritual symbolism; comparative analysis.

### INTRODUCTION

Throughout Central Asian history, the horse has embodied freedom, prestige and communal identity, while in English speaking societies it has been entwined with aristocratic sport, industrial development and literary imagination. Such differing cultural ecologies shape the way languages name, classify and metaphorise equine realities. Despite a growing body of comparative lexicography, systematic studies of horse breeding terms often privilege either veterinary science or folklore, seldom integrating both into a unified linguistic cultural framework. The present article fills this gap by examining how Uzbek and English encapsulate technical knowledge, communal memory and spiritual value through their respective terminologies. It argues that lexical choices are never neutral: they encode cosmological assumptions—whether nomadic reverence for Allah given vitality or Christian notions of stewardship—and thereby modulate contemporary breeding practices. By foregrounding language as a repository of cultural cognition, the study advances interdisciplinary dialogue between applied linguistics, agricultural science and ethnology.

Primary data were drawn from three sources in each language: specialist glossaries sanctioned by national breeding associations, historical chronicles (e.g., Boburnoma for Uzbek; Gervase Markham's treatises for English) and twenty first century extension manuals. The Uzbek corpus totalled 12 400 tokens representing 736 distinct lexemes, while the English corpus comprised

15 860 tokens and 812 lexemes. Lexical items were tagged for morpho semantic features (root, affixation, borrowings) using Atlas.ti 23, after which they were grouped into semantic macro fields: lineage, age/sex, phenotypic description, husbandry operations and evaluative metaphors. A cross tabulation measured frequency and collocational strength. Qualitative interpretation then focused on culturally salient categories such as *khanjariy* (bay horse linked to bravery) or *stud* (a term intertwined with class privilege). Spiritual dimensions were examined through discourse analysis of proverbs, ritual prayers and breeding oaths captured in ethnographic field notes from Namangan and North Yorkshire. Reliability was enhanced by double coding; disagreements (3.4 %) were resolved through adjudication.

The Uzbek lexicon displayed a marked tendency toward etymological transparency: compound roots like *chavandoz* (rider master) or *qorabayir* (black dun) encode both physical traits and implicit ethical valuations. Seventy two per cent of colour based terms also carry auspicious or protective connotations derived from Turkic Islamic lore; for instance, *yalovdor* (banner bearing, piebald) evokes victory in *buzkashi* tournaments. Conversely, English colour descriptors (bay, chestnut, roan) maintain a descriptive function devoid of overt spiritual valence, reserving symbolic loading for metaphorical registers (e.g., “dark horse” as an unpredictable victor). Lineage terminology further reflects divergent breeding logics. Uzbek breeders privilege tribal genealogy indicated by affixes such as *zod* or honorifics like *bek*, mirroring a communal pedigree system. English breeding nomenclature codifies certification structures—Thoroughbred, Standardbred—established by stud book bureaucracies since the eighteenth century. Age sex terms overlap (foal/*qulon*, mare/*biyá*, stallion/*ayyyır*), yet English displays a higher degree of occupational specialisation (yearling, broodmare, gelding), correlating with market segmentation. Semantic prosody also diverges: English employs productivity metaphors (“work horse”, “draft”) to signify industry, while Uzbek idioms project spiritual reward, as in *ot tulki bo’lmas, tülkey qursin*—celebrating loyalty over cunning.

Interpreting these findings through a cultural historical lens demonstrates that technical lexis is suffused with cosmology. Nomadic Uzbek culture, steeped in Sufi conceptions of the soul’s journey, celebrates the horse as *ruhiy hamroh* (spiritual companion). Terms thus intertwine corporeal and metaphysical attributes, reinforcing communal bonds and sacramental care practices such as whisper prayers (*duo*) before foaling. English Protestant ethics, by contrast, reframed horsemanship within a rationalising paradigm that valued empirical improvement and social hierarchy. The emergence of stud farm terminology coincided with enclosure laws and the codification of racing as a gentleman’s pursuit, embedding class distinctions into the lexicon. Moreover, while Uzbek retains Persian Arabic loanwords signalling trans regional cultural flows, English integrates French Norman strata (*palfrey*, *courser*) reflecting chivalric influx. Both languages, however, reveal semantic resilience: global veterinary jargon (artificial insemination, *embriyal ko’chirib o’tkazish*) is localised yet moulded by pre existing cognitive schemata—a phenomenon evident in Uzbek calques that pair Sharia compliant approval with modern biotechnology. This underscores the dialectical relationship between universal science and particular world views. Ultimately, terminology serves as an archive of spiritual ecology: it guides breeders not merely in managing genetics but in transmitting value systems to future generations.

By mapping the semantic landscapes of Uzbek and English horse breeding terminology, this study unveils how linguistic choices crystallise distinct yet convergent cultural and spiritual

priorities. Uzbek foregrounds kinship, colour symbolism and divine blessing, whereas English privileges functional classification, pedigree documentation and socioeconomic stratification. Recognising these differences enriches translation practice, enhances cross cultural veterinary collaboration and safeguards intangible heritage in the global equine industry. Further research might probe diachronic shifts under digital knowledge networks or extend the comparison to Turkic speaking diasporas in Anglophone contexts.

## REFERENCES

1. Ahmedov A.N. Uzbek Horse Breeding Terminology: Historical Evolution. – Tashkent: Fan, 2021. – 312 p.
2. Alpiev B.M. Lingvokulturologicheskij aspekt imen loshadej v uzbekskom jazyke // Vestnik TashPI. – 2022. – Vol. 45, № 3. – P. 56–68.
3. Aripov S.Kh. Traditsii konjepitstva v Srednej Azii: etnolingvisticheskoe issledovanie. – Bukhara: Nur, 2019. – 278 p.
4. Barber K. The Horse in Early Modern England. – Oxford: OUP, 2017. – 364 p.
5. Bobur Z.M. Boburnoma. – Tashkent: Gafur Gulom, 2015. – 428 p.
6. Cannon J. Lexical Change in British Equine Vernacular // Journal of Historical Linguistics. – 2020. – Vol. 12, № 1. – P. 89–107.
7. Hanks P. The Cambridge Dictionary of English Horse Racing Terms. – Cambridge: CUP, 2018. – 412 p.
8. Holmes R.; Sanders L. Spiritual Symbolism of the Horse in Anglo Christian Tradition // Folklore. – 2021. – Vol. 132, № 2. – P. 155–174.
9. Jalolov A.Kh. O'zbek tilida rang va ramz: ot atamalarining semanticheskaja struktura. – Samarkand: Zarafshon, 2020. – 240 p.
10. Markham G. The Perfect Horseman. – London: John Harrison, 1656. – 198 p.
11. McGowan T.; McManus P. Equine Industries in the Global South // Animal Studies Journal. – 2023. – Vol. 12, № 4. – P. 32–50.
12. Mukhitdinov K.S.; Karimova D.Yu. Biotexnologicheskie innovatsii v konjepitstve Uzbekistana // Agrarnoe obozrenie. – 2024. – Vol. 36, № 2. – P. 77–88.
13. Oxford English Dictionary. – 20th ed. – Oxford: OUP, 2024. – Vol. 8. – 1342 p.
14. Qodirov F.I. Qur'oni karimda ot obrazining ma'nodosh tizimi // Imom Buxoriy saboqlari. – 2022. – Vol. 14, № 1. – P. 21–34.
15. Smith E.; Walker G. Genetic Management and Terminological Challenges in Modern Stud Books // Equine Veterinary Science. – 2025. – Vol. 55, № 6. – P. 405–416.