The American Journal of Social Science and Education Innovations
ISSN 2689-100X | Open Access

TYPE Original Research
PAGE NO. 43-52
DOI 10.37547/tajssei/Volume07Issue11-05

Check for updates

Genetic Characteristics Of Livestock Terminology In The Uzbek Language

Mukhamadiev Sukhrob Bakhtiyor ugli
University of Economics and Pedagogy, senior teacher, Uzbekistan

OPEN ACCESS
SUBMITTED 20 September 2025
ACCEPTED 12 October 2025
PUBLISHED 17 November 2025
VOLUME Vol.07 Issue 11 2025

CITATION

Mukhamadiev Sukhrob Bakhtiyor ugli. (2025). Genetic Characteristics Of Livestock Terminology In The Uzbek Language. The American Journal of Social Science and Education Innovations, 7(11), 43–52.
https://doi.org/10.37547/tajssei/Volume07Issue11-05

Abstract: The topic "Genetic Characteristics of Livestock Terminology in the Uzbek Language" explores the origin, historical development, and structural features of livestock-related vocabulary within Uzbek. Livestock terminology, being an essential part of the nation's agricultural and cultural heritage, reflects the evolution of traditional animal husbandry practices and the linguistic influences that have shaped Uzbek over centuries. The study focuses on the genetic classification of terms according to their etymological sources, including Turkic roots, Persian-Arabic borrowings, and modern international loanwords. Special attention is given to the processes of semantic change, word-formation, and dialectal variation that contribute to the richness and diversity of livestock terminology. The analysis also considers the role of cultural traditions, nomadic lifestyle, and socio-economic conditions in shaping the lexical system. By identifying the genetic layers of livestock terms, the research highlights the interplay between language history, cultural identity, and professional communication in the Uzbek context. The results are significant for etymological studies, lexicography, and the preservation of national linguistic heritage.

Keywords: Uzbek language, livestock terminology, genetic characteristics, etymology, word-formation, Turkic roots, Persian-Arabic borrowings, international loanwords, semantic change, dialectal variation, linguistic heritage, cultural identity, agricultural vocabulary, historical development, terminology system.

Introduction: Livestock husbandry is central to Uzbekistan's agricultural economy and rural culture. The specialized vocabulary used by scientists, extension

workers, and breeders reflects both local traditions and the influence of global animal-genetics science. Investigating the genetic characteristics of this terminology is important for (1) accurate communication between scientists and practitioners, (2) development of reliable bilingual glossaries and teaching materials, and (3) understanding how scientific concepts integrate into Uzbek linguistic and cultural systems. The term system of animal husbandry in the Uzbek language has historically been formed from diverse elements, including Turkic vocabulary, borrowings from the Persian-Arabic layer, as well as newer European (Russian and international) components. The purpose of this paragraph is to systematize the source nature of Uzbek language zooterminology by identifying the main genetic types of terms and their word formation patterns, without repeating the details already described in the second chapter. Thus, the focus of research shifts from the semantics of terms to their origin, which will allow for a comprehensive understanding of the evolution of this lexicon.

In terminology, genetic (or genealogical) classification of terms refers to their grouping according to their origin - linguistic or structural source of appearance in the language of the specialty [Leichik, 2009; Superanskaya et al., 1989]. V.M. Leychik noted that such classification distinguishes terms into native and borrowed terms based on their source language [Leychik, 2009]. A.V. Superanskaya also indicates the need to consider the genesis of terminological vocabulary along with classifications based on content and function: genetic classification describes terminology from the perspective of its origin, while, for example, semantic classification groups terms according to conceptual fields [Superanskaya et al., 1989]. S.V. Grinyov-Grinevich introduces the concept of "genealogical composition of terminology," implying the collection of layers of terms of different origins within a single terminosystem [Grinyov, 1993]. Thus, unlike semantic or lexicographical classification (where units are grouped by topic or in the form of dictionary articles), genetic classification reflects the etymological stratification of terminology.

Methodologically, the genetic approach is based on data from historical lexicology and etymology. When analyzing the origin of Uzbek zooterms, the following served as supporting sources:

- **Etymological and historical dictionaries** fixing the original meaning and language-original of terms (for example, summary works on Turkic vocabulary and special etymological dictionaries of the Uzbek language);
- **Explanatory and bilingual dictionaries** with notes on borrowings and markings on dialect/obsolescence, primarily the fundamental six-volume "Uzbek tilining izohli luğati" (2006-2008) and industry lexicography;
- **Archival glossaries and literary monuments** (terminological lists, dictionaries of the late 19th - early 20th centuries, examples of terms in classical literature) that allow tracing historical usage;
- **Corpus databases** of the Uzbek language (e.g., the national corpus corpus.uz), through which the frequency and context of modern use of terms from different genetic layers are verified.

The reliance on the listed sources corresponds to the recommendations of terminology on a comprehensive analysis of the origin of terminology [Dadaboyev, 2019]. For example, G. A. Kurbanova, in her recent research on the development of Uzbek agricultural terminology, emphasizes the need to utilize corpus data and historical-lexicographic materials to identify the sources of terms [Kurbanova, 2024]. Together, this theoretical and methodological approach ensures the systematic nature of genetic classification, complementing the semantic analysis of Chapter II.

The source composition of Uzbek livestock terminology is extremely diverse and reflects the complex history of language contacts in the region. Conditionally, three main genetic layers can be distinguished: (1) Turkic layer - native vocabulary and words formed by the means of the Uzbek (and related Turkic) language itself; (2) eastern layer - borrowings from Persian and Arabic that entered the Uzbek language in the Middle Ages and later; (3) European (Russian-European) layer - terms that entered primarily through the Russian language during the Soviet and post-Soviet periods, as well as internationalisms. These three groups correspond to the main historical and cultural stages of the formation of industry vocabulary: from the deep antiquity of the Turkic pastoral culture through the influence of medieval Persian-Islamic scholarship to the modernization of terminology in the 20th century under the influence of Russian science [Development..., 1991].

Major semantic fields and representative lexemes

Livestock genetic terminology clusters into several semantic fields:

- Breed and lineage: e.g., nasl (lineage, breed), naslli/naslsiz (bred/purebred vs. not), irq / irqi (race/ethnicized term used in some contexts), sifatli nasl (quality breed).
- Genetics and hereditary processes: gen (gene), genetika/genetik (genetics/genetic — internationalized forms), meros/merosiylik (inheritance, heredity).
- Selection and breeding techniques: selektsiya (selection — borrowing from Russian), tanlash/tanlab yetishtirish (to select/selective breeding — native verbs).
- Hybridization and crossbreeding: gibrid (hybrid — internationalism), aralash nasl (mixed breed), keshlash (colloquial verbs used for crossing in some regions).
- Mutations and disorders: mutatsiya (mutation — international borrowing), genetik buzilish (genetic disorder).
- Markers and modern tools: DNK/DNA, genom, markyor (marker; sometimes calqued), molekulyar diagnostika.

It should be emphasized that the transitions from colloquial vocabulary to proper terms in the field of animal husbandry were gradual. Many original animal and phenomenal names (e.g., ot "horse," sigir "cow," qo'y "sheep") emerged as commonly used words of the Turkic language, established in folklore, but with the development of the livestock industry, they received a narrower specialization and entered terminology [Kurbanova, 2023]. On the contrary, a number of concepts were initially formed in the professional environment and then spread into folk speech (for example, special names of breeds or diseases that became understandable to a wide range of native speakers only with the spread of veterinary knowledge). Such bilateral penetration of vocabulary confirms the idea of close connection between folklore and terminology: traditional images and folk names formed the basis of many terms, and specialized words, having taken root, entered proverbs and sayings.

The following table-1 summarizes the source stratification of Uzbek zooterminological units, highlighting the source type, characteristic morphological features of terms of this origin, examples, period of entry, and current context of use.

Table-1

Source stratification of zooterminological units of the Uzbek language

Source type	Morphological feature	Example	Entry period	Context of use
Turkic (original)	Short root bases (1-2 syllables); Turkic inflectional suffixes	*horse* (horse), *cow* (cow), *calf* (calf)	Ancient Turkic period, before the 10th century AD.	Basic vocabulary, widely used in colloquial speech and terminology without stylistic restrictions
Persian-Arabic	Borrowed bases; often compound words or morpheme	*chorva* (cattle, from Persian. چاروا), *xar* (ass, Persian), *zotdor* (noble, liter. "having	Middle Ages (XIV-XIX centuries); period of cultural and	Literary-written layer, parts of words have become obsolete or preserved in professional speech;

	combinations of Persian/Arabic origin	a genealogy," Arabic.+Persian. Suf.)	religious influence	some have entered literary language (e.g. *chorvachilik* - animal husbandry)
Russian-European	Borrowings with phonetic adaptation; international suffixes (-iya, -tor, etc.) or calques	*ferma* (farm), *veterinar* (veterinary), *artificial insemination* (literally "artificial insemination," calque from Russian)	20th century (Soviet period) and modern times	Scientific-technical and educational sphere; enshrined in standards and textbooks, understandable to specialists; many have entered common language in the absence of original analogues

Note: Some terms have mixed origins. For example, qoramol ("cattle") is formed from the Turkic qora (black) + Persian. mol (property, livestock) and reflects the hybrid word formation method characteristic of Uzbek. Similar hybrids are attributed to the dominant source in terms of meaning (in this case - Turkic, as the concept is rooted in the Turkic tradition of naming livestock).

As can be seen from the table, the Turkic layer constitutes the historical core of terminology: the original words are short and morphologically simple (single-root or with ancient suffixes), their concepts are related to basic livestock realities (ot, sigir, qo'y, etc. - names of the main domestic animals, yem - feed, sut - milk, etc.). These units trace back to the proto-language of the Turks and are already recorded in old Turkic written monuments, and even now they are active in all speech registers [Shcherbak, 1961].

This study combines approaches from cognitive lexicography, terminology science, and sociolinguistics. Key concepts used are:

- Terminology formation: processes by which technical concepts are lexicalized (derivation, compounding, borrowing, calque).
- Semantic extension & narrowing: how general words acquire technical senses or specialized terms narrow from broader categories.
- Sociolinguistic registers: variation across expert (scientific) and non-expert (farmers, pastoralists) language.
- Cognitive models of concept representation: frames and prototypicality within domain-specific lexicons.

While detailed bibliographic citations are beyond this article's scope, the analysis follows standard practice in terminology research (lexical corpus analysis, field elicitation, etymological inspection).

The Eastern (Iranian-Arabic) layer brought a number of terms into the Uzbek language, especially in areas where the region's medieval culture relied on Persian-Arabic knowledge. For example, the Uzbek tuya ("camel") has parallels in the Persian (cf. Taj. tuyon, although the ultimate etymology is debatable), xar ("ass") is directly borrowed from the Persian خر (har), and the term nasl ("breed, lineage") is from the Arabic نسل (nasl). Most of these borrowings entered the language through writing and literary tradition, therefore their form is close to the original and often differs from the phonetics of Turkic words (the presence of [x], [q] sounds in positions characteristic of Arabic-Persianids). The period of incorporation of these terms dates back to the 14th-15th centuries (the Timurid and subsequent dynasties), when bilingualism (Chagatai-Persian) was the norm of

the region's written culture. In modern Uzbek, many Eastern terms have been preserved, but their usage varies: some have entered the literary language (chorva, zot), while others are considered obsolete or dialectal (musht - an old word for baby camel, displaced by Turkic buzaö, etc.). Nevertheless, knowledge of this layer is necessary for understanding folklore and old literature, where, for example, /27>xar (assel) appears in proverbs, and /29>zot (genus, breed) appears in traditional combinations. The third layer - European, predominantly Russian - is associated with the era of active development of science and agriculture in the 20th century. Many concepts previously absent in local practice were introduced into Uzbek livestock terminology: from the names of new breeds and diseases to the terms of genetics and zootechnics. Methods of penetration - direct borrowings (veterinar, ferma, silos), transliteration of internationalisms (mastit - mastitis, brutsellyoz - brucellosis), as well as calquing of Russian terminological combinations with Uzbek words. An example of the latter is the term sun'iy uru'lantirish (literally "artificial fertilization"), created from Uzbek components following the model of the Russian expression "sun'iy" (Arabic origin. 'artificial') + "fertilization" ('fertilization') instead of the direct borrowing of the word "insemination". Such calques, being understandable to speakers due to their native root, became widespread and established as normative terms [Ismailov, 2011]. The period of active replenishment of terminology through the Russian language was the 1920s-1980s, when targeted work was carried out to create Uzbek scientific vocabulary based on Russian (through textbook translations, dictionary publication). As a result, by the end of the 20th century, a significant layer of bilingual terminological correspondences had formed. For example, in the Russian-Uzbek Agricultural Dictionary of 1983, equivalents were recorded: "tyola" - ğunajin, "yalovaya (non-sterile) cow" - qisir, "valukh (chested bull) " - hökiz, etc. [Nosirov et al., 1996]. This indicates that by that time, Uzbek terms for most important concepts had either been restored from folk usage (like hökiz for "ox") or specifically introduced into scientific usage (like qisir for "yalovoy," from Arabic. *qisir - barren").

In the post-Soviet period, a dual trend is observed: on the one hand, the borrowing of international terms (in veterinary medicine, genetics - for example, virus, vaksina), often indirectly through Russian or directly from English, continues; on the other hand, there is a desire to order the terminology, replacing some Russian words with native Uzbek words, or to harmonize the form of borrowings with Uzbek phonetics [Dadaboyev, 2019]. Thus, the terms ferma and xo'jalik (farm) are used in parallel to denote a farm; instead of the Russian "plemennaya zavod", sometimes the Uzbek naslchilik xo'jaligi (plemennaya xo'jalik' from the Arabic nasl - offspring) are used. Nevertheless, most European borrowings have become so ingrained that they are perceived by native speakers as an integral part of terminology. Contexts of use of this layer - scientific articles, textbooks, official documents (standards, veterinary rules, etc.), however, many words (such as tractor - tractor, sut - serum, antibiotik - antibiotic) have also entered the everyday speech of specialist villagers. The study synthesizes data from three complementary sources:

1. Reference materials: Uzbek agricultural and veterinary glossaries, textbooks, and manuals used in higher education and extension.

2. Field elicitation: Semi-structured interviews with livestock specialists (veterinarians, animal-breeders, agricultural extension agents) and with craftsmen and pastoralists in rural regions, to capture colloquial and practice-oriented vocabulary.

3. Comparative inspection: Cross-linguistic comparison with Russian and English cognates where relevant to identify borrowings and calques.

Analytical methods included lexico-semantic classification, morphological parsing (identifying roots and affixes), etymological classification (native vs. borrowed), and register analysis (frequency and informal/formal usage). Representative examples are given to illustrate key patterns.

In conclusion, Uzbek livestock terminology is multi-layered in its origin. Turkic roots ensure its continuity with the ancient culture of nomadic pastoralists, Eastern borrowings reflect the regional Islamic-Persian era, and the Russian-European layer integrates the achievements of modern science. Each of these layers plays a role, and further analysis requires consideration not only of the linguistic source but also of the methods of term formation within each layer.

A characteristic feature of the studied terminology is the diversity of word formation models. The Uzbek

language, possessing rich agglutinative morphology, forms new terms both through affixation and through base addition, calquing, and semantic derivation. This section examines the main types of word formation of Uzbek zooterms, the degree of their productivity and frequency, and the motivational state of terminological units.

1. Suffixal method (affixation). This is the most productive method of forming new terms on Uzbek material [Ismailov, 2011]. Turkic word-formation suffixes are widely used:

Professional and personal name suffixes: -chi/-shi. With their help, personal names related to animal husbandry have been formed: cho'pon (shepherd, literally "shepherd," from qo'y "sheep" + old suffix. -pon), tuyachi (camel driver, from tuya "camel" + -chi), qushchi (poultry farmer, from qush "bird"). The suffix -chi<21 is extremely productive and in modern language denotes professions related to a particular animal or action (cf. baliqchi - fisherman, arichi - beekeeper, etc.) [Dadaboyev, 2019].

Industry/Sphere Suffix -chilik. It forms abstract nouns denoting a field of activity or industry: chorvachilik (animal husbandry, from chorva "cattle"), qöychilik (sheep husbandry, from qöy "sheep"), quyonchilik (rabbit husbandry, from quyon "rabbit"). The suffix -chilik is productive for agricultural sector names and has firmly established itself in terminology and official vocabulary [Dadaboyev, 2019]. It is noteworthy that in many cases, -chilik joins the borrowed root: for example, fermerchilik (farming) from fermer (Eng. farmer) + -chilik, demonstrating the adaptation of the foreign root by means of Uzbek derivation.

Suffixes of qualitative adjectives and carrier adjectives: -dor, -li, -siz etc. For example, zotdor (kind: zot "kind" + Persian suffix. -dor "possessing"), junli (woolly: jun "wool" + -li "possessing"), tuxumsiz (yol, dosl. "without egg": tuxum "egg" + -siz "without"). These models are less productive, but they are used in terminology to describe animal characteristics (milkiness, fertility, etc.). The suffix -dor came from the Persian language and is considered bookish, while -li/-siz is native Turkic and is also used in colloquial style. Functional differences are observed: -dor is more commonly used in official terms (nasldor mol - pedigree livestock), while the equivalent with -li is more general in nature (naslli - pedigree, having a pedigree).

Word Composition (Basic Composition). Many Uzbek zooterms are compound words or phrases, often combined into a single concept. The composition can be:

Complete (closed word): for example, qoramol (cattle, from qora "black" + mol "livestock/property"), qo'ytikan (literally "sheep's thorn," the name of a type of fodder plant), suvloq* (from suv "water" + loq "bull," a term for a bull used for watering the herd - a conditional example). In such words, the components are not separated and form a new lexical unit. Sometimes addition occurs according to the "determiner + determiner" model, reflecting a characteristic feature: for example, qalpoqdor* ("roach, dung beetle," dosl. "wearing a hat," due to the characteristic shape of the horns on the beetle's head) - here, zoological terminology is superimposed on folk naming.

Analytical (word combination): a term is expressed by a combination of several words that can function as a single name. For example, uy hayvoni ("domestic livestock"), naslchilik xöjaligi ("breeding farm"), sun'iy uruğlantirish usuli ("artificial insemination method"). In the Uzbek language, such combinations often calqued foreign terms or developed from descriptive definitions. Over time, some of them transform into stable terminological units, approaching compound names. Morphologically, they remain separate, but their components remain virtually unchanged and are used together. For example, qoramol pari - literally "fairy of cattle," the folk name for the cattle death epidemic - functions as a single term in the speech of older generations (compare. rus. "cattle's sea").

2. Calking and translation correspondences. As mentioned, during the Soviet period and later, the creation of translation terms - direct equivalents of Russian terms through the selection of Uzbek roots - was actively practiced. This method can be considered a special type of word formation, in which the model is borrowed, and the linguistic material is native. Examples:

Rus. "poultry farm" → uzb. qushxona (literally "birdhouse," although initially qushxona could mean simply a poultry house among the people, it became a term due to the need to distinguish industrial poultry breeding);

Rus. "live weight" (live weight of an animal) → uzb. jonli vazn (literally the same);

Rus. "feed unit" → uzb. ozuqa birligi (direct translation of two components).

Many such calques have become official terms, although their normativity initially required their consolidation in dictionaries and textbooks [Development..., 1991]. The advantage of calqued terms is their comprehensibility for specialists without knowledge of a foreign language; the disadvantage is sometimes the complexity or length of the expression compared to the original. Nevertheless, calquing remains relevant: in recent times, terminology committees prefer to create Uzbek equivalents for international terms, especially in basic agricultural vocabulary [Dadaboyev, 2019].

3. Conversion and semantic derivation. Another way to enrich terminology is to use existing words of the common language to denote new concepts without external change of form, that is, semantic term formation [Ismailov, 2011]. In the Uzbek language, many livestock terminologies arose through the specialization of meaning:

The everyday word has acquired a narrow terminological semantics. For example, tish means "tooth," but in horse breeding, tish (or tishli at, literally "toothed horse") is a term for adult horses over 5 years old whose all teeth have changed. Here, the biological characteristic (dental condition) formed the basis of age gradation, and the word acquired a specific meaning in the context of the economy.

Metonymic transfer: bosh - "head" in common language, but in animal husbandry it is used as a counting word for livestock (ikki bosh qoramol - two heads of cattle). This is more of a functional variation of using a word in professional speech.

Terminologization of phraseological units: Some fixed expressions or folk names become terms. For example, qötos is the folklore name for the breeding of yak and cow mentioned in old sources; now this term is also used in scientific literature when describing hybrids (hybrid of Bos grunniens and Bos taurus).

The semantic method of enriching terminology is less obvious, but it was productive during the period of terminology formation, when many common language words were "designated" to denote scientific concepts [Ismailov, 2011]. G'. Ismailov, in his research on Uzbek terminology, notes that semantic derivation often went parallel to morphological: first, a descriptive phrase or metaphorical name appeared in the speech of practitioners, then it entered writing and became a term in the dictionary [Ismailov, 2011]. Thus, for example, the vocabulary of diseases was enriched: quturish (literally "rabies," from the verb qutirmoq - to rage) became the term "dog rabies, hydrophobia" along with the Latin rabies, sil (literally "exhaustion, measles") - the term "tuberculosis," applicable to animals, etc. Here, motivation through figurative meaning is evident: the speakers had a figurative basis (the behavior of a rabid patient is associated with буйство - quturish), which facilitated the adoption of the word as a term.

5. Mixed and Reduced Models. In addition to the main methods, there are rare cases of non-standard word formation in terminology:

Abbreviation and reduction: are not characteristic of Uzbek zooterminology, but several abbreviations borrowed from Russian are used: AO (ATB - artificial insemination), JB (JB - live weight/weight) - mainly in technical texts and tables.

Contamination (base fusion): practically not recorded in this area.

Obsolete affixes and forms: some terms retained ancient suffixes that are no longer productive. For example, the word ğunajin (calf) contains the suffix -jin, which no longer functions in any new word; tönğiz (pig) has the ancient suffix -iz, which is not highlighted by modern speakers as a morpheme. These reduced elements are historically interesting, but no longer participate in word formation.

Table-2 summarizes the main word-formation models of zooterms in the Uzbek language, indicating their source, degree of standardization (to what extent they are accepted by modern language norms), frequency, and example.

Table-2

Word-formation models of zooterms: productivity, frequency, origin

Model	Source	Normativity	Frequency	Example

Turkic suffixation	native Uzbek	Very high (productive, approved by the Termincom)	dozens of terms, new ones are being actively formed	*sheep* breeding, *camel* herder,
Suffixation borrowed.	Pers./Arabic. Suffixes in Uzbek.	Average (normative in established words, no new ones are formed)	limited set of established terms	*zotdor* (strained), *naslsiz* (non-strained)
Addition of bases	Turkic tradition and hybrids	High (compound terms have been adopted, although new ones are more commonly used as combinations)	a significant number of base terms	*cattle* (cattle), *sheep hut* (sheep hut)
Calquing	russian/international.	High (officially encouraged to replace foreign terms with calques)	a significant number, especially during the Soviet era.	*artificial* insemination, *naslchilik ishlari,*
Semantic derivation	internal (general vocabulary)	High (many terms are the result of metaphor or narrowing of meanings)	it is difficult to calculate, as the process is gradual.	*qoraqalpoq* (literally, "black hat" - the name of a breed of sheep), *quturish* (from the word "rabies" meaning "to rage")
Borrowing	Russian/Lat.	Moderate (used, but there's a policy to replace it with Uzbek ones)	there are many terms, but some are replaced by Uzbek equivalents.	*brucellosis* (brucellosis), *mastitis* (mastitis), *vitamin* (vitamin)

Note: The given frequency of models reflects the current situation: terms continue to be formed most

actively through suffixal and calquing methods, while the direct import of foreign words is being reduced due to language policy considerations [Dadaboev, 2019]. At the same time, it is impossible to completely avoid borrowings, especially for concepts that have no analogues in traditional culture (genetic terms, drug names, etc.). Therefore, a compromise is observed: internationalisms are introduced in an adapted form (vaksina along with em - "vaccination," biotexnologiya along with descriptive biological technology, etc.), while established Russisms are retained if they are difficult to replace.

Lexicographic sources confirm institutional shifts. While many borrowings (often without alternatives) were recorded in Soviet dictionaries, recent editions strive to add Uzbek equivalents to them. For example, in the English-Uzbek Dictionary of Agricultural Terms (Jurayev, 2020), for each English term, an Uzbek translation and (in brackets) Russian are provided - this reflects the transition period when a specialist possesses both Russian and Uzbek terminology. However, there is a trend towards complete autonomy of Uzbek terminology. In publications from the early 2020s, the indication of a Russian word is becoming increasingly rare - it is believed that a sufficient fund of own terms has been created. At the same time, efforts are aimed at popularizing terminology among a wide range - through glossaries in popular journals, agricultural television and radio programs in the Uzbek language, where national terms are deliberately used. Thus, the return of terms to the mass consciousness occurs: what was previously known only to specialists (for example, the word laktoza is replaced by the expression sut shakari, literally "milk sugar," which is understandable to any bearer).

Conclusion

In conclusion, the evolution of Uzbek livestock terminology is a process of gradual replacement and coexistence of different layers of vocabulary in pursuit of clarity and national identity. Many original and previously borrowed words have received a "second life" in the form of standardized terms, while others have become passive. Due to the purposeful activity (academic and state) of fixing and selecting vocabulary, modern zooterminology in Uzbekistan represents a sufficiently holistic system. It relies on a folk base, is enriched with international concepts, but at the same time, it is maximally expressed in the native language. It should be noted that the genetic characterization of livestock terminology in the Uzbek language - from its origin to its formation and consolidation methods - provides a complete picture of how this sectoral lexicon was formed and developed. Such an analysis creates a basis for further research on functional-stylistic and comparative aspects.

References

1. Animal Husbandry: Encyclopedia. Chief Ed. P.A. Vlasov. – Moscow: Soviet Encyclopedia, 1980. – 656 p.
2. Juraev L. English-Uzbek-Russian Dictionary of Agricultural Terms. – Tashkent: Universitet, 2020. – 540 p.
3. Zaychenko N.F. Lexico-Semantic Group “Animal Names” and its Word Formation Potential in Modern Russian: PhD Abstract. – Kyiv, 1983. – 19 p.
4. Inchina I.V. Semantic Adaptation of Borrowed Terms in English (on the Material of Veterinary Medicine) // Proceedings of the Academy of Sciences. – 2002. – No. 4. – P. 112–119.
5. Kipriyanova A.A. Names of Young Domestic Animals in Russian: Semantics and Word Formation // MSU Bulletin. Series 9, Philology. – 1999. – No. 2. – P. 34–40.
6. Klushin N.A. On the Classification of Animal Husbandry Terminology // Reports of VASKhNIL. – 1989. – No. 5. – P. 29–37.
7. Koval P.N., Livanova K.K. Breeding of Farm Animals. – Moscow: Kolos, 2001. – 360 p.
8. Kosilshchuk E.A. Zoomorphic Lexemes in Russian Folk Speech (Semantic-Stylistic Analysis on the Material of Central Russian Dialects): PhD Thesis. – Kostroma, 1999. – 172 p.
9. Kosykh E.A. Folk Names of Domestic Animals in the Russian Language: PhD Thesis. – Volgograd, 1994. – 187 p.
10. Kurbanova G.A. Study of Livestock Terminology in Russian and Uzbek Languages // Journal of Universal Science Research. – 2023. – Vol. 2, No. 6. – P. 70–72.
11. Kurbanova G.A. Correlation of Form and Meaning in Livestock Terminology in Russian and Uzbek Languages // Journal of Multidisciplinary Bulletin. –

2025. – Vol. 8, No. 3. – P. 45–50.

12. Oripova F.M. Structural-Semantic Analysis of Livestock Vocabulary in Tajik and English Languages: PhD Thesis. – Dushanbe, 2016. – 177 p.

13. Romanova N.B. Cattle Breeding Vocabulary in 18th Century Russian. – Leningrad: Leningrad State University, 1982. – 134 p.

14. Russian-Uzbek Agricultural Dictionary. In 2 Vols. – Tashkent: Fan, 1983. – 600 p.

15. Мухаммадиев, С.Б. (2017). Экономическое влияние Южной Кореи на постсоветском пространстве на примере Центральной Азии. Экономика Центральной Азии, 1(2), 57-65.

16. угли Мухаммадиев, С.Б. (2024). Изучение семантических характеристик терминов животноводства в узбекском и английском языках. Innovative achievements in science 2024, 3(30), 142-154.

17. Мухаммадиев, с.б. (2018). Южная корея: экономическая стратегия в центральной азии в 2000-2010-х гг. Экономические отношения, 8(1), 95-104.

18. Mukhamadiev, S. B. U. (2024). Сравнительный анализ лексики животноводства в узбекском и английском языках. Sustainability of education, socio-economic science theory, 2(19), 228-231.

19. Muxammadiyev, s. (2025). O'zbek tilida chorvachilik terminologiyasining shakllanishi va hozirgi HOLATI. News of the NUUz, 1(1.2), 348-350.

20. Saymiddinov D. Livestock Lexicon in the Tajik Language: Semantic Groups and Development. – Dushanbe: Donish, 2001. – 276 p.

21. Sattarov A.Kh. Comparative Analysis of Horse Breeding Terms in English and Uzbek // Proceedings of the Conference on Comparative Linguistics. – Tashkent, 1974. – P. 80–85.

22. Saadiyeva G.F. Structural-Semantic Analysis of Agricultural Terminology (on the Material of Tajik, Russian, and English): PhD Abstract. – Dushanbe, 2006. – 24 p.

23. Teshayev Kh.I. Functioning of the Thematic Word Group “Animal World” in Russian and Tajik Languages: PhD Thesis. – Dushanbe, 2016. – 156 p.

24. Tlehatuk S.R. Sheep Breeding Terminology in English and Adyghe Languages: Comparative Study. – Maykop, 2001. – 190 p.

25. Trubachyov O.N. Names of Domestic Animals in Indo-European Languages: An Attempt of Semantic Reconstruction. – Moscow: Academy of Sciences USSR, 1960. – 314 p.