

Explanation of yurt building terms with through semantic methods

Berdiev Husan Holnazarovich

Samarkand (Uzbekistan).

Annotation

The vocabulary of yurt building with its connection with the notion of “yurt, orda”, expresses the scientific, philosophical, political, social, juridical and administrative events. Some notions and events of every day life, the demand for word usage causes the appearance of new combinations and expressions by means of logical expressive means. In accordance with this the yurt building vocabulary of the Uzbek language as well as of other Turkish languages is characterized by colourful richness. In the history of Turkish people the yurt and other houses of yurt type has a specific role. These kinds of housing is widely used in modern time in seasonal process and in tourism spheres. Their specific features are connected with terminology. This article deals with metaphorical terms of this sphere.

Keywords: yurt building, lexical system, semantic method, metaphorical term, basis of resemblance.

Introduction. As it is mentioned in historical, archeological and ethnographical researches, their transformation mainly began at the beginning of the last century. During that historical process the yurt and yurt-type houses have preserved their value as national dignity and it can be demonstrated with a lot of examples. And the terminological system of that sphere was also preserved. The learning of its artistic, scientific, historical sources and examples being used nowadays are one of the actual tasks of linguistics.

There are lots of historical processes, dates, spiritual and material values which have a definite importance in the existence of a nation. Doubtless, kigiz (a type of a textile used for covering the yurt) had a special role in the past life style [1]. Different signs – symbols were described on it. Their names formed metaphorical terms. We can find lots of characteristic examples for it in prestigious sources. As the words/terms in Turkmen, Uygur, Chigil, Kashkar, Kurgan languages given in “Devonu-lugotit-turk”. For example, “chaydam – a light type of carpet for covering in rain” [2] or “changalduruk – a type of a

cjver used for protection from rain and hot sun, it is made of namat (a type of light carpet)” [2].

Materials and Methods. As researches show the turkish people of Central Asia all had yurtas and yurta-type houses (yurta, white house, black house, mobile house, wing, land-wing, double-wing etc.) and the main material for covering was kigiz. S.M.Abramzon mentioned in his book “Kirgyzs and their ethnogenetical and historical-cultural relations” mentioned the usage of kigiz for covering the yurts and yurta-type houses by the people of Central Asia. In some areas as in Tuvinian people the animal skin was used for covering [3].

The preparation of kigiz material, colours, missions and other features took different names in accordance with the names of places of inhobitance. As in Turkish languages the houses with wooden basis covered with kigiz had various names. The following characteristic features caused the naming:

in Karakalpak language: kigiz house, black house, “house-hold equipent built of sheep wool thick carpet type cover with wooden basis” [4].

in Kazakh language: kuyiz house, named after the main construction material of the dwelling house-kigiz [5].

in Kirghiz language: boz- house, named after the colour of main construction material for building the dwelling house-kigiz [6].

in Uzbek language: in accordance with the apparence and indication of kigiz it was named-House, Old Black House, used yurta, Black House, Yurta, New Yurta [7], [8].

Forming of words or terms through semantic method is the most important linguistic basis in both general literary language and terminological systems. Problems of forming of terms through semantic method was studied a little in Uzbek linguistics. Several scientists as N. Mamatov, S.Ibrohimov, S.Akobirov, H.Jamolkhonov, R.Doniyorov, O.Ramazonov, T.Tursunova, A.Husanov, A.Madvaliev, A.Hojiev, H.Shamsiddinov, A.Sobirov, Z.Mirahmedova, I.Pardaeva, H.Yodgorov, M.Abdiev, N.Mirtojiev, G.Ismoilov spoke about ways of forming the terms through semantic method in their monographic researches. The work of G.Ismoilov is considered as the most dominant among other works devoted to forming the terms through semantic method in terminological system. The work was about the reason of transforming of terms of one sphere into another; spiritual peculiarities of terms in new meanings; transforming through metaphor, metonymy, definition; their synonymic, variant, homonymous relationship; the

place of formed terms in general vocabulary and terminology. But there is not the unique monographic research about the place of semantic method in terminological systems.

The terms on yurt building through semantic method have their own place in Uzbek terminology.

As other terminological systems, the way of forming terms with the help of metaphor is also widely used in yurt building terminology. In general, the similarity of one object to another forms the new meaning through semantic methods. This can be seen also in yurt building terminology.

The majority of words in yurt building terminology are formed through semantic method, this terminology developed through several centuries. The changes in semantics are especially based in transformations as metaphor, metonymy, and synecdoche.

Terms which were formed through semantic method have lexical-semantic and semantic-syntactic peculiarities. In the first there can be seen vocabulary changes, in the latter the mix of semantic and syntactic features [9].

So, the article is about metaphoric terms used in yurt building.

Yurt building terms formed through semantic method firstly used in single, secondly in complex structures: Single usage of semantic terms; complex usage of semantic terms.

Historical development of forming of the noun through semantic method is closely connected with changing of the word's meaning. Semantic method helps to differentiate noun and other classificatory.

Results. In forming the terms through semantic method the following shapes are very important:

- The basis of resemblance is the object: *uzukbov* (Dehkonobod, the belt for carpet which tied from different sides), *shahmati* (Dehkonobod, 1. Tie up the ropes to the house, 2. Type of design in national sewing, 3. Langar, patched cloth as chessboard, 4. Embroidered carpet as chessboard), *kosagul* (Dehkonobod, coloured woolen decorated centre of the carpet), *sochoq* (unfinished part of the carpet: Who cut the unfinished (sochoq) part of the carpet?), *shopqilich* (Shahrisabz, type of design in embroidered cloth), *qilich* (Karshi, one wide side, one narrow sided instrument for knitting the carpet), *qilichak* (Mirishkor, knitted with qilich (instrument) cotton or woolen carpet);

- The basis of resemblance is the amount: *tuqqiz* (prepared clothes, jewellery and sweet for bride by bridegroom), *qunqaroq* (1, Dehkonobod, a year old ram), (2, Shahrisabz, type of design as horn of ram);

- The basis of resemblance is part of object: pichoquchi (1, Chem, a decorated knitted flower on the carpet), gildirovik (Dehkonobod, 12-15 sm wide belt for velveteen house);

- The basis of resemblance is ethnonym: turkmani (type of carpet knitted in turmak (knitting instrument)), arabi (carpet) [10];

- The basis of resemblance is toponym: bagdodi (Toshkurgan, design in woolen carpet: we call this flower Bagdodi), qashqari (Okirtma, type of bag knitted with wool or cotton);

- The basis of resemblance is part of the body: bilaklamoq (press the carpet by kneeling several persons), bilaklash (presence of women in pressing), boshbov (the rope which ties two sides), boshqur (resistance), urchuqbosh (Chem, round stone or clay device with a hole in the centre for distaff: My distaff was broken), suyak (Davkamar, wooden parts of the house), urtaquloq (Guzor, one wide sided, one narrow sided part of carpet which tied together), qubizquloq (Dehkonobod, flower, design for belt of the house);

- The basis of resemblance is name of animal: julkurs (Ciyal, piled carpet) [7], [11], tuyabuyin (Chem, design (decoration, flower) in the carpet which includes 18 fibers), shobarchin (Shahrisabz, copy of the design of suzane (decoration of scorpion or any insect on the flower in the carpet), quzitish (Suvlik, decoration in the collar of women's dress), quyitishi (Chem, decoration on the knitted carpet), quchqormayiz (Chem, design (decoration, flower) in the carpet which includes 14 fibers);

- The basis of resemblance is astronomic object: oynusxa (Dehkonobod, design on the belt of the house), osmoni (Guzor, blue colour);

- The basis of resemblance is name of plant: olmagul (decoration on the belts of the yurts);

- The basis of resemblance is name of birds: qushoyoq (Dehkonobod, decoration on the belts of the yurts).

Discussion and Conclusion. Noun-formation by semantical way in the historical development process on the basis of change of word meaning is connected with the formation of a new word with new lexical meaning. Semantic way is used to distinguish between the nouns and other parts of speech:

- the usage of metaphorical terms in sphere vocabulary aims the short and simple expression of opinion;

- the learning of metaphorical terms proves their lexico-semantical peculiarities;

- in the formation of metaphorical terms the usage of zoomorphical signs is important and they consist of such lexemas as wing, horn, nose, hoof which are widely used;

- in sphere vocabulary as well as yurt-building metaphorical terms the role of surrounding environment is important and it is characterized by the influence of this terms in materialistic and spiritual life of the nation.

In general, metaphoric terms used in yurt building have a great significance in ethno linguistic, linguocultural aspects as linguistic value, their investigation is the most important issue nowadays.

References:

1. Usmonova Sh.R. (2010), *The research of consumer vocabulary in Altaic languages*, Fan, Tashkent, Uzbekistan. p. 81.
2. Mahmud Koshghariy. (1963), “*Devonu lugotit-turk*” - “*Vocabulary of Turkish words*”, Fan, III, Tashkent, Uzbekistan. pp. 191, 398.
3. Abramzon S.M. (1975), *Kirghyzs and their ethnogenetical and historical-cultural relations*, Hauka, Leningrad, Russian. p.119.
4. 4 volumes of “*Explanatory dictionary of Karakalpak language*”, (1984), II, Nokus, pp. 345-346.
5. I-IX volumes of “*Explanatory dictionary of Kazakh language*”, (1974-1985), Almaty, V. pp. 42-43.
6. 2 volumes of “*Explanatory dictionary of Kirghyz language*”, (1984), Mektep, I, Frunze. p.518.
7. Nafasov, T. (2011), *The dictionary of Uzbek national words of Kashkadarya region*, Muharrir, I, Tashkent, Uzbekistan. pp. 427.
8. Mirzaev, N. (1991), *The Explanatory dictionary of Uzbek ethnographisms*, Fan, Tashkent, Uzbekistan. p. 44.
9. Mirahmedova, Z. (2010), *Anatomic terminology of Uzbek language and problems of ordering them*, Fan, Tashkent, Uzbekistan. p. 57.
10. Rahimov, S. (1995), *The dictionary of Surkhadarya region dialects*, Tashkent, Uzbekistan, p. 18.
11. Tuychiboyev, B., Shirinov, S., Kashkirly, K., (1991), *The spring of endless values*, Tashkent, Uzbekistan. p. 78.