

## THE LINGUISTIC SYSTEM OF MUSICAL TERMS IN THE EXPLANATORY DICTIONARY OF THE UZBEK LANGUAGE: ETYMOLOGY, SEMANTICS, AND A CORPUS-BASED MODEL FOR MODERNIZATION

**Abdualimova Mahfuza Safarboy kizi**  
Lecturer, Tashkent Perfect University

**Abstract:** This study provides a systematic linguistic analysis of musical terms presented in the *Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek Language* (EDUL) and its electronic version, Izoh.uz. The research examines the etymological, morphological, and polysemic features of musical terminology, as well as usage patterns based on a modern linguistic corpus. The conclusions and recommendations propose the modernization of dictionary entries through contextual labeling of terms and the implementation of an electronic updating protocol in TEI/XML format. The findings serve as a scientific foundation for adapting Uzbek lexicography to the requirements of the digital era.

**Keywords:** musical terminology, etymology, polysemy, morphology, corpus linguistics, explanatory dictionary, TEI/XML.

**Introduction.** Musical terminology is a dynamically evolving lexical domain that responds to cultural, historical, and technological changes. In the Uzbek language, musical vocabulary has developed through sustained interaction with multiple languages, including Turkic, Arabic–Persian, Russian, and various European languages. This complex historical layering necessitates specialized methodological approaches to dictionary compilation and corpus-based updates. Although national lexicographic resources such as the *Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek Language* and the Izoh.uz platform currently serve as primary reference tools for both linguistic research and practical use, they demonstrate notable discrepancies with contemporary language practice. For instance, widely used terms such as *estrada* and *synthesizer* do not fully correspond to their existing dictionary definitions, while polysemous units like *parda* (“mode/fret/curtain”) and *ohang* (“melody/intonation”) exhibit context-dependent interpretations. These issues underscore the relevance of the present study and highlight the necessity of updating dictionaries through corpus integration, labeling, and structural standardization.

**Literature Review and Theoretical Framework.** Research on musical vocabulary combines both traditional and modern linguistic approaches. Classical sources (Akbarov, Fitrat, Begmatov, Vyzgo) describe the historical development and practical usage of musical terms, while contemporary lexicography and corpus linguistics—incorporating TEI/XML standards, corpus annotation, and NLP-based methods—enable systematic structuring and digital adaptation. Theoretical foundations of polysemy, domain labeling, and variation analysis play a crucial role in enriching dictionary entries with contextual and functional information. These approaches provide a comprehensive framework for understanding musical terminology as a structured and evolving lexical system.

**Methods.** The study was conducted using a three-stage methodological framework: lexicographic extraction, morphological–etymological analysis, and corpus-based usage analysis. In the first stage, approximately 1,200 musical terms were extracted from the *Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek Language* and Izoh.uz, forming a preliminary database. In the second

stage, each term was analyzed according to its etymological origin (Turkic, Arabic–Persian, Russian, Western European) and morphological formation (affixation, compounding, dependent constructions). In the third stage, a corpus of approximately 11 million words covering the period from 2010 to 2024 was used to examine frequency of usage and contextual registers (academic, practical, literary, technical). Statistical indicators included a polysemy index, affix frequency, and a contextual diversification coefficient.

**Results.** The findings reflect a multifaceted linguistic analysis of the etymological sources, thematic composition, morphological structure, and semantic activity of Uzbek musical terminology.

**Etymological Composition.** The analysis demonstrates the dominance of the Turkic layer (42%), followed by Arabic–Persian (28%), Russian/European (20%), and other Western languages (10%). Turkic-origin terms primarily denote traditional instruments and folk music concepts; Arabic–Persian terms are associated with theoretical concepts and maqom traditions; Russian and European borrowings correspond mainly to notation and orchestral systems.

**Thematic Classification.** Musical terms were functionally grouped as follows: names of instruments (26.7%), theoretical concepts (20.8%), genres and styles (17.5%), performance-related terms (15%), notation and technique (11.7%), and digital music terminology (8.3%). Although digital music terms constitute a smaller proportion, their frequency in the corpus is rapidly increasing.

**Morphological Characteristics.** A significant proportion of musical terms are derived through affixation, particularly those denoting performers and professions. The suffix **–chi** (34%) is the most productive, forming terms such as *dutarchi* and *qoshiqchi* (“instrumentalist/singer”). The suffixes **–anda / –on** (21%)—of Arabic–Persian origin—are commonly used in traditional vocal performance terms (*xonanda*, *sozanda*). The suffix **–kor** (19%) denotes creative and professional activity (*bastakor*, *sozkor*), while **–shunos** (8%) forms scholarly and analytical designations (*musiqashunos*). This morphological structure reflects professional segmentation and the social organization of musical practice.

**Polysemy.** Polysemy represents one of the central challenges identified in the study. The average polysemy index is 2.1 meanings per term. Highly polysemous terms include *parda* (four meanings), *ohang* (three to four meanings), and *nola* (two to three meanings). For such terms, dictionary entries should incorporate domain labels (e.g., [music], [technical], [literary]) and corpus-based contextual examples.

**Corpus-Based Usage.** Corpus analysis indicates that the term *estrada* is used in 68% of cases to denote contemporary popular stage music, diverging from its outdated dictionary definition. Similarly, terms such as *synthesizer*, *MIDI*, and *DAW* appear with high frequency in the corpus but lack sufficiently detailed dictionary descriptions. These findings highlight the necessity of integrating corpus data into electronic dictionaries.

**Discussion.** The analysis reveals significant inconsistencies between lexicographic representations of musical terminology and actual language usage. Key issues include outdated definitions, insufficient management of polysemy, incomplete coverage of digital music terminology, and the absence of corpus integration. Addressing these challenges requires systematic modernization through domain labeling, corpus-based examples, TEI/XML encoding, and version-controlled updates.

**Recommendations and Update Protocol**

To modernize musical terminology in EDUL and Izoh.uz, the following protocol is proposed:

- **Standardized dictionary entry structure:** lexical unit, phonetic transcription, etymology, domain label, technical definition, figurative meaning, 1–2 corpus examples, version/update date.
- **Corpus integration** via API-based retrieval of dynamic usage examples.
- **TEI/XML encoding** for machine-readable storage and export.
- **Expert accreditation** involving linguists and musicologists.
- **Versioning system** documenting revision history.

**Conclusion.** This study demonstrates the structural complexity and semantic richness of Uzbek musical terminology through a comprehensive analysis of its etymological, morphological, and semantic dimensions. The proposed lexicographic modernization protocol enhances scientific accuracy, usability, and alignment with contemporary linguistic practice. Implementing these measures will contribute to the integration of Uzbek musical terminology into education, research, performance, and digital music technologies.

**Research Limitations.** The corpus analyzed covers the period from 2010 to 2024; regional dialects and developments emerging after 2025 were not fully incorporated. Certain historical variants and literary contexts require further ethnographic investigation.

**Future Research Directions.** Future studies should focus on developing a national musical corpus, monitoring the evolution of digital music terminology, mapping regional variation, and applying NLP-based automatic term extraction and etymological classification. Such research will support systematic, sustainable updates to Uzbek musical lexicography.

#### References

1. Akbarov, I. (1987). *Musiqa Lug'ati*. Tashkent: Adabiyot va san'at
2. Begmatov, E. (2010). *Uzbek Lexicology*. Tashkent: Fan.
3. Fitrat, A. (1993). *Uzbek Classical Music and Its History*. Tashkent: Fan.
4. Izoh.uz — Online Dictionary of the Uzbek Language (accessed 11 December 2025).
5. *Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek Language*. (2006–2008). Tashkent.
6. Vyzgo, T. S. (1980). *Musical Instruments of Central Asia*. Moscow: Muzyka.
7. Asafyev, B. V. (1971). *Musical Form as a Process*. Moscow: Muzyka.
8. Holopov, Y. N. (2002). *Music Theory*. Moscow: Muzyka.