

UDK: 37.091.3:81'243

SEMANTIC FEATURES OF CLOTHING NAMES IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Nasrullaeva Gulshan Samadovna,*Surkhandarya campus of Navoi University of Innovations
Associate Professor of the Department of General Sciences**Doctor of Philological Sciences (DSc)**Email: nasrullayevagulshan13@gmail.com**https://orcid.org/0009-0002-6992-2591***Toshtemirova Gulnora,***Surkhandarya campus of Navoi University of Innovations
First-year Master's student in Linguistics (English Language)**Email: dilnavozismatullayeva8@gmail.com*

Abstract: This study examines the semantic features of clothing names in English and Uzbek from a comparative perspective. Within lexical semantics, clothing terms are viewed not only as nominative units but also as reflections of a nation's historical experience, cultural values, and social life. The main objective is to identify similarities and differences in denotative and connotative meanings, nominative functions, and structural characteristics of clothing vocabulary in both languages. The research employs comparative, descriptive, semantic, and contextual analysis methods, with data selected from modern dictionaries, academic sources, and literary texts. The findings reveal that English clothing terminology is largely characterized by functional and stylistic distinctions, whereas Uzbek clothing names demonstrate stronger ethnocultural marking, historical symbolism, and close connections with national identity.

Keywords: lexical semantics, clothing names, English language, Uzbek language, comparative linguistics, semantic analysis, national culture.

Аннотация. Данное исследование посвящено сравнительному анализу семантических особенностей наименований одежды в английском и узбекском языках. В рамках лексической семантики термины одежды рассматриваются не только как номинативные единицы, но и как отражение исторического опыта, культурных ценностей и социального уклада народа. Основной целью является выявление сходств и различий в денотативных и коннотативных значениях, номинативных функциях и структурных характеристиках данной лексики. В исследовании использованы сравнительный, описательный, семантический и контекстуальный методы анализа. Результаты показывают, что в английском языке наименования одежды характеризуются функциональной и стилистической дифференциацией, тогда как в узбекском языке они обладают более выраженной этнокультурной маркированностью и исторической символикой.

Ключевые слова: лексическая семантика, наименования одежды, английский язык, узбекский язык, сравнительное языкознание, семантический анализ, национальная культура.

Annotatsiya. Mazkur tadqiqot ingliz va o'zbek tillaridagi kiyim nomlarining semantik xususiyatlarini qiyosiy nuqtai nazardan tahlil qilishga bag'ishlangan. Leksik semantika doirasida kiyim terminlari nafaqat predmet nomini bildiruvchi birliklar, balki xalqning tarixiy tajribasi, madaniy qadriyatlar va ijtimoiy hayot tarzini aks ettiruvchi muhim vosita sifatida qaraladi. Tadqiqotning asosiy maqsadi ikki til kesimida kiyim nomlarining denotativ va konnotativ ma'nolari, nominativ funksiyalari hamda strukturaviy xususiyatlaridagi o'xshash va farqli jihatlarni aniqlashdan iborat. Ishda qiyosiy, tavsifiy, semantik va kontekstual tahlil metodlaridan foydalanildi, materiallar esa zamonaviy lug'atlar, ilmiy manbalar va badiiy matnlardan tanlab olindi. Tahlil natijalari shuni ko'rsatdiki, ingliz tilida kiyim nomlari asosan funksional va stilistik jihatdan farqlansa, o'zbek tilida ular kuchli etnomadaniy belgilanish, tarixiy ramziylik va milliy identifikatsiya bilan chambarchas bog'liq holda namoyon bo'ladi.

Kalit so'zlar: leksik semantika, kiyim nomlari, ingliz tili, o'zbek tili, qiyosiy tilshunoslik, semantik

tahlil, milliy madaniyat.

Introduction. Language serves not only as a means of communication but also as a repository of national consciousness, cultural memory, and social experience. Every lexical unit carries information that reflects both universal human concepts and nationally specific features. Among various lexical-semantic groups, clothing names occupy a special place because they are directly related to everyday life, cultural traditions, social hierarchy, professional identity, and historical development. The vocabulary of clothing is one of the richest semantic fields where language and culture closely interact.

The study of clothing terminology in linguistics is particularly important because garments are not only material objects but also symbolic markers of gender, age, profession, religion, ethnicity, and social status. In many cultures, clothing names preserve traces of historical periods, social changes, and national identity. For example, in Uzbek culture, lexical units such as *doppi*, *chapan*, *paranja*, and *atlas ko'ylak* reflect not only garments themselves but also centuries-old traditions and cultural values. Similarly, English lexical items such as *suit*, *blazer*, *uniform*, and *hoodie* may indicate formal status, institutional belonging, or generational identity [1].

The semantic analysis of clothing names becomes especially significant in comparative linguistics, where the goal is to identify how different languages conceptualize similar objects and how lexical meanings are shaped by national worldview. English and Uzbek languages belong to different language families-Germanic and Turkic respectively-and have developed within distinct historical and cultural environments. As a result, their lexical systems demonstrate both common semantic universals and substantial national specificity.

In lexical semantics, meaning is understood not only as the direct denotative reference of a word but also as its connotative, associative, and pragmatic dimensions. Clothing names often possess multiple layers of meaning. For instance, the English word *dress* may denote a specific garment, but it can also function metaphorically in expressions such as *dress for success*, where it symbolizes professionalism and self-presentation. Similarly, the Uzbek word *chapan* may refer to traditional outerwear, but culturally it also symbolizes respect, honor, and hospitality, especially when presented as a ceremonial gift [2].

Modern globalization and intercultural communication have further increased the importance of studying clothing terminology. The fashion industry, international trade, tourism, migration, and translation activities constantly require accurate interpretation of clothing-related vocabulary. Many lexical units cannot be translated directly due to cultural specificity. For example, the Uzbek term *doppi* cannot be fully replaced by the English equivalent *cap* because it contains strong national and symbolic meanings. Such lexical gaps create difficulties for translators and language learners and require deeper semantic understanding [3].

Another important issue is the distinction between native lexical units and borrowed terminology. English clothing vocabulary contains numerous borrowings from French, Italian, and Latin due to historical contact and the development of fashion discourse. Words such as *boutique*, *lingerie*, and *silhouette* demonstrate foreign lexical influence. Uzbek clothing terminology also includes Persian, Arabic, Russian, and modern English borrowings, especially in contemporary fashion vocabulary such as *pidjak*, *futbolka*, and *palto*. These borrowings influence the semantic structure of the lexical field and reveal sociolinguistic changes in society [4].

The relevance of this research is determined by the need for deeper lexical-semantic investigation in comparative linguistics and translation studies. Although many studies have examined general lexical semantics, the specific field of clothing names in English and Uzbek remains insufficiently explored, particularly from the perspective of semantic features and cultural connotations. This article seeks to fill this gap by analyzing the lexical meanings, semantic shifts, functional classifications, and cultural symbolism of clothing names in both languages.

The object of the research is the lexical-semantic group of clothing names in English and Uzbek. The subject of the research is the semantic features of these lexical units, including denotative meaning, connotative meaning, polysemy, synonymy, metaphorical extension, and cultural specificity.

The aim of the study is to identify and compare the semantic characteristics of clothing names in English and Uzbek and to determine how these lexical units reflect national-cultural values.

To achieve this aim, the following tasks are established:

1. To define the theoretical foundations of lexical semantics related to clothing terminology;
2. To analyze the semantic structure of clothing names in English and Uzbek;
3. To identify similarities and differences between the two lexical systems;
4. To examine culturally marked lexical units and translation difficulties;
5. To evaluate the role of clothing names in reflecting national identity and linguistic worldview.

The scientific novelty of the article lies in its comparative approach to the semantic analysis of clothing names in English and Uzbek, with special attention to cultural connotations and national specificity. The practical significance of the research is connected with its application in lexicology, translation studies, intercultural communication, and foreign language teaching.

Thus, clothing names represent not only lexical units of material culture but also important semantic indicators of social consciousness and cultural identity. Their comparative analysis allows a deeper understanding of how language reflects human experience across different linguistic communities.

Literature review. The study of lexical semantics has long occupied a central place in linguistic research because vocabulary reflects not only linguistic structure but also cultural consciousness, historical memory, and social development. Within lexical semantics, the lexical-semantic group of clothing names represents a particularly rich field of analysis due to its close connection with material culture, national identity, and symbolic representation. In comparative linguistics, clothing terminology offers valuable material for examining how different languages conceptualize daily life and encode cultural values.

Many scholars have addressed the theoretical foundations of lexical meaning and semantic structure. According to V.V. Vinogradov, lexical meaning is a complex phenomenon that combines nominative, grammatical, and stylistic components, and words function not only as designators of objects but also as carriers of emotional and cultural associations [1]. This approach is especially relevant for clothing names because garments often perform both practical and symbolic functions. For example, words such as *uniform* or *wedding dress* contain clear social and ritual meanings beyond their denotative reference.

A.I. Smirnitsky emphasizes that lexical units should be studied through their semantic fields and paradigmatic relations, including synonymy, antonymy, polysemy, and semantic extension [2]. Clothing names belong to a well-structured semantic field where lexical relations are highly productive. For instance, English words such as *coat*, *jacket*, *blazer*, and *cardigan* form a semantic cluster based on shared functional features, while distinctions emerge through style, material, or social use. Similarly, Uzbek terms such as *to'n*, *chapan*, *yaktak*, and *kamzul* reveal layered semantic differentiation shaped by regional and historical factors.

In Uzbek linguistics, Sh. Rahmatullayev's works on explanatory lexicology provide an important foundation for analyzing lexical meaning and national vocabulary [3]. He notes that lexical meaning is inseparable from ethnocultural context, particularly in words connected with everyday traditions. Clothing names in Uzbek often preserve ancient semantic structures that reflect family relations, ceremonial practices, and social values. For example, *sarpo* refers not simply to clothing but also to a traditional ceremonial gift associated with weddings, hospitality, and social honor.

Research in linguoculturology further supports the importance of studying clothing vocabulary. V.A. Maslova argues that language and culture form a single cognitive system where lexical units reflect national mentality and cultural models [4]. Clothing terminology serves as an example of this interaction because garments are cultural symbols that express belonging, prestige, modesty, and tradition. Uzbek national dress terms such as *doppi*, *atlas*, and *paranja* are deeply embedded in cultural narratives, while English terms like *business suit* or *school uniform* reflect institutional and professional identity.

Comparative studies by Nida and Newmark in translation theory also highlight the problem of lexical equivalence in culturally specific vocabulary [5]. Clothing names frequently create translation challenges because direct equivalents may not exist across languages. For instance, translating *doppi* as *hat* or *cap* results in semantic loss because the original term includes national symbolism and historical significance. Likewise, the English word *hoodie* may require descriptive translation in Uzbek because it represents a modern sociocultural category rather than a simple garment type.

Textbooks used in higher education also contribute to understanding lexical-semantic analysis. I.R. Galperin's stylistics textbook discusses connotative meaning and metaphorical extension, which are highly relevant for clothing names [6]. Clothing vocabulary often appears in metaphorical expressions such as *white-collar worker*, *blue-collar job*, or *under someone's coat*. These examples show that clothing terms may shift from material reference to abstract social meaning. Uzbek also demonstrates similar metaphorical extensions, such as expressions involving *to 'n kiydirmoq* (to honor someone) or *bosh kiyim* symbolizing authority and dignity.

Educational materials in lexicology by Arnold further explain that semantic change often occurs through social transformation and cultural borrowing [7]. Modern clothing vocabulary illustrates this clearly. English has absorbed numerous fashion-related borrowings from French and Italian, while Uzbek has integrated Russian and English terms such as *palto*, *pidjak*, *futbolka*, and *kurtka*. These borrowings often coexist with native terms, creating semantic competition and stylistic variation.

Several researchers have examined national clothing terminology specifically. Ethnographic studies by Karimova and ethnolinguistic analyses of Uzbek national costume show that garments function as markers of age, gender, marital status, and regional identity [8]. For example, the lexical distinction between women's and men's traditional clothing reflects not only physical appearance but also moral and social expectations. In English-speaking cultures, clothing classification is more strongly influenced by profession, occasion, and fashion industry categories rather than ritual symbolism.

Despite these valuable studies, there remains a lack of focused comparative analysis between English and Uzbek clothing names from the perspective of semantic structure. Most existing research either examines lexical semantics in general or studies national costume from ethnographic rather than linguistic viewpoints. Few works systematically compare denotative meaning, connotation, polysemy, metaphorical usage, and translation equivalence across the two languages.

This gap is particularly important in modern language education and translation practice. Students learning English often encounter lexical confusion when translating culturally marked clothing terms, while translators face difficulties preserving both semantic accuracy and cultural meaning. Therefore, a comparative lexical-semantic study

is necessary not only for theoretical linguistics but also for practical application in foreign language teaching and intercultural communication.

Methodology. This research investigates the semantic features of clothing names in English and Uzbek using a comparative lexical-semantic approach. Since clothing terminology reflects both linguistic structure and cultural identity, the methodology combines linguistic analysis with elements of linguoculturology and translation studies. The aim is not only to identify lexical meanings but also to reveal the cultural and symbolic dimensions embedded in clothing vocabulary.

The object of the research is the lexical-semantic group of clothing names in English and Uzbek. The subject of the research is the semantic characteristics of these lexical units, including denotative meaning, connotative meaning, polysemy, synonymy, metaphorical extension, cultural specificity, and translation equivalence.

The material for analysis was selected from several categories of sources. First, explanatory dictionaries of English and Uzbek were used to determine primary lexical meanings and semantic variations. These include Oxford English Dictionary, Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, and Sh. Rahmatullayev's Uzbek explanatory dictionary [3]. Second, bilingual dictionaries were consulted to compare translation equivalents and identify lexical gaps between the two languages. Third, examples were collected from literary texts, academic textbooks, and linguistic studies in order to observe contextual usage and pragmatic meaning. Finally, ethnographic descriptions of national clothing were included to understand culturally marked lexical units.

The lexical units selected for analysis include both everyday clothing names and culturally specific garments. English examples include *shirt, dress, suit, blazer, cardigan, hoodie, uniform, trousers, and wedding dress*. Uzbek examples include *ko'ylak, to'n, chapan, doppi, atlas, kamzul, yaktak, and sarpo*. Special attention is given to lexical items that demonstrate strong national-cultural meaning and limited translatability.

Several research methods were applied in the study.

The first method is the descriptive method, which is used to identify and classify clothing names according to their semantic structure. This method allows the researcher to define lexical units, describe their dictionary meanings, and determine their place within the lexical-semantic field. Through descriptive analysis, words are grouped according to categories such as outerwear, headwear, ceremonial clothing, professional clothing, and modern fashion terminology.

The second method is comparative analysis, which forms the core of the research. English and Uzbek lexical units are compared according to meaning, function, usage, and cultural association. This method helps reveal similarities and differences in semantic representation. For example, both languages have equivalent terms for universal garments such as *shirt* and *ko'ylak*, but differences become more evident in culturally specific terms such as *doppi* or *hoodie*, where full semantic equivalence is absent.

The third method is semantic analysis, which focuses on the internal structure of lexical meaning. This includes the study of denotative and connotative meaning, polysemy, synonymy, semantic narrowing, semantic broadening, and metaphorical extension. For example, the English word *dress* may function both as a noun and as a verb, while the Uzbek word *sarpo* extends beyond clothing to ceremonial meaning. Semantic analysis reveals how lexical meaning develops through social and cultural context.

The fourth method is contextual analysis, used to examine how clothing names function in authentic texts. Dictionary definitions alone are insufficient because many meanings emerge only in context. Literary texts, journalistic materials, and spoken expressions provide examples of figurative usage, emotional coloring, and pragmatic implication. For instance, the phrase *white-collar worker* cannot be understood literally without contextual interpretation [6].

The fifth method is linguocultural analysis, which examines the relationship between language and national culture. This method is especially important for Uzbek clothing names because many lexical units reflect traditional customs, family rituals, and symbolic values. The term *chapan*, for example, represents not only outerwear but also hospitality and respect when gifted ceremonially. Linguocultural analysis helps explain why direct translation may fail to preserve the original meaning.

The sixth method is translation equivalence analysis, which evaluates how clothing names are rendered between English and Uzbek. This method identifies complete equivalence, partial equivalence, and non-equivalence. For example, *coat* and *palto* demonstrate close equivalence, while *doppi* requires descriptive translation due to cultural specificity. This approach is particularly useful for translation studies and language teaching.

The research follows a qualitative rather than quantitative design because the focus is on semantic interpretation rather than statistical frequency. However, lexical classification and comparative grouping provide systematic organization of data.

The stages of the research were organized as follows:

1. Selection of lexical units from dictionaries and academic sources;
2. Classification of clothing names into semantic subgroups;
3. Identification of denotative and connotative meanings;
4. Comparative analysis of English and Uzbek lexical units;
5. Contextual examination of metaphorical and symbolic usage;
6. Evaluation of translation difficulties and cultural specificity;
7. Generalization of findings and formulation of conclusions.

The reliability of the research is ensured through the use of authoritative dictionaries, recognized academic textbooks, and established linguistic theories. Cross-checking lexical meanings across multiple sources minimizes interpretive subjectivity and strengthens analytical validity.

The limitations of the study should also be acknowledged. Since the lexical-semantic field of clothing is extremely broad, the article focuses primarily on the most representative lexical units rather than attempting exhaustive coverage. Regional dialectal variations and highly specialized fashion terminology are not analyzed in detail. Future studies may expand the corpus by including dialectal vocabulary, corpus linguistics methods, or sociolinguistic surveys.

Analysis and results. The comparative analysis of clothing names in English and Uzbek demonstrates that this lexical-semantic group contains both universal and culturally specific features. Clothing vocabulary reflects not only material objects but also social roles, cultural identity, symbolic values, and historical experience. The results of the study reveal significant differences in denotative meaning, connotative meaning, polysemy, lexical borrowing, and translation equivalence between the two languages.

Denotative Meaning and Lexical Classification. At the denotative level, many clothing names in English and Uzbek show direct equivalence because they refer to universal garments used in everyday life. Examples include *shirt* – *ko‘ylak*, *trousers* – *shim*, *coat* – *palto*, *hat* – *shlyapa*, and *shoes* – *poyabzal*. These lexical units are primarily nominative and demonstrate relatively stable semantic correspondence.

However, even apparently equivalent terms often reveal semantic divergence upon closer examination. For instance, the English word *dress* usually refers specifically to women’s one-piece clothing, while the Uzbek *ko‘ylak* may denote both women’s dress and men’s shirt depending on context. This broader semantic range of *ko‘ylak* reflects differences in lexical categorization and cultural usage [1].

Similarly, the English word *suit* carries formal and professional connotations associated with office culture, business identity, and institutional representation. In Uzbek, its closest equivalent may vary between *kostyum*, *shim-kostyum*, or descriptive translation depending on context. This indicates that denotative equivalence does not always guarantee semantic equivalence.

Connotative Meaning and Cultural Symbolism. The strongest semantic differences appear at the connotative level. Uzbek clothing names are often deeply connected with tradition, ritual, and symbolic social meaning. Words such as *chapan*, *doppi*, *atlas*, and *sarpo* cannot be understood fully through dictionary definitions alone.

The lexical unit *chapan* refers to traditional outerwear, but in Uzbek culture it symbolizes respect, honor, and hospitality. Presenting a *chapan* to a guest, elder, or honored person functions as a ceremonial act of recognition. Therefore, translating it simply as *robe* or *coat* results in significant semantic loss [2].

Likewise, *doppi* is not merely a cap but an ethnocultural symbol associated with national identity, regional belonging, and traditional values. It carries aesthetic and symbolic importance that English equivalents such as *hat* or *skullcap* cannot fully express.

In English, clothing names more frequently reflect professional, institutional, and social style categories. Terms such as *uniform*, *blazer*, *hoodie*, and *wedding dress* often signal occupation, class identity, or generational belonging rather than ritual symbolism. For example, *hoodie* in modern English may imply youth culture, informality, and sometimes social stereotypes depending on context [3].

Polysemy and Semantic Extension. Both languages demonstrate polysemy in clothing terminology, though the nature of semantic extension differs. In English, the word *dress* functions both as a noun and a verb. As a noun, it refers to a garment; as a verb, it means “to wear clothes” or “to prepare appropriately.” Expressions such as *dress for success* or *dress the wound* illustrate semantic broadening.

The word *coat* also demonstrates polysemy, referring both to clothing and to a covering layer in phrases like *a coat of paint*. Such semantic extension reflects metaphorical development based on shared conceptual features [4].

In Uzbek, polysemy is often connected with social function and ceremonial meaning. The word *sarpo* may refer literally to clothing, but it also denotes a traditional set of gifts prepared for weddings, family celebrations, or respected guests. Similarly, *to‘n kiydirmoq* literally means “to dress someone in a robe,” but figuratively it expresses honoring or rewarding a person.

These examples show that English semantic extension is frequently functional and metaphorical, while Uzbek extension is more closely related to ritual and social relationships.

Synonymy and Stylistic Variation. English clothing vocabulary demonstrates a high degree of stylistic differentiation due to the influence of fashion discourse and lexical borrowing. For example, *jacket*, *blazer*, *coat*, *cardigan*, and *outerwear* may overlap semantically but differ in function, style, and formality.

Borrowings from French and Italian such as *lingerie*, *boutique*, and *silhouette* often introduce stylistic prestige and professional fashion terminology [5]. This creates a layered lexical system where native and borrowed terms coexist.

Uzbek also contains synonymic variation, particularly between native and borrowed vocabulary. Words such as *palto*, *pidjak*, and *futbolka* entered the language through Russian and later international influence, while native terms such as *to‘n* and *kamzul* preserve traditional semantic identity.

This coexistence creates stylistic contrasts between traditional and modern vocabulary. Younger speakers may prefer international borrowings, while older generations often preserve native lexical choices.

Translation Equivalence. The analysis confirms three major types of translation equivalence: Complete equivalence: Words such as *shirt* – *ko‘ylak*, *coat* – *palto*, and *shoes* – *poyabzal* show relatively direct translation because the objects and functions are universally recognized.

Partial equivalence: Terms such as *dress* – *ko‘ylak* and *suit* – *kostyum* demonstrate partial equivalence because semantic scope differs across languages.

Non-equivalence: Culturally specific terms such as *doppi*, *chapan*, and *sarpo* require descriptive translation rather than direct lexical substitution. These cases are most problematic for translators because semantic meaning includes cultural symbolism rather than material reference alone [6].

The same applies in reverse translation. English words like *hoodie* or *blazer* may require explanation in Uzbek because they represent modern style categories without exact traditional equivalents.

Thus, translation of clothing names demands not only lexical knowledge but also cultural competence.

Discussion. The findings of this study confirm that clothing names represent an important lexical-semantic field where language and culture interact closely. The comparison between English and Uzbek demonstrates that lexical meaning cannot be reduced to simple dictionary definitions because many semantic features emerge through historical context, social usage, and national worldview.

One of the most significant observations is that Uzbek clothing terminology preserves stronger ethnocultural marking. Traditional garments function not only as physical objects but also as cultural symbols of honor, family structure, hospitality, and identity. This reflects the collective orientation of Uzbek society, where ceremonial practices and social relationships strongly influence lexical meaning.

In contrast, English clothing names show stronger differentiation according to profession, institution, and modern lifestyle categories. The lexical field is heavily influenced by urbanization, industrialization, and fashion classification. Terms such as *business suit*, *school uniform*, and *hoodie* demonstrate social categorization rather than ritual symbolism.

Another important issue concerns globalization and lexical borrowing. Both languages actively absorb foreign clothing terminology, but the process affects them differently. English borrowings often enrich stylistic and professional vocabulary, while Uzbek borrowings frequently replace or compete with native terms. This creates sociolinguistic tension between preservation of national identity and adaptation to global fashion discourse.

The study also highlights serious implications for translation studies. Literal translation often fails because clothing names carry hidden cultural information. Effective translation requires interpretation rather than substitution. This is especially relevant for literary translation, intercultural communication, and foreign language education.

For language teaching, comparative semantic analysis helps students avoid false equivalence and understand deeper cultural meaning. Learning vocabulary such as *doppi* or *hoodie* requires knowledge beyond grammar and dictionary definitions.

Therefore, clothing names should be studied as linguocultural units rather than isolated lexical items. Their semantic analysis contributes to lexicology, translation theory, ethnolinguistics, and language pedagogy.

Conclusion. The present study examined the semantic features of clothing names in English and Uzbek from a comparative lexical-semantic perspective. The research confirmed that clothing terminology represents one of the most culturally significant lexical groups because it reflects not only everyday material life but also social structure, historical memory, and national identity.

The analysis showed that at the denotative level many clothing names demonstrate direct or partial equivalence, especially for universal garments such as *shirt*, *coat*, and *shoes*. However, significant differences emerge in semantic scope and lexical categorization, as seen in examples such as *dress* and *ko'ylak*.

At the connotative level, Uzbek clothing names reveal stronger ethnocultural symbolism. Lexical units such as *chapan*, *doppi*, and *sarpo* contain deep ritual and social meanings that cannot be fully transferred through literal translation. English clothing terminology, by contrast, more often reflects professional identity, social style, and institutional belonging.

The study also identified differences in polysemy, semantic extension, and synonymic variation. English clothing vocabulary demonstrates extensive stylistic differentiation and metaphorical extension, while Uzbek semantic development is more closely connected with ceremonial and relational functions.

Translation analysis proved that clothing names require careful contextual interpretation. Complete equivalence is relatively rare, while partial equivalence and non-equivalence are common, especially for culturally marked lexical units.

The scientific significance of the research lies in its contribution to comparative lexicology and linguoculturology. The practical significance is related to translation studies, intercultural communication, and foreign language teaching, where understanding lexical meaning beyond surface definition is essential.

Future research may expand this study by including dialectal clothing vocabulary, corpus-based analysis, and sociolinguistic investigation of modern fashion discourse in bilingual contexts.

In conclusion, clothing names are not merely vocabulary items describing garments; they are semantic indicators of cultural values and national worldview. Their study provides deeper insight into how language reflects human experience across different societies.

References:

1. Виноградов В.В. Основные типы лексических значений слова // Вопросы языкознания. – М.: Наука, 1977. – С. 45-67.
2. Смирницкий А.И. Лексикология английского языка. – М.: Издательство литературы на иностранных языках, 1956. – С. 260.

3. Раҳматуллаев Ш. Ўзбек тилининг изоҳли луғати. - Тошкент: Ўзбекистон миллий энциклопедияси, 2006. – Б. 680.
4. Маслова В.А. Лингвокультурология. – М.: Академия, 2001. – С. 208.
5. Newmark P. A Textbook of Translation. – London: Prentice Hall, 1988. – P. 292.
6. Galperin I.R. Stylistics. – M: Higher School, 1977. – P. 334.
7. Arnold I.V. The English Word. – M: Vysshaya Shkola, 1986. – P. 295.
8. Каримова Л. Ўзбек миллий кийимлари тарихи. – Тошкент: Фан, 2010. – Б. 214.
9. Nida E.A. Toward a Science of Translating. - Leiden: Brill, 1964. - 331 p.
10. Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English. - Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2014. – P. 2224.
11. Oxford English Dictionary. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. – P. 2100.
12. Crystal D. The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. – P. 499.

