



## Semantic Refunctionalization of Arabic-Origin Tourism Terminology in Uzbek and Tajik: A Comparative Structural Analysis

إعادة التوظيف الدلالي للمصطلحات السياحية ذات الأصل العربي في اللغتين الأوزبكية

والطاجيكية: دراسة بنيوية مقارنة

Shavkatjon Rahmatovich Alamov<sup>1</sup>, Wahyu Putra Pratama<sup>2</sup>, Ubay<sup>3</sup>, Muhammad Zulhaq<sup>4</sup>

Nab'han Hadyan Adnan<sup>5</sup>, Nurhapsari Pradnya Paramita<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages Samarkand, Uzbekistan

<sup>2,4,5</sup>Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia

<sup>3</sup>Universitas Islam Negeri Datokarama Palu, Indonesia

<sup>6</sup>Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Kalijaga Yogyakarta, Indonesia

\*Corresponding E-mail: [shavkatalamov@gmail.com](mailto:shavkatalamov@gmail.com)

### ABSTRACT

This article examines Arabic-origin tourism terminology in Uzbek and Tajik from semantic and structural perspectives within a comparative linguistic framework. The relevance of the study lies in the fact that tourism vocabulary in Central Asian languages has developed not only through modern international terminology, but also through long-standing historical, religious, and cultural contact with Arabic. From this perspective, a number of Arabic-origin lexemes that originally functioned in religious, educational, or architectural discourse now operate as active terminological units in pilgrimage tourism, cultural tourism, and historical-architectural heritage description. The study focuses on ten representative Arabic-origin terms related to travel, pilgrimage, sacred sites, educational monuments, burial places, and architectural components. The aim of the article is to identify their original etymological meanings, their formal realization in Uzbek and Tajik, their semantic evolution in tourism discourse, and their potential for forming productive terminological combinations. The research is based on comparative-linguistic, semantic, structural, etymological, and component analysis. The findings show that these units do not function merely as historical or religious lexical remnants; rather, they constitute an active and productive layer of contemporary tourism terminology. The study also demonstrates that their adaptation in Uzbek and Tajik is not identical, since each language restructures Arabic-origin units according to its own phonetic, morphological, and functional norms. The results are relevant to comparative linguistics, terminology studies, Arabic lexical influence in Central Asian languages, tourism discourse analysis, and specialized lexicography. The study argues that these terms represent a case of semantic refunctionalization, whereby historically religious, educational, and architectural lexemes acquire new terminological functions in contemporary tourism discourse. In this sense, Arabic-origin tourism terminology in Uzbek and Tajik should be understood not merely as a lexical borrowing phenomenon, but as a contact-induced terminological field shaped by cultural memory, heritage interpretation, and discourse-based specialization.

**Keywords:** Arabic-origin terminology; tourism terminology; Uzbek language; Tajik language; comparative linguistics.

### مستخلص البحث

اعتمد البحث على عشرة مصطلحات ممثلة ذات أصل عربي ترتبط بالسفر، والزيارة، والمواقع المقدسة، والمعاليم التعليمية، والمواضع الجنائزية، والعناصر المعمارية. وتمت دراسة هذه المصطلحات في السياق اللغوي الثلاثي: العربية / الأوزبكية / الطاجيكية، مع تتبع صيغها ووظائفها في الأوزبكية والطاجيكية. وتهدف الدراسة إلى بيان الأصل الاشتقاقي لهذه الوحدات، وكيفية تحققها الصوري في اللغتين، وتطورها الدلالي في الخطاب السياحي، وما طرأ عليها من تخصيص دلالي أو توسيع وظيفي، فضلاً عن قدرتها على توليد تركيبات اصطلاحية منتجة. واستند البحث

### Citation:

Alamov, S. R., Pratama, W. P., Ubay, U., Zulhaq, M., Adnan, N. H., & Paramita, N. P. (2026). Semantic Refunctionalization of Arabic-Origin Tourism Terminology in Uzbek and Tajik: A Comparative Structural Analysis. *Al-Muyassar: Journal of Arabic Education*, 5 (3), 629– 650.

إلى المنهج اللغوي المقارن، والتحليل الدلالي، والتحليل البنيوي، والتحليل الاشتقاقي، والتحليل المكوّني. وقد أظهرت النتائج أن هذه الوحدات لا تعمل بوصفها رواسب معجمية دينية أو تاريخية فحسب، بل تمثل طبقة اصطلاحية نشطة ومؤثرة في وصف المسارات السياحية، والمواقع التراثية، والعناصر المعمارية. كما بيّنت الدراسة أن تكييف هذه المصطلحات في الأوزبكية والطاجيكية ليس متطابقاً، بل يخضع في كل لغة لمعاييرها الصوتية والصرفية والوظيفية الخاصة. وتكتسب نتائج البحث أهمية في اللسانيات المقارنة، وعلم المصطلح، ودراسة التأثير المعجمي العربي في لغات آسيا الوسطى، وتحليل الخطاب السياحي، وصناعة المعاجم المتخصصة. ويرى البحث أن هذه المصطلحات تمثل حالة من إعادة التوظيف الدلالي، إذ تكتسب الألفاظ ذات الخلفية الدينية والتعليمية والمعمارية وظائف اصطلاحية جديدة في الخطاب السياحي المعاصر. ومن ثم، ينبغي فهم المصطلحات السياحية ذات الأصل العربي في الأوزبكية والطاجيكية لا بوصفها ظاهرة اقتراض معجمي فحسب، بل بوصفها حقلاً اصطلاحياً ناشئاً عن الاتصال اللغوي والثقافي، ومشكلاً بفعل الذاكرة الثقافية، وتأويل التراث، والتخصّص الخطابي.

الكلمات المفتاحية: المصطلحات ذات الأصل العربي؛ المصطلحات السياحية؛ اللغة الأوزبكية؛ اللغة الطاجيكية؛ اللسانيات المقارنة.

## INTRODUCTION

In the contemporary era of globalization, tourism has become not only a major sector of the world economy but also a complex socio-cultural phenomenon closely connected with cultural memory, historical heritage, civilizational contact, and linguistic representation. For this reason, the study of tourism-related vocabulary and terminology cannot be limited to the language of service industries, hospitality, transport, marketing, or travel logistics alone. In regions with deep historical and religious traditions, especially in Central Asia, the language of tourism has developed as a multilayered lexical system in which modern international terms coexist with older historical, cultural, and religious strata. From this perspective, Arabic-origin lexical items used in Uzbek and Tajik deserve special attention, since many of them continue to function actively in contemporary tourism discourse rather than remaining passive remnants of earlier linguistic history (Davidson, 2012; Meng, 2008).

When tourism terminology is discussed, scholarly attention is often directed toward modern international items associated with booking, transfer, destination, logistics, tourist service, hospitality management, or tour operation. However, this approach captures only one segment of tourism discourse. In pilgrimage tourism (زيارة / ziyorat / зиёрат tourism), cultural tourism, and historical-architectural tourism, the terminological landscape is substantially different. In such contexts, language does not merely designate movement, service, or travel planning; it also names sacred sites, historical monuments, architectural forms, devotional destinations, and culturally marked spaces. As a result, lexical units that originally emerged in religious, educational, or architectural usage often acquire renewed functional significance in modern tourism communication. Thus, tourism terminology should be treated not only as a set of contemporary internationalisms but also as a field shaped by the interaction of language, memory, religion, architecture, and cultural heritage (Cabr  Castellv , 1999; Meng, 2008).

Uzbek and Tajik provide a particularly productive comparative field for this kind of inquiry. Both languages have maintained long and intense historical contact with Arabic through Islam, religious scholarship, manuscript culture, madrasa education, urban civilization, and architectural traditions. Arabic, for centuries, occupied a privileged position as a language of religion, knowledge, and learned culture (the language of science). Consequently, Arabic-origin words entered both languages not only as elements of general literary vocabulary but also as stable components of specialized lexical systems. In the sphere of tourism, this Arabic lexical layer is especially visible in the terminology used to describe sacred places, pilgrimage destinations, historical monuments, and architectural components of heritage sites. The study of such terms therefore has significance not only for tourism discourse analysis but also for comparative linguistics, contact linguistics, historical lexicology, and the study of Arabic lexical influence in Central Asian languages (Alamov, 2025; Dadaboyev, 2020; Nazarzoda, 2003).

The relevance of the present study also stems from a research gap. Existing works on tourism vocabulary in Uzbek and Tajik have largely focused on general tourism terminology, the classification of sector-specific terms, or the explanation of modern international lexical items. By contrast, Arabic-origin tourism terms have not been sufficiently investigated as an independent object of comparative semantic and structural analysis. In particular, the way in which a shared Arabic source unit is adapted in a Turkic language such as Uzbek and an Iranian language such as Tajik has not yet been explored in a systematic manner. Questions of semantic retention, semantic narrowing (specialization), functional extension, phonetic adaptation, graphic realization, and terminological productivity in tourism discourse remain insufficiently described. This article seeks to address that gap by examining how Arabic-origin lexical units function in two historically related yet typologically distinct linguistic environments (Haspelmath & Tadmor, 2009; Haugen, 1950; Perry, 2005).

In this study, tourism terminology is understood in a broad functional sense. It is not restricted to lexical items referring to tourism services or travel infrastructure. Rather, it includes units that name travel activity, the participant in travel, the purpose of travel, the visited object, and the architectural components of historically or religiously significant sites. On that basis, the corpus of the study consists of ten Arabic-origin lexical units that are active or potentially active in Uzbek and Tajik tourism discourse: سياحة / sayohat / сайёҳат, سياح / sayyoh / сайёҳ, زيارة / ziyorat / зиёрат, مسجد / masjid / масҷид,

مدرسة / madrasa / мадраса, مقبرة / maqbara / мақбара, منارة / minora / манора, قبة / qubba / қубба, محراب / mehrob / меҳроб, and حجرة / hujra / ҳуҷра. These units were not selected arbitrarily. They were chosen because of their historical depth, their visibility in heritage-related discourse, their relevance to pilgrimage and cultural tourism, and their suitability for comparative analysis across Uzbek and Tajik (Alamov, 2024a, 2025; Davidson, 2012).

The object of the research is the set of Arabic-origin tourism terms used in Uzbek and Tajik. The subject of the research is the semantic structure, original etymological meaning, present-day functional meaning, phonetic and graphic form, structural pattern, and combinatory productivity of these terms in tourism discourse. The main aim of the article is to reveal the semantic and structural features of Arabic-origin tourism terms in Uzbek and Tajik on a comparative basis and to determine the principles by which they become active sectoral terms in tourism-related communication. To achieve this aim, several tasks are addressed: identifying the original Arabic form and meaning of each lexical unit; describing its formal realization in Uzbek and Tajik; determining its functional role in tourism discourse; explaining cases of semantic extension, semantic specialization, or functional shift; and analyzing its participation in terminological combinations.

The theoretical significance of the study lies in its treatment of terminology not as a static lexical inventory but as a dynamic functional system shaped by discourse. Many Arabic-origin words entered Uzbek and Tajik initially as religious, educational, or architectural lexemes. Yet in present-day tourism discourse, they perform additional roles: they name routes, interpret heritage, classify destinations, and describe the symbolic and material features of historical sites. This means that the study is concerned not merely with the historical entry of Arabic words into Central Asian languages, but with their current semantic life and disciplinary relevance. In comparative terms, the study also shows that a common Arabic source unit does not necessarily undergo identical development in Uzbek and Tajik. Each language adapts and restructures borrowed items according to its own phonetic, morphological, and functional norms (Alamov, 2025; Cabré Castellví, 1999).

The scientific novelty of the article lies in the fact that Arabic-origin tourism terms are treated not as isolated lexical facts but as elements of an interconnected semantic and structural system. One layer of this system denotes movement and traveler roles, another

denotes tourist objects and sacred or historical destinations, and a third denotes architectural details that become salient in heritage interpretation. Such an approach allows the Arabic lexical layer in tourism discourse to be seen as a meaningful and hierarchically organized terminological field. This is especially important for Arabic studies and comparative linguistics, since it highlights how Arabic lexical influence continues to operate in contemporary regional discourse rather than being confined to earlier literary or religious registers (Alamov, 2024a, 2025; Cabré Castellví, 1999).

The practical significance of the article is equally notable. Its results may be used in the preparation of Uzbek-Tajik-Arabic specialized glossaries, in the editing of pilgrimage and cultural tourism texts, in the development of accurate terminological materials for guides and interpreters, and in the standardization of descriptions used in catalogues of historical monuments and heritage sites. Moreover, the findings may assist in presenting Central Asian cultural heritage to international audiences in a linguistically precise and conceptually coherent way. In this sense, the present study aims to contribute both to theoretical scholarship and to applied work in tourism communication, Arabic linguistic influence, and heritage discourse (Al-Hay'a al-'Amma li-l-Siyāḥa wa-l-Āthār, 2013; Davidson, 2012).

## RESEARCH METHOD

The material of the study consists of ten Arabic-origin lexical units that are active or potentially active in Uzbek and Tajik tourism discourse: سياحة / sayohat / сайёҳат, سياح / sayyoh / сайёҳ, زيارة / ziyorat / зиёрат, مسجد / masjid / масҷид, مدرسة / madrasa / мадраса, مقبرة / maqbara / мақбара, منارة / minora / манора, قبّة / qubba / қубба, محراب / mehrob / меҳроб, and حجرة / hujra / ҳуҷра. These items were selected according to four criteria. First, each term had to have a clear Arabic lexical origin. Second, each item had to be attested in Uzbek and Tajik. Third, it had to possess direct or indirect relevance to tourism discourse, whether through naming travel, sacred visitation, heritage sites, or architectural elements. Fourth, it had to be functionally significant in the description of pilgrimage, cultural tourism, or historical-architectural heritage. The corpus was therefore not assembled randomly but constructed in accordance with the aims of the study.

Methodologically, the article combines comparative-linguistic, semantic, structural, etymological, and component analysis. The primary method is comparative-linguistic analysis. This method is used to compare the same Arabic-origin lexical unit across

Uzbek and Tajik in order to determine similarities and differences in formal shape, functional scope, semantic stability, and discourse behavior. The purpose of comparison here is not merely to note surface correspondences, but to explain how typological structure, lexical tradition, and cultural environment influence the development of borrowed units in each language (Haspelmath & Tadmor, 2009; Perry, 2005).

Semantic analysis constitutes the second major method. Each term is examined in relation to its original Arabic meaning and its present function in Uzbek and Tajik tourism discourse. In this part of the analysis, particular attention is given to four possible semantic developments: retention of the original meaning, semantic narrowing (specialization), semantic expansion, and functional shift. This makes it possible to distinguish, for example, between terms that remain close to their original source meaning and those that become specialized within pilgrimage or heritage discourse. Such semantic analysis is especially important for terms like *زيارة* / *ziyorat* / *зиёрат*, *مدرسة* / *madrasa* / *мадраса*, and *مقبرة* / *maqbara* / *мақба́ра*, whose current usage reflects not only lexical continuity but also discourse-specific reinterpretation (Alamov, 2024a, 2025; Haugen, 1950).

The third method is structural analysis. Here the focus falls on the formal behavior of the selected units in the receiving languages: whether they function as simple lexical terms, whether they generate stable terminological combinations, and how they participate in descriptive constructions within tourism discourse. Structural analysis is also used to identify the productivity of these terms in compound and phrasal patterns, such as combinations referring to pilgrimage routes, sacred sites, historical mosques, monumental madrasas, or architectural features. Because Uzbek and Tajik differ typologically, structural comparison also includes attention to differences in syntactic patterning and term combination (Cabr  Castellv , 1999; Dadaboyev, 2020).

The fourth method is etymological analysis. This method is used to trace each lexical item back to its Arabic source form and to clarify its primary lexical meaning. In some cases, attention is also given to the possibility of mediation through Persian or broader Islamic scholarly usage before the term stabilized in Uzbek and Tajik. The role of etymological analysis in this study is not limited to identifying lexical origin; it also serves as the baseline against which later semantic developments are measured. Without the source meaning, semantic retention and functional change cannot be evaluated with sufficient precision (Almaany, n.d.; Ibn Manz r, 2016; Majma‘ al-Lughah al-‘Arabiyyah,

2004; Murtada al-Zabidi, 2006).

The fifth method is component analysis. This is especially useful for terms whose meanings are internally layered. Certain units in the corpus contain more than one semantic component at the same time, for example religious meaning, architectural function, historical value, sacredness, and tourist visibility. Component analysis makes it possible to separate these semantic layers and identify which of them becomes dominant in tourism discourse. This is particularly relevant for terms such as مسجد / masjid / масҷид, مقبرة / maqbara / мақбаъа, and محراب / mehrob / меҳроб, where the same lexical unit may function simultaneously in religious, architectural, historical, and tourism-related registers.

The research procedure was carried out in several stages. At the first stage, the corpus was defined and the Arabic source forms were identified. At the second stage, the Uzbek and Tajik formal realizations of each unit were established at the graphic and phonological levels. At the third stage, the original and current meanings of the terms were compared on the basis of lexicographic and discourse-related evidence. At the fourth stage, the terms were grouped according to their role in tourism discourse: movement and traveler terms, tourism-object terms, and architectural component terms. At the fifth stage, the results were synthesized in order to identify broader patterns of semantic change, structural productivity, and differential adaptation in the two languages.

The combination of these methods is appropriate for the goals of the study because Arabic-origin tourism terms in Uzbek and Tajik cannot be explained adequately from a single perspective. Purely etymological description would not account for discourse function; purely semantic analysis would overlook structural integration; and simple comparison would remain superficial without lexical grounding in the Arabic source system. By integrating these methods, the article aims to present Arabic-origin tourism terminology as a dynamic contact-induced lexical field shaped by semantic change, structural adaptation, and cultural continuity.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

### **Thematic and Semantic Classification of Arabic-Origin Tourism Terms.**

A comparative examination of the selected corpus shows that Arabic-origin tourism terms in Uzbek and Tajik do not constitute a semantically uniform lexical set. Rather, they form an internally differentiated system whose members perform distinct

functions within tourism discourse. Some designate travel activity and the traveler, others name tourist destinations and heritage objects, and still others denote architectural components that become prominent in descriptive and interpretive representations of monuments. For this reason, the selected units should not be treated merely as a random collection of Arabic borrowings; instead, they should be understood as an interconnected sectoral system organized by function and discourse role (Cabr  Castellv , 1999; Meng, 2008).

On this basis, the ten selected terms may be divided into three major groups. The first group includes terms referring to travel and the participant in travel: سياحة / sayohat / сай хат, سياح / sayyoh / сай х, and زيارة / ziyorat / зи рат. The second group includes terms referring to tourist destinations and heritage objects: مسجد / masjid / мас ид, مدرسة / madrasa / мадраса, مقبرة / maqbara / ма бара, and منارة / minora / манора. The third group includes architectural component terms: قبة / qubba / қубба, محراب / mehrob / мехроб, and حجرة / hujra / ху ра. This classification is not arbitrary. It reflects the functional organization of tourism discourse itself, in which movement, destination, and heritage interpretation are closely interconnected (Alamov, 2024a, 2025).

The first group is dynamic in character. It represents tourism as process, participant, and purpose. Sayohat refers to travel as an activity, sayyoh refers to the person undertaking the journey, and ziyorat refers to a particular kind of purpose-oriented or spiritually marked travel. The second group is object-centered. It names those places and structures that serve as tourist attractions, pilgrimage destinations, or carriers of historical and cultural meaning. The third group is descriptive and interpretive. It does not name the entire monument, but rather the parts through which monuments become visually, historically, and symbolically intelligible to tourists and heritage audiences.

This tripartite classification provides the methodological foundation for the analysis that follows. It shows that Arabic-origin tourism terminology in Uzbek and Tajik is not merely inherited vocabulary preserved in static form, but a layered terminological field in which semantic differentiation corresponds to the communicative needs of tourism, heritage interpretation, and pilgrimage discourse.

**Theoretical Interpretation of Semantic Refunctionalization.** The findings of the present study indicate that Arabic-origin tourism terms in Uzbek and Tajik cannot be explained adequately through etymology alone. Although their Arabic source meanings remain important, their current function in tourism discourse is the result of a broader process



of semantic refunctionalization. By semantic refunctionalization, this article refers to the process through which a lexical unit originally associated with one sphere of use, such as religion, education, architecture, or devotional practice, acquires a new and stable function within another specialized discourse. In the present case, terms such as *ziyora* / *зиёрат*, *madrasa* / *мадраса*, *maqbara* / *мақба́ра*, *minora* / *манора*, *qubba* / *қу́бба*, *mehrob* / *меҳроб*, and *hujra* / *хўҷра* have not lost their original cultural and religious associations; rather, these associations have been reorganized and activated within the modern language of pilgrimage tourism, cultural tourism, and historical-architectural heritage (Bondi & Sezzi, 2021).

This process is especially visible in the term *ziyora* / *зиёрат*. The Arabic source *زيارة* denotes the act of visiting, but in Uzbek and Tajik tourism discourse the term has become strongly associated with sacred visitation, pilgrimage routes, shrine culture, and religiously marked travel. This shift should not be interpreted as a simple narrowing of meaning only. It also reflects the transformation of a general lexical meaning into a specialized tourism concept. Therefore, *ziyora* / *зиёрат* functions as a bridge between religious practice and tourism discourse. It encodes not only movement toward a destination, but also intention, reverence, sacred memory, and cultural identity.

A similar process may be observed in *madrasa* / *мадраса* and *maqbara* / *мақба́ра*. In their original and traditional usage, these terms belong primarily to educational and funerary-religious domains. However, in contemporary tourism discourse, *madrasa* / *мадраса* frequently denotes a historical monument, architectural ensemble, and object of cultural interpretation rather than only an active educational institution. Likewise, *maqbara* / *мақба́ра* does not function merely as a burial-place term. It combines several semantic components: burial, memory, sacredness, historical personality, monumentality, and tourist visibility. Thus, these terms demonstrate how inherited Arabic-origin vocabulary becomes reinterpreted as part of heritage-based tourism terminology.

The difference between Uzbek and Tajik is also theoretically significant. The same Arabic source unit does not always undergo identical adaptation in both languages. Uzbek, as a Turkic language, tends to integrate Arabic-origin terms into its own phonetic, morphological, and syntactic patterns, often alongside Turkic, Russian, and international lexical elements. Tajik, as an Iranian language with a long Persian literary and cultural tradition, often preserves Arabic-origin items within a Persianate lexical environment. As a result, the shared Arabic lexical layer produces both common semantic cores and

language-specific patterns of functional development. This confirms that Arabic-origin tourism terminology in Uzbek and Tajik is not a passive borrowing layer, but a dynamic contact-induced terminological system.

From the perspective of terminology theory, these findings show that sectoral terms do not always arise from modern technical innovation or direct international borrowing. In many cultural domains, especially tourism and heritage discourse, terms may emerge through the reactivation of older lexical strata. In this respect, Arabic-origin tourism terms in Uzbek and Tajik demonstrate how historical vocabulary can acquire renewed terminological relevance when social, cultural, and institutional contexts change. Tourism discourse transforms these units into specialized names for routes, destinations, monuments, architectural features, and culturally significant spaces.

### **Travel and Traveler Terms.**

The first semantic group consists of lexical items associated with travel activity and its human participant. These terms are central because they define the movement dimension of tourism discourse and establish the semantic framework in which tourist action is conceptualized.

The term سياحة / sayohat / сайёҳат represents the most general designation of travel in the corpus. In Arabic, the lexical source is associated with movement, wandering, or traveling. In Uzbek and Tajik, however, the term has become stabilized as a general term for tourism or tourist travel rather than merely movement in a broad sense (Alamov, 2025; Almaany, n.d.; Ibn Manzur, 2016). What is especially significant here is that the source meaning has not disappeared entirely; instead, it has undergone sectoral stabilization. In other words, the older semantic association with movement has been narrowed and regularized into a recognized tourism term. Thus, sayohat now functions as one of the core neutral terms of tourism discourse in Uzbek and Tajik.

The term سياح / sayyoh / сайёҳ develops in a parallel but distinct way. If sayohat names the process, sayyoh names the participant. In Arabic, the lexical source refers to a traveler or wanderer. In Uzbek and Tajik, the item has become a stable sectoral designation for a tourist, traveler, or visitor to cultural and historical sites (Almaany, n.d.; Ibn Manzur, 2016). The semantic core remains intact, but its discourse environment has become more specialized. In contemporary usage, sayyoh functions as the subject-centered counterpart of sayohat and is especially common in descriptions of travel experience, tourist movement, and heritage visitation.

The term *ziyarat* / زياره / зиярат occupies a distinct position within this first group. Its Arabic source meaning involves visitation or paying a visit. Yet in Uzbek and Tajik, the term has undergone stronger specialization than either *sayohat* or *sayyoh*. In both languages, it is closely associated with visiting sacred places, shrines, tombs, or religiously significant locations, and in modern discourse it has become a core term in the semantic field of pilgrimage tourism (Alamov, 2024a, 2025; Alamov, 2024b). This is a clear case of semantic narrowing combined with functional specialization. A broader notion of visit has been reinterpreted as a culturally and spiritually marked travel act. Thus, *ziyarat* does not merely denote movement toward a place; it encodes intention, devotion, reverence, and sacred destination.

From a comparative perspective, the semantic core of these three terms is broadly shared across Uzbek and Tajik. The main differences are not in their basic meaning, but in stylistic tone, degree of specialization, and cultural association. In Uzbek, *sayohat* and *sayyoh* are often more strongly linked with general or cultural tourism discourse, whereas *ziyarat* is strongly tied to pilgrimage and sacred travel. Tajik displays a comparable pattern, although the Persianate cultural environment may intensify the spiritual or literary resonance of certain units, especially *ziyarat* (Nazarzoda, 2003; Perry, 2005). Overall, these three terms form the semantic core of tourism-as-movement: process, participant, and purpose.

### **Terms Naming Tourist and Heritage Objects.**

The second group includes the terms that name places, monuments, and structures functioning as tourist destinations. These are especially important because they anchor tourism discourse in the material and symbolic space of heritage. If the first group is process-oriented, the second is object-oriented.

The term *masjid* / مسجد / масҷид originally denotes a mosque, that is, a place of worship. In Uzbek and Tajik, this core meaning is preserved; however, in tourism discourse the term regularly extends beyond purely religious reference. Historical mosques are described not only as places of prayer, but also as architectural monuments, historical sites, and tourist destinations (Encyclopaedia Britannica, n.d.-d; Ibn Manzur, 2016). This demonstrates functional expansion. The semantic component of sacredness remains present, but it is joined by architectural, historical, and representational functions. In heritage discourse, *masjid* therefore becomes a multilayered term that links faith, architecture, memory, and tourism.

The term *madrasa* / مدرسة / мадраса exhibits an even more visible case of functional

shift. In its original sense, it refers to a place of learning or an educational institution. In Uzbek and Tajik tourism discourse, however, the term often refers less to an active educational institution than to a historical building, an architectural ensemble, or an element of urban heritage (Encyclopaedia Britannica, n.d.-a; Melchert, 1997). The educational function is not erased, but it is backgrounded, while historical, architectural, and representational functions become more prominent. Thus, madrasa provides a strong example of how an originally institutional term becomes refunctionalized as a tourism-object term.

The term مقبرة / maqbara / мақбаъа represents one of the most semantically rich units in the corpus. In its basic sense, it refers to a burial place or tomb-related site. Yet in Uzbek and Tajik discourse, especially where pilgrimage and heritage overlap, it often denotes a monumental tomb associated with a saint, ruler, scholar, or historically important figure (Alamov, 2025; Alamov, 2024b). The lexical component of burial remains, but it is joined by sacredness, prestige, memory, monumentality, and tourist significance. In this sense, maqbara stands at the intersection of pilgrimage tourism and historical-architectural tourism. It is not a neutral burial term in current discourse, but a heritage designation shaped by symbolic and cultural value.

The term منارة / minora / маҳора also illustrates functional extension. Its original semantic field is architectural, referring to the minaret as a vertical feature associated with the mosque. In tourism discourse, however, it often acquires a broader representational role: the minaret becomes the visible symbol of a monument, an urban skyline marker, or a defining element of historical identity (Encyclopaedia Britannica, n.d.-c; Ibn Manzur, 2016). Here the primary architectural meaning remains intact, but the term also acquires symbolic and visual-touristic force. In descriptions of historical cities, minora often operates not merely as an architectural label but as a marker of recognizability and heritage value.

Comparatively, these object terms retain much of their core semantic content in both Uzbek and Tajik, yet their cultural activation may vary. Uzbek heritage discourse may foreground national-cultural and urban-civilizational rhetoric, whereas Tajik usage may preserve additional Persianate literary or stylistic associations in some contexts (Nazarzoda, 2003; Perry, 2005). Nevertheless, in both languages these units form the nominative center of heritage tourism discourse.

## Terms Referring to Architectural Components.

The third group includes terms referring to architectural parts rather than entire monuments. These units are particularly important in descriptive and interpretive discourse because they allow monuments to be represented not only as named objects, but as structured and meaningful built forms.

The term *قبة* / qubba / қyбба preserves its architectural semantic core with relatively little change. It refers to the dome or domed upper structure of a building (Ibn Manzur, 2016; O’Kane, 2013). In Uzbek and Tajik, this meaning remains stable. However, in tourism discourse the term becomes more than a technical architectural label. It functions as a descriptor of stylistic identity, visual form, period association, and aesthetic significance. The dome is often one of the most visible and symbolically resonant elements of historical architecture, and thus qubba becomes important not only in technical description but also in tourist interpretation.

The term *محراب* / mehrob / mexpoб combines religious and architectural meaning. In its source sense, it refers to the niche in a mosque indicating the direction of prayer. This meaning is preserved in both Uzbek and Tajik, but in heritage and tourism discourse the term also acquires representational value. It becomes an element of interior design, symbolic orientation, and visual distinction (Encyclopaedia Britannica, n.d.-b; Ibn Manzur, 2016). A mehrob is therefore not only a liturgical feature but also a historical and artistic focal point in the presentation of mosque interiors.

The term *حجرة* / hujra / xyчpa demonstrates semantic narrowing and contextual specialization. In Arabic, it may refer generally to a room, chamber, or enclosed interior space. In Uzbek and Tajik heritage discourse, however, it most often refers to a room within a madrasa or historical building, especially one associated with residence, student life, or learned habitation (Almaany, n.d.; Melchert, 1997; Pazhuhishgohi zabon va adabiyoti Rūdakī, 2008a, 2008b). Thus, a broad interior-space meaning is narrowed into a historically and architecturally specific heritage term. The lexical item remains semantically transparent, but its discourse use becomes specialized.

Taken together, these terms show that Arabic-origin architectural vocabulary in Uzbek and Tajik functions not merely as technical terminology, but as part of the interpretive language through which monuments are described, explained, and made meaningful. In tourism discourse, they perform a detailing function: they help construct visual and cultural understanding of monuments by naming significant parts, not just wholes.

## **Models of Semantic Change.**

The comparative analysis of the ten selected terms reveals several recurrent models of semantic development. The first model is semantic retention with sectoral stabilization. In this case, the original lexical meaning remains broadly recognizable, but the term becomes stabilized within a tourism or heritage context. This applies especially to *sayohat*, *sayyoh*, and *qubba*. Their meanings are not fundamentally transformed, but they become established as sector-specific lexical items.

The second model is functional expansion. Here the original meaning remains, but the term acquires additional functions in historical, architectural, cultural, or tourism discourse. *Masjid*, *madrassa*, and *minora* are the clearest examples. They do not lose their original semantic identity, but they gain new representational roles within tourism communication.

The third model is semantic narrowing and specialization. This is most evident in *ziyorat* and *hujra*. A broader lexical meaning becomes restricted to a more specific cultural or tourism-related context. In both cases, the term comes to designate not just any visit or room, but a culturally marked and contextually specialized form of that concept.

The fourth model is discursive reinterpretation. This occurs when a term keeps its original meaning but becomes invested with new communicative force in heritage discourse. *Maqbara* and *mehrob* are good examples. Their lexical identity persists, but in tourism discourse they carry stronger connotations of monumentality, sacred memory, artistic value, and guided interpretation.

These models show that Arabic-origin terms in Uzbek and Tajik do not survive mechanically. They are refunctionalized within the recipient language according to discourse needs, lexical tradition, and cultural context. Therefore, their present status cannot be explained by etymology alone; discourse analysis and semantic-functional interpretation are equally necessary (Haspelmath & Tadmor, 2009; Haugen, 1950).

## **Structural Features and Terminological Productivity.**

Structural analysis shows that the selected Arabic-origin units function primarily as simple lexical terms. Each is a stable nominative unit that can operate independently in discourse: *sayohat*, *sayyoh*, *ziyorat*, *masjid*, *madrassa*, *maqbara*, *minora*, *qubba*, *mehrob*, and *hujra*. This structural simplicity contributes to their lexical stability and communicative accessibility (Cabr  Castellv , 1999; Dadaboyev, 2020).

At the same time, these terms do not remain isolated lexical forms. They are structurally productive and capable of generating terminological combinations in tourism discourse. Sayohat may combine with modifiers referring to cultural, historical, or pilgrimage travel. Ziyorat readily forms combinations related to pilgrimage sites, routes, and tourism. Object terms such as masjid, madrasa, maqbara, and minora combine with descriptive modifiers referring to age, fame, sacredness, monumentality, or architectural distinction. Architectural component terms such as qubba, mehrob, and hujra participate in descriptive phrases that specify interior or structural features of monuments.

From a comparative perspective, one of the main structural differences between Uzbek and Tajik appears in the syntax of term combination. In Uzbek, most combinations are formed through preposed modifiers and modifier-head structures, such as madaniy sayohat, tarixiy masjid, qadimiy minora, and naqshli mehrob. In Tajik, equivalent combinations are commonly realized through izāfa-based constructions, such as сайёҳати маданӣ, масҷиди таърихӣ, манораи қадимӣ, and меҳроби нақшдор. This contrast shows that the same Arabic-origin lexical base may participate in different structural models depending on the grammatical system of the receiving language. Uzbek tends to employ Turkic modifier-head patterns, whereas Tajik frequently uses Persianate izāfa relations to connect the head noun with its attribute (Nazarzoda, 2003; Perry, 2005).

Phonetic and graphic adaptation also show that Arabic-origin terms have been naturalized into the recipient languages rather than preserved as foreign lexical bodies. Their localized forms are not obstacles to recognition; rather, they demonstrate that the terms have become fully functional elements of Uzbek and Tajik lexical systems. In this sense, these terms are not static borrowings but integrated and productive sectoral units.

### **General Discussion.**

The results of the analysis demonstrate that Arabic-origin tourism terminology in Uzbek and Tajik performs three major functions: it names tourist movement, identifies tourist and heritage objects, and describes the architectural composition of monuments. Across these functions, the selected lexical units display a range of semantic developments, including retention, specialization, expansion, and reinterpretation. Structurally, they function both as stable simple terms and as productive centers for terminological combinations.

This confirms that Arabic-origin terms in Central Asian tourism discourse should

not be viewed merely as historical residues. They are living lexical units that continue to connect language, heritage, religion, architecture, and tourism communication. Their contemporary relevance lies precisely in the fact that they preserve historical depth while remaining adaptable to present-day sectoral discourse. In that sense, the Arabic lexical layer in Uzbek and Tajik tourism terminology represents a field of both continuity and renewal.

**Table 1**

*Comparative Semantic, Functional, and Combinatory Profile of Arabic-Origin Tourism Terms in Uzbek and Tajik*

| Arabic source form | Uzbek form | Tajik form | Core/original meaning                     | Current tourism-related meaning                         | Type of semantic development                       | Uzbek example combinations                                   | Tajik example combinations                            |
|--------------------|------------|------------|-------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| سياحة              | sayohat    | сайёҳат    | travel, wandering, movement               | general tourism / travel activity                       | semantic retention with sectoral stabilization     | <i>madaniy sayohat, tarixiy sayohat</i>                      | сайёҳати маданӣ, сайёҳати таърихӣ                     |
| سياح               | sayyoh     | сайёҳ      | traveler, wanderer                        | tourist, visitor                                        | semantic retention with functional specialization  | <i>xorijiy sayyoh, sayyohlar oqimi</i>                       | сайёҳи хориҷӣ, ҷараёни сайёҳон                        |
| زيارة              | ziyosat    | зиёрат     | visit, visitation                         | pilgrimage visit; sacred travel                         | semantic narrowing and specialization              | <i>ziyosat turizmi, ziyosat maskani, ziyosat marshruti</i>   | сайёҳии зиёратӣ, макони зиёратӣ, масири зиёратӣ       |
| مسجد               | masjid     | масҷид     | mosque, place of worship                  | mosque as sacred, historical, and tourist site          | functional expansion                               | <i>tarixiy masjid, qadimiy masjid, muqaddas masjid</i>       | масҷиди таърихӣ, масҷиди қадимӣ, масҷиди муқаддас     |
| مدرسة              | madrasa    | мадраса    | school, place of learning                 | historical madrasa as heritage / tourist object         | functional shift and expansion                     | <i>tarixiy madrasa, madrasa majmuasi, mashhur madrasa</i>    | мадрасаи таърихӣ, маҷмааи мадраса, мадрасаи машхур    |
| مقبرة              | maqbara    | мақба́ра   | burial place, tomb site                   | mausoleum as pilgrimage and heritage destination        | discursive reinterpretation                        | <i>muqaddas maqbara, tarixiy maqbara, ziyoratbop maqbara</i> | мақбараи муқаддас, мақбараи таърихӣ, мақбараи зиёратӣ |
| منارة              | minora     | манора     | minaret, vertical architectural structure | minaret as visual and symbolic landmark                 | functional expansion                               | <i>baland minora, qadimiy minora, mashhur minora</i>         | манораи баланд, манораи қадимӣ, манораи машхур        |
| قبة                | qubba      | қубба      | dome                                      | dome as architectural and visual heritage feature       | semantic retention with descriptive specialization | <i>katta qubba, ko'k qubba, me'moriy qubba</i>               | қуббаи калон, қуббаи кабуд, қуббаи меъморӣ            |
| محراب              | mehrob     | меҳроб     | prayer niche                              | mihrab as liturgical and artistic architectural feature | discursive reinterpretation                        | <i>naqshli mehrob, masjid mehrobi, tarixiy mehrob</i>        | меҳробӣ, нақшдор, меҳробӣ масҷид, меҳробӣ таърихӣ     |
| حجرة               | hujra      | хучра      | room, chamber                             | cell/room in a madrasa or historical building           | semantic narrowing and contextual specialization   | <i>talaba hujrasi, madrasa hujrasi, qadimiy hujra</i>        | хучраи талаба, хучраи мадраса, хучраи қадимӣ          |



Note. The example combinations are illustrative and show how the selected Arabic-origin terms may function in pilgrimage, cultural tourism, and heritage-related discourse. They reflect the semantic and functional tendencies identified in the analysis rather than quantitative corpus-based frequency.

### **Comparison with Previous Studies.**

The results of this study partly correspond to previous research on tourism terminology and tourism discourse, which emphasizes the role of specialized vocabulary in organizing tourism communication, destination description, heritage presentation, and service-related discourse. Recent studies on sacred-place websites, tourism communication, and multimodal destination promotion also show that tourism discourse functions as a field where cultural, religious, visual, and institutional meanings are actively mediated to visitors (Bondi & Sezzi, 2021; Gatti et al., 2023; Du & Cheong, 2025). However, the present article differs from studies that treat tourism terminology mainly as a set of modern international, managerial, digital, or service-oriented terms. The analysis demonstrates that tourism discourse in Uzbek and Tajik also includes a historically inherited Arabic-origin layer that remains active in the description of pilgrimage, sacred sites, cultural heritage, and architectural monuments.

In comparison with general studies of lexical borrowing, the findings confirm that borrowed units are not simply transferred from one language into another in an unchanged form. Rather, they are adapted, semantically reorganized, and integrated into the functional system of the receiving language. The Uzbek and Tajik material supports this view, since the selected Arabic-origin terms show semantic retention, narrowing, expansion, and discursive reinterpretation. At the same time, the present study extends the discussion of borrowing by showing that long-established Arabic-origin vocabulary may acquire new terminological functions in a modern sector such as tourism.

The study also complements previous research on Arabic lexical influence in Central Asian languages. Earlier works have generally examined Arabic-origin vocabulary in relation to religion, literature, education, law, administration, or general lexicology. The present analysis shows that this lexical layer should also be studied within contemporary tourism discourse. Terms such as *ziyosat* / зийѳат, *madrasa* / мадраса, *maqbara* / мақба̀ра, *minora* / ма̀но̀ра, *qubba* / қубба, and *mehrob* / меҳро̀б are not only historical or religious lexical items; they also function as active units of heritage interpretation and tourism communication.

In relation to Uzbek and Tajik terminology studies, the article contributes a more specific comparative perspective. It shows that the same Arabic source term may preserve a shared semantic core in both languages while developing different formal, stylistic, and functional features. This finding is important because it demonstrates that Arabic-origin tourism terminology is shaped not only by common Islamic-cultural heritage, but also by the typological structure and lexical traditions of each receiving language. Therefore, the present research advances existing knowledge by connecting terminology studies, contact linguistics, Arabic lexical influence, and tourism discourse analysis within a single comparative framework.

## CONCLUSION

This study has shown that Arabic-origin tourism terms in Uzbek and Tajik constitute an independent and active layer of sectoral vocabulary rather than a passive residue of earlier religious or literary contact. Their use is not restricted to historical or devotional texts; on the contrary, these units function productively in contemporary tourism discourse, especially in the language of pilgrimage, cultural heritage, historical monuments, and architectural description.

The analysis of the ten selected terms—سياحة / sayohat / сайёҳат, سياح / sayyoh / сайёҳ, زيارة / ziyorat / зиёрат, مسجد / masjid / масҷид, مدرسة / madrasa / мадраса, مقبرة / maqbara / мақбаъа, منارة / minora / манора, قبة / qubba / қубба, محراب / mehrob / меҳроб, and حجرة / hujra / ҳуҷра—demonstrates that they can be grouped into three major semantic domains: terms referring to travel and the traveler, terms naming tourist and heritage objects, and terms designating architectural components. This internal organization confirms that Arabic-origin tourism vocabulary in Uzbek and Tajik is not random or fragmented, but forms a coherent lexical field with clear functional relations.

The semantic analysis further indicates that these terms display several recurrent patterns of development, including semantic retention, sectoral specification, functional expansion, semantic narrowing, and discursive reinterpretation. Some units have moved from broad lexical meaning to more specialized tourism-related meaning, while others have preserved their original semantic core but acquired additional cultural, historical, or architectural functions within tourism discourse. As a result, these terms connect historical lexical inheritance with present-day communicative needs.

From a comparative perspective, the study shows that Arabic-origin units do not develop identically in Uzbek and Tajik. Although their semantic core is often preserved

in both languages, differences appear in phonetic adaptation, graphic representation, stylistic value, and structural integration. These differences reflect the typological nature of each language and the distinct cultural-linguistic environments in which the borrowed units have been refunctionalized.

The structural analysis has also demonstrated that the selected units function not only as stable simple terms but also as productive bases for terminological combinations in tourism discourse. This confirms that Arabic-origin tourism terms in Uzbek and Tajik should be understood as living and productive lexical resources rather than merely inherited vocabulary.

Overall, the semantic and structural analysis of Arabic-origin tourism terminology in Uzbek and Tajik confirms that this lexical layer is historically deep, functionally active, and fully relevant to the present-day discourse of tourism, heritage, and cultural representation. For that reason, Arabic-origin tourism terms deserve continued attention in comparative linguistics, Arabic lexical influence studies, tourism discourse analysis, and specialized lexicography.

The theoretical contribution of the study lies in its demonstration that tourism terminology may develop not only through modern international borrowing, but also through the semantic refunctionalization of historically inherited lexical units. The Uzbek and Tajik material shows that Arabic-origin terms originally connected with religion, education, architecture, and sacred space may become productive units of contemporary tourism discourse. This finding enriches terminology studies by showing that specialized vocabulary can emerge through discourse-based reactivation of older lexical layers. It also contributes to contact linguistics by demonstrating that the same Arabic source units are adapted differently in Uzbek and Tajik according to the phonetic, morphological, stylistic, and functional norms of each language. In tourism studies, the article shows that heritage and pilgrimage tourism rely not only on economic or institutional terminology, but also on culturally loaded lexical units that transmit memory, sacredness, and historical identity.

The study also has certain limitations. The analysis is based on ten selected Arabic-origin terms and therefore does not claim to represent the entire Arabic-origin layer of Uzbek and Tajik tourism terminology. In addition, the research is primarily qualitative and is not based on a large-scale empirical corpus of tourism texts, official tourism websites, guidebooks, brochures, or field materials. For this reason, the findings should be understood as a focused comparative analysis of selected representative terms rather

than a complete statistical description of all Arabic-origin tourism vocabulary in Uzbek and Tajik.

Future research may expand the corpus by including a larger number of Arabic-origin tourism terms from official tourism portals, museum descriptions, pilgrimage guides, travel brochures, dictionaries, and real tourist communication. Further studies may also compare Uzbek and Tajik material with Arabic, Persian, Russian, English, and Turkish tourism terminology in order to identify broader patterns of lexical adaptation and terminological standardization. Corpus-linguistic methods would be especially useful for determining the frequency, collocational behavior, and functional distribution of these terms in contemporary tourism discourse. Separate studies may also be devoted to pilgrimage tourism, architectural heritage terminology, and the role of Arabic-origin vocabulary in the international presentation of Central Asian cultural heritage.

## REFERENCES

- Al-Hay'a al-'Amma li-l-Siyāḥa wa-l-Āthār. (2013). *Lexicon of tourism terms: English-Arabic = Mu'jam al-muṣṭalahāt al-siyāḥiyya: Injilīzī-'Arabī*. Riyadh.
- Alamov, S. R. (2024a). Etymology and comparative analysis of the terms "Ziyorat" and "Sayohat" [Ziyorat va sayohat atamalarining etimologiyasi va qiyosiy tahlili]. In *Conference proceedings: Fostering your research spirit* (pp. 200–202).
- Alamov, S. R. (2024b). Pilgrimage tourism terms and their translation issues [Ziyorat turizmi atamalari va ularning tarjima masalalari]. In *Uzbekistan State World Languages University* (pp. 277–283).
- Alamov, S. R. (2025). A comparative study of the terms "tourism" (siyāḥa) and "visitation" (ziyāra) within the field of tourism. *Oriental Journal of Philology*, 5(3), 354–365.
- Almaany. (n.d.). Arabic-Arabic dictionary (Qāmūs 'Arabī-'Arabī). <https://www.almaany.com>
- Bondi, M., & Sezzi, A. (2021). Disseminating the heritage of sacred places in the 21st century: The websites of British and Italian cathedrals. *Iperstoria*, 18, 33–57.
- Cabré Castellví, M. T. (1999). *Terminology: Theory, methods, and applications*. John Benjamins.
- Dadaboyev, H. (2020). *Uzbek terminology [O'zbek terminologiyasi]*. Nodirabegim nashriyoti.
- Davidson, L. (2012). *Pilgrimage and tourism*. Routledge.
- Du, S., & Cheong, C. Y. M. (2025). Beyond the scenic view: A multimodal discourse analysis of sustainable tourism imaginaries on TikTok in Anhui, China. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 12, Article 690. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-05015-3>
- Encyclopaedia Britannica. (n.d.-a). Madrasah. In *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Retrieved June 19, 2026, from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/madrasah>
- Encyclopaedia Britannica. (n.d.-b). Mihrab. In *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Retrieved June 19, 2026, from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/mihrab>
- Encyclopaedia Britannica. (n.d.-c). Minaret. In *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Retrieved June 19, 2026, from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/minaret>
- Encyclopaedia Britannica. (n.d.-d). Mosque. In *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Retrieved June 19, 2026, from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/mosque>

- Gatti, M. C., Lazzeretti, C., & Vitali, F. (2023). Navigating uncertainty: Social media narratives of tourism during COVID-19. *Lingue Culture Mediazioni / Languages Cultures Mediation*, 10(2), 55–78. <https://doi.org/10.7358/lcm-2023-002-gatt>
- Haspelmath, M., & Tadmor, U. (Eds.). (2009). *Loanwords in the world's languages: A comparative handbook*. De Gruyter Mouton.
- Haugen, E. (1950). The analysis of linguistic borrowing. *Language*, 26(2), 210–231.
- Ibn Manzur. (2016). *Lisān al-‘Arab [Tongue of Arabs]*. Dār al-Ma‘ārif.
- Mahmudov, O. (2000). Lexical development of the Uzbek language [O‘zbek tilining leksik taraqqiyoti]. Fan.
- Majma‘ al-Lughah al-‘Arabiyyah. (2004). *Al-Mu‘jam al-Wasīṭ [The intermediate dictionary]*. Maktabat al-Shuruq al-Dawliyyah.
- Melchert, C. (1997). Education IV. The medieval madrasa. In *Encyclopaedia Iranica*. <https://www.iranicaonline.org/>
- Meng, F. (2008). *Tourism linguistics*. Peter Lang.
- Murtada al-Zabidi. (2006). *Tāj al-‘Arūs min Jawāhir al-Qāmūs [The bride’s crown from the pearls of al-Qāmūs]*. Ṭab‘a al-Kuwayt.
- Nazarzoda, S. (2003). Formation of socio-political terminology of the Tajik language [Tashakkuli istilohoti ijtimoi-siyosii zaboni tojikī]. Donish.
- O’Kane, B. (2013). Domes. In *Encyclopaedia Iranica*. <https://www.iranicaonline.org/>
- Pazhuhishgohi zabon va adabiyoti Rūdakī. (2008a). *Explanatory dictionary of the Tajik language (Vol. 1) [Farhangi tafsirii zaboni tojikī]*.
- Pazhuhishgohi zabon va adabiyoti Rūdakī. (2008b). *Explanatory dictionary of the Tajik language (Vol. 2) [Farhangi tafsirii zaboni tojikī]*.
- Perry, J. R. (2005). *A Tajik Persian reference grammar*. Brill.