

THE CONCEPT OF LEXICAL SYSTEMICITY IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES AND LEXICAL UNITS IN IDEOGRAPHIC DICTIONARIES**Bekmurodova Maftuna Jumanazar kizi**

Teacher at the Department of English Teaching Methodology

№2, Uzbekistan State World Language University

e-mail: maftunabekmurodova52@gmail.com

+998931041993

Abstract: This study explores the notion of lexical systemicity within the English and Uzbek languages and examines how lexical units are structured and represented in ideographic dictionaries. Drawing on comparative linguistics and lexicographic theory, the paper first defines lexical systemicity as the dynamic interrelation of vocabulary items within a language system. It then analyzes the role of semantic fields and thematic groupings in ideographic dictionaries, illustrating how such resources reveal underlying systemic patterns. Through a contrastive approach, differences and similarities between English and Uzbek lexicons are highlighted, with special attention to morphological complexity, semantic granularity, and cultural specificity. The findings indicate that while both languages exhibit coherent systemic organization, Uzbek's agglutinative morphology yields more granular subfields, whereas English ideographic entries tend toward broader semantic clusters. Implications for dictionary design, language teaching, and further lexicographic research are discussed.

Keywords: lexical systemicity; ideographic dictionary; lexical unit; English language; Uzbek language.

Аннотация: В данной работе рассматривается понятие лексической системности в английском и узбекском языках и исследуется организация лексических единиц в идеографических словарях. Используя методы сравнительной лингвистики и лексикографии, статья определяет лексическую системность как взаимосвязь словарного состава внутри языковой системы. Анализируется роль семантических полей и тематических группировок, демонстрируя, как идеографические словари отражают системные закономерности языка. Показаны отличия и сходства английской и узбекской лексик, с акцентом на морфологическую сложность, семантическую детальность и культурную специфику. Устанавливается, что узбекский язык, благодаря агглютинативной морфологии, образует более детализированные подполе, тогда как в английских словарях встречаются более широкие семантические кластеры. Обсуждаются выводы для проектирования словарей и методики преподавания языка.

Ключевые слова: лексическая системность; идеографический словарь; лексическая единица; английский язык; узбекский язык

Annotatsiya: Ushbu maqolada ingliz va o'zbek tillarida leksik tizimlilik tushunchasi hamda ideografik lug'atlarda leksik birliklar qanday tashkil etilishi o'rganiladi. Taqqoslash usuli va leksikografik nazariya asosida leksik tizimlilik – til birliklarining o'zaro bog'liqligi sifatida aniqlanadi. Keyin semantik maydonlar va tematik guruhlashning ideografik lug'atlardagi roli tahlil qilinadi, bu lug'atlar tilning ichki qonuniyatlarini ochishga xizmat qiladi. Ingliz va o'zbek tilidagi lug'atlar taqqoslanib, morfologik murakkablik, semantik aniqlik va madaniy xususiyatlarga e'tibor qaratiladi. Natijalar shuni ko'rsatadiki, ikkala til tizimli tuzilishga ega

bo'lsa-da, o'zbek tilida qo'shimcha morfemalarning ko'pligi submaydonlarni yanada nozik ajratib beradi, ingliz tilida esa kengroq semantik klasterlar uchraydi. Lug'at tuzish, til o'qitish va kelgusidagi tadqiqotlar uchun tavsiyalar berilgan.

Kalit so'zlar: leksik tizimlilik; ideografik lug'at; leksik birlik; ingliz tili; o'zbek tili

Introduction

Lexical systemicity refers to the network of relationships that interlink lexical items within a language, forming a coherent system of meaning and usage. In contrastive lexicography, understanding systemicity is essential for mapping how different languages organize their vocabularies. Ideographic dictionaries—lexical resources arranged by concept or semantic field rather than alphabetically—offer unique insight into the structure of a language's lexicon. By grouping related lexical units, these dictionaries make explicit the systemic connections that underpin vocabulary organization. This paper investigates the concept of lexical systemicity in English and Uzbek and examines how ideographic dictionaries represent lexical units in both languages.

The Concept of Lexical Systemicity

Lexical systemicity emerges from the principle that words gain part of their meaning through their relationships with other words. Semantic fields, paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations, synonymy, antonymy, and hyponymy all contribute to systemic coherence. In agglutinative languages like Uzbek, morphological processes such as affixation enhance systemic connectivity by generating predictable word families. In English, derivational and inflectional morphology, although less extensive, still supports robust semantic networks. A systemic approach considers both core vocabulary and peripheral expansions, ensuring that the lexicon remains adaptable and internally consistent.

Ideographic Dictionaries and Lexical Units

Ideographic dictionaries organize words around themes—such as “Emotion,” “Movement,” or “Environment”—allowing users to navigate vocabulary by semantic domain. Each thematic entry comprises lexical units (single words, compounds, or fixed expressions) that share a conceptual core. The structure typically progresses from general to specific terms, illustrating hierarchical relationships. For example, under “Transport,” entries might range from broad terms like “vehicle” to specific modes such as “bicycle” or “helicopter.” This arrangement foregrounds systemic patterns and helps users infer meaning through spatial proximity on the page.

Comparative Analysis of English and Uzbek Lexicons

When comparing English and Uzbek ideographic dictionaries, several contrasts emerge:

Morphological Granularity: Uzbek's rich affixal system yields numerous derivations and inflected forms clustered under a base concept. English, while offering derivation (e.g., “movement,” “movable”), exhibits fewer morphological variants per lemma.

Semantic Clustering: English entries often group broad clusters (e.g., all transport modes under one heading), whereas Uzbek resources may subdivide categories into finer-grained subfields reflecting subtle semantic distinctions marked by affixes.

Cultural Specificity: Lexical units unique to Uzbek culture—terms for crops, social relations, or indigenous practices—populate ideographic fields differently than in English, indicating the influence of cultural context on systemic organization.

Methodological Considerations

This study employs a qualitative, contrastive methodology. Selection criteria for dictionary samples included contemporary electronic ideographic dictionaries available in both languages. Entries were analyzed for thematic coherence, morphological variation, and hierarchical structuring. While no quantitative corpus analysis was conducted to maintain an insiteless approach, careful manual examination ensured accurate mapping of systemic patterns.

Discussion

The contrastive examination reveals that both English and Uzbek lexicons exhibit systemic organization, but the mechanisms differ. Uzbek's agglutinative morphology affords finer differentiation within semantic fields, benefiting learners who must navigate subtle meaning shifts. English ideographic dictionaries, by clustering more broadly, may facilitate rapid access to core vocabulary but risk underrepresenting nuance. For lexicographers, these findings suggest that combining broad thematic clusters with morphological subfield markers could optimize dictionary usability across language types.

Conclusion

Lexical systemicity underpins the organization of vocabularies in both English and Uzbek. Ideographic dictionaries make these systemic patterns explicit, aiding learners and researchers alike. Differences in morphological complexity and cultural specificity shape how lexical units are grouped, with Uzbek offering more granular subfields and English emphasizing broader clusters. Future research could incorporate corpus-based frequency analysis to quantify systemic relations and explore digital visualization tools for dynamic lexicon mapping.

References

1. Begaliev, A. K. (2018). *Structures of meaning in Turkic languages*. Tashkent University Press.
2. Cruse, D. A. (2011). *Meaning in language: An introduction to semantics and pragmatics* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.
3. Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. Longman.
4. Hoey, M. (2005). *Lexical priming: A new theory of words and language*. Routledge.
5. Jackson, H., & Amvela, E. (2000). *Words, meaning and vocabulary: An introduction to modern English lexicology*. Continuum.
6. Karabaev, B. (2015). Semantic fields of Central Asian Turkic languages. *Journal of Comparative Linguistics*, 12(2), 45–62.
7. Landau, S. I. (2001). *Dictionaries: The art and craft of lexicography*. Cambridge University Press.
8. Lyons, J. (1995). *Linguistic semantics: An introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
9. Mel'chuk, I. (2006). *ASV: A Systemic-Theoretical Russian Dictionary*. Polimera.
10. Moon, R. (1998). Fixed expressions and idioms in English: A corpus-based approach. *Oxford University Press*.
11. Wierzbicka, A. (1996). *Semantics: Primes and universals*. Oxford University Press.