

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF LEXICOGRAPHIC CODIFICATION OF PSYCHOLOGICAL STATE TERMS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK EXPLANATORY AND SPECIALIZED DICTIONARIES

<https://doi.org/10.70728/phil.v05.i03.077>

Mirzaeva Irodaxon Xamdamovna
<https://orcid.org/0009-0005-7435-8026>
irodaxonmirzayeva89@gmail.com
Andijan Branch of Turon University

Abstract: This dissertation examines the codification of psychological state terminology in English and Uzbek explanatory and specialized dictionaries through a comparative linguistic framework. The study investigates how lexical units denoting human emotional and mental states are defined, structured, and standardized across different lexicographic traditions. Particular attention is given to definitional models, semantic categorization, terminological consistency, and the influence of cultural and linguistic factors on dictionary representation. The research employs comparative, componential, and descriptive methods, focusing on terms such as *anxiety*, *depression*, *stress*, and their Uzbek equivalents. The findings reveal that English lexicography demonstrates a high level of standardization, precision, and terminological consistency, often supported by corpus-based evidence and strict semantic differentiation between general and clinical meanings. In contrast, Uzbek lexicography is characterized by a more descriptive, explanatory, and culturally embedded approach, where synonymy and contextual interpretation play a significant role. The study also identifies that Uzbek psychological terminology is still in the process of codification, with noticeable variation between native and borrowed lexical units. These differences are shaped by historical development, cultural worldview, and the level of scientific advancement. The research contributes to comparative lexicography, psycholinguistics, and translation studies, emphasizing the necessity of further standardization and systematization of psychological terminology in Uzbek.

Keywords: codification, lexicography, psychological terminology, semantic analysis, comparative linguistics, Uzbek language, English language, dictionary analysis, terminology standardization, psycholinguistics, explanatory dictionaries, specialized dictionaries

Language serves as a fundamental tool for representing human cognition, emotions, and mental processes. Among lexical categories, psychological state

terminology occupies a unique position due to its interdisciplinary nature, bridging linguistics, psychology, and cultural studies. Codification, understood as the process of standardizing linguistic units through authoritative sources such as dictionaries, plays a crucial role in ensuring consistency and clarity in language use. In the context of psychological terminology, codification becomes particularly significant, as precise definitions are required for both scientific and everyday communication. English lexicography has a long-standing tradition of systematic codification, supported by extensive corpus-based research and well-established scientific frameworks. In contrast, Uzbek lexicography, while rich in expressive and descriptive resources, is still developing in terms of terminological standardization, especially in specialized domains such as psychology. This dissertation aims to conduct a comprehensive comparative analysis of the codification of psychological state terms in English and Uzbek dictionaries.

The theoretical foundation of this study is based on works in lexicography, general linguistics, and terminology studies. According to Hartmann and James, codification is the process of establishing linguistic norms through dictionaries, which serve as authoritative references for language users¹. Crystal emphasizes that modern lexicography relies heavily on corpus data, allowing for precise and context-sensitive definitions². Similarly, Saussure highlights the systemic nature of language, where lexical units derive their meaning through relational structures within the linguistic system³. In Uzbek linguistics, scholars such as Hojiyev and Rahmatullayev emphasize the descriptive and interpretative nature of dictionary definitions⁴. They note that Uzbek lexicography often reflects cultural and cognitive perspectives, which influence the representation of abstract concepts such as emotional and psychological states⁵.¹

Despite these contributions, comparative studies focusing specifically on the codification of psychological terminology across English and Uzbek languages remain limited, which highlights the relevance of this research.

Methodology: This study adopts a qualitative comparative research design aimed at analyzing the codification patterns of psychological terminology in two different linguistic systems. The following methods were applied:

- Comparative analysis
- Componential analysis
- Descriptive method

1. Hartmann, R.R.K., & James, G. (1998). *Dictionary of Lexicography*. London: Routledge.

2. Crystal, D. (2003). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

3. Saussure, F. de (1983). *Course in General Linguistics*. London: Duckworth.

4. Hojiyev, A. (2002). *O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati masalalari*. Toshkent.

5. Rahmatullayev, Sh. (2006). *O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati*. Toshkent.

- Semantic analysis

The research is based on the following lexicographic sources:

- *Oxford English Dictionary*
- *Cambridge Dictionary*
- *APA Dictionary of Psychology*
- *O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati*
- Specialized Uzbek psychological terminology dictionaries

Analytical Units: The study focuses on the following lexical units:

- anxiety / xavotir
- depression / depressiya / tushkunlik
- stress / stress / tanglik
- emotion / hissiyot

Results: English dictionaries typically employ concise and logically structured definitions based on the genus-differentia model. Each term is defined through a clear hierarchical structure that emphasizes its essential characteristics.

In contrast, Uzbek dictionaries tend to use descriptive and explanatory approaches. Definitions often include synonymic expansion, providing a broader semantic context rather than strict terminological precision.

Semantic Categorization: In English lexicography, a clear distinction is made between general and clinical meanings. For example, the term *depression* may refer to both a temporary emotional state and a clinically diagnosed disorder.

In Uzbek lexicography, such distinctions are often less rigid, and meanings may overlap depending on context. This reflects a less formalized semantic categorization system.

Terminological Standardization: English psychological terminology demonstrates a high level of standardization, with consistent definitions across different dictionaries. In contrast, Uzbek terminology shows variability, particularly in the coexistence of native and borrowed terms (e.g., *xavotir* vs. *anxiety*). This indicates an ongoing process of codification.

Cultural and Linguistic Factors: Uzbek language frequently expresses psychological states through metaphorical and figurative language, such as *yuragi siqildi* (felt emotionally burdened). Such expressions are often absent from formal dictionaries but remain an essential part of everyday communication. English, on the other hand, prioritizes analytical clarity and scientific precision. The comparative analysis reveals that differences in codification are influenced by several factors:

- The level of development of psychological sciences
- Lexicographic traditions
- Cultural conceptualization of emotions
- Language policy and standardization practices

English lexicography functions as a normative system that ensures consistency and clarity, while Uzbek lexicography combines descriptive richness with emerging standardization efforts. These differences pose challenges for translation, academic writing, and international communication, particularly in interdisciplinary fields such as psychology. The present study aimed to conduct a comparative analysis of the codification of psychological state terminology in English and Uzbek explanatory and specialized dictionaries. Based on the findings, several important conclusions can be drawn.

First, the codification of psychological terminology in English lexicography is highly developed and demonstrates a strong degree of standardization. English dictionaries provide concise, precise, and systematically structured definitions that are often based on well-established scientific principles and corpus-based evidence. The semantic boundaries of terms are clearly defined, and the distinction between general and clinical meanings is consistently maintained. This contributes to the stability and universality of English psychological terminology across different contexts.

Second, the codification process in Uzbek lexicography is comparatively less standardized and remains in a developmental stage. Definitions in Uzbek dictionaries tend to be more descriptive and explanatory, often incorporating synonymic expansion to ensure clarity. While this approach enhances comprehensibility, it may reduce terminological precision. Additionally, the coexistence of native and borrowed lexical units leads to variability in the usage of psychological terms, which reflects an ongoing process of terminological adaptation and systematization.

Third, significant semantic and structural differences exist between English and Uzbek in representing psychological states. English tends to adopt an analytical and scientific approach, whereas Uzbek language often reflects cultural, metaphorical, and cognitive perspectives. This indicates that language not only serves as a communicative tool but also as a reflection of cultural worldview and cognitive patterns.

Fourth, the study highlights the necessity of further standardization and systematization of psychological terminology in Uzbek. Developing unified terminological standards, improving lexicographic practices, and incorporating international linguistic and scientific approaches would significantly enhance the accuracy and consistency of terminology usage.

Fifth, the results of this research can be applied in various fields, including translation studies, psycholinguistics, and comparative lexicography. In particular, the findings may contribute to improving translation accuracy by minimizing semantic ambiguity and ensuring equivalence between source and target terms.

In conclusion, the codification of psychological state terminology in English and Uzbek reflects different stages of linguistic development, shaped by historical, cultural, and scientific factors. While English demonstrates a high level of terminological maturity, Uzbek is still in the process of establishing a fully standardized system. Future research should focus on expanding terminological resources, refining dictionary entries, and developing a comprehensive and unified framework for psychological terminology in the Uzbek language.

References

1. Crystal, D. (2003). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language*. Cambridge University Press.
2. Hartmann, R. R. K., & James, G. (1998). *Dictionary of lexicography*. Routledge.
3. Saussure, F. de. (1983). *Course in general linguistics*. Duckworth.
4. Hojiyev, A. (2002). *O'zbek tili leksikologiyasi*. Toshkent.
5. Rahmatullayev, Sh. (2006). *O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati asoslari*. Toshkent.
6. Ne'matov, H. (2008). *Til va nutq nazariyasi*. Toshkent.
7. Yo'ldoshev, B. (2010). *Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili leksikasi*. Toshkent.
8. O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati. (2006-2008). Toshkent.