

The Morphological Structure and Composition of the Educational Dictionary (Based on Cognate Words)

MUSURMONQULOV ADHAM ABDURASHID OG' LI
Termez State University, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

This article discusses the types of educational dictionaries, their organization in linguistics, and their importance in education. It outlines several lexicographic criteria and foundations for the formation of educational dictionaries with cognate words, as well as a linguistic classification. In the educational dictionary of the Uzbek language, the classification process of cognate words has been studied, and the lexicographic interpretation of words that are in cognate relationships in educational dictionaries has been examined and described.

Keywords: Educational dictionaries, thematic (cluster-based) dictionary, cognateness, cognate groups, lexicographic criterion.

INTRODUCTION

In the compilation of educational dictionaries, special attention should be paid to the ordering and arrangement of lexical entries. From this perspective, Professor B. Bahriddinova classifies educational dictionaries into the following types. According to her, "The lexical content of an educational dictionary may be arranged alphabetically depending on the type of dictionary (e.g., word formation, orthographic, or explanatory dictionaries), or it may be organized thematically under a specific subject, with entries placed in internal alphabetical order within each thematic

unit.” Based on this, three types of educational dictionaries are distinguished:

- a. Alphabetically ordered dictionary
- b. Thematic (cluster-based) dictionary
- c. Mixed order dictionary. [1]

We would like to state that the dictionary we are analyzing belongs to the thematic dictionary category. If we rely on the theoretical ideas expressed around this issue during the process of creating a learning dictionary of cognate words, it becomes clear that the following thought is of general importance to us. “Considering that cognate units remind each other in an associative manner, the unit that was relatively actively used among them was chosen as the stimulus word. For example, among the cognate words such as xomsuvoq, shuvoq, and loysuvoq, the lexeme loysuvoq was selected, or from the group of units turshak, mayiz, and qoqi, the lexeme turshak was taken as the stimulus word” [4]. It is understood that cognate units remind each other in an associative manner. According to this property, they unite around a common nest. Also, a linguistic-cultural approach is visible in the relationship of cognates. The belonging of national-cultural units to cognate units. China – a plant, doira – a frame, atlas – adras, karnay – surnay are connected in pairs of national-cultural units based on the relationship of cognates through mutual associative connections [6]. In our opinion, cognate words can also be manifested considering the national characteristics of each language. It is necessary to evaluate based on the criteria that states, “The compilation of a cognate dictionary involves organizing issues such as the presentation of dictionary articles, explaining word meanings, ensuring the coherence of ideas in related dictionaries (synonyms, antonyms, gradable words, homophones, cognate word dictionaries), and regulating problems like excessive repetitions and evaluating a word in two different contexts” [1: 59].

LITERATURE ANALYSIS

In Uzbek, Professor B. Mengliyev talks about the social necessity of creating a “cognate words learning dictionary” in the preface of the educational dictionary titled *Synonymous Words Learning Dictionary* authored by O. Shukurov and B. Boymatov, stating: "It is an urgent task to create explanatory dictionaries for schools, synonymous words dictionaries, antonym dictionaries, gradation dictionaries, outdated words dictionaries, dialect-specific words dictionaries, idioms dictionaries, collocational dictionaries, cognate words dictionaries, form-related words dictionaries, pronunciation-related words dictionaries, as well as separate terminological dictionaries and glossaries for each field" [7: 3]. This clearly shows that the issue is relevant in today's philological education.

At the beginning of the 21st century, the era of creating initial educational dictionaries in Uzbek linguistics began, and several dictionaries were created. Under the leadership of Professor B. Mengliyev, the dictionary *Educational Dictionary of Synonymous Words in the Uzbek Language* by O. Shukurov & B. Boymatova, the *Educational Dictionary of Borrowed Words in the Uzbek Language* by Y. Hamrayev, the *Educational Dictionary of Antonymous Words in the Uzbek Language* by U. To'rayeva & D. Shodmonova, the *Educational Dictionary of Word Composition in the Uzbek Language* by B. Mengliyev & B. Bahridinova, the *Educational Dictionary of Formative Words in the Uzbek Language* by X. Suvonova & G. Turdiyeva, the *Educational Toponymic Dictionary of the Uzbek Language* by T. Nafasov & V. Nafasova, the *Educational Dictionary of Pronunciation Similar Words in the Uzbek Language*, the *Educational Dictionary of Obsolete Words in the Uzbek Language* by X. Norxo'jayev, and the *Educational Dictionary of Word Formation in the Uzbek Language* by B. Mengliyev, B. Bahridinova, O. Xoliyorov, M. Zaripova, and M. Xushvaqto'v are among these.

Indeed, it should be noted that although the practicalities of educational lexicography are being put in place to some extent today, the development of the linguistic and pedagogical foundations of educational dictionaries and the establishment of

principles for the compilation of specific educational dictionaries remain pressing issues in Uzbek linguistics and language didactics. Of course, these thoughts are significant in that they will determine the future development of modern lexicography. In any lexicographic research, criteria are developed for the dictionaries to be compiled, and dictionaries created based on these criteria are relied upon. We have also attempted to develop criteria based on such approaches. Y. Hamrayeva, who developed the principle of compiling an ideographic dictionary, emphasizes forming it based on the following criteria. According to her, the following principles are taken as the basis:

1. The principle of harmony between theory and practice.
2. The principle of scientific accuracy.
3. The principle of educational value.
4. The principle of avoiding leaps (logical jumps).
5. The principle of general-to-specific relationship.
6. The principle of interpretation without explanation.
7. The principle of consistency.
8. The principle of deviation from alphabetical order.

Several lexicographic criteria are followed in compiling the dictionary of cognate words. Based on the opinion of linguist Y. Hamroyeva on the criteria for creating an ideographic dictionary, we have developed criteria for compiling a dictionary of cognate words. These criteria ensure that the dictionary is scientifically grounded, systematic, and user-friendly. We will express our thoughts on the following main criteria. We tried to compile this dictionary based on eight criteria:

1. The criterion of thematization.
2. The criterion of semantic cognateness.
3. The criterion of sequence (chain).
4. The classification criterion.
5. The criterion of using visual symbols (emojis).
6. The principle of deviation from alphabetical order.
7. The criterion of multidisciplinary integration.
8. The criterion of user-oriented design.

1. *The criterion of thematization*

Each group of cognate words should be based on a specific topic or field, such as: Educational process, literature, biology, linguistics, etc.

2. *The criterion of semantic cognates*

Words must be meaningfully related to each other or belong to the same semantic field. For example: In each group like School – lesson – notebook – teacher – grade, there should be at least 4-7 related words.

3. *Sequence (chain) criterion*

Words are arranged in a natural sequence or based on a process. This makes it easier for children to understand cause and effect.

4. *Classification criteria*

Large topics are divided into smaller sections. Within each group, there may be smaller cognate groups (1.1, 1.2).

5. *Criteria for using visual symbols (emojis)*

Groups can be distinguished with pictograms (emojis) to make them memorable and easy to read for children.

6. *The principle of deviation from alphabetical order*

In the dictionary, words are not subjected to alphabetical order.

7. *The criterion for multidisciplinary integration*

Cognate groups may relate to several subjects. Each subject or section is marked with a specific index (for example: 1.1).

8. *User orientation*

Based on the above criteria, 12 major thematic groups have been identified, and a vocabulary structure has been developed in accordance with the age category along with visuals (emojis).

School, group of cognates related to technologies

1.1. *Educational institutions*

🎓 preschool → school → lyceum → technical school → institute → university

1.2. *Educational process*

📖 lesson → lecture / seminar / practical → lecturer → teacher → student / pupil → assignment → call

1.3. *Literature and writing*

📄 poetry → rubai → masnavi → satirical poetry

📖 prose → roman → story → novella → essay → sketch

🎭 drama → tragedy → comedy → melodrama → absurdist drama

📰 publicistic → article → essay → interview

🌀 Literary directions: realism → modernism → postmodernism → romanticism → surrealism

1.4. *Literature*

📖 novel → story → tale → drama

📄 ghazal → rubai → poetry

👤 author → writer → literateur

☐ meeting → event → conversation → criticism

1.5. *Science*

🔍 research → exploration → innovation

💡 idea → hypothesis → experiment

☐ field → method → theory → practice

1.6. *Educational technologies*

💻 STEAM → online course → educational platform

🌐 Distance education → learning module → digital literacy → life skills

1.7. *Process, assessment*

📅 plan → lesson development → class notebook → written work → control → assessment → ranking

1.8. *Innovative approaches*

☐ merge → blitz query → step by step → chain → crossword → cluster → hot chair

1.9. *Event*

🎉 holiday → gathering → seminar → conference → meeting → ceremony

1.10. *Classic poetic arts*

✍ metaphor → antithesis → citation → allusion → exaggeration →
synecdoche → metaphorical expression

1.11. *Linguistics*

🗣 Phonetics → Lexicology → Morphology → Syntax → Semantics
→ Stylistics

1.12. *Mathematics*

➕ addition → subtraction → multiplication → division → fraction →
percent → formulas

1.13. *Biology*

• cell → gene → DNA → organs → plant → animal

1.14. *History*

📅 era → state → individual → event → war → colony →
independence 1.1.15. Technology

💻 program → internet → computer → application → device →
coding

Cognate groups can be used in the teaching process, in designing tasks, or in developing curricula. By studying the phenomenon of cognateness, it becomes possible to identify lexical-thematic groups (LTGs) in the Uzbek language, determine their semantic interrelations, and highlight the central (dominant) lexeme within each LTG. This approach provides a scientific basis for identifying semantic hierarchies and thematic networks within the Uzbek lexical system.

When lexical groups based on cognateness are compiled in the form of a dictionary, they not only reflect the existing semantic relationships in the language but also become a key reference point in language learning. Especially for students and language learners, these groups serve as an effective tool for placing words within semantic fields, logically linking them with one another, and developing skills to use them in context.

In general, we can observe that extensive discussions have been made in our linguistics regarding contemporary

lexicography and the significance of educational dictionaries within it. Researcher O. Shukurov notes: “Dictionaries, in the truest sense, are a phenomenon that reflects the socio-economic, political, and cultural achievements, progress, and evolution of any nation through language. The importance of a dictionary is not limited to the language of a particular nation and the structure formed through that language, but also encompasses the culture, history, and lifestyle revealed through it.”

Indeed, it is evident to all that the vocabulary of the Uzbek language has undergone considerable changes during the years of independence. The quantitative changes in our lexicon and the emergence of new linguistic phenomena must, of course, be reflected in our dictionaries.

REFERENCES

1. Bahriddinova, B. M. 2020. Educational Lexicography in Uzbekistan: Linguistic Foundations, History, and Prospects. Doctor of Philological Sciences (DSc) dissertation, Samarkand.
2. Ҳамраева Ў. 2014. Феллармисолидаидеографиклуғаттузиш. Тошкент: Монография.
3. Khamraeva, Y. 2014. *Compiling an Ideographic Dictionary Based on Verbs*. Monograph. Tashkent.
4. Lutfullayeva, D., Davlatova R. & Tojiboyev B. 2019. *Associative Dictionary of the Uzbek Language*. Tashkent.
5. Mengliev, B. & Kholiyorov, U. 2007. *Mother Tongue (Encyclopedia)*. Tashkent: New Century Generation.
6. Tojiboyev, B. 2023. *The Structure of Associative Meaning of Words in the Uzbek Language*. Tashkent.
7. Shukurov, O. & Boymatova, B. 2009. *Educational Dictionary of Synonyms*. Tashkent: New Century Generation.
8. Shukurov, O. 2022. *Evolution, Transformation, and Lexicographic Interpretation of Modern Borrowings. Monograph*. Karshi: Intellect Publishing House.
9. Mirtojiev, M. 2007. *Lexicology and Lexicography of the Uzbek Language. Textbook*. Tashkent: UzMU Publishing House.
10. Nematov, H. & Rasulov, R. 1995. *Foundations of Systemic Lexicology of the Uzbek Language*. Tashkent: O'qituvchi.

11. Sobirov, A. 2004. *Studying the Lexical Level of the Uzbek Language Based on the Principle of a System of Systems*. Tashkent: Ma'naviyat.
12. Tojiboyev, B. 2023. *The Structure of Associative Meaning of Words in the Uzbek Language*. Tashkent.
13. Usmonov, S. 1974. *General Linguistics*. Tashkent: O'qituvchi.
14. *Manual for Compiling the Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek Language*. 1964. Ed. S. F. Akobirov. Tashkent: Fan.
15. Apresyan, Y. D. 1962. *Distributional Analysis of Meanings and Structural Semantic Fields*. Lexicographic Collection. Issue V. Moscow.
16. Gak, V. G. 1977. *General Issues of Educational Lexicography*. Moscow: Russian Language.
17. Karaulov, Y. N. *General and Russian Ideography*.
18. Saussure, F. de. 1977. *Course in General Linguistics. Works on Linguistics*. Trans. and Ed. A. A. Kholodovich. Moscow: Progress.
19. Akhmanova, O. S. 1969. *Dictionary of Linguistic Terms*. Moscow.
20. Morkovkin, V. V. 1970. *Ideographic Dictionaries*. Moscow: Moscow State University.
21. Roget's Thesaurus. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Roget's_hesaurus.
22. Shcherba, L. V. *Essay on a General Theory of Lexicography*. <http://feb-web.ru/feb/izvest/1940/03/403-089.htm>.

MUSURMONQULOV ADHAM ABDURASHID OG' LI
TERMEZ STATE UNIVERSITY,
INDEPENDENT PHD RESEARCHER
IN UZBEK PHILOLOGY.
[HTTPS://ORCID.ORG/0009-0005-7109-8265](https://orcid.org/0009-0005-7109-8265)
E-MAIL: <ADHAMMUSURMONQULOV76@GMAIL.COM>