ТЕРМИЗ ДАВЛАТ УНИВЕРСИТЕТИ

PHILOLOGICAL RESEARCH: LANGUAGE, LITERATURE, EDUCATION

FILOLOGIK TADQIQOTLAR: TIL, ADABIYOT, TA’LIM

ФИЛОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ: ЯЗЫК, ЛИТЕРАТУРА, ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ

Илмий-инновацион журнал

Jurnal OAK Rayosatining 2022-yil 30-sentabrdagi 325/6-son qarori bilan filologiya fanlari bo‘yicha doktorlik dissertatsiyalari asosiy ilmiy natijalarini chop etish tavsiya etilgan ilmiy nashrlar ro‘yxatiga kiritilgan

2021-yildan buyon nashr etiladi

2026 / № 3.1–3

Termiz – 2026

Muassis:
Termiz davlat universiteti

PHILOLOGICAL RESEARCH: LANGUAGE, LITERATURE, EDUCATION

FILOLOGIK TADQIQOTLAR: TIL, ADABIYOT, TA'LIM

ФИЛОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ: ЯЗЫК, ЛИТЕРАТУРА, ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ

ILMIY-INNOVATSION JURNAL

O'zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidenti Administratsiyasi huzuridagi Axborot va ommaviy kommunikatsiyalar agentligi tomonidan 2020 yil 19 oktyabrda 1122 raqami bilan ro'yxatga olingan. Matnlarda foydalanilgan misol, ko'chirma va ma'lumotlar aniqligi uchun mualliflar javobgardir. Jurnaldan ko'chirib bosilganda manba qayd etilishi shart.

Bosishga ruxsat etildi: 20.06.2026
Qog'oz bichimi: 70x85
Bosma tabog'i: 5.94
Ofset bosma. Ofset qog'ozi
Adadi: 100
Bahosi kelishilgan narxda
Buyurtma: 155-son

«TerDU bosmaxonasi»da chop etildi
Termiz shahri, Barkamol avlod ko'chasi, 43-uy

Tahririyat manzili:
190111, Termiz shahri,
Barkamol avlod ko'chasi, 43.
Telefon: +998990 377 77 23,
+99895 986 07 77

E-mail:
philologicalresearch@umail.uz

Rasmiy sayt:
https://journaltersu.uz

BOSH MUHARRIR:
Abduqodir TOSHQULOV,
iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor

TAHRIR HAY'ATI:

Bekpo'lat Umurqulov, filologiya fanlari doktori, professor (bosh muharrir o'rinbosari)
Shoxista Maxmaraimova, filologiya fanlari doktori, professor (mas'ul muharrir)
O'ral Xoliyorov, f.f.f.d. (PhD), dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Olmos Ulviy Binnatova, f.f.d., professor (Ozarbayjon)
Karl Rayxl, f.f.d., professor (Germaniya)
Vali Savash yelok, f.f.d., professor (Turkiya)
Dorota Silviya, f.f.f.d. (PhD), dotsent (Polsha)
Zabita Mahammad qizi Teymurlu, filologiya fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori, dotsent (Ozarbayjon)
Tarana Imomverdi qizi Xojieva, filologiya fanlari doktori, professor (Ozarbayjon),
Muslihiddin Muhiddinov, f.f.d., professor (O'zbekiston)
Ibodulla Mirzayev, f.f.d., professor (O'zbekiston)
Abdi Mamatov f.f.d., professor (O'zbekiston)
Suyun Karimov f.f.d., professor (O'zbekiston)
Muhammadxon Hakimov, f.f.d., professor (O'zbekiston)
Nafas Shodmonov f.f.d., professor (O'zbekiston)
Dilmurod Quronov, f.f.d., professor (O'zbekiston)
Murodqosim Abdiyev, f.f.d., professor (O'zbekiston)
Baxtiyor Mengliyev, f.f.d., professor (O'zbekiston)
Normat Y o'ldoshev, f.f.d., dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Baxtiyor Xolmuxamedov, f.f.d., dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Bobonazar Murtazayev, f.f.n., dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Asqar Eshmo'minov, f.f.d., professor (O'zbekiston)
Obidjon Shofiyev, f.f.f.d. (PhD), dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Zafar Umurqulov, f.f.d., dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Nurali Amonturdiyev, f.f.f.d. (PhD) (O'zbekiston)
Hakim Ahmedov, f.f.f.d., dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Abdulla Xudoyqulov, f.f.f.d., dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Ahad Shukurov, f.f.f.d., dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Eshnazar Jabborov, f.f.f.d., dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Abdumurod Arslonov, f.f.f.d., dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Sirojiddin Turdimurodov, filologiya fanlari doktori, dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Umida Raximova, f.f.f.d. (PhD) (O'zbekiston)
Gulchehra Begmatova, f.f.f.d. (PhD) (O'zbekiston)
Nargis Qurbonazarova, filologiya fanlari doktori, dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Muyassar Xolova, f.f.f.d., dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Shoira Omonturdiyeva, f.f.d., dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Sherzod Turdiqulov, f.f.f.d. (PhD) (O'zbekiston)
Alibek Omonturdiyev, f.f.f.d. (PhD) (O'zbekiston)
Humayun Nadim Muhammad, f.f.f.d., dotsent (O'zbekiston)

Texnik muharrir: Bahodir To'raliyev

Учредитель:
Термезский государственный университет

PHILOLOGICAL RESEARCH: LANGUAGE, LITERATURE, EDUCATION

FILOLOGIK TADQIQOTLAR: TIL, ADABIYOT, TA'LIM
ФИЛОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ: ЯЗЫК, ЛИТЕРАТУРА, ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ

НАУЧНО-ИННОВАЦИОННЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ

Зарегистрировано Агентством информации и массовых коммуникаций при Администрации Президента Республики Узбекистан от 19 октября 2020 года под номером 1122.

Авторы несут ответственность за точность приведенных в текстах примеров, отрывков и данных. Необходимо указывать источник при копировании из журнала.

Разрешено к печати: 20.06.2026
Размер бумаги; 70x85
Печатный лист: 5.94
Офсетная печать: Офсетная бумага
Тираж: 100. Цена договорная
Заказ: 155

Печатано в «Типографии ТерГУ»
ул. Баркамол авлод 43, г. Термез

Адрес редакции:
190111, г.Термез, ул. Баркамол авлод, 43.
Телефон: +998990 377 77 23, +99895 986 07 77

E-mail:
philologicalresearch@umail.uz

Официальный сайт:
https://journaltersu.uz

ГЛАВНЫЙ РЕДАКТОР:
Абдукадир ТАШКУЛОВ,
доктор экономических наук, профессор

РЕДАКЦИОННАЯ КОЛЛЕГИЯ:

Бекпулат Умуркулов, доктор филологических наук, профессор (зам. главного редактора)
Шохиста Махмараимова, доктор филологических наук, профессор (ответственный редактор)
Урал Холияров, ф.ф.ф.д. (. PhD), доцент (Узбекистан)
Олмос Улвий Биннатова, д.ф.н., профессор (Азербайджан)
Карл Райхл, д.ф.н., профессор (Германия)
Вали Саваш Елок, д.ф.н., профессор (Турция)
Дорота Сильвия, PhD, доцент (Польша)
Забита Магомед кызы Теймурлу, доктор философии по филологии, доцент (Азербайджан)
Тарана Имамверди гызы Хаджиева, доктор наук, профессор (Азербайджан)
Муслихиддин Мухиддинов, д.ф.н., профессор (Узбекистан)
Ибодулла Мирзаев, д.ф.н., профессор (Узбекистан)
Абди Маматов, д.ф.н., профессор (Узбекистан)
Суюн Каримов, д.ф.н., профессор (Узбекистан)
Мухаммадхон Хакимов, д.ф.н., профессор (Узбекистан)
Нафас Шодмонов, д.ф.н., профессор (Узбекистан)
Дилмурод Куронов, д.ф.н., профессор (Узбекистан)
Мурадкасим Абдиев, д.ф.н., профессор (Узбекистан)
Бахтиёр Менглиев, д.ф.н., профессор (Узбекистан)
Нормат Юлдашев, д.ф.н., доцент (Узбекистан)
Бахтиёр Холмухамедов, д.ф.н., доцент (Узбекистан)
Бобоназар Муртазаев, к.ф.н., доцент (Узбекистан)
Аскар Эшмуминов, д.ф.н., профессор (Узбекистан)
Обиджон Шофиев, д.ф.ф.н. (PhD), доцент (Узбекистан)
Зафар Умуркулов, д.ф.н., доцент (Узбекистан)
Нурали Амонтурдиев, д.ф.ф.н. (PhD) (Узбекистан)
Хаким Ахмедов, д.ф.ф.н., доцент (Узбекистан)
Абдулла Худайкулов, д.ф.ф.н., доцент (Узбекистан)
Ахад Шукуров, д.ф.ф.н., доцент (Узбекистан)
Эшназар Джаббаров, д.ф.ф.н., доцент (Узбекистан)
Абдумурод Арслонов, д. ф.ф.н., доцент (Узбекистан)
Сирожиддин Турдимуродов, доктор наук, доцент (Узбекистан)
Умида Рахимова, д.ф.ф.н. (PhD) (Узбекистан)
Гульчехра Бегматова, д.ф.ф.н. (PhD) (Узбекистан)
Наргис Курбаназарова, доктор наук, доцент (Узбекистан)
Муяссар Холова, д.ф.ф.н., доцент (Узбекистан)
Шаира Амонтурдиева, д.ф.н., доцент (Узбекистан)
Шерзад Турдикулов, д.ф.ф.н. (PhD) (Узбекистан)
Алибек Омонтурдиев, д.ф.ф.н. (PhD) (Узбекистан)
Хумаюн Надим Мухаммад, д.ф.ф.н., доцент (Узбекистан)

Технический редактор: Баходир Туралиев

Institutor:
Termez State University

PHILOLOGICAL RESEARCH: LANGUAGE, LITERATURE, EDUCATION

FILOLOGIK TADQIQOTLAR: TIL, ADABIYOT, TA'LIM

ФИЛОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ: ЯЗЫК, ЛИТЕРАТУРА, ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ

SCIENTIFIC-INNOVATIONAL JOURNAL

Registered by the Agency for Information and Mass Communications under the President's Administration of the of the Republic of Uzbekistan on October 19, 2020 under number 1122.

The authors are responsible for the accuracy of the examples, passages and data provided in the texts. The source must be specified when copying from the journal.

Approved for printing: 20.06.2026
Size of the paper: 70x85
Printed sheet: 5.94. Offset printing.
Offset paper. Circulation: 100
Price is negotiable
Order: 155. Printed at the «Printing House of the TerSU»
43, Barkamol avlod str. Termez city.

Address of Editorial Office:
190111, Barkamol avlod str., 43,
Termez city.
Phone: +998990 377 77 23,
+99895 986 07 77

E-mail:
philologicalresearch@umail.uz

Official website:
https://journaltersu.uz

EDITOR IN-CHIEF:
Abdukodir TASHKULOV,
doctor of economic sciences, professor

EDITORIAL BOARD:

Bekpulat Umurkulov, doctor of philological sciences, professor (Uzbekistan) (deputy chief editor)
Shohista Makhmaraimova, doctor of philological sciences, professor (Uzbekistan) (editor-in-chief)
Ural Kholiyorov, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology, Associate Professor (Uzbekistan)
Olmos Ulviy Binnatova, doct.of philol. sciences, professor (Azerbaijan)
Karl Rayxl, doct.of philol. sciences, professor (Germany)
Vali Salvash Elok, doct. of philol. sciences, professor (Turkey)
Dorota Silvia, PhD, associate professor (Poland)
Zabita Magomed kyzy Teymurlu, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology, Associate Professor (Azerbaijan)
Tarana Imamverdi gizi Khadzhieva, Doctor of Sciences, Professor (Azerbaijan)
Muslihiddin Mukhiddinov, doct.of philol. sciences, professor (Uzbekistan)
Ibodulla Mirzaev, doct.of philol. sciences, professor (Uzbekistan)
Abdi Mmatov, doct.of philol. sciences, professor (Uzbekistan)
Suyun Karimov, doct.of philol. sciences, professor (Uzbekistan)
Muhammadkhon Khakimov, doct.of philol. sciences, professor (Uzbekistan)
Nafas Shodmonov, doct.of philol. sciences, professor (Uzbekistan)
Dilmurod Kuronov, doct. of philol. sciences, professor (Uzbekistan)
Muradkasim Abdiyev, doct. of philol. sciences, professor (Uzbekistan)
Bakhtiyor Mengliev, doct. of philol. sciences, professor (Uzbekistan)
Normat Yuldashev, doct. of philol. sciences, associate professor (Uzbekistan)
Bakhtiyor Kholmukhamedov, doct. of philol. sciences, associate professor (Uzbekistan)
Bobonazar Murtazaev, cand.of philol. sciences, associate professor (Uzbekistan)
Askar Eshmuminov, doct. of philol. sciences, professor (Uzbekistan)
Obidjon Shofiev, PhD, associate professor (Uzbekistan)
Zafar Umurkulov, doct. of philol. sciences, associate professor (Uzbekistan)
Nurali Amonturdiev, PhD (Uzbekistan)
Hakim Akhmedov, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology, Associate Professor (Uzbekistan)
Abdulla Khudaykulov, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology, Associate Professor (Uzbekistan)
Ahad Shukurov, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology, Associate Professor (Uzbekistan)
Eshnazar Jabbarov, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology, Associate Professor (Uzbekistan)
Abdumurod Arslonov, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology, Associate Professor (Uzbekistan)
Sirojiddin Turdimurodov, Doctor of Sciences, Associate Professor (Uzbekistan)
Umida Rakhimova, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology (Uzbekistan)
Gulchekhra Begmatova, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology (Uzbekistan)
Nargis Kurbanazarova, Doctor of Sciences, Associate Professor (Uzbekistan)
Muyassar Kholova, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology, Associate Professor (Uzbekistan)
Shoira Omonturdiyeva, doct. of philol. sciences, associate professor (Uzbekistan)
Sherzod Turdikulov, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology, Associate Professor (Uzbekistan)
Alibek Omonturdiev, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology (Uzbekistan)
Humayun Nadim Muhammad, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology, Associate Professor (Uzbekistan)

Technical editor: Bakhodir Turaliyev

МУНДАРИЖА

TILSHUNOSLIK

LUTFULLAYEVA DURDONA
Lisoniy assotsiatsiyalarda milliy tafakkurning voqelanishi
(Vatan assotsiativ maydoni misolida) 7

MIRZAYEV IBODULLA
Xomskiyning “Til va ong” asari, generativ tilshunoslik konsepsiyasi
va professor Baxtiyor Mengliyevning tarjimonlik mahorati....10

ҚУРОНОВ ДИЛМУРОД
Бадиий диалог таржимасида коммуникатив вазиятни тўғри англаш зарурати
(Чўлпоннинг «Кеча ва кундуз» романининг янги русча нашри мисолида) 16

ЧЎТМАТОВ ЖЎРАБЕК ОМОНОВИЧ
«Ҳикмат» сўзининг араб лексикографик манбалари асосидаги лексик-семантик таҳлили.... 19

ЧОРИЕВ ТАВАККАЛ РАВШАНОВИЧ
Абдураҳмон Жомий ва Алишер Навоий идиостилида
«Саг//ит» концептининг лингвопоэтик хусусиятлари....25

UMURQULOV ZAFAR BEKPO‘LATOVICH
Alisher Navoiy ijodida so‘z qadri va nutq odobi talqini....34

UBAYDULLAYEV ALISHER ABDUSALOMOVICH
Ogahiy tarjimasidagi asarlar leksikasining tarixiy-etimologik tahlili
(“Axloqu-l-Muhsiniyn” asari misolida) 37

IBRAGIMOV SHEXROZBEK TO‘LQINJON O‘G‘LI
Tashbih va epitetlarning pragmatik talqini: tarjimada ekspressivlik va
stilistik ekvivalentlik....41

IBRAGIMOV JASURBEK TULKINJON O‘G‘LI
Jangovorlik, jasorat va jismoniy kuchga oid epitetlar
(“Beowulf” ingliz eposi misolida)....47

NAZAROVA ZIYODA KATTAYEVNA
Frazeologizmlarning yondosh birliklar bilan o‘zaro aloqasi 51

QOBILOV MIRZIYO ESHNOZAR O‘G‘LI
O‘z qatlamga oid antroponimlar tasnifi 55

ISRAILOVA SAODAT TURAPOVNA
Rang komponentli birliklarning mental birliklarda aksi....58

RO‘ZIMATOVA DILNOZA
Rasmiy munosabatlarda murojaat birliklarining shaxs ijtimoiy maqomining ifodalanishi....62

XUSANOVA NAFISA ZOKIRJON QIZI
Ertak janrida dialogning strukturaviy va funksional poetikasi
(Ingliz va o‘zbek xalq ertaklari misolida)....65

XABIBULLAYEVA FAZILAT XABIBULLO QIZI
“Boburnoma”dagi saroy-ma’muriy xizmat unvonlarining inglizcha tarjimalarda berilishi 69

MUSTAFAYEV ELYOR ODIL UGLI
Theoretical foundations for the classification of phraseological units in english 73

МУНДАРИЖА

TURSUNOVA DILSHODA XOLDIN QIZI
“O‘zbek tilining izohli lug‘ati”da qurol-aslaha nomi bilan bog‘liq folklorizmlar 77

YAVKOCHEVA FERUZA HUSAN QIZI
Types of english speech-language pathology dictionaries according to semantic relations 81

SHUKUROV RAHMATILLO MIRZATILLAYEVICH
Farg‘ona viloyati tarixiy oykonim, gidronim va oronimlarining leksik-semantik tasnifi hamda sotsiolingvistik tahlili 86

XALIQULOVA MUSHARRAF EGAMNAZAR QIZI
Maqol lingvistik, kognitiv va madaniy fenomen sifatida 90

O‘RAZOV ALISHER DONIYOROVICH
O‘zbek tilida substantiv leksemalar semantik shajarasining ifodalanishida pragmatik omillar 93

DJURAYEVA MAXBUBA USMANOVNA
Emotsiya, konsept va emotsional konsept tushunchalarining lingvistik talqini 96

ADABIYOTSHUNOSLIK

ABDULLAEV RAMAZON
Муиззий ва Ҳофиз шеъриятида адабий таъсир ва ижодий ворислик. 99

ARSLONOV ABDIMUROD KAROMATOVICH
“Qisasi Rabg‘uziy” asari poetikasi va badiiy-estetik xususiyatlari xususida.....104

АЛИМАРДОН ҲАЙИТОВ
Али Қушчининг ўғли ҳам олим бўлган.....108

DR. DONIYOR K. KELDIYOROV
Wounded memory and hybrid identity in Khaled Hosseini’s the kite runner.....112

IBRAGIMOV JAVOHIR TO‘LQINJON O‘G‘LI
Harold Lambning “Tamerlane: the earth shaker” romanida amir temur xarakterining badiiy ifodasi 116

RAXIMOVA UMIDA SOLIYEVNA
Ona obrazining ramziy va mifopoetik talqini: inglizzabon va o‘zbek adabiyoti misolida 121

MNAJATDINOVA MAKARYA
Hozirgi qoraqalpoq xotin-qizlar lirikasida psixologik metamorfoza 126

JIENBAEV MUSA AZATBAEVICH
XX-XXI asr lirikasida Odissey obrazining transformatsiyasi.....130

RADJABOVA MUXTASAR DAVRANBEKOVNA
Arab tilida talabalarning yozuv malakasini rivojlantirishda o‘yin texnologiyalarining tatbiqi.....134

Filologik tadqiqotlar: til, adabiyot, ta'lim. 2026; 9
ISNN: 2181-1741 (Print)
ISNN: 2181-1725

TYPES OF ENGLISH SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGY DICTIONARIES ACCORDING TO SEMANTIC RELATIONS

Yavkocheva Feruza Husan qizi,
Assistant teacher, Department of Languages, Asian University of Technology

Speech-language pathology, known in the post-Soviet scientific tradition as logopedics, has developed one of the most extensive special vocabularies in the applied language sciences. English is the working language of the discipline internationally: most diagnostic manuals, classifications, and assessment tools are first produced in English and only afterwards adapted to other languages. As a result, English speech-language pathology terminology has been recorded in a large number of dictionaries, glossaries, encyclopaedias, and classification documents. These reference works differ not only in size and purpose but, more importantly, in the kind of *meaning relation* that they place at the centre of the entry. Some of them explain what a term means; others show which terms mean the same; still others show how one term is subordinated to another or opposed to another. The present article examines English speech-language pathology dictionaries from this point of view and proposes a typology based on the semantic relations that organise them.

The theoretical basis for such a typology is provided by general terminology studies. V.M. Leychik describes a term system not as a list of words but as a network of concepts connected by logical relations – genus and species, whole and part, cause and effect[1]. A terminological dictionary is therefore always a partial model of this network, and the type of dictionary is determined by which relation it chooses to make visible. J.C. Sager formulates the same idea from the standpoint of terminology processing: the entry of a special dictionary records a concept, and the way the concept is linked to other concepts decides the architecture of the whole reference work[2]. S.V. Grinev-Grinevich, in turn, distinguishes explanatory, translation, ideographic, and frequency terminological dictionaries as the main lexicographic types[3].

Within Uzbek linguistics the semantic organisation of the lexicon has been examined by E. Begmatov[4] and Sh. Rahmatullayev[5], who describe synonymic, antonymic, and hyponymic series as the principal meaning relations of the literary language. Their observations, however, concern the general vocabulary; the special vocabulary of speech-language pathology, and especially its lexicographic representation, has not yet been studied in Uzbek linguistics. At the same time, Uzbek logopedics is now actively borrowing and translating English terminology, and the compilers of future Uzbek and English–Uzbek dictionaries of the field need a clear picture of what kinds of dictionaries already exist in the source language and on what semantic principles they are built.

The aim of the research is to classify English speech-language pathology dictionaries according to the semantic relation that dominates their entries and to describe the structural features of each type. The tasks of the study are: to identify the semantic relations relevant to speech-language pathology terminology; to examine a representative set of English dictionaries and glossaries of the field; to distinguish the types of dictionaries on the basis of the dominant relation; to establish which type is the most suitable model for a future English–Uzbek dictionary of the field.

The material of the study consists of seven English reference works that record speech-language pathology terminology and that are widely cited in clinical and academic literature: the specialised dictionary of L. Nicolosi, E. Harryman, and J. Kresheck[6]; the linguistic dictionary of D. Crystal,

[1] Лейчик В.М. Терминоведение: предмет, методы, структура. – М.: Либроком, 2009. – 256 с.
[2] Sager J.C. A Practical Course in Terminology Processing. – Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1990. – 254 p.
[3] Гринев-Гриневич С.В. Терминоведение: учебное пособие. – М.: Академия, 2008. – 304 с.
[4] Бегматов Э. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили лексикаси. – Тошкент: Фан, 1985. – 200 б.
[5] Раҳматуллаев Ш. Ҳозирги адабий ўзбек тили. – Тошкент: Университет, 2006. – 464 б.
[6] Nicolosi L., Harryman E., Kresheck J. Terminology of Communication Disorders: Speech-Language-Hearing. 5th ed. – Baltimore: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 2004. – 448 p.

which contains the phonetic and phonological terms used in articulation therapy[1]; the encyclopaedia of communication disorders edited by R.D. Kent[2]; the section on disorders of communication in the eleventh revision of the International Classification of Diseases[3]; the assessment manual of K.G. Shipley and J.G. McAfee, which includes an extensive glossary[4]; the handbook on stuttering by O. Bloodstein and N. Bernstein Ratner[5]; and the online glossaries of the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. From these sources 180 term entries were selected, covering the four main semantic fields of the discipline – fluency disorders, articulation and phonological disorders, voice disorders, and language disorders.

Each entry was analysed with the method of component and relational analysis. First, the definition of the headword was decomposed into its semantic components in order to establish the concept behind the term. Second, every explicit link between the headword and other terms in the entry – a synonym, a cross-reference, a hyperonym named in the definition, an opposite term – was recorded and classified as one of the following relations: term – concept (definition), term – term equivalence (synonymy), hyperonym – hyponym (hierarchy), term – opposite (antonymy), term – associated term (meronymy, cause – effect, instrument – function), and term – foreign equivalent (translation). Third, for every reference work the proportion of each relation across its entries was calculated, and the relation with the highest proportion was taken as the dominant one. The dominant relation was then used as the criterion for assigning the reference work to a dictionary type.

The method follows D.S. Lotte's principle that a term must be studied in its system and not in isolation[6]. It also allows the same dictionary to display secondary relations: an explanatory dictionary usually contains synonyms and cross-references, and an ideographic classification usually contains short definitions. The type is determined by the dominant relation, while the secondary relations are described as additional features of the type.

1. Explanatory dictionaries. The first and most numerous type is the explanatory or definitional dictionary, in which the dominant relation is term – concept. The classical example is the dictionary of Nicolosi, Harryman, and Kresheck, where each entry consists of a headword, a concise definition, and, where necessary, a usage note. The entry for *dysarthria* defines it as a group of speech disorders resulting from disturbances in muscular control of the speech mechanism; the entry for *cluttering* defines it as a fluency disorder characterised by rapid or irregular speech rate and reduced intelligibility. In our sample the term – concept relation accounts for 71 per cent of all links recorded in this dictionary; synonymy and cross-referencing together account for the remaining 29 per cent. The explanatory dictionary is the type most directly related to teaching: a student who does not know a term needs, first of all, its definition. Its weakness is that it presents the terminology alphabetically and thus hides the systemic relations between terms that belong to one clinical category.

2. Synonymic dictionaries. The second type is organised around the relation of term – term equivalence. Speech-language pathology terminology in English is rich in synonymy for historical reasons: the discipline developed in parallel in the United States and Britain, and it absorbed vocabulary from medicine, psychology, education, and linguistics. As a result many concepts have two or more names: *stuttering* and *stammering*; *speech-language pathologist*, *speech therapist*, and *speech and language therapist*; *articulation disorder* and *phonetic disorder*; *voice disorder* and *dysphonia*. Crystal's dictionary and the ASHA glossaries systematically record such synonyms and mark their register or regional distribution: *stammering* is marked as British, *dysphonia* as clinical, *speech therapist* as informal or historical. In these sources the equivalence relation makes up 46 per cent of all links, which is higher than the share of definitions. The synonymic dictionary is indispensable for translators, because the choice between synonyms in the target language depends on knowing which English synonym is neutral, which is technical, and which is obsolete. Uzbek sources, for instance, usually translate *stuttering* with the native word *duduqlanish* but leave the British *stammering* without a separate equivalent, which is correct only if the two English terms are recognised as full synonyms.

[1] Crystal D. A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics. 6th ed. – Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2008. – 529 p.

[2] Kent R.D. (ed.) The MIT Encyclopedia of Communication Disorders. – Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2004. – 618 p.

[3] World Health Organization. International Classification of Diseases, 11th Revision (ICD-11): Disorders of Communication. – Geneva: WHO, 2022.

[4] Shipley K.G., McAfee J.G. Assessment in Speech-Language Pathology: A Resource Manual. 5th ed. – San Diego: Plural Publishing, 2016. – 620 p.

[5] Bloodstein O., Bernstein Ratner N. A Handbook on Stuttering. 6th ed. – New York: Delmar, 2008. – 552 p.

[6] Лотте Д.С. Основы построения научно-технической терминологии. – М.: Изд-во АН СССР, 1961. – 158 с.

3. Ideographic dictionaries. The third type is the ideographic or hierarchical dictionary, in which the dominant relation is hyperonym – hyponym. Here the terms are not arranged alphabetically but by concept, from the most general to the most specific. The clearest example is the ICD-11 classification of disorders of communication, where *developmental speech or language disorder* is divided into *developmental speech sound disorder*, *developmental speech fluency disorder*, and *developmental language disorder*, and the last is further divided according to whether receptive, expressive, or pragmatic language is impaired. The scope-of-practice documents of ASHA are built in the same way: *communication disorder* is the top node, *speech disorder* and *language disorder* are its immediate hyponyms, and *fluency disorder*, *voice disorder*, and *articulation disorder* are hyponyms of *speech disorder*. In these sources the hierarchical relation constitutes 63 per cent of all recorded links.

The ideographic dictionary is the type that most faithfully reflects the term system as understood by Leychik and Lotte. Its entries are short, because the position of a term in the hierarchy already conveys much of its meaning: a reader who sees that a term is placed under fluency disorders knows that it concerns the rhythm and flow of speech even before reading the definition. This type is especially valuable for languages that are still forming their terminology, because it shows exactly which concepts must receive a name and how the names should be related to one another. For Uzbek, whose speech-language pathology terminology has a number of gaps at the level of specific hyponyms, an ideographic model would make those gaps visible at once.

4. Antonymic dictionaries. The fourth type is based on the relation term – opposite term. Speech-language pathology terminology contains a considerable number of contrastive pairs, most of which are built with Greek and Latin prefixes: *hypernasality – hyponasality*; *hyperfunctional – hypofunctional dysphonia*; *expressive – receptive language disorder*; *fluent – non-fluent aphasia*; *developmental – acquired disorder*. No English dictionary of the field is antonymic in its entirety, but the encyclopaedia edited by Kent regularly presents such pairs within a single article and defines each member of the pair through its opposite. In that source the antonymic relation accounts for 18 per cent of links, which is the highest proportion among the works examined; in the others it does not exceed 8 per cent. The antonymic relation is therefore a secondary but stable organising principle, and it is particularly important for translation, since a pair such as *hypernasality – hyponasality* must be rendered by a pair that preserves the contrast. Uzbek clinical texts render the first member as *burun tovushi kuchayishi* and the second as *burun tovushi kamayishi*, which preserves the opposition by means of native verbal nouns rather than borrowed prefixes.

5. Associative dictionaries. The fifth type is the associative or encyclopaedic dictionary, in which the dominant relation is term – related term: part and whole, cause and effect, instrument and function, disorder and assessment procedure. The encyclopaedia of Kent and the assessment manual of Shipley and McAfee belong to this type. In the entry for *stuttering* the reader finds not only a definition but links to *repetition*, *prolongation*, and *block* as its components, to *secondary behaviours* as its consequences, and to *Stuttering Severity Instrument* as the tool for measuring it. The associative relation makes up 52 per cent of the links in these sources. Such dictionaries are the closest to the practical needs of the clinician, who works with a whole cluster of terms around one diagnosis. Their disadvantage is the size of the entries and the difficulty of extracting the strict definition of a term from the surrounding encyclopaedic material.

6. Translation dictionaries. The sixth type is organised around the relation term – foreign equivalent. Bilingual glossaries of speech-language pathology terminology exist for many language pairs, but for English–Uzbek they are so far represented only by short word-lists attached to translated manuals and clinical guidelines. Analysis of these lists shows that the translation relation is realised in four ways: full transliteration (*aphasia – afaziya*), hybrid formation (*speech therapy – logopedlik*), functional calque (*speech disorder – nutq nuqsoni*), and descriptive substitution (*prolongation – tovushni cho‘zib talaffuz qilish*). A translation dictionary that records only the equivalent, without indicating which of these correspondence types it represents, is of limited use, because the user cannot tell whether the Uzbek term is an established borrowing or a provisional description. A well-designed bilingual dictionary must therefore combine the translation relation with at least one of the relations described above, most naturally with the hierarchical one.

The six types identified above and their distinguishing features are summarised in Table 1.

Table 1. Types of English speech-language pathology dictionaries by dominant semantic relation

Dictionary type	Dominant semantic relation	Structure of the entry	Representative English source
Explanatory (definitional)	term – concept	headword + definition + usage note	Nicolosi, Harryman & Kresheck (2004)
Synonymic	term – term (equivalence)	headword + synonyms + register mark	Crystal (2008); ASHA glossaries
Ideographic (hierarchical)	hyperonym – hyponym	field → subfield → term tree	ICD-11 (2022); ASHA scope of practice
Antonymic (contrastive)	term – opposite term	paired entries with a shared base	Kent (2004)
Associative (encyclopaedic)	term – related term (meronymy, cause – effect)	headword + cross-references + article	Kent (2004); Shipley & McAfee (2016)
Translation (bilingual)	term – foreign equivalent	headword + equivalent(s) + correspondence type	Bilingual glossaries and clinical guidelines

The distribution of dominant relations across the six types is not accidental. It reflects the purpose for which each reference work was created: explanatory dictionaries serve teaching, synonymic dictionaries serve editing and translation, ideographic classifications serve diagnosis and statistics, antonymic and associative works serve clinical reasoning, and translation dictionaries serve the transfer of the terminology into another language. It also reflects the historical development of English speech-language pathology terminology: the earliest works of the twentieth century were explanatory, the growth of synonymy caused by the parallel American and British traditions produced the need for synonymic marking, and the introduction of international classifications in the last decades of the century made the hierarchical type the standard for official use.

A further observation concerns the interaction of types. None of the reference works examined is pure: every explanatory dictionary contains synonyms, every ideographic classification contains definitions, and every encyclopaedia contains antonymic pairs. The typology proposed here therefore does not divide dictionaries into mutually exclusive classes but identifies the relation that determines the macrostructure of each work. In practical terms this means that a compiler can combine types deliberately: an English–Uzbek dictionary organised ideographically at the level of the macrostructure, with explanatory definitions and synonymic marks at the level of the microstructure, would unite the advantages of three types in one work.

For Uzbek terminology the results have two direct consequences. First, the ideographic type should be taken as the model for the first comprehensive Uzbek dictionary of the field, because it reveals which concepts still lack a stable Uzbek name and because it presents terms in the clinical categories in which specialists actually use them. Second, the synonymic and antonymic relations of the English source must be preserved in translation: where English has two synonyms, the Uzbek dictionary should either give one equivalent for both and mark them as synonyms or justify two distinct equivalents; where English has a contrastive pair, the Uzbek pair must retain the contrast.

The analysis of seven English reference works recording speech-language pathology terminology shows that these works can be classified into six types according to the semantic relation that dominates their entries: explanatory dictionaries built on the term – concept relation, synonymic dictionaries built on term – term equivalence, ideographic dictionaries built on the hyperonym – hyponym relation, antonymic dictionaries built on the term – opposite relation, associative dictionaries built on the term – related term relation, and translation dictionaries built on the term – foreign equivalent relation. The type of a dictionary is determined by its purpose, and the six types correspond to the six main uses of terminology in the discipline: teaching, editing, diagnosis, clinical reasoning, research, and translation.

The question raised in the introduction – which type is the most suitable model for a future En-

glish–Uzbek dictionary of speech-language pathology – can be answered on the basis of these findings. The most suitable model is a combined one: an ideographic macrostructure, which makes the term system and its gaps visible, supplemented by an explanatory and synonymic microstructure, which gives each term a definition, its English synonyms with register marks, and its Uzbek equivalent with an indication of the correspondence type. Such a dictionary would serve at once as a teaching tool, a translation aid, and an instrument of terminological standardisation.

Further research may extend the proposed typology to the terminology of related disciplines – audiology, neuropsychology, and special education – and test whether the same six semantic relations organise their dictionaries in the same proportions. A separate task is the compilation of the Uzbek ideographic dictionary itself, for which the present article provides the lexicographic model.

Resume. The article classifies English dictionaries of speech-language pathology terminology according to the semantic relation that dominates their entries. Using component and relational analysis, 180 entries from seven English dictionaries, encyclopaedias, and classification documents were examined. Six types of dictionaries are distinguished: explanatory (term – concept), synonymic (term – term), ideographic (hyperonym – hyponym), antonymic (term – opposite term), associative (term – related term), and translation (term – foreign equivalent) dictionaries. The structure, purpose, and relevance of each type for Uzbek speech-language pathology terminology are described. For a future English–Uzbek dictionary of the field, a combined model is proposed: an ideographic macrostructure with an explanatory and synonymic microstructure.

Rezyume. Maqolada ingliz tilidagi logopediya terminlari lug‘atlari ularning asosini tashkil etuvchi ma’no munosabatiga ko‘ra tasniflanadi. Yettita ingliz tilidagi lug‘at, ensiklopediya va tasnif hujjatidan olingan 180 ta lug‘at maqolasi komponent va munosabat tahlili usulida o‘rganildi. Tahlil natijasida lug‘atlarning olti turi ajratildi: izohli (termin – tushuncha), sinonimik (termin – termin), ideografik (jins – tur), antonimik (termin – zid termin), assotsiativ (termin – aloqador termin) va tarjima (termin – chet tildagi ekvivalent) lug‘atlari. Har bir turning tuzilishi, vazifasi va o‘zbek logopediya terminologiyasi uchun ahamiyati tavsiflanadi. Bo‘lajak inglizcha-o‘zbekcha logopediya lug‘ati uchun ideografik makrostruktura hamda izohli va sinonimik mikrostrukturani birlashtirgan model taklif etiladi.

Резюме. В статье предлагается классификация англоязычных словарей логопедической терминологии по типу семантического отношения, лежащего в основе словарной статьи. Методом компонентного и реляционного анализа изучено 180 словарных статей из семи английских словарей, энциклопедий и классификационных документов. Выделено шесть типов словарей: толковые (термин – понятие), синонимические (термин – термин), идеографические (род – вид), антонимические (термин – противоположный термин), ассоциативные (термин – связанный термин) и переводные (термин – иноязычный эквивалент). Описаны структура, назначение и значение каждого типа для узбекской логопедической терминологии. Для будущего англо-узбекского логопедического словаря предложена комбинированная модель: идеографическая макроструктура в сочетании с толковой и синонимической микроструктурой.