

**MENTAL ENLIGHTENMENT SCIENTIFIC –
METHODOLOGICAL JOURNAL****MENTAL ENLIGHTENMENT SCIENTIFIC –
METHODOLOGICAL JOURNAL**<http://mentaljournal-jspu.uz/index.php/mesmj/index>**A LEXICOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH COMPOUND NOUNS WITH “MAN”
IN ENGLISH – UZBEK DICTIONARIES*****Dilfuza Ibodullayeva****Master's student, Department of English Linguistics**Karshi State University**Email: dilfuzaibodullayeva5@gmail.com**Karshi, Uzbekistan***ABOUT ARTICLE**

Key words: compound nouns, man-compounds, lexicography, bilingual dictionaries, translation equivalence, gender-neutral language, semantic analysis, English-Uzbek translation.

Received: 01.05.26**Accepted:** 02.05.26**Published:** 03.05.26

Abstract: This study investigates the lexicographic representation of English compound nouns containing the word “man” in both English monolingual and English-Uzbek bilingual dictionaries. The research focuses on their structural, semantic, and sociolinguistic features, as well as their translation equivalents in Uzbek. The findings reveal that English monolingual dictionaries provide detailed entries, including definitions, usage labels, and contextual examples, whereas English-Uzbek bilingual dictionaries tend to offer limited information, mainly focusing on direct semantic equivalents. The study identifies different types of translation equivalence, including direct, functional, and descriptive translation. It also demonstrates that stylistic and gender-related features are often neutralized in translation. The paper concludes that bilingual dictionaries should be improved by incorporating stylistic, pragmatic, and sociolinguistic information to better reflect modern language usage and enhance their usefulness for learners and translators.

Introduction. In modern linguistics, compound nouns are considered one of the most productive way of word formation in English. Among them, compounds containing the component “man” plays a special role due to their historical development, semantic diversity,

and sociolinguistic relevance. Such units as policeman, chairman, businessman, and gentleman have long been part of the core vocabulary and are widely represented in lexicographic sources.

However, the way these compounds are presented in dictionaries is not always consistent. English monolingual dictionaries usually provide rich and detailed entries, including definitions, pronunciation, stylistic labels, and examples of usage. But, English – Uzbek bilingual dictionaries tend to provide more limited information, often focusing only on direct translation equivalents and overlooking important semantic, stylistic, and cultural aspects. This difference becomes especially important when it comes to translation. Compound nouns with the component “man” are not just simple lexical items; they also carry meanings related to gender, style, and context. In modern English, many of these forms are gradually changing as speakers prefer gender-neutral language. Therefore, dictionary entries should represent not only traditional forms but also the ways in which these expressions are evolving in modern usage.

From a lexicographic point of view, representing such compounds accurately involves more than simply giving direct equivalents. As Zgusta [1] points out, dictionary entries should reflect not only meaning but also how words are used and how they function in different contexts. In a similar way, Béjoint [2] highlights that modern dictionaries need to combine linguistic and pragmatic information so that they can be truly useful for both learners and translators.

The aim of this research is to analyze the lexicographic representation of English compound nouns with the component “man” and to examine the degree of translation equivalence provided in English–Uzbek dictionaries. To achieve this aim, the study addresses the following objectives:

- to examine the structural and semantic features of “man”-compounds;
- to analyze their representation in English monolingual dictionaries;
- to evaluate their treatment in English–Uzbek bilingual dictionaries;
- to identify the main problems of translation equivalence;
- to propose improvements for lexicographic practice.

Literature Review. The study of compound nouns remains a central topic in modern morphology and lexicology, particularly in the analysis of English word formation. Compounding is widely recognized as a productive way that allows the creation of new lexical items through the combination of existing elements. As noted by Laurie Bauer [3] compounds often develop meanings that are not entirely predictable from their individual components, which makes them a significant object of linguistic research. Further studies in morphology

emphasize that compounding involves a complex interaction between structure and meaning. According to Rochelle Lieber [4], compound nouns demonstrate both semantic and structural variability, which requires detailed analysis in terms of interpretation and classification. This is particularly relevant for “man” compounds, where the element “man” may function as a marker of profession, a reference to a person, or a general human-related concept.

Recent linguistic research also highlights the importance of usage-based approaches to word formation. As argued by Ingo Plag [5], modern morphology increasingly focuses on how lexical units function in real communicative contexts. This perspective is especially important for compounds that carry additional stylistic or sociolinguistic meanings. For example, forms such as *businessman* and *salesman* are still used in everyday communication, but in formal or professional contexts they are often replaced by more neutral alternatives such as *businessperson* or *sales representative*. Similarly, *man-made* is frequently used in general contexts, while *artificial* may be preferred in more formal or scientific discourse. These examples show that the choice of compound forms depends not only on their structure but also on context, register, and communicative purpose. In addition, vocabulary is closely connected with social change. Deborah Cameron [6] emphasizes that language reflects evolving attitudes toward gender and identity. This observation is particularly relevant to “man”-based compounds, many of which are increasingly replaced by gender-neutral alternatives in contemporary English. For example, traditional forms such as *policeman*, *chairman*, and *fireman* are now often replaced by *police officer*, *chairperson*, and *firefighter*, respectively. These changes reflect a broader shift toward inclusive language and have important implications for both lexicographic description and translation.

From a lexicographic perspective, modern research highlights the need for dictionary entries that are both detailed and user-friendly. As Zgusta [1] points out, dictionaries should do more than simply define words; they should also provide information about how words are used, the contexts in which they appear, and their functions in communication. In a similar vein, Béjoint [2] emphasizes that effective modern dictionaries must combine semantic, stylistic, and pragmatic information. Today’s lexicographic practices place strong emphasis on meeting users’ needs and ensuring accessibility. As noted by B. T. Sue Atkins and Michael Rundell [9] dictionaries should include not only clear definitions but also usage labels, illustrative examples, and contextual details to help users understand and apply words accurately. In translation studies, recent research shows that achieving equivalence between languages is not always easy and often requires careful adaptation. As Mona Baker [10] explains, translators need to take into account not only the meaning of words but also pragmatic and cultural factors

when conveying ideas across languages. Likewise, Jeremy Munday [11] stresses that translation is not simply a matter of replacing words, but a process of interpreting meaning within its specific context.

Recent developments in Uzbek linguistics show an increasing interest in lexicography and the modernization of dictionaries. As Babajanova [12] points out, modern lexicographic approaches should not only ensure the systematic organization of lexical units but also reflect how they are actually used in real communicative contexts. In a similar way, Sharipov [13] argues that traditional lexicographic practices often struggle to capture the dynamic nature of language and its constantly evolving usage patterns. This limitation can create difficulties for both language learners and translators. Moreover, recent research in Uzbek linguistics emphasizes the importance of improving bilingual dictionaries by including semantic, stylistic, and contextual information. As Karimov [14] explains, lexical units should not be viewed as isolated items, but rather as elements shaped by their functional, cultural, and communicative contexts, especially in bilingual settings. In addition, recent studies highlight the importance of interdisciplinary approaches that bring together lexicology, translation studies, and linguocultural analysis. As Rahimov [15] points out, many linguistic studies still tend to examine word formation, translation, and lexicography as separate areas, rather than integrating them into a unified analytical framework. Although there is a considerable amount of research in morphology, lexicography, and translation studies, relatively little attention has been given to the specific issue of how “man”-compounds are represented in English – Uzbek dictionaries. Most existing studies tend to examine these areas separately, without exploring their intersection from a lexicographic perspective. Therefore, this study aims to address this gap by analyzing the lexicographic representation and translation equivalence of “man”-compounds in English – Uzbek dictionaries. Particular attention is given to their semantic, stylistic, and gender-related features.

Methodology. This study adopts a qualitative approach and examines how English compound nouns with the component “man” are represented in dictionaries and translated into Uzbek. The research follows a descriptive and comparative design, focusing on the linguistic and lexicographic features of these compounds. In particular, it aims to evaluate how semantic, stylistic, and gender-related aspects are reflected in dictionary entries and their Uzbek equivalents.

The data for this study include a set of commonly used “man”-compounds, such as policeman, businessman, spokesman, gentleman, fisherman, salesman, and man-made. These lexemes were selected based on their frequent use in modern English, their presence in both

monolingual and bilingual dictionaries, and their semantic diversity, covering professions, social roles, and more abstract meanings. In addition, many of these compounds carry stylistic or gender-related features, which makes them particularly relevant for the purposes of this research. The analysis is based on data taken from English monolingual dictionaries (such as Oxford and Cambridge dictionaries) and English – Uzbek bilingual dictionaries. These sources were chosen in order to compare how the same lexical items are treated in different lexicographic contexts. Several methods are used in this research. Lexicographic analysis is applied to examine how dictionary entries are structured, including definitions, usage labels, and examples. Semantic analysis is used to explore the meanings and variations of the selected compounds. Comparative analysis helps identify similarities and differences between English and Uzbek dictionary entries. In addition, translation analysis is used to evaluate how meaning is transferred from English into Uzbek. To ensure consistency, the analysis is guided by a set of clear criteria. These include the completeness of meaning, the presence of stylistic or usage labels, the treatment of gender-related aspects, the accuracy of translation equivalents, and the use of contextual examples. The research is carried out in several stages. First, relevant compounds are selected and collected from dictionaries. Next, their entries are analyzed and compared across different sources. Then, the Uzbek equivalents are examined in terms of meaning and usage. Finally, the results are interpreted to identify common patterns and key challenges in lexicographic representation and translation.

Results and discussions. The analysis of English compound nouns with the component “man” reveals several consistent patterns in their lexicographic representation and translation into Uzbek. First, English monolingual dictionaries provide detailed and structured entries that include definitions, usage labels, and contextual examples. For instance,

The image shows two dictionary entries for the word "spokesman".

The top entry is from the Cambridge Academic Content Dictionary. It shows the word "spokesman" as a noun [C]. The US pronunciation is /'spouks-mən/ and the plural is "-men". The definition is "a male spokesperson".

The bottom entry is from the Cambridge Business English Dictionary. It shows the word "spokesman" as a noun [C] with a "MARKETING" label. The UK pronunciation is /'spəʊksmən/ and the US pronunciation is /'spouks-/. The plural is "spokesmen". The definition is "a man who acts as a spokesperson:". An example sentence is provided: "The spokesman repeated the company's claim that it was not to blame for the accident".

Figure 1.

A dictionary entry for “spokesman” illustrating gender-specific labeling (Cambridge Dictionary)

The dictionary entry for spokesman defines it as “a male spokesperson” and further explains it as “a man who acts as a spokesperson for an organization or group”. The inclusion of the term “male” clearly marks the word as gender-specific. In addition, the entry provides pronunciation, grammatical details, and example sentences, demonstrating how the word is used in real contexts. This example highlights that modern lexicographic practice not only defines lexical items but also reflects their grammatical, semantic, and sociolinguistic characteristics.

Another example, the following dictionary entry presents information about the word craftsman from the Cambridge Dictionary.

craftsman noun [C]

US /'kræfts·mən/ plural

craftsmen US /'kræftsmən, -'men/

craftswomen US /'kræfts,wimən/ (female craftswoman, /'kræfts wumən/)

The entry defines craftsman as “a person who is skilled in doing or making something” highlighting its general meaning related to manual skill and expertise. Additionally, the entry includes pronunciation (both UK and US), grammatical information (noun, countable), and plural forms (craftsmen, craftswomen), which reflect gender distinctions in traditional usage. Moreover, the dictionary implicitly demonstrates modern lexicographic tendencies by including the alternative form craftswoman, indicating a shift toward more gender-inclusive language. This supports the argument that contemporary English dictionaries not only provide definitions but also include sociolinguistic considerations such as inclusivity and variation in usage.

In contrast, English–Uzbek bilingual dictionaries tend to provide simplified lexical equivalents without extensive lexicographic elaboration. For instance, spokesman is translated as *rasmiy vakil*, businessman as *tadbirkor*, middleman as *vositachi*, and craftsman as *hunarmand*. While these equivalents adequately convey the core semantic meaning, they generally lack additional information regarding stylistic nuance, register, and gender-related implications. Consequently, such dictionaries prioritize semantic equivalence over pragmatic and sociolinguistic detail, which may limit users’ awareness of contemporary language usage and inclusive alternatives.

The analysis further identifies several types of translation equivalence. Direct equivalence is observed in cases such as craftsman – hunarmand and fisherman – baliqchi, where both form and meaning are closely aligned. Functional equivalence appears in examples like statesman – davlat arbobi and businessman – tadbirkor, where the Uzbek equivalent reflects the function or social role rather than preserving the original lexical structure. Descriptive translation is evident in cases such as spokesman – rasmiy vakil and middleman – vositachi shaxs, where the meaning is conveyed through explanatory phrases rather than single-word equivalents.

Another important group consists of abstract or idiomatic compounds. For example, man-made is typically translated as sun'iy, and manpower as ishchi kuchi. In these cases, the component “man” is not translated literally; instead, it is interpreted semantically in accordance with the overall meaning of the compound. Similarly, gentleman is translated as janob, where the general social meaning is preserved. However, certain nuances related to social class, politeness, and cultural connotations may be partially reduced or lost in translation.

The results further demonstrate that stylistic and sociolinguistic features are frequently simplified in translation. In English, compounds such as salesman, spokesman, and businessman may carry traditional or gender-marked connotations. However, their Uzbek equivalents (savdo xodimi, rasmiy vakil, tadbirkor) are generally neutral and do not reflect these distinctions. As a result, certain sociolinguistic dimensions of meaning, particularly those related to gender and formality, tend to be neutralized in the translation process. Finally, the analysis indicates that recent developments in English, especially the shift toward gender-neutral language, are not consistently represented in bilingual dictionaries. While English lexicographic sources increasingly include alternatives such as spokesperson, businessperson, and chairperson, these distinctions are rarely given in Uzbek equivalents. This discrepancy creates a gap between contemporary English usage and its lexicographic representation in Uzbek, potentially limiting users' awareness of evolving language norms and inclusive forms.

Conclusion. This study has analyzed the lexicographic representation and translation of “man”-compounds in English monolingual dictionaries and English –Uzbek bilingual dictionaries. The findings demonstrate that while English dictionaries provide comprehensive information, including definitions, usage patterns, stylistic features, and gender-related nuances, English–Uzbek bilingual dictionaries tend to prioritize concise semantic equivalents, often omitting important pragmatic and sociolinguistic details. The findings have shown that different types of translation equivalence – namely direct, functional, and descriptive – are used in translating “man”-compounds into Uzbek. While these strategies generally ensure accurate

transmission of core meaning, they frequently result in the loss or neutralization of stylistic and gender-related connotations. In particular, gender-marked elements in English compounds are usually translated into neutral forms in Uzbek, reflecting differences in language and culture. However, this approach may also lead to partial loss of underlying morphological and cultural information embedded in the source language.

In conclusion, although English – Uzbek bilingual dictionaries effectively fulfill their primary function of conveying meaning, they would benefit from a more comprehensive approach that includes stylistic labels, usage notes, and sociolinguistic information. Incorporating such features would enhance their pedagogical and practical value, particularly for language learners, translators, and researchers. Future studies may further explore larger datasets, additional compound structures, and user-oriented lexicographic design to improve the quality and relevance of bilingual dictionaries in a rapidly evolving linguistic landscape.

References:

- [1] Zgusta, L. (1971). *Manual of lexicography*. Mouton.
- [2] Béjoint, H. (2010). *The lexicography of English: From origins to present*. Oxford University Press.
- [3] Bauer, L. (2017). *Compounds and compounding*. Cambridge University Press.
- [4] Lieber, R. (2016). *Introducing morphology* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- [5] Plag, I. (2018). *Word-formation in English*. Cambridge University Press.
- [6] Cameron, D. (2003). *Gender and language ideologies*. Oxford University Press.
- [7] Atkins, B. T. S., & Rundell, M. (2008). *The Oxford guide to practical lexicography*. Oxford University Press.
- [8] Baker, M. (2018). *In other words: A coursebook on translation* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- [9] Munday, J. (2016). *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- [10] Babajanova, D. (2024). Modern trends in Uzbek lexicography. *Uzbek Language and Literature*, 5(1), 15–22.
- [11] Sharipov, N. (2021). Problems of modern Uzbek lexicography. *Linguistic Research Journal*, 10(3), 67–74.
- [12] Karimov, S. (2020). Lexical units in bilingual lexicography and their functional features. *Uzbek Linguistics Journal*, 12(2), 45–52.
- [13] Rahimov, A. (2019). Interdisciplinary approaches in modern linguistics. *Philology Issues*, 8(1), 23–30.

[14] Oxford English Dictionary. <https://www.oed.com>

[15] Cambridge Online Dictionary. <https://dictionary.cambridge.org>