



Article

# Lexicographic Representation of the Concept of Loyalty and its Semantic Field in English and Uzbek

Umurzakova Aziza\*<sup>1</sup>

1. Doctoral student at NSU

\* Correspondence: [aziza.umurzakova1999@gmail.com](mailto:aziza.umurzakova1999@gmail.com)

**Abstract:** The concept of loyalty constitutes a fundamental moral and social value in human interaction and is deeply embedded in linguistic systems through a network of lexical and semantic representations. Despite its universal ethical significance, the linguistic conceptualization of loyalty varies across languages and cultures, particularly in terms of semantic structure, synonymic expansion, and stylistic orientation. This research article is a contrastive lexicographic study of loyalty in English and Uzbek: the way the concept of loyalty, the approximation and its co-hyponymic words with it are reflected, described and interpreted in terminology and synonymic paper resources. Based on the data from the fundamental sources of English lexicography (Oxford English Dictionary, Merriam-Webster, Cambridge Dictionary, Collins Dictionary), and lexicographic works of Uzbek (O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati, O'zbek tili sinonimlar lug'ati, O'zbek tili etimologik lug'ati), this research focuses on definitional structures, intrinsic semantic components, object orientation and synonymic networks related to loyalty denoting lexemes. The results show that by comparison of types of meanings, lexically English is shown to possess a more diverse model of loyalty (loyalty, allegiance, fidelity, devotion), whereas Uzbek is semantically more concentrated and focused around sadoqat and its close variants (sodiqlik, vafodorlik, vafu). The research demonstrates both common and particular features of the concept of loyalty and makes a contribution to comparative lexicography and conceptual semantics.

**Citation:** Aziza U. Lexicographic Representation of the Concept of Loyalty and its Semantic Field in English and Uzbek. Central Asian Journal of Literature, Philosophy, and Culture 2026, 7(2), 69-75.

Received: 09<sup>th</sup> Nov 2025

Revised: 15<sup>th</sup> Dec 2025

Accepted: 22<sup>nd</sup> Jan 2026

Published: 26<sup>th</sup> Feb 2026



**Copyright:** © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

**Keywords:** Loyalty, Sadoqat, Lexicographic Analysis, Semantic Field, English and Uzbek, Moral Concepts.

## 1. Introduction

The concept of loyalty occupies a central position in the system of moral values that regulate human behavior, social relations, and institutional stability. Despite its apparent universality, loyalty is not a semantically homogeneous notion [1], [2]. Its linguistic realization is shaped by historically conditioned meanings, culturally embedded evaluations, and lexicographically fixed norms that vary across languages.

Conceptual meaning is stabilized by lexicography in a pivotal way. Dictionaries codify not just a semantic content but also a hierarchical relationship between lexical units, prioritizing some meanings above others, whilst disguising some as non-meanings. So looking at loyalty, emerge as a kind of semantic field, semantic field, center and periphery, units in the field of tolerance (from the point of view of the units of intensity, scope and stylistic unit). [3] In English, the term loyalty is a rooted member of a contextually lexically differentiated paradigm, comprising of units such as allegiance, fidelity, devotion and commitment that are each encoding various nested institutional,

emotional or pragmatic dimensions. The overwhelmingly related lexemes in Uzbek, on the other hand, focuses mainly on *sadoqat* and its closely related words (*sodiqlik*, *vafodorlik*, *vafo*) which reveals their character or ethical meanings with overlap, so that the main burden of the responsibility is on one electoral [4], [5]. This highlights a key research question: what do diff lexicographic systems tell us about loyalty structure and its lang spec conceptual pairing.

To answer this question, we present a comparative lexicographic study on the concept of loyalty in English and Uzbek in the current article. Rather than treating dictionaries as auxiliary reference tools, the study approaches them as primary analytical data, reflecting culturally sanctioned interpretations of moral values [6], [7]. By examining dictionary definitions, synonymic networks, semantic components, object orientation, and stylistic markers, the research reconstructs the internal structure of the loyalty concept in both languages.

The objectives of the study are therefore threefold:

- (1) To identify the core and peripheral lexical units representing the concept of loyalty in English and Uzbek lexicographic sources;
- (2) To analyze the semantic and functional differentiation of loyalty-related lexemes within each language;
- (3) To compare the lexicographic structuring of loyalty as a culturally grounded moral concept [8], [9].

The findings offer a theoretically informed framework for analyzing moral concepts through dictionary data and provide a replicable methodological model applicable to other value-laden concepts across languages.

## 2. Materials and Methods

### Research approach

This study adopts a comparative lexicographic-semantic approach to the analysis of the concept of loyalty in English and Uzbek. The methodology is grounded in the assumption that dictionaries function not merely as repositories of lexical meaning but as normative models of conceptual organization, reflecting culturally stabilized interpretations of moral values. Consequently, lexicographic data are treated as primary empirical material, rather than auxiliary reference sources [10].

### Data selection and lexicographic sources

The empirical corpus of the study consists of authoritative explanatory, synonymic, and etymological dictionaries representing contemporary standard usage in both languages.

#### English lexicographic sources:

- *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED).
- *Merriam-Webster Dictionary*.
- *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary*.
- *Collins English Dictionary*.
- *American Heritage Dictionary*.

These sources were selected due to their descriptive depth, historical coverage, and explicit marking of semantic, stylistic, and usage-related features.

#### Uzbek lexicographic sources:

- *O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati*.
- *O'zbek tili sinonimlarining izohli lug'ati*.
- *O'zbek tilining etimologik lug'ati*.
- *O'zbek tili frazeologik lug'ati*.

- *O'zbek tili sinonimlarining katta izohli lug'ati.*
- *"Ma'naviyat" asosiy tushunchalar izohli lug'ati.*

The inclusion of multiple lexicographic types ensures a comprehensive view of how loyalty-related meanings are codified, evaluated, and hierarchically structured within each language.

### Identification of loyalty-related lexical units

Lexical units associated with the concept of loyalty were identified through a multi-stage procedure:

1. Extraction of headword entries explicitly defining loyalty (*loyalty, sadoqat*)
2. Identification of synonymic and semantically adjacent units listed within dictionary entries
3. Verification of semantic relevance through definitional overlap and shared core components (e.g., faithfulness, commitment, fidelity, devotion)

As a result, a closed analytical set of loyalty-related lexemes was established for each language, ensuring methodological consistency and preventing uncontrolled semantic expansion.

### Analytical criteria

The lexicographic analysis was conducted using four interrelated criteria, applied uniformly across both languages.

#### a) *Definitional structure*

Dictionary definitions were analyzed to identify:

- Core semantic components,
- Evaluative markers,
- Degree of abstraction and generality.

This criterion reveals which meanings are foregrounded as conceptually central.

#### b) *Semantic core and periphery*

Based on definitional prominence and frequency of cross-referencing within dictionaries, lexical units were classified into:

- **Core units** (central, generalized representations of the concept),
- **Near-peripheral units** (semantically close but functionally restricted),
- **Far-peripheral units** (context-bound or stylistically marked).

This classification operationalizes the core-periphery model within a lexicographic framework.

#### c) *Object orientation*

Each lexical unit was analyzed with respect to the **typical object of loyalty** encoded in dictionary definitions (e.g., person, institution, moral principle, collective entity). This criterion allows for the identification of conceptual scope and functional extension.

#### d) *Synonymic expansion and differentiation*

Synonymic networks were examined to determine:

- The degree of semantic differentiation,
- Overlap versus specialization among loyalty-related units,
- Patterns of semantic concentration or dispersion.

This criterion is crucial for comparative analysis, as it highlights systemic differences between English and Uzbek lexicographic representations.

### Comparative procedure

The comparative stage involved a matrix-based analysis, in which loyalty-related lexemes from both languages were aligned according to the five analytical criteria. This procedure enabled the identification of:

- Shared conceptual cores,

- Language-specific peripheral structures,
- Asymmetries in semantic distribution and lexical differentiation.

Importantly, comparison was conducted at the conceptual-structural level, rather than through direct lexical equivalence, avoiding reductionist translation-based assumptions.

### 3. Results

Lexicographic analysis reveals that the concept of loyalty is defined in both English and Uzbek dictionaries through a set of recurrent semantic components, which constitute the definitional core of the concept. Lexicographic sources in English define loyalty as unwavering allegiance, support, or devotion to a person, institution, or principle. The central semantic elements consist of faithfulness, loyalty, and causal permanence, whereas evaluative markers entail positive moral judgment markers [11].

For example, one Uzbek lexicon explains *sadoqat* with terms rich in content such as *chin qalbdan berilganlik*, *vafodorlik*, and *sodiqlik*, which emphasize sincerity, moral integrity, and constancy. While English definitions have a lot of institutional and ideological objects, Uzbek definitional structures are mainly tracking toward interpersonal and ethical orientation. This difference suggests that although their core moral frameworks align, the extent of their conceptual extension reflected in dictionaries diverges markedly [12].

This lexicographic organization of the concept of loyalty in English and Uzbek can partially be traced back to an analysis of the etymological origins of the core lexical units. English devotion is translated from Old French *loialté*, noun derivative from Latin *legalis* literally meaning “lawful, according to the law”, from *lex* “law”. Historically, this etymological trajectory hints that both fealty and fidelity were obligations enjoined within a context of rules and orders where the state's and the church's claims on people were defined. Thus, in traditional English discourse, loyalty (from Lat. *fidere* as in faith) has often been linked not only to kin bond faithfulness but also to legitimate, civil and civic loyalty [13].

In contrast, the etymological origin of the Uzbek lexeme *sadoqat* noticeably differs. Borrowed from the Arabic word: *ṣadāqat*, with its encoded meaning of truth, candidness, and righteousness. In this semantically-rich tradition, *sadoqat* is perceived firstly as an internal moral virtue rather than an external duty [14].

Given definitional prominence, cross-reference patterns and synonymic clustering, a strong core–periphery structure is observed in both languages. The core of loyalty is clearly defined in English lexicography. It serves as the household head, from which other loyalty lexemes are pendulous. Things like allegiance, fidelity, devotion, and commitment are categorized as near-peripheral units of meaning but with definitional limitations that render their functional range small. For instance, while fidelity is heavily lexically associated with marriage, morality, or technology, allegiance is lexically associated with formal duty and political power. Far-peripheral units, including *fealty* and *piety*, are marked as archaic, formal, or contextually restricted, indicating their marginal role in the contemporary conceptual field. Their placement reflects historical rather than functional relevance.

Lexicographic evidence indicates that the conceptual core of loyalty in Uzbek is not represented by a single lexeme but rather by a dual-core structure consisting of *sadoqat* and *sodiqlik*. Despite the apparent morphological relationship of these units, dictionary definitions and usage notes show that they encode semantically overlapping core meanings, and are often at least partially interchangeable in normative contexts (for example, [15]).

Sadoqat and sodiqlik examine two fundamental meanings, if not the core, of moral permanence, loyalty and eternal commitment. But in the near-peripheral zone there are mostly derivational and stylistic variants (*vafodorlik*, *vafo*, *sidq*, *sidqidillik*, *fidoyilik*, *fidokorlik*) that strengthen the core meaning, and not damaging it. Far-periphery units in Uzbek lexicography has narrow evaluative range or stylistic markedness

Semantic organisation within the synonymic field of loyalty reveal its contrasting behaviour. Dictionaries in English offer a lexically differentiated synonymic network, in which different lexemes encapsulate different dimensions of loyalty. The near-derivative units each bear a particular semantic weight: loyalty foregrounds civic obligation, devotion encodes emotional or religious intensity, and commitment foregrounds pragmatic or institutional engagement. Such differentiation indicates that the concept of loyalty content is divided on more than one lexeme in the English language lexicographical discourse.

In contrast, Uzbek lexicographic sources adopt a synonymic consolidation strategy. The synonyms of *sadoqat* have a very high overlap in core components of meaning and differ mostly in style or context. Instead of serving as separate conceptual nodes, these units together emphasize a single version of morality. This pattern shows a lexicographic disposition toward semantic integration as opposed to semantic differentiation.

Exploiting object orientation reveals additional cross-linguistic asymmetries. Loyalty and its near-peripheral equivalents in English dictionaries, on this reading, encode facilitation potentiality to many types of entity: individuals, states, institutions, ideologies, and businesses. The conceptual breadth reflects its functional flexibility across social contexts.

Meanwhile, Uzbek lexicographic definitions link *sadoqat* specifically with people, ethical characteristics and community (e.g., *Vatan*, *xalq*), with institutional or market items also scarcely invoked. Such limitation implies that what Uzbek lexicography understands under concept of loyalty is rather an ethical and relational value, than a pragmatic or transactional one.

Based on the findings, it can be concluded that English and Uzbek differ lexicographically as well as semantically to loyalty. But English lexicography prefers the semantic differentiation and dispersal of all conceptual components into a host of specialized lexemes; By contrast, Uzbek lexicography shows semantic concentration: the idea of loyalty combines around the dominant core lexeme with reinforcing variants. The implications of these findings are that lexicographic representation is not only descriptive, but also conceptually generative, conditioning the linguistic categorization and hierarchization of moral values (Table 1).

**Table 1.** Cross-linguistic differences in lexicographic structuring of the concept of loyalty In English and Uzbek.

	Comparative parameter	English (loyalty)	Uzbek (sadoqat)
1	Historical emphasis	Borrowed from Old-French, originally denoting loyalty to a ruler or authority	Borrowed from Arabic, originally associated with friendship, sincerity and faithfulness
2	Core semantic components	Stability, duty-bound allegiance, faithfulness in relationships	Faithfulness, devotion, moral loyalty

3	<b>Synonymic structure</b>	Broad and lexically differentiated	Semantically concentrated
4	<b>Object orientation</b>	Broad: individual, state, institution/brand, duty, idea/principle/belief	Relatively narrow: individual, homeland, belief
5	<b>Stylistic and connotative status</b>	Generally neutral, occasionally critical (e.g. <i>blind loyalty</i> )	Positive

#### 4. Discussion

The revised lexicographic analysis of loyalty in English and Uzbek reveals that conceptual centrality cannot always be adequately captured through a single-core model. Whereas English lexicography actually reveals an almost pure monocentric arrangement configured upon the lexeme loyalty, lexicographic information for Uzbek suggest a double-core structure, co-composed of *sadoqat* and *sodiqlik*. Such result requires a revision regarding the way conceptual cores are recognized in comparative lexicographic studies, especially in the case of moral or value-laden concepts.

Three converging, lexicographic criteria – (1) definitional overlap, (2) stylistic neutrality, and (3) functional interchangeability – justify the placement of *sadoqat* and *sodiqlik* at the conceptual core. The definitions of lexemes in authoritative Uzbek dictionaries imply common semantic constituents (adherence to both moral values, faithfulness and long-standing commitment) without imposing systematic contextual or stylistic limits on their use. In addition, many illustrative examples and usage notes suggest that the two units are semantically interchangeable in normative contexts. This interchangeability helps to establish that *sodiqlik* is not a lower or more specialized realization of the idea of *sadoqat*, but instead a lexical realization of the same basic moral concept.

The theoretical viability of this dual-core structure is that it can be interpreted as providing indirect evidence for the view that conceptual centrality may be polylexemic, particularly in languages with derivational morphology that is central to lexical organization. In terms of morphosemantic approach what is interesting in Uzbek is the balance in the core *sadoqat* and *sodiqlik* that consists of abstract nominalization and quality orientation, instantly (4). This balance does not break the conceptual field, it stabilizes the loyalty concept in the lexicographic field.

In contrast, the English lexicographic model is based on semantic differentiation and not morphosemantic variation. Not only does loyalty act as the single central lexeme, near-peripheral units (such as faithfulness, fidelity, and devotion) encode specialized semantic dimensions moral integrity, relational constancy, or emotional intensity that limit their functional range. It is therefore that the English language lexicography splits the semantic burden of the loyalty throughout lexemes that reflect different locations in the conceptual hierarchy. This contrast highlights a fundamental cross-linguistic asymmetry: English organizes loyalty through lexical specialization, whereas Uzbek organizes it through core reinforcement.

#### 5. Conclusion

The comparative analysis reveals that, although loyalty is grounded in a shared ethical foundation across both languages, its semantic field is organized differently in English and Uzbek. English lexicography displays a tendency toward lexical differentiation, distributing loyalty-related meanings across multiple semantically

specialized units, whereas Uzbek lexicography exhibits a more integrated and value-centered representation. Such variations reflect the influence of lexicographic tradition, sociocultural emphasis, as well as morphosemantic organization, on conceptual meaning. These results show how analyses relying on dictionaries can provide valid information about the mechanism through which such abstract domains as morality become fixed, appraised, and hierarchically ordered in a given language. Thus, the method used in this study offers a repeatable protocol for how to study other word concepts that are defined by values in other languages. Overall, the research contributes to comparative lexicography, conceptual semantics, and linguocultural linguistics by showing that cross-linguistic variation in moral concepts is systematic rather than incidental, and that lexicographic evidence plays a crucial role in uncovering these underlying conceptual patterns.

## REFERENCES

- [1] B. T. S. Atkins and M. Rundell, *The Oxford Guide to Practical Lexicography*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- [2] Cambridge University Press, *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org>
- [3] Collins, *Collins English Dictionary*. Glasgow, U.K.: Collins, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.collinsdictionary.com>
- [4] D. Geeraerts, *Theories of Lexical Semantics*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press, 2010. doi: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198734460.001.0001.
- [5] A. Hojiyev, *Hozirgi o'zbek tili faol so'zlarining izohli lug'ati*. Toshkent, Uzbekistan: Sharq, 2002.
- [6] Z. M. Ma'rufov, Ed., *O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati*, vols. 1–5. Toshkent, Uzbekistan: Fan, 1981.
- [7] B. Mengliyev and R. Sayfullayeva, *Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili*. Toshkent, Uzbekistan: Innovatsiya-Ziyo, 2018.
- [8] Merriam-Webster, *Merriam-Webster Dictionary*. Springfield, MA, USA: Merriam-Webster, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.merriam-webster.com>
- [9] Oxford University Press, *Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.oed.com>
- [10] S. Rahmatullayev, *O'zbek tili frazeologik lug'ati*. Toshkent, Uzbekistan: Fan, 2006.
- [11] I. I. Rakhimov, "Lexico-semantic fields in Russian and Uzbek languages," 2023.
- [12] E. M. Baxtiyor o'g'li, "Semantic features of the concept of 'Love–Muhabbat' in English and Uzbek languages," *dĤZ dSmSe [hS^ iSca YfcS^*, vol. 17.
- [13] S. B. Nashirova, "Bilingual lexical units: Semantic criteria in education dictionaries."
- [14] Y. M. Rizomat o'g'li, "Lexical-semantic study of metonyms in English and Uzbek languages," *Tadqiqotlar*, vol. 76, no. 4, pp. 251–256, 2025.
- [15] S. K. Kholmurodova, "Contrastive analysis of lexemes naming 'Debt' in English, Russian and Uzbek languages," *Spanish Journal of Innovation and Integrity*, vol. 42, pp. 234–237, 2025.