

THE CONCEPT OF THE LEXICAL-SEMANTIC FIELD IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK DREAM INTERPRETATIONS

Allayev Zafar Mengboyevich,
Termez University of Economics and service
Teacher of Foreign language and literature department
E-mail: zafarallayev598@gmail.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18721284>

Abstract: This article studies the lexical-semantic field in English and Uzbek dream interpretations. Using a comparative and linguocultural approach, it analyzes the structure of dream-related vocabulary, including core and peripheral elements, as well as their symbolic meanings. The results show that dream lexemes contain both shared semantic features and culture-specific meanings influenced by historical, religious, and cognitive factors of the oneirosphere.

Keywords: lexical-semantic field, dream interpretation, oneirosphere, symbolism, comparative linguistics.

Annotatsiya: Ushbu maqolada ingliz va o'zbek tillaridagi tush ta'birlarida leksik-semantik maydon tushunchasi qiyosiy hamda lingvomadaniy nuqtayi nazardan o'rganiladi. Tush bilan bog'liq leksik birliklarning ichki tuzilishi, markaziy va chekka qatlamlari, shuningdek ularning ramziy mazmuni tahlil qilinadi. Tadqiqot natijalari oneyrosoha doirasida umumiy va milliy-madaniy belgilar o'zaro uyg'un holda namoyon bo'lishini tasdiqlaydi.

Kalit so'zlar: leksik-semantik maydon, tush ta'biri, oneyrosoha, ramziy ma'no, qiyosiy tilshunoslik

Аннотация: В данной статье с опорой на сопоставительный и лингвокультурный подходы исследуется лексико-семантическое поле в английских и узбекских интерпретациях сновидений. Особое внимание уделяется внутренней организации сновидческой лексики, её центральным и периферийным компонентам, а также символическим значениям. Результаты исследования демонстрируют сочетание общих и культурно обусловленных характеристик онейросферы.

Ключевые слова: лексико-семантическое поле, интерпретация сновидений, онейросфера, символика, сопоставительное языкознание.

Introduction. Dream interpretation has traditionally attracted attention in both linguistics and cultural research because dreams are closely connected with a society's shared beliefs, symbols, and collective ways of thinking. From a linguistic perspective, vocabulary related to dreams can be examined through the framework of the lexical-semantic field, which makes it possible to group and analyze words that belong to the same conceptual sphere. In both English and Uzbek traditions, texts devoted to dream interpretation contain culturally shaped lexical systems that reflect national outlooks, mythological concepts, and dominant values.

The purpose of this article is to explore how the lexical-semantic field functions in English and Uzbek dream interpretation discourse. Special attention is given to the internal organization of dream-related lexemes, their semantic features, and their cultural specificity.

The significance of the research lies in its relevance to comparative and cognitive linguistics, as well as linguocultural studies, particularly within the study of the oneirosphere — the linguistic representation of dream experience. Through a comparative analysis of English and Uzbek sources, the paper highlights both shared semantic tendencies and culturally distinctive features that shape the lexical-semantic field of dream interpretation.

Literature Review. The concept of the lexical-semantic field has been widely discussed in structural and cognitive linguistics. Early semantic theories emphasized that vocabulary is not an isolated collection of words but a system of interrelated units organized around shared conceptual domains. J. Lyons (1977) argued that meaning in language is structured through networks of semantic relations, where lexical items derive significance from their position within a broader system rather than from individual reference alone. This theoretical foundation made it possible to analyze lexical groups as structured fields with internal organization.

Further development of field theory demonstrated that lexical-semantic fields usually consist of a core and a periphery. Core elements tend to represent the most general and conceptually central notions, while peripheral units reflect more context-bound, culturally marked, or metaphorical meanings. According to Crystal (2008), semantic fields provide insight into how speakers categorize experience and conceptualize reality through language. This idea is especially relevant when examining symbolic domains such as dreams, where meaning is rarely literal and often shaped by cultural interpretation [1].

Dream interpretation itself has attracted attention not only in psychology but also in linguistics and cultural studies. Freud's foundational work *The Interpretation of Dreams* (1900/1999) introduced the idea that dreams operate through symbolic mechanisms, displacement, and condensation [2].

Although Freud approached dreams primarily from a psychoanalytic perspective, his observations about symbolic transformation remain significant for linguistic research, particularly in understanding metaphorical and associative meanings in dream-related vocabulary.

In Slavic and Turkic linguistic traditions, scholars have also explored the cultural and symbolic aspects of dreams. N. I. Tolstoy (2003) emphasized that dream symbolism in folklore reflects mythological thinking and collective beliefs, which are encoded in language. Such approaches highlight that dream-related lexemes are embedded in a wider ethnocultural system and cannot be interpreted independently of tradition and worldview [3].

Despite extensive studies on semantic fields and dream symbolism separately, comparatively fewer works focus on the lexical-semantic organization of dream interpretation discourse across languages. In the context of English and Uzbek, existing research mainly addresses folklore, symbolism, or translation issues, while the systematic

modeling of the lexical-semantic field of the oneirosphere remains underexplored. Therefore, a comparative analysis of English and Uzbek dream interpretation lexicon can contribute to bridging this gap by revealing both universal semantic structures and culturally specific features shaped by historical, religious, and cognitive factors.

Methods. This study is based on a qualitative and comparative research design. The material for analysis was collected from English and Uzbek dream interpretation books, folklore sources, and explanatory dictionaries. From these texts, a corpus of dream-related lexical units was compiled, which served as the primary data for semantic examination.

Several analytical procedures were employed in the research. First, lexical-semantic analysis was carried out to identify the core meanings and semantic components of dream-related words. This step made it possible to clarify how individual lexemes function within the broader semantic system.

Second, field modeling was used to organize the collected vocabulary into structural zones, distinguishing between central (core) elements, near-core units, and peripheral items. Such structuring allowed for a clearer understanding of internal relationships within the lexical-semantic field.

Third, a comparative approach was applied to reveal common patterns and distinctive features in English and Uzbek dream interpretation lexicon. Through systematic comparison, similarities and differences in symbolic meanings and semantic development were identified.

Finally, linguocultural interpretation was employed to explain culturally specific meanings. This method helped to connect semantic variations with historical traditions, religious beliefs, and shared cultural values reflected in dream symbolism.

The theoretical framework of the study is grounded in lexical-semantic field theory as developed in structural and cognitive linguistics. Particular emphasis is placed on figurative meaning, especially metaphorical, metonymic, and symbolic extensions, since these mechanisms play a central role in the language of dream interpretation.

Results and their analysis. The conducted analysis demonstrates that the lexical-semantic field of dream interpretation in both English and Uzbek is not homogeneous but internally structured into several interconnected microfields. These microfields encompass symbols related to nature (water, fire, sky), animals (snake, horse, bird), parts of the human body (hand, eye, heart), social relations (mother, child, enemy), actions (falling, flying, dying), and emotional states (fear, joy, anxiety). Such grouping confirms that dream-related vocabulary reflects key domains of human experience, organized through culturally shaped semantic associations.

At the structural level, the core of the lexical-semantic field is formed by the lexemes dream, to dream, tush, and tush ko'rmoq, which directly denote the act or phenomenon of dreaming. These units function as semantic centers around which other lexemes are organized. According to (Lyons, 1977), central elements typically carry the

most general and conceptually dominant meanings within the system[4]. In both languages, the core lexemes serve as reference points that activate broader associative networks in dream interpretation discourse.

The near-core zone includes frequently recurring symbolic lexemes that appear consistently in dream interpretation texts. In English, these include water, death, child, snake, and horse, while in Uzbek the corresponding units are *suv*, *o'lim*, *bola*, *ilon*, and *ot*. Crystal (2008) emphasises that these lexemes demonstrate high interpretative productivity, meaning that they generate multiple symbolic explanations depending on context. Their semantic richness confirms the idea that lexical-semantic fields are dynamic systems shaped by cultural cognition [5].

The peripheral layer of the field consists of culturally specific or metaphorically extended lexemes. In Uzbek dream interpretation discourse, peripheral vocabulary often includes items connected with agriculture (e.g., *bug'doy*, *hosil*), kinship structures (*ota*, *aka*, *qaynona*), and religious concepts (*duo*, *masjid*, *farishta*). These elements reflect the agrarian worldview, strong family ties, and Islamic tradition embedded in Uzbek culture. In contrast, English dream interpretation texts more frequently emphasize psychological states, personal transformation, and abstract notions such as success, freedom, or subconscious fear. This distinction points to a difference in interpretative focus: collectivist and tradition-oriented symbolism in Uzbek sources versus a more individual-centered and psychological orientation in English materials.

From a comparative perspective, the lexical-semantic field of dream interpretation displays both universal and culture-specific characteristics. Certain symbols, such as water or death, appear in both linguistic traditions, which suggests the existence of shared archetypal imagery. However, their semantic interpretation varies significantly. According to Freud (1900), in English dream discourse, water is often associated with emotional depth, instability, or the unconscious mind - an interpretation influenced by psychoanalytic thought [5]. In Uzbek tradition, by contrast, *suv* commonly symbolizes life, blessing, purification, and divine favor, reflecting religious and folkloric values.

Animal symbolism provides another revealing example. In English sources, the lexeme *snake* typically conveys meanings related to danger, betrayal, hidden fear, or temptation, which can be traced to Biblical narratives and Western symbolic traditions. In Uzbek interpretations, *ilon* may indeed represent an enemy or threat; however, depending on contextual nuances, it can also symbolize wisdom, *испытание* (trial), or spiritual testing. According to Tolstoy (2003), such semantic duality illustrates how culturally embedded narratives shape the interpretative potential of a single lexical unit [6].

Overall, the structure of the lexical-semantic field in Uzbek dream interpretation appears to be strongly influenced by folklore, collective memory, and Islamic symbolic systems. The English lexical-semantic field, while also historically grounded, demonstrates greater emphasis on personal psychology and inner emotional experience.

These findings confirm that the lexical-semantic field is not merely a formal linguistic model but a reflection of cultural cognition and worldview.

Thus, the oneirosphere in each language encodes culturally meaningful concepts that influence how dreams are verbalized, categorized, and interpreted. The comparative analysis highlights that universal archetypes coexist with nationally specific semantic developments, forming a multilayered and culturally conditioned lexical-semantic structure.

Conclusion. The analysis of the lexical-semantic field in English and Uzbek dream interpretation texts clearly shows that language, culture, and human cognition are closely interconnected. Although both linguistic traditions share a central group of core dream-related lexemes, the way these units develop semantically and interact within the field is shaped by distinct historical experiences, religious traditions, and cultural values.

The results confirm that the lexical-semantic field framework provides a productive methodological tool for examining dream interpretation discourse. It enables a structured and systematic comparison of lexical units, making it possible to identify both shared symbolic patterns and culturally specific meanings.

At the same time, the study opens several directions for further research. Future investigations may broaden the empirical material, apply quantitative or corpus-based methods, or focus on particular aspects such as gender differences, psychological interpretation models, and the evolution of dream symbolism in contemporary discourse. Such approaches would contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of the linguistic and cultural dimensions of dream interpretation across languages.

References:

1. Crystal, D. (2008). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
2. Freud, S. (1999). *The Interpretation of Dreams*. London: Wordsworth Editions. (Original work published 1900)
3. Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
4. Tolstoy, N. I. (2003). *Slavic Mythology and the Semantics of Dreams*. Moscow.