HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

HEADWORDS AND CROSS-REFERENCES IN AN UZBEK–GERMAN VERB DICTIONARY

Sativoldiyeva Mamura Maxamadaminovna
Doctor of Philology (DSc)
Namangan State Institute of Foreign Languages named after Is'hoqkhon Ibrat
ORCID: 0009-0000-4106-6135
Email: mamura.sativoldiyeva7@gmail.com
Doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23947161

Abstract. This article examines how an Uzbek–German verb dictionary can guide readers from the form they look up to the entry that explains its meaning and use. Drawing on the selection described in Sativoldiyeva (2025), it distinguishes two editorial decisions: whether the evidence supports a bilingual description and where readers should find that description. Regional verbs illustrate the need for attested meanings and contexts. Reflexive, reciprocal, and passive forms raise a different question: can readers recover the relevant German construction from the base entry, or does the derived form require a description of its own? Multiword verbs illustrate how alphabetical placement affects access. Where German expresses a meaning through a phrase, the phrase can serve as the equivalent if the entry also shows how to use it. The resulting model relates the choice between a full entry and a cross-reference to semantic autonomy, valency, and the reader's lookup task.

Keywords: Uzbek–German verb dictionary, headword selection, cross-reference, lookup, valency, translation equivalent, multiword verb

Introduction

The macrostructure of a bilingual dictionary is primarily determined by which lexical units are included as headwords, or lemmas, and how those units are arranged. Lemma selection is therefore an initial lexicographic decision with direct consequences for every subsequent stage of dictionary compilation. If a lemma is selected inappropriately or its meaning remains insufficiently specified, the identification of translation equivalents, grammatical description, the construction of valency patterns, and the selection of examples all become unreliable. Schaeder (1987) identifies the choice of lexical units, the intended extent of coverage, and the principles of their arrangement as central issues in macrostructural design. These issues are especially complex in Uzbek–German verb lexicography because the two languages differ in morphology and syntax, in how verbal meanings are segmented, and in their word-formation processes.

In the conceptual framework of Usbekisch–Deutsches Verbwörterbuch, lemma selection is treated as a distinct organizational stage. The monograph reports approximately 7,400 verb lemmas in the Uzbek monolingual explanatory dictionary used as a starting point, whereas approximately 2,450 verb lemmas were selected for the version of the Uzbek–German verb dictionary under consideration (Sativoldiyeva, 2025). The difference does not merely reflect an attempt to reduce the dictionary's size. Selection raises several difficult questions: the meanings of certain regional verbs are hard to establish; some Uzbek verbs have no direct German equivalent; and reflexive, reciprocal, passive, and multiword verbal constructions present problems of lemmatization. Accordingly, the extent of lemma coverage should be understood as a qualitative, function-oriented metalexicographic decision rather than a purely quantitative one.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

This article asks how much information a reader should find under the Uzbek form being consulted and when a reference to another entry will suffice. It examines three connected decisions: whether the source meaning is sufficiently documented, whether the German equivalent and its argument pattern require a separate explanation, and where that explanation should appear. Regional verbs, derived forms, verbs without one-word German equivalents, and multiword verbs bring different aspects of these decisions into focus.

Research Methodology

The primary source for this study is Sativoldiyeva's monograph on the conceptual development of an Uzbek–German verb dictionary. Its treatment of macrostructure, headword selection, specific types of lemmas, and dictionary organization is examined and reorganized within an integrated analytical framework. The theoretical foundations include Schaeder's work on lemmatization and macrostructure, Wiegand's metalexicographic and user-oriented approach to dictionary design, Engelberg and Lemnitzer's discussion of dictionary structure and information access, and relevant descriptions of Uzbek grammar and explanatory lexicography (Schaeder, 1981, 1987; Wiegand, 2000; Engelberg & Lemnitzer, 2004; Mahmudov & Nurmonov, 1995; Jamolxonov, 2005).

The analysis proceeds in four stages. First, instances of lemma-selection difficulties identified in the monograph are categorized through content analysis as regional units, derived forms, verbs without direct equivalents, and multiword verbs. Second, metalexicographic analysis is used to establish the consequences of each category for dictionary macrostructure. Third, semantic and componential analysis is applied to assess the semantic autonomy of each lemma and the possibility of expressing its meaning in German. Fourth, a valency-based criterion is used to determine whether a reliable sentence-pattern description can be established for the verb. This approach treats selection not as an isolated decision to include or omit a word, but as the first link in an interconnected sequence: lemma → meaning → equivalent → valency → usage example.

The term "verb without a direct equivalent" does not imply absolute untranslatability. Rather, it refers to an Uzbek verb for which German lacks an established single lexical unit that fully covers its semantic range. Such meanings may be represented through a descriptive phrase, a verbal construction, or a context-dependent paraphrase. In this article, "derived verb" refers primarily to morphologically or grammatically derived forms, particularly reflexive, reciprocal, and passive forms. Independent lemma status is determined not simply by the presence of a formal suffix but by the emergence of a distinct meaning or a new pattern of argument realization.

Results

Macrostructural Criteria for Lemma Selection

The analysis indicates that no single universal criterion is sufficient for selecting lemmas in an Uzbek–German verb dictionary. Frequency or conformity to the standard language does not, by itself, justify automatically excluding a regional item that has a German counterpart. Equally, the mere availability of a one-word German equivalent does not necessarily justify inclusion. As a dictionary is designed for a particular purpose and audience, its lexical inventory must be aligned with those requirements. Wiegand (2000) emphasizes the relationship between dictionary design, its users, and situations of use; in a verb valency dictionary, the user needs not only translation equivalents but also syntactic information necessary for constructing sentences.

The practical selection discussed in the monograph begins with approximately 7,400 Uzbek verbal lemmas from a reference explanatory dictionary, but the version of the Uzbek–German dictionary examined comprises approximately 2,450 entries. Such selection does not divide the entire Uzbek verbal lexicon into "useful" and "useless" subsets. Instead, it defines the functional

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

requirements of a particular dictionary type. At least three conditions are important: the meaning of the source verb must be identified reliably; a functional equivalent or explanatory rendering must be available in the target language; and the verb's grammatical and syntactic properties must be described consistently. If any one of these conditions is unmet, the resulting entry may formally exist yet offer users inaccurate or ambiguous information.

The Challenge of Lemmatizing Regional Verbs

Regional verbs constitute one of the categories requiring the greatest caution in lemma selection. The monograph notes that a substantial proportion of omitted verbs were regional and that the precise meanings of some are difficult to recover even for native speakers (Sativoldiyeva, 2025). This creates two interrelated difficulties for a bilingual dictionary. First, where the source-language meaning is unclear, the semantic limits of a proposed German equivalent cannot be assessed. Second, the valency pattern of a poorly understood verb is necessarily speculative, including assumptions about the type of subject, the object case, adpositional or prepositional requirements, and obligatory versus optional arguments.

Therefore, regional distribution alone should not serve as an exclusion criterion; what matters is the degree to which an item can be verified. A regional verb can be included with an appropriate regional label if its meaning is documented in reliable dialectological or explanatory sources, supported by authentic examples, and linked to a defensible German functional equivalent. Conversely, where a proposed meaning rests only on an ambiguous definition or conflicting explanations, presenting the verb as an entry for productive use may mislead the reader. Verifiability and semantic stability should consequently take precedence over regional status as such.

This distinction also reflects the different purposes of monolingual explanatory and bilingual valency dictionaries. A monolingual dictionary may aim to document the historical, regional, and infrequent strata of a language. By contrast, a bilingual verb valency dictionary intended particularly for advanced learners and translators must also demonstrate how an item functions in actual use. Inclusion as a lemma in a monolingual dictionary is therefore not sufficient grounds for automatic inclusion in a bilingual valency dictionary. Each candidate must be reassessed in relation to the aims of the new reference work.

Derived Verbs: Reflexive, Reciprocal, and Passive Forms

Grammatically and morphologically derived verb forms constitute a second major problem for Uzbek headword selection. The monograph points out that some explanatory dictionaries list reflexive and reciprocal forms as independent lemmas even when the accompanying information is limited to an indication of the derived form. An analogous question arises for passive verbs: does the regular formation of a grammatical voice require a separate full entry for every form, or is a cross-reference to the base verb sufficient?

Morphology alone cannot resolve this question. If the meaning of a derived form follows regularly and predictably from that of its base verb, providing a complete independent entry may unnecessarily increase dictionary size. A cross-reference or an appropriate grammatical field within the base entry may suffice. However, if the derived form develops a new lexical meaning, changes the number or types of arguments, establishes distinctive collocational behavior, or requires an entirely different German verb, it becomes a lexicographically independent unit rather than merely a morphological variant.

Syntactic reorganization is particularly important in passive constructions. The reassignment of the nominative subject in an active clause, the expression or omission of the agent, and changes in the communicative perspective of the verb all need to be represented in bilingual description. Hence, valency transformation must accompany semantic autonomy as a criterion for independent lemma

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

status. Even where a derived form retains the lexical core of the base verb, a separate access point may be helpful if it requires a different German construction or lexical equivalent.

Criteria for Including Verbs Without Direct Equivalents

A third major issue concerns Uzbek verbs for which no direct one-word equivalent can be identified in German. The monograph reports that certain verbs were excluded because no suitable German equivalent could be found or because the items were not active in contemporary usage; behbehlamoq is cited as an example. At the same time, it recognizes that Uzbek verbs without a matching single German lexeme may remain in the dictionary if their meanings can be explained accurately by means of a multiword expression. This distinction demonstrates why the assertion that "there is no equivalent" is insufficient on its own.

Two different situations must be distinguished. In the first, the Uzbek verb has a well-established meaning, but German does not lexicalize the same content in a single verb. Here, a descriptive paraphrase, a functional verbal construction, or the closest semantic equivalent accompanied by an explanation may be appropriate. In the second, the source verb's meaning itself has not been adequately established, or its actual usage cannot be substantiated. In that case, the problem is not translation but identification of the source lexical unit. The former type can be admitted; the latter should not be included without further verification.

In a bilingual dictionary, the formal shape of an equivalent should not determine whether a headword qualifies for inclusion. The absence of a one-word equivalent is not a deficiency of the lemma. Typologically distinct languages often segment meaning differently: a single Uzbek verb may correspond to a German phrase, while a German prefixed verb may be expressed through a more general Uzbek verb supplemented by context. The purpose of lemma selection is not to impose formal symmetry but to provide users with a functional, verifiable route to translation. Accordingly, the availability of a multiword equivalent or paraphrase does not prevent lemmatization; rather, it calls for more extensive semantic explanation and valency information in the entry.

Multiword Verbs and Lemma Arrangement

The monograph also addresses multiword verbs in relation to selection and alphabetical arrangement. Uzbek constructions such as sotib olmoq ("buy"), olib bormoq ("take/carry to a destination"), and olib kelmoq ("bring") are not structurally or semantically uniform. Some are relatively transparent on the basis of their components, whereas others acquire conventionalized, contextual, or idiomatic meanings. The lexicographic issue is therefore not merely whether an expression can be classified as a multiword verb, but how users are likely to search for it and what target-language unit corresponds to it.

Two organizational approaches are considered: nested alphabetical arrangement (German: nestalphabetisch) and independent lemmatization. Nesting makes word-formation relationships visible but requires users to search under a shared component. Schaeder (1987) notes that such arrangements may complicate access. Giving every multiword unit an independent position in a continuous alphabetical sequence improves retrieval. Since rapid access is an important aim of the Uzbek–German verb dictionary, independent headword placement has greater functional value, supplemented where necessary by cross-references to constituent verbs.

Table 1. Recommended criteria for selecting lemmas in an Uzbek–German verb dictionary

Criterion	**Guiding question**	**Condition for inclusion**	**Recommended treatment**
Status and usage	Is the item standard, regional, or obsolete?	Meaning and usage are attested	Include with regional/register label
Semantic clarity	Can the meaning be	Definition and	Verify further if

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

	identified consistently?	examples agree	ambiguous
Semantic autonomy	Does the derived form develop a new meaning?	Meaning or function differs from the base	Independent lemma or cross-reference
Translatability	Is there a functional German equivalent?	One-word or multiword rendering can be identified	Supply paraphrase and context
Valency description	Can a sentence pattern be established reliably?	Arguments and government are identifiable	Provide valency pattern
User accessibility	Will users look up the form independently?	Independent search is probable	Alphabetical entry and cross-reference

Discussion

A cross-reference is useful only if the entry it points to answers the reader's question. For a predictable passive form, a reference to the base verb can suffice if that entry shows how the participants in the active clause are expressed in the passive. If the derived form calls for a different German verb, the reader also needs its complements and an example of their use. In that case, placing the translation and construction together under the derived form gives the reader a reason to consult a separate entry. The same distinction applies to regional synonyms: a reference to a standard form is informative only to the extent that the two share the relevant sense.

For regional verbs, a central implication is that native-speaker intuition is not always sufficient evidence. As the monograph observes, even native speakers may find certain regional items difficult to interpret. Bilingual lexicography entails transferring identified meanings responsibly into another language; uncertainty at the source-language level is liable to be compounded in the German entry. Dialect corpora, regional dictionaries, or a wider range of authentic examples may therefore be required. Where such evidence is unavailable, provisional exclusion can be regarded as scholarly caution rather than a denial that the item exists in Uzbek.

For derived verbs, the central tension lies between economy of space and semantic precision. Treating every reflexive, reciprocal, or passive form as a separate lemma produces repetition, whereas linking all such forms exclusively to their base verbs may conceal genuine differences in the target language. Semantic autonomy and shifts in valency should therefore serve as the two principal filters. Where the German equivalent differs from that of the base verb, or where argument structure changes, a derived form has independent lexicographic value for the user.

The findings concerning verbs without direct equivalents confirm that one-to-one lexical symmetry is not a scientifically appropriate objective for a translation dictionary. Excluding an Uzbek lemma simply because German lacks a corresponding one-word verb would remove precisely those lexical items that reveal language-specific and typological distinctions. A dictionary demonstrates its value by explaining such asymmetries. Multiword equivalents, paraphrases, register or stylistic labels, and parallel contexts can help users understand not only the translation but also conceptual differences between the two languages. Baunebjerg Hansen's work and Wiegand's approaches to the organization of bilingual entries underscore the importance of theoretically motivating the placement and function of equivalents.

The connection between lemma selection and valency is a particularly significant result of this study. Identifying a German equivalent does not by itself satisfy the purpose of a bilingual verb dictionary if its argument structure remains unclear. Helbig and Schenkel (1983), as well as

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

subsequent work on valency, have shown that verbal meaning is closely linked to syntactic environment. Consequently, the criterion "an equivalent exists" must be tested against "a reliable valency pattern can be established". This is especially important for semantically uncertain regional items and derived forms: insufficient semantic identification also undermines the reliability of the sentence-pattern description.

The user perspective brings these criteria together. The monograph identifies advanced users as its principal audience. Such users require more than a general translation equivalent: they also need semantic precision, grammatical government, restrictions on use, and contextualized examples. Maximizing the number of headwords does not necessarily increase lexicographic quality. On the contrary, unverified or inadequately described lemmas may introduce informational noise. An optimal macrostructure is thus not the largest possible word list, but a selection for which each entry can be supported by an adequate and verifiable microstructure.

Table 2. A lexicographic decision model for problematic lemma types

Lemma type	**Primary risk**	**Decisive criterion**	**Recommended solution**
Regional verb	Uncertain meaning or usage	Verification and authentic examples	Include with regional label when supported
Reflexive/reciprocal derivative	Redundant entries or missed meaning distinctions	New meaning and valency	Independent lemma or cross-reference
Passive derivative	Reducing the item to grammatical form	Syntactic transformation and German equivalent	Separate access point if functionally distinct
Verb without a one-word equivalent	Unjustified exclusion	Clear paraphrase and functional translation	Retain with multiword equivalent
Multiword verb	Difficult retrieval under nested entries	Search likelihood and semantic unity	Independent alphabetical entry and cross-references

Conclusion

Lemma selection in an Uzbek–German verb dictionary is not a mechanical reduction of the language's entire inventory of verbs. It is a process of selection grounded in dictionary type, user needs, and the feasibility of constructing a reliable microstructure for each lexical unit. The reduction from approximately 7,400 verb lexemes in the reference explanatory dictionary to approximately 2,450 lemmas in the monograph's selected inventory illustrates the importance of this functional approach. For regional units, the decisive issue is not their geographical distribution itself, but whether their meaning can be verified and whether dependable equivalents and valency patterns can be established.

For derived forms, independent lemma status should depend on semantic autonomy, changes in valency, and the likelihood of independent user searches rather than on morphology alone. A cross-reference may be adequate when a reflexive, reciprocal, or passive form is predictable from the base verb. Conversely, a new meaning, grammatical government pattern, or German equivalent may justify separate entry status. For verbs lacking one-word German counterparts, this absence alone provides no sufficient grounds for exclusion: where the meaning is clear, the item should be retained with a multiword equivalent or paraphrase.

The proposed model separates the form readers can look up from the entry in which they find a translation and its valency pattern. For example, placing olib kelmoq under its own alphabetical

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

heading allows a reader to consult the expression as a whole. A predictable derived form can instead direct the reader to the relevant sense of its base verb, provided that the entry explains the German construction. These are editorial proposals. A lookup study could test them by asking learners and translators to find a given form and then use its German equivalent in a sentence.

References

1. Baunebjerg Hansen, G. (1990). Artikelstruktur im zweisprachigen Wörterbuch: Überlegungen zur Darbietung von Übersetzungsäquivalenten im Wörterbuchartikel. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
2. Cornell, A., Fischer, K., & Roe, I. F. (Eds.). (2003). Valency in Practice: Valenz in der Praxis. Oxford u. a.: Peter Lang.
3. Engelberg, S., & Lemnitzer, L. (2004). Lexikographie und Wörterbuchbenutzung (2. Aufl.). Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
4. Helbig, G., & Schenkel, W. (1983). Wörterbuch zur Valenz und Distribution deutscher Verben (7. Aufl.). Tübingen: Niemeyer.
5. Herbst, T., & Klotz, M. (2003). Lexikografie. Paderborn/München: Schöningh.
6. Ismoilov, Y., & Karimov, Sh. (2000). Wörterbuch Deutsch–Usbekisch, Usbekisch–Deutsch (3., veränd. Aufl.). Tashkent: Akademnashr.
7. Jamolxonov, H. (2005). Hozirgi o‘zbek adabiy tili. Toshkent: Talqin.
8. Madvaliyev, A. (2006–2008). O‘zbek tilining izohli lug‘ati. Toshkent: O‘zbekiston milliy ensiklopediyasi.
9. Mahmudov, N., & Nurmonov, A. (1995). O‘zbek tilining nazariy grammatikasi. Toshkent: O‘qituvchi.
10. Ma’rufov, Z. (1981). O‘zbek tilining izohli lug‘ati. Moskva: Russkiy yazik.
11. Sativoldiyeva, M. M. (2025). Usbekisch–Deutsches Verbwörterbuch. Namangan: IBRAT PRINT.
12. Schaeder, B. (1981). Lexikographie als Praxis und Theorie. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
13. Schaeder, B. (1987). Germanistische Lexikographie. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
14. Schlaefer, M. (2009). Lexikologie und Lexikographie: Eine Einführung am Beispiel deutscher Wörterbücher (2. Aufl.). Berlin: Erich Schmidt.
15. Wiegand, H. E. (2000). Kleine Schriften. Band 1. Berlin–New York: Walter de Gruyter.