LEXICOGRAPHY AS A SCIENTIFIC FIELD

Karimbaeva Mavluda
Senior lecturer Andijan State University, Uzbekistan

Abstract: *This article deals with some questions related to the disciplinary status of Lexicography. We draw on the opinions of L.Zgusta, R.Ilsson, H.Wiegand, R.Gouws, H.Bergenholtz, S.Tarp,R. Lew and others who argue in favour of the view that lexicography constitutes a science and that the work on a dictionary constitutes a scientific activity.*

The main topics discussed in this paper include understanding the complexity of word meaning, how dictionaries play a role in the description of word meaning, and developing lexical semantics.

We also focus on the definition method of lexicography which is based on an examination of dictionary definitions, elements of lexicographic theory, the relationship between lexicographic theories and practice, and how lexicography is taught as an academic discipline in universities.

The article makes the case that, in this age of globalization, having the appropriate lexicography approach and disciplinary standing is especially crucial. The future of many languages, especially those with lower usage rates, can only be secured by cutting-edge lexicographic and corpus resources, which can only be developed once lexicography is properly acknowledged as a science with a "big interdisciplinary vocation" (Tarp 2017); that is, until lexicography is elevated to the status of an academic discipline through advanced lexicographic theory, lexicography instruction at universities, and other means.

Keywords: *disciplinary status of lexicography, meaning of words, componential analysis of meaning, definitional method of analysis, OED, theory of lexicography, lexicographic practice, teaching lexicography, academic discipline,*

Throughout its centuries-long history, lexicography has experienced substantial change. The hard word glossaries, glossaries, and glossaries were replaced by dictionaries that included the entire vocabulary of each specific language. Significant alterations were also made to word meaning research and description techniques. Thousands of illustrative phrases and sentences from literary works were compiled into corpora, which became the primary tool for studying meaning and helped to establish scholarly lexicography. Lexicography has consistently kept up with, and often far ahead of, the most recent advances in linguistics and allied sciences.

The Oxford English Dictionary on Historical Principles (OED) entries mirrored the emergence of comparative-historical linguistics. Lexicography instantly mirrored the growth of electronic corpora and corpus linguistics in the 1980s, since word meaning research has since relied solely on the examination of enormous corpora of data. The advent of computerized dictionaries has given lexicography entirely new opportunities, making it one of the most exciting and quickly expanding areas of study.

Semantic theories, corpus-based approaches, techniques for natural language processing, e-lexicography, dictionary use research, dictionary criticism, dictionary didactics,

terminology, etymology, and other elements are all part of the multifaceted, multidisciplinary field of modern lexicography. Thus, assertions that constructing a dictionary is not a scientific endeavor appear to be a ridiculous misinterpretation. Several academics, including Herbert Wiegand and Ladislav Zgusta (1971, 1992/93), (1984), Robert Lew (2007), Sven Tarp (2017), Rufus Gouws (2012), Henning Bergenholtz (2012), Robert Ilson (2012), and others have written insightful pieces about the state of lexicography.

Together, the experts in lexicography, computerlike, and academia offered a comprehensive perspective on the field of lexicography. But the issue was that every group had a distinct and constrained perspective on the matter. Scholars possessed their concepts; the computer-like ones, their algorithms. Unfortunately, though, all too frequently, they appeared to be ignorant of the specifics of what dictionaries are like and how they are made. However, the expert lexicographers frequently gave the impression that they had little in-depth understanding of linguistics, and their very thorough understanding of Really Existing Dictionaries frequently looked to be restricted to the ones they had actually worked on. However, lexicographers are pressed for time and have little desire to write for academic journals because they have to satisfy dictionary deadlines. (Ilson 2012)

Descriptive linguistics, which focused on describing the phonological and morphological systems of language for decades, viewed the lexical level of language as peripheral and non-structural, which may be one of the causes.

The lexicon had been disregarded in favor of syntax and phonology after serving as the primary focus of philologists' research for the majority of the nineteenth century since it was more challenging to define and codify in rules. For structuralists, vocabulary was the least important aspect of a language.

In fact, a few of them questioned whether vocabulary really belonged in a language. In his book Semantics, Ullmann further affirms that lexicology was rarely considered a subfield of linguistics throughout the first three-quarters of the 20th century, and that semantics was mostly formal during that time.

The componential analysis methodology, which took its cues from structural phonology and attempted to characterize meaning based on a limited set of semantic components, was also influenced by this approach to the phenomenon of meaning. Like distinctive phonological features, the combination of which describes each phoneme, componential analysis attempted to characterize meaning. (Geeraerts 2010: 70-80) The complexity of the cognition of the world that meaning is closely associated with determines how complicated meaning is.

The process of perceiving the world and making generalizations, forming concepts, and other numerous processes is called cognition. etc. In addition to being the primary nominative unit of a language, a word's lexical meaning is established by reflecting a particular aspect of extralinguistic reality—that is, a category of objects, occasions, etc.—in our brains and the minds of other language users. This process is known as denotatum. A notion (designatum) is what gives a word its meaning. Lexical meaning represents the idea (designatum) that a linguistic community has about a subject rather than a particular aspect of reality (denotatum). Since the world is infinite, formalizing meaning in the same way as

phonology or grammar and describing it with a finite number of features was bound to fail. However, these kinds of viewpoints discouraged the study of meaning.

As a consequence, if the scientific study of meaning was impossible, then lexicography, which was primarily involved in the study of words and their meanings, could not be a science. Later, this disregard for the content plane of language changed, and nowadays different theories of lexical semantics study meaning from many different angles (Geeraerts 2010), but it has left its mark on the understanding of the essence of lexicography.

The aforementioned method of studying meaning is all the more unexpected given that the 19th and 20th century dictionaries offered good scientific investigations of meaning as it was represented in their word entries.

The so-called definitional method of analysis, one of the componential analysis of meaning techniques used by linguists, provides evidence for this (Margalitadze 2014). The majority of the English philologists at Tbilisi State University's language department adhered to the views of foreign and Russian linguists, like American E. Nida, who saw meaning as a structure made up of semantic elements ordered in a hierarchical order. According to Mary Iankoshvili (1972), a linguist from Georgia, a word's meaning is a structure made up of a core and periphery potential semes. A lexical categorial (hyponymic) semantic component, a differential seme or semes, and a grammatical categorial semantic component (form that expresses meaning) make up the core, in accordance with her theory. Around the core are potential semes, which represent various aspects of denotatum as defined by a word's meaning that either uniquely characterizes denotatum or is associated with it by a linguistic community.

For example, the OED defines "father" and includes lexical categorial (hyponymic) and differential semantic components (kinship term, nearest male ancestors) in its definition. It also includes several additional components: a male ancestor who is farther away than a parent, particularly the patriarch of a race or family, a forefather, or progenitor (definition 2); one who institutes, originates, or calls into being (definition 3.a); one who provides fatherly protection; one who demonstrates paternal kindness; one who is entitled to filial reverence and obedience 4.a), and so forth. The OED entry for "heart" describes both the differential semantic component and the hyponymic component of its meaning, which refers to the body organ.

The hollow muscular or other contractile organ that maintains blood circulation in an animal's vascular system through dilation and contraction (definition 1.a) — however, different definitions of the entry point to distinct additional semantic elements that the English language community has assigned to the concept of heart: The meanings of "seat of life," "seat of one's innermost thoughts and secret feelings," "seat of emotions," "seat of love or affection," "seat of the mental or intellectual faculties," "seat of courage," "definition 11.a," and so on are all applicable.

According to Hanks (2000), a word's meaning potential is composed of several elements. These elements are linked in a network that provides the semantic foundation of the language, and other words in the context in which they are used have the potential to cognitively activate them. This has a ton of dynamic possibilities for expressing novel ideas and connecting the unexpected to the familiar.

Because each word has a distinct meaning and is made up of a special arrangement of semantic elements, each word's meaning needs to be examined separately. Zgusta rightly emphasizes in his Manual of Lexicography that utterances—specific examples of a word being used in a certain context—are the resources available to lexicographers. On the basis of the study of utterances, lexicographers deduce and the OED team was able to collect 10 million quotation slips to be analysed for their dictionary.

Were lexicographers able to define meaning or know what it meant? definition or definitions of a term. This was well known to lexicographers in the 17th and 18th centuries. For his lexicon, Samuel Johnson gathered 250 000 quotations from 500 sources. The lexicographers of the 19th century refined this technique even more.

They certainly knew it extremely well; they produced and employed corpora for their studies, and they explained word meaning in a way that made dictionaries the primary resources for meaning research in the decades that followed.

Since there were no semantic theories during the 18th and 19th centuries, dictionaries of those eras developed their own theories through word entries, which fueled the growth of lexical semantics.

As previously indicated, the definitional method of analysis is a technique that was created to examine a word's semantic structure and constituent parts. It is predicated on a comparison and examination of definitions from extensive explanatory dictionaries. The Oxford English Dictionary on Historical Principles (OED) and Webster's Third New International Dictionary are particularly notable in this respect since, prior to the development of corpus linguistics and related techniques, their definitions served as the foundation for the semantic analysis of English words. The development of the Internet in recent years, the availability of corpora, and corpus linguistics have opened up previously unheard-of possibilities for more objective study and investigation into language and meaning; nonetheless, meaning was not always the focus of these developments not studied in previous decades.

In my opinion, a theory of lexicography consists of the following elements and builds upon the knowledge required of lexicographers in the creation of dictionaries:

1. Lexicographical theory in general

The essence and purposes of lexicography, dictionary typology, and various theories required for dictionary production—such as those pertaining to lexical semantics, methods of semantic research, including corpus linguistics, theory and techniques for natural language processing—are all included in this section of lexicographic theory.

2. Lexicography's Past

3. Lexicography Genres

This section of lexicographic theory describes the lexicographic principles that underpin the various lexicographic genres, such as historical dictionaries, terminological dictionaries, specialized dictionaries, comprehensive monolingual dictionaries, comprehensive bilingual dictionaries, and learner's dictionaries in both languages.

This section also covers electronic lexicography and the modifications it has made to dictionary construction. Lexicography genres investigate the planning of various dictionary production phases, the choice of sources, the gathering and processing of data, creating

entries for various dictionary kinds, and the utilization of contemporary technologies in dictionary production. There is some criticism of dictionaries in this section, as criticism of different types of dictionaries should be based on the knowledge of the genres.

4. Dictionary Use Research

Practical lexicography: what is it? What role does dictionary production play in the theory? Our experience shows that creating dictionaries involves more than just putting theory into practice. Lectors use this understanding of lexicography theory and its constituent parts as a foundation for organizing and carrying out their dictionary projects. Working practically on a dictionary begins with:

1. A dictionary's layout, including a thorough explanation of the guiding principles it will follow (e.g., guidelines for choosing lemmas, handling homonyms, multiword units, etc.); an account of the sources; methods for gathering and analyzing data; etc. Lexicographers require the previously mentioned theoretical expertise, as well as understanding of the target group's needs and preferences, dictionary use research, and previous studies and trials in the subject. Lexicographers must have background information on the evolution of similar dictionaries, the particulars of the genre, etc., while creating a lexicon. Lexicographers must therefore have a solid understanding of theory from the outset when creating their dictionaries, including the genre specifics, history, and so forth.

2. Gathering information for the dictionary is the second step. Lexicographers today require an understanding of general lexicographic theory, lexical semantics theories, meaning analysis techniques, etc. They also need knowledge of data collection and data processing experience in the genre and so on.

The process of compiling entries requires lexicographers to have a solid understanding of theory. Based on the sources and information gathered, a lexicographer must examine each entry as it has a distinct meaning. A lexicographer works through several processes for each entry: gathering and processing data, verifying sources, interpreting meanings, choosing examples, examining the meaning's connotation and scope of application, and so forth (Zgusta 1971). Lexicography theory and practice are interdependent; it is not a ready theory that is implemented blindly in practice.

Theory knowledge is required for practical work, which is not just compilation but rather work based on solid theoretical understanding and the in-depth analysis of each distinct meaning carried out by skilled lexicographer-scholars. New solutions found by lexicographers working on various projects contribute to the theory of lexicography in each project. For some dictionaries, lexicographers might need to create whole new guidelines, but in order to find better solutions for their projects, they still need to be aware of the current best practices.

According to scientists observations, the belief that creating a dictionary is not a scientific endeavor stems from a lack of knowledge about the intricate relationship between a word's description and its meaning.

The complexity of the cognition of the world that meaning is closely associated with determines how complicated meaning is. The belief that lexicography lacks theory serves as another justification for this method of approaching the subject. Such viewpoints make it

more difficult to comprehend lexicography as a multifaceted, multidisciplinary field with many moving parts.

The general lexicographic theory, lexicographic history, lexicographic genres, and dictionary use study comprise the theory of lexicography, which builds and collects the information required of lexicographers in the development of dictionaries. A dictionary is created according to a well-prepared model which is based on a sound theoretical approach. It is the unity of theory and practice that turns lexicography into an academic discipline.

REFERENCES:

1.Béjoint, H. 2010. The Lexicography of English. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

2. Bergenholtz, H. and R.H. Gouws. 2012. What is Lexicography? Lexikos 22: 31-42.

3.Bothma, T.J.D., R.H. Gouws and D.J. Prinsloo. 2016. The Role of e-Lexicography in the Confirmation of Lexicography as an Independent and Multidisciplinary Field. Margalitadze, T. and G. Meladze (Eds.). 2016. Proceedings of the XVII EURALEX International Congress. Lexicography and Linguistic Diversity, Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia, 6–10 September, 2016: 109-116. Tbilisi: Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University. Available at: http://euralex. org/category/publications/euralex-2016/.

4. (CEGD) Margalitadze, T. (Editor-in-chief), G. Meladze, A. Chanturia et al. 1995–2012. Comprehensive English–Georgian Dictionary (Vol. I–XIV); the Online Version www.dict.ge. Tbilisi: Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Lexicographic Centre.

5. (EGBD) Khundadze, G., G. Meladze, T. Margalitadze et al. (Eds.). 2014. English–Georgian Biology Online Dictionary. http://bio.dict.ge. Tbilisi: Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Lexicographic Centre.

6.Wiegand, H.E. 1984. On the Structure and Contents of a General Theory of Lexicography. Hartmann, R.R.K. (Ed.). 1984. LEXeter '83 Proceedings. Papers from the International Conference on Lexicography at Exeter, 9–12 September 1983: 13-30. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

7.Williams, G. 2016. In Praise of Lexicography, and Lexicographers. Margalitadze, T. and G. Meladze (Eds.). 2016. Proceedings of the XVII EURALEX International Congress: Lexicography and Linguistic Diversity, Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia, 6–10 September, 2016: 77-88. Tbilisi: Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University. Available at http://euralex.org/category/ publications/euralex-2016/.

8. Zgusta, L. 1971. Manual of Lexicography. Prague: Academia / The Hague: Mouton.