Interpretation of Polysemy in Compiling Bilingual Dictionaries of English and Uzbek Languages

Shahnoza Nashirova

Senior Lecturer of Karshi State University, Uzbekistan

ANNOTATION

Lexicographers have to deal with a number of problems in compiling bilingual dictionaries. The most burning issues of lexicography are connected with the selection of headwords, the arrangement and the content of the vocabulary entry, the principles of definitions and semantic classification of words, polysemous words, synonymous words etc. There are also cases when a bilingual dictionary is created through a bilingualisation of an existing monolingual dictionary. Although it seems to a simple task, it will actually require more skills and efforts to turn a fully-fledged monoligual dictionary into a bilingual one than to fashion a bilingual dictionary from a semi-finished product. This article will discuss lexical interpretation of polysemous words in the compiling bilingual "Uzbek-English, English-Uzbek dictionaries" which is one of the most important issues in Modern Lexicography.

KEYWORDS: bilingual dictionary, polysemy, polysemous words, lexical interpretation of words, semantic classification of words.

Introduction

Compiling bilingual dictionary has a great deal in common with other lexicographic genres, notably with the monolingual learners' dictionary. In the language-learning context, bilingual dictionaries are potential usefulness for learners of target group. Hence, we cannot imagine learning any language in the world without dictionary. Dictionaries take important part in spreading novelties and they play the most leading role in studying a language. Dictionaries are used not only to teach and educate users, but also serve to keep close nations.

Lexicographers have to deal with a number of problems in compiling bilingual dictionaries. The most burning issues of lexicography are connected with the selection of headwords, the arrangement and the content of the vocabulary entry, the principles of definitions, semantic classification of words, lexical interpretation of polysemous words, etc. There are also cases when a bilingual dictionary is created through a bilingualisation of an existing monolingual dictionary. Although seemingly a simpler task, it may actually require more skill and effort to turn a fully-fledged monoligual dictionary into a bilingual one than to fashion a bilingual dictionary from a semi-finished product. So, English-Uzbek, Uzbek-English dictionaries will make the universal language of English more easily accessible to speakers of Uzbek, it will also make the rich Uzbek

language accessible to English speakers. Taking these facts into consideration, to explore lexical interpretation of polysemous words in the compiling bilingual "Uzbek-English, English-Uzbek dictionaries" to be today's one of the most important issues and we will discuss polysemy in a bilingual dictionaries in this article.

Materials and Methods

Polysemy is represented differently in a bilingual dictionary than in a monolingual dictionary. One reason lies in the fact that the objectives and scope of a bilingual dictionary are defined differently than the objectives of a monolingual dictionary. With regard to polysemy, these differences are expressed in the fact that the decision as to whether an independent meaning position is postulated or not depends not only on the extent to which this appears to be justified from the language-internal L1 perspective, but above all on which view the L2 perspective suggested. Technically, these are often cases where the need to translate a particular L1 word differently depending on the context prompts the decision to ascribe multiple semantic positions to that L1 word according to its L2 equivalents, even if it is from the L1 -perspective is perceived as monoseme.

Three types of L1-L2 assignment are possible:

(a) The L1 word has several meanings, all of which have different-sounding L2 equivalents. This case is trivial and easy to represent lexicographically. In addition, each L2 equivalent is often polysemous in itself. However, the sememes that have nothing semantically to do with the relevant L1 word are traditionally excluded by specifying synonyms, comments and usage examples.

(b) An intrinsically monosemous L1 word is split into multiple meanings because of the existence of different L2 equivalents, each covering part of the concept expressed by the L1 word. The ambiguity is thus imposed on the L1 word from the outside.

(c) Semantic structures of the L1 word and the corresponding L2 word coincide, i.e. both words have the same sememes. These rare cases, even in regular polysemy are particularly welcome in the lexicographical description. For such lexico-semantic parallels can be treated as monosemic lexical units.

Traditional bilingual dictionaries often resort to this descriptive device, using annotations as in different meanings. Although legitimate from a technical perspective, such a solution is not always satisfying from a cognitive point of view. Both the same and different conceptual structures can stand behind different meanings of a word. When implementing conceptual polysemy criteria, these differences become evident. In the former case, polysemy arises from focusing on different facets of the conceptual structure in question. Because they are the same conceptual structure, there are several ways to restructure the ambiguity in their representation in a contrastive language description. In the latter case, polysemy arises from the fact that the word in question refers to different knowledge structures. As a result, different positions of meaning have to be postulated in such cases for each description of language that strives for a cognitively realistic representation of the linguistic facts.

As we mentioned above, lexicographers have to deal with a number of problems in compiling bilingual dictionaries. The most burning issues of lexicography are connected with the selection of headwords, the arrangement and the content of the vocabulary entry, the principles of definitions and semantic classification of words, lexical interpretation of synonymous words, lexical interpretation of polysemous words in compiling bilingual dictionaries.

For instance, Uzbek scholar R. Hudjayeva, provides a scientific justification for the influencing factors both linguistic and extralinguistic on the productivity of genetically unrelated homonyms in English and Uzbek and

also their lexicographical interpretations in her scientific dissertation. The rows of genetically unrelated lexical homonyms include homonyms belonging to the same word family, belonging to different word families and due to the fact that words learned from two or more different languages (sometimes and at different times) have the same pronunciation in languages due to certain phonetic reasons occurs under the influence of factors. For example, in English: cricket1 - *chigirtka* (from an unknown language), cricket 2 – *sport turi* (from Anglo-Saxon);

Hudjayeva mentioned among the homonyms with medium semantic efficiency in the dictionaries, she included rest (1) homonyms with 14 meanings of the rest homonymous series and key (1) homonyms with 17 meanings of the key homonymous series belonging to this etymological group. Hudjayeva included 9 meaningful rest (2) and 3 meaningful rest (3) homonyms in the group of homonyms with lower meanings. Hence, the homonym rest (1) has higher semantic efficiency than the homonyms rest (2) and rest (3).

However, Uzbek-English and English-Uzbek dictionary (80000 words and expressions) by Shavkat Butayev, provides 2 meaningful rest (1) denoting the two meanings (dam, qoldiq) and key (1) homonyms with three meanings which are frequently used words in Uzbek and English. This shows that bilingual dictionary needs to be enriched with more meanings of the words.

We may say those lexicographers' dictionaries will be the base for further developing of Uzbek lexicography in the future. However, there are some problems in those dictionaries to be solved. There are general shortcomings of Uzbek-English dictionaries. Typological category of natural gender in most dictionaries for the words "amakivachcha, tog'avachcha, ammavachcha", the word "cousin" was given in English as their translation. That has to say "cousin" is generally used for both male and female: amakivachcha *n* cousin [28, p.615]. tog'avachcha n cousin (Sh.Butayev, A.Irisqulov). We consider that separate variants for male and female should also be given in such kind of examples, like this: "ammavachcha " *n* cousin (child of father's sister) "cousin" is used for both male and female. Nevertheless, "nephew" is used for male and niece is used for female. Specific shortcomings of Uzbek-English dictionaries. Sometimes, antonyms were given as the words which are equal in meaning in L. Jurayev's dictionary:

busiz a without this (= bu). [30, p 22].

In Sh.Butayev and A.Irisqulov's dictionary sometimes grammatical mistakes can be seen: buyon adv since; … uch yildan ~ since three years. Here should be used "for" instead of "since" before the unit "three years".

When studying bilingual dictionary Uzbek-English and English-Uzbek dictionary by Shavkat Butayev, it becomes obvious that in the process of working on it, the author not only expanded the lexical material, but also significantly improved lexicographic solutions related to the systematization and presentation of the words in the dictionary. In particular, the presentation of the semantic structure of polysemantic words in Butayev's bilingual dictionary is very carefully worked out. The representation of the lexical interpretation of a polysemantic word in a bilingual dictionary has its own characteristics in comparison with the development of a polysemy of the same words in a monolingual (explanatory) dictionary. When interpreting the meanings of words in a monolingual dictionary, their definition and grouping are partly determined by the volume of the meaning of those synonyms that are used for interpretation, and in a bilingual dictionary - by the volume of the meaning of foreign language correspondences. Therefore, there is nothing surprising in the fact that the semantic structure of the same words can be represented by different sets of meanings in explanatory and bilingual dictionaries of the same volume.

Conclusion

As conclusion, it should be noted that the representation of polysemy in a bilingual dictionary is fair specific. Theoretically interesting are those differences in the area of polysemy representation from an internal language and contrastive perspective, which are not simply due to coincidences of the lexicalization processes, but show systemic traits. The analysis of interpretation of polysemous words in compiling bilingual dictionaries needs to be enriched with more meanings of the words.

References:

1. Apresian, Yuri. 1974. Regular polysemy. In: Linguistics.

2. Добровольский, Дмитрий О. 2000. Полисемия // Энциклопедия «Кругосвет»