

# Research methods of lexico-phraseological level of the language

Rimma Abdulhalikova

Aktoty Toksambay

MO19-4

# The principles of “systemic lexicography” and “integral vocabulary” Yu.D.Apresyan

The development of modern lexicographic practice is due to the general direction of scientific knowledge is an anthropological strategy and the desire for integration. Therefore, it seems relevant to consider the integral principle of the lexicography of a word. The scientific basis of such a principle for describing lexical units goes back to the ideas of Yu. D. Apresyan set forth in the book "Integral language description and systemic lexicography."

The integral word in the "New Dictionary of Foreign Words" is interpreted as "inextricably linked, integral, single." In relation to lexicographic practice, the integral principle assumes the most complete information about the unit of description. However, the word is not only a formally and semantically complex unit, but also a unit consisting in various relations with other members of the lexical-semantic and grammatical system, as well as a multifunctional speech unit. It follows from the foregoing that the problem of integrability in lexicography is directly related to the systemic principle of describing a word in dictionaries.

Analysis of dictionaries of the system (non-alphabetic) type, as well as examples of the integrated lexicographic approach to the word are considered in the dissertation studies by Ya. L. Belitsina (Yunina) [5], R.V. Popov [17] and O. V. Tsibizova [22] (supervisor A. A. Kamalova).

An analysis of modern lexicographic sources suggests that the idea of an integrated description of the vocabulary of the Russian language is specifically implemented in Russian lexicographic practice. Let us consider particular and, in our opinion, original examples of integrability in lexicographic sources.

A review of dictionaries of this type seems right to begin with the most original lexicographic work - “The lexical basis of the Russian language.

The principle of the integral description of the word is relevant for the “New explanatory dictionary of synonyms of the Russian language ”(2003), prepared under the general guidance of Academician Yu. D. Apresyan [16]. The dictionary meets the ideas of systemic lexicography, based on the following basic principles: activity, integrity, consistency and linguistic experimentation; the key concept of systemic lexicography is the lexicographic type [3, p. 407]. The integral description also means the consistency of the dictionary and grammar (in a broad sense) both by the type of linguistic information being input and by the ways of writing it, which requires two practical principles:

- 1) When constructing a dictionary entry for a certain lexeme, the linguist must work on the entire space of grammatical rules and explicitly ascribe to the lexeme all the properties that the rules may require access to (setting the dictionary to grammar).
- 2) In constructing a certain rule, a linguist must work on the entire space of lexemes and take into account all types of their behavior that are not provided for in the dictionary (setting the grammar to dictionary).

# “New explanatory dictionary of synonyms of the Russian language” (Acad. Yu.D. Apresyan)

Although the commercialization of vocabulary largely determines the content of the overall “vocabulary”, the most notable works on it demonstrate a serious scientific breakthrough in Russian lexicography and are correlated with two leading trends. On the one hand, implemented significant lexicographic projects focused on systemocentric vocabulary description. We will name only a few of them. So, an event in domestic lexicography was the appearance “A New Explanatory Dictionary of Synonyms of the Russian Language”, created by a team of authors led by Yu.D. Apresyan.

This dictionary is a fundamentally new lexicographic edition - a dictionary of the active type, consistent with a specific grammatical description of the Russian language. The dictionary implements the idea of an integrated linguistic description, providing for the maximum consistency of grammatical and lexical characteristics. It is fundamentally important that the dictionary be based to the richest (over 5 million word usage) corpus of texts of different functional styles and genres.

# Methods of “linguistic portraiture”

It is recently that a special direction has been formed in Russian linguistics that studies the linguistic personality from the point of view of describing its speech portrait. A speech portrait is a linguistic personality embodied in speech in a particular social community. With all the attention to individuality, the interest of scientists is primarily attracted by those features of a linguistic personality that carry the signs of a group.

The immediate impetus for the development of the concept of “social-speech portrait” was the idea of a phonetic portrait, put forward in the mid 60-ies of the XX century M.V. Panov and brilliantly embodied by him in a number of phonetic portraits of politicians, writers, scientists of the XVIII - XX centuries. Although these portraits described the individual way of pronouncing an individual, a given person, their social and cultural value is undeniable, since each of the portraits reflects the peculiarities of speech in a certain social environment (the representative of which is “portrayed”). Choosing a “model” for creating a phonetic portrait, MV Panov justifies his choice with social and sociocultural considerations: belonging to a particular generation, social layer, following a certain cultural tradition (theatrical, poetic, everyday, etc.) in speech. ), the presence of local speech features (1).

# “Semantic primitives” A. Vezhbitskaya

“Semantic primitives are insurmountable words of a natural language, with the help of which one can interpret the meanings of all other words, expressions, and sentences of a language without resorting to the hermeneutic circle, that is, the definition of some words through others - those that have already been given definitions; a method developed by linguist and philosopher Anna Vezhbitskaya, who lives in Australia. We all know that in ordinary explanatory dictionaries, words are explained by idem per idem (one through the same, definition through the definable). For example, “red” can be defined as “a color close to the color of blood”, and “blood”, in turn, as “red fluid circulating in the body.” Philosophers have long wondered whether it would be possible to create such a primitive dictionary that would allow us to get away from the vicious method of idem per idem. The great Leibniz was thinking of creating such a “language of thought” (*lingua mentalis*).

# Concept and phraseology methods as a science of lexical combinations.

(I.A.Melchuk)

Phraseology is a branch of linguistics which studies phraseological unities. The term phraseology is used in two ways: 1) the quantity of phraseological unities in a language and 2) the branch (subject) studying these unities [7, 137]. Phraseology comes from Greek “phrasis”- expression and “logos”- word and it means the science of phrases that are idioms. Phraseology is a combination of phraseological unities which are the equivalent of a word. They are semantic and structural inseparable word combinations. They possess various features of meaning and usage. Lexicology studies the content of vocabulary and phraseology studies the one of phraseological unities. The language unity in vocabulary is a word; however, idiom is a language unity of phraseology. The vocabulary of any language consists of words and idioms.

The matter of studying phraseology as an independent branch of linguistics was advanced by Russian linguist E.D.Polivanov. As he maintains positively, lexis studies separate words’ meanings, morphology studies words’ structure, syntax studies the structure of word combinations. In his opinion, there is a necessity for an independent field which studies peculiar unique word combinations. E.D.Polivanov was sure that phraseology would become firmly fixed in linguistics and it occurred. The matter of studying phraseology as a separate branch of linguistics was promoted by Russian scholar V.V.Vinogradov too. V.V.Vinogradov’s great service is that he separated phraseological unities into semantic groups. However, phraseology remained a part of lexicology, because the principal criteria proving that phraseology could be an independent field of linguistics hadn’t been worked out yet. So, phraseology was being learned as the part of lexicology. After E.D.Polivanov and V.V.Vinogradov the first who promoted the idea of studying phraseology independently was scholar B.A.Larin. He affirmed that enough scientific research hadn’t been done in phraseology. In Russian linguist A.V.Kunin’s opinion, phraseology came off the lexicology circle: its range and significance have been raised. Though a lot of, sometimes controversial ideas were expressed concerning phraseology a number of scientific research works had been done. Such outstanding linguists as N.N. Amosova, A.V. Kunin, V.A. Smirnitsky, S.S. Gorelik, V.I. Arkhangelsky, V.V. Vinogradov, B.A. Larin, I.A. Melchuk, I.I. Revzin, S.N. Savitskaya, Yu.D.

## Differentiation of stability and idiomatic properties of lexemes combinations; gradual nature of idiom and stability.

For the first time, the idiom of a word is thoroughly substantiated by M.V. Panov. In his works, this feature of the meaning of the word was called the phraseological unit of semantics. The scientist showed that the property of idiom is an integral, most important feature of most words of the Russian language. When asked what a word is, Panov answers: “Words are semantic unity, which are not a free combination of smaller (minimal) semantic unity. Consequently, every word in its composition is either indivisible (not a combination) or phraseological unit ”[Panov, 1999]



- ▶ Next point which I need to highlight deals with phraseological idiomaticity and related to it motivation, accentuates gradual nature of these properties. It considers the method of study of phraseological idiomaticity which has been introduced by I. A. Melchuk and consists in comparing the meanings the words-components have in the phraseological unit with the usual (given in dictionaries) meanings of these words. It discusses the existing approaches to the application of the Melchuk's method, notes their shortcomings. It looks into the improvement 33 Мовознаўства to the method which has been developed by N. B. Mechkovskaya and concerns the distinction of the central, metonymically derived and metaphorically derived meanings among the meanings of the polysemantic word and facilitates the differentiation of phraseological units according to the degree of idiomaticity. It offers a specification to the Melchuk - Mechkovskaya method of phraseological idiomaticity study: while comparing the meanings of the words-components and the usual meanings of these words with regard to the distinction among the latter the central, metonymically derived and metaphorically derived meanings, it suggests that the semantic context of the underlying word-combination should be taken into account and only that usual meaning of the polysemantic word which agrees in the context should be considered. It demonstrates that taking the semantic context into account helps to correctly identify which usual meaning of the word is realized in the underlying word-combination and as a result to accurately establish the degree of idiomaticity of the phraseological unit.