Antonyms in "Johnson Dictionary"

Rakhmonov Ulugbek Bakhodirovich

Doctor of Philosophy in Philology (PhD), Andijan State University, Associate Professor

Nabiev Ozodbek Nodirbekovich

Andijan State University, 1st year student of the Faculty of Philology

Abstract. *This article analyzes the composition of normative-explanatory dictionaries, and in particular, the interpretation of antonyms in the Johnson dictionary, from the perspective of modern lexicography. The article notes the existence of various vocabulary groups included in the dictionary in lexicography. Also, the issue of inclusion of normative lexicon and non-normative lexicon in the dictionary is discussed.*

Key words: *Normative-explanatory lexicon, antonym, dominant, lexicography, vocabulary..*

In modern lexicography, the content of normative-explanatory dictionary is extremely diverse. Here, in addition to some words, we find grammatical (irregular) forms of words, polysemous words, homonyms, synonyms, antonyms, phraseology, prefixes, etc. we will meet. In this regard, it is interesting to observe the general laws that apply to all these diverse groups of vocabulary. The sequence of topics, especially in the last section, is different from that usually accepted in lexicology. The sub-sections devoted to different types of vocabulary are arranged in descending order of their clear, explicit definition in Johnson's dictionary and in current dictionaries.

In lexicography, it is customary to solve the problem of the composition of a dictionary in the following way. Normative-explanatory dictionaries, except for minor exceptions, do not include lexicon related to sectoral, colloquial language, outdated narrow specialization, that is, primarily non-normative lexicon. Normative lexicon is included in normative-explanatory dictionary. However, the last rule needs clarification.

However, so far no coherent theory has been developed that can adequately systematize these categories and phenomena for the needs of lexicography. Often, many achievements of grammar and lexicology are not sufficiently taken into account in lexicography, and there are conflicting definitions even within the discipline of lexicography.

First of all, we will provide a rationale and explanation for the concepts we have introduced. We understand supplementivism as derivation in the broadest sense of the word, that is, not only morphological derivation, but also semantic derivation. It is used in synonymy, antonymy, etc. appears. Hence, synonyms can be evaluated as derived words relative to the dominant of the synonymous series; one of the two antonyms can be considered a derived word; an accepted phraseologically related meaning may also be considered a derivative of the word it describes. Thus, derivation can be morphological if morphological derivation occurs; semantic derivation is evidenced by the phenomenon of polysemy; lexical derivation is manifested in synonymy or antonymy; derivation, which manifests itself in stylistic synonyms or expressive phraseologisms, etc., is stylistic derivation.

Antonyms can be placed in the same row as the word, which is expressed as a supplement and explained in the dictionary using the reference method. Correct, if one does not refer to dictionaries of antonyms, but confines oneself to the scope of explanatory dictionaries, then it must be admitted that their compilers are in most cases far from the idea that antonyms are supplementary forms of a single word.

Let us cite one of the most widespread definitions, which belongs to N.M. Shansky: "Antonyms are words with different meanings, which express opposite, but interconnected concepts"[1. 64]. Then N.M. Shansky, without classifying them, gives a number of examples: good - bad, speaking - keeping silent, opening - closing, pouring - spitting, adding - subtracting, turning on - turning off, etc. Fomina approaches these examples in a rather differentiated manner: "In antonymy, two types of logical connections are distinguished: first, a contrast indicating different levels or norms of the same quality, object or phenomenon, for example: expensive - cheap, high - low; second, a contrast indicating the presence or absence of some quality, characteristic, sign in the object, for example: sad - cheerful, poor - rich, etc."[2. 67].

n Johnson's dictionary, antonyms were defined approximately as they are in modern dictionaries. In other words, both antonymic forms of a word are considered autonomous words, but sometimes there is a greater or lesser connection between them. The closest to the ideal case is:

High. adj. ...2. Elevated in place; raised aloft: *Opposed to low*.

Low. adj. I. Not high.

Bilateral references are extremely rare in the case of suppletive forms of one word:

To go, v.n. ...9. To depart from a place; to move from a place; *the opposite of to come*.

To come. v.n. ...I. To remove from a distant to a nearer place; to arrive: *opposed to go.*

A more frequent case is one-sided links in a non-dominant form:

Fondness, n.s, ...I. Foolishness; weakness; want of sense; want of judgement.

Dislike, n.s. ...I. Disinclination; absence of affectation; *the contrary to fondness*.

Beautiful. adj. ...Fair; having the qualities that constitute beauty.

Ugly. Adj. ...Deformed; offensive to the sight; *contrary to beautiful*; **hateful.**

Love. n.s. ...I. The passion between the sexes.

Hate. n.s. ...Malignity; detestation; *contrary to love*.

Sympathy. n.s. ...Fellowfeeling; mutual sensibility; the quality of being affected by affectation of another.

Antipathy. n.s. ...I. A natural contrarity to any thing, so as to shun it involunterilty; aversion; dislike. *It is opposed to sympathy*.

Intromission, n.s. ...I. The act of sending in.

Extramission, n.s. ...The act of emitting.

Perhaps it is this unique feature (one-way references) that distinguishes Johnson's dictionary from contemporary lexicography.

Examples of the opposite can also be found. The link is given next to the dominant form, and the non-dominant is left unlinked:

To take. v.a. I. To receive what is offered; correlative to give, *opposed torefuse*.

To refuse. v.n. Not to accept; not to comply.

However, as is the case in current lexicography, the most frequent occurrence is the absence of references to both forms. For example:

To mask. v.a. To disguise with mask or visor.

To dismask. v.a. ...To divest of a mask; to uncover from concealment.

The general conclusion we can draw about the antonyms in Johnson's dictionary is a logical consequence of the matter. Only the dominant antonymic form of a word should be explained; the explanation of the non-dominant form should refer to the dominant form in *the best* possible way. In this respect, Johnson's dictionary is on par with current lexicography, although it cannot be considered ideal. A common shortcoming of both Johnson's dictionary and modern dictionaries is the lack of reference to the dominant form when explaining the non-dominant form. This is not good for two reasons: firstly, the dictionary does not reflect one of the most important forms of semantic correlation of lexical units - antonymic relations, and secondly, it uses these relations for its own convenience as an effective and precise means of explaining meanings.

The vocabulary of Johnson's Normative-Explanatory Dictionary is composed of primary words, which are explained, and secondary words, which are explained by reference to primary words. Secondary vocabularies are forms of primary vocabularies.

Primary vocabularies include synchronistic incoherent words and non-expressive phraseology. Secondary (referential) vocabulary includes highly regular synchronic derivatives, non-dominant antonyms, non-dominant synonyms, expressive phraseological units, parts of words, or morphemes.

In fact, most of the derived words are defined by reference.

Regular synchronic derivatives that are not included in the dictionary are explained by referring to those non-derivative words that are included in the normative-explanatory dictionary. Non-normative vocabulary is semantically identical to the normative vocabulary included in the normative-explanatory dictionary, while non-semantic (stylistic, etc.) vocabulary differs from it and is phonetically irregular (suppletive). Therefore, it is explained by referring to normative vocabulary. Even so, inclusion of non-normative lexicon in normative-explanatory dictionary was not accepted at all.

List of used literature

1. Шанский Н.М. Лексикология современного русского языка. М., URSS, 2022. стр. 310.

2. Фомина М.И. Лексика современного русского языка. -М., Изд-во "Высшая школа", 1990. - С. 152.