

AN APPROACH TO LANGUAGE POLICY THROUGH LEXICOGRAPHY**Karimbaeva Mavluda***Senior lecturer Andijan State University, Uzbekistan*

Abstract: *At many levels, language policies are prevalent, and when they are formulated, the data is usually presented in a prescriptive manner. Lexicographers are required to incorporate the decisions made by language policy makers into their dictionaries. By include just the approved forms, dictionaries can thus strictly follow a prescriptive approach. Additionally, dictionaries can provide a descriptive account of language use without offering advice or claiming to be accurate. Thirdly, by endorsing particular forms—even if they deviate from the suggested forms—dictionaries can be proscriptive. An overview of the many language policy levels as well as the concepts of prescription, description, and proscription are provided in this article. To demonstrate some of the lexicographic applications of prescription, examples are provided.*

It is underlined that dictionary users need to have access to pertinent info. As a result, proscription applied to lexicography is explored as a potential substitute for prescription. It is proposed that proscription, in its various conceivable uses, can result in a lexicographic presentation that is advantageous to the user and helps to fulfill the purposes of a particular dictionary.

Keywords: *complementary proscription, description, direct prescription, direct proscription, domain-specific language policy, indirect prescription, indirect proscription, language policy, levels of language policy.*

Relevant language bodies often create strict or less strict norms that govern the official use of language on various levels. At different stages of the policy-making process, there are variations in language policies and methods for putting them into practice. To refer to different connected elements, a number of terminologies have been introduced (Gouws 2006). The contrast between language policy and communication policy, as they relate to the intralingual and interlingual levels, is crucial in this context. The phrase "language policy" is used in this article to refer to all levels of choices and their implementation that are intended to regulate diverse aspects of language use, particularly in relation to formal word recognition, spelling, inflection, and pronunciation.

Lexicographers must consider the various language policies that are pertinent to the dictionaries they are creating, and they must decide how to react to the formal decisions made by language policy makers. They must agree on the appropriate course of action to guarantee that both the true goal of the dictionary and its functions may be fulfilled. This suggests that while they may follow the guidelines set forth by official bodies when creating their language standards, the demands and purposes of the dictionary's users may occasionally necessitate the addition of forms that are not prescribed.

By examining the differences between prescription, description, and proscription, this paper seeks to address the challenges faced by numerous lexicographers in many countries when determining how to respond lexicographically to language policy. The purported regulation of use within a certain speech community—whether it is the only community in a given country, the only community among others within a specific country, or a cross-border community—is referred to in this article as "national language policy."

The national language policy is typically established by an official or semi-official organization, such as an academy or national language board, and it typically specifies proper pronunciation as well as spelling and inflection forms.

It even specifies words to be used in some linguistic groups; however, there are no examples of national language policies that dictate terminology. There are speech communities with competing language policy authorities in addition to the boards or academies in charge of the nation's language policy, each of which may have varying levels of power.

The language policies established by "intermediate" entities, such as businesses, ministries, universities, local governments, and various types of organizations, are referred to as domain-specific language policies. This kind of language policy may control the language, or languages, that are allowed to be used inside their purview, that is, in internal company communications or with external parties. In addition, the style that must be followed both internally and externally inside the concerned entity is typically governed by the domain-specific language policy. It is often subservient to the national language policy, albeit it has the authority to specify words and word forms that must be used, sometimes even going against the policy's recommendations.

Finally, the term terminological language policy refers to the regulation of terminology within one or several specialized subject fields. This policy

may be decided by a national or regional terminological board or by separate organization, companies or other entities. In this way, it is sometimes interwoven with the domain-specific language policy and sometimes even with the national language policy. The regulation of terminology normally embraces the selection of the recommended terms and their definition.

As is evident, while there may be some overlap, the three categories of language policies listed above control and address distinct facets of language use. This needs to be considered while organizing and assembling various lexicographic works. The national language policy is relevant to lexicographers working with general dictionaries for communicative and cognitive purposes, as well as to lexicographers (or terminologists) working with specialized dictionaries and the relevant terminological language policy. Additionally, lexicographers compiling company, branch, and similar dictionaries must refer to the domain-specific language policy to the extent that it pertains to their work.

But in addition to establishing a macro-level relationship with the language policy, it is crucial to ascertain the nature of this relationship. This will be covered in more detail in the paragraphs that follow, using examples from both general and specialized dictionaries. However, it is necessary to briefly explore the fields of description, prescription, and proscription in the subject of methodology before moving on to this debate.

Different approaches of gathering and applying data from various sources, such as corpora, linguistic surveys, text investigations, etc., are represented by prescription, description, and proscription (Bergenholtz 2003). The concepts of prescription, description, and proscription are crucial in the relationship between lexicography and language policy. As a result, a quick explanation of these ideas is required.

Language boards and official language bodies are prescriptive by nature. They are prescribing, for example, when they create a language's spelling norms or recognize some loan terms as part of the language's standard variety. A prescription does not always mean that one form is acknowledged. A linguistic body would frequently formally acknowledge various variations, such as orthographic versions of a single term.

Dictionary usage primarily emphasizes prescription. Dictionaries are viewed as utility tools in a user-driven lexicographic approach, as they are created for a specific target user group with particular lexicographic demands in a particular circumstance.

Dictionaries are useful tools that knowledgeable people utilize to help them solve real-world challenges. An optimal retrieval of information from the facts available in the dictionary should be the outcome of their dictionary consultation. These users depend on the dictionary to provide the information they require so they may obtain the necessary data.

It is now well acknowledged that no dictionary can satisfy every person's needs. Lexicographers must decide what function(s) the intended dictionary will serve before beginning any dictionary planning process. All dictionary components should be planned with these functions in mind.

A cursory examination of dictionaries throughout history reveals that many lexicographic products were assembled to present the information the lexicographer chose, frequently without considering the needs of these users or identifying a target user group. Too frequently, there has been little indication of a practical approach from the dictionary compilation. Users' general perception had been that the lexicographer knew what should be included in a dictionary, that dictionaries are reliable sources of information because they contain the complete truth and nothing but the truth, and that users should rely on them as such. Many dictionaries view authority as being synonymous with prescription, that is, as lexicographers telling users how to use language. This was clearly clear from Samuel Johnson's method of creating his 1755 dictionary when he stated that the primary goal of the work was "fixing the language" in *The Plan of a Dictionary of the English Language* (1747). He states that "toleration, adoption, and naturalization have run their lengths" in describing his prescriptive approach. Authority and good order are now required.

Lexicographers that use a prescriptive approach force their viewpoint on the dictionary and its intended audience. In fact, a lot of dictionary users would prefer this kind of help, particularly when using dictionaries to produce texts.

The dictionary should provide users with a single, accurate form rather than offering options, highlighting variations, or providing regional or colloquial terms. It is possible to distinguish between various forms and degrees of prescription (cf. Bergenholtz 2003); these forms are not covered in this article. For the purposes of this discussion, it is sufficient to say that prescription—especially a strong prescriptive approach—can be understood as either presenting one form—with respect to, say, pronunciation, meaning, or morphological possibilities—or more than one form as the dictionary's preferred form(s), with no mention of other words from the non-standardized use. This strict rule suggests that only these forms

and words should be accepted as accurate, while any other forms or words should be forbidden.

By using a prescriptive method, the lexicographer puts himself in the awkward position of having to evaluate the language and decide which forms are acceptable. Prescriptive dictionaries frequently adhere to the guidelines established by an official language body or other agency, as mentioned in the language policy section. The prescription of the pertinent body is contained in the dictionary, which will subsequently serve as an extension and tool at the disposal of this standardized authority.

The typical dictionary user views the dictionary as the pinnacle of authority and does not discriminate between various language bodies and academies. Lexical prescription does not always follow official guidelines, just as domain-specific language policy occasionally deviates from the national language policy's prescription. It also predominates when lexicographers provide a single form and disregard all other variations, even though the forms they provide depart from the standards of the official language in terms of morphology, spelling, and other areas. In this situation, the dictionary applies its own prescriptive rules rather than extending the corpus of language.

An official body's choices or the application of an official language policy on any of the levels covered in a previous section of this article are not the only things that are reflected in description. Instead, description aims to provide a thorough explanation of how language is actually used by offering a range of forms, such as orthographic, morphological, or phonetic variants, or terms that indicate dialectal, sociolect, or chronolectal varieties, among others. The description refrains from categorizing naturally occurring forms as acceptable or unacceptable. It captures the range of real language use.

Even official language bodies occasionally reflect the use of non-prescribed forms, despite their primary job being prescriptive. They have been added to reflect variations and other terms from registers not formally acknowledged by the prescriptive language body, but they are neither presented as allowed nor required as accurate. The fact that they have been included to an additional list—a descriptive list that supplements the official prescriptive list—is significant, though.

Certain dictionaries place a lot of emphasis on description. When a lexicographer uses a descriptive approach, they attempt to capture how language is actually used, allowing for several variations but neither designating a preferred form or designating a certain form as

unacceptable. According to Bergenholtz (2003), there are several kinds and levels of description. A descriptive method may or may not satisfy consumers, depending on the features of the dictionary. A display of all the various variations in a dictionary created for text receiving can help users efficiently.

A descriptive method frequently frustrates users using dictionaries for text production or translation since it does not provide clear instructions on the optimal, proper, or most accurate form. They don't expect a dictionary to force them to make decisions or present them with options.

The description does not indicate that all variations are used equally frequently or are on the same acceptability scale. In certain instances, variations in the frequency of usage are mentioned, although the dictionary does not explicitly state which version is advised. Users may find an overly descriptive approach annoying, particularly if they are using the dictionary to produce text and are presented with a wide range of options without being provided a suggested form.

Because consumers view dictionaries as reliable sources, even descriptions may be misunderstood by the typical user as a list of the proper forms. Wiegand (1986) discusses how descriptive dictionaries have normative power. Lexicographers must decide decisively what strategy to apply in their dictionaries, even though many users are unable to discern between description, prescription, and proscription—discussed in the next section. This choice must consider a number of potential effects that the chosen strategy may have on the users and language and dictionary usage within the specified speech group.

Lexicographers must acknowledge that both prescription and description have an impact on the success of information retrieval in a given dictionary, and language bodies should be well informed of the benefits and drawbacks of each strategy.

A proscriptive approach to lexicography involves the lexicographer expressing "this is recommended" rather than "this should be done," departing from the prescriptive method. A proscriptive technique often suggests only one form, although it can also offer other options or contain various terms together with a clear indication of the lexicographer's preferred form. It might also result in the recommendation of two or more forms in certain particular circumstances. This could be the case, for example, when these forms occur in a corpus with the same frequency or when new terms or words are introduced into a language. It will be up to future events to determine whether a word is a pure loan, transliterated, or

coined, for example, and whether it will become common in the speech community.

Even though one or more suggested forms are provided, this does not mean that they are the only ones that are acceptable. It does not always have to represent the choices made by an official language body; it only expresses the lexicographer's recommendation.

Regarding linguistic policy, there aren't many issues with the idea of description. Proscription is not a matter of language policy. When it comes to the idea of prescription, actual issues surface. As a result, the emphasis in this article will shift from description to prescription and the issues that arise when dictionaries adopt this approach. There will be justifications made for the application of a proscriptive approach as a remedy.

REFERENCES:

1. Bergenholtz, H. 2003. User-oriented Understanding of Descriptive, Proscriptive and Prescriptive Lexicography. *Lexikos* 13: 65-80.
2. Bergenholtz, H. and R.H. Gouws. 2006. How to Do Policy with Dictionaries. *Lexikos* 13: 13-45.
3. *Hermes, Journal of Linguistics* 13: 291-304.
4. Gottlieb, H. and J.E. Mogensen (Eds.). 2007. *Dictionary Visions, Research and Practice*: 217-240. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
5. Gouws, R.H. 1995. Dictionaries and the Dynamics of Language Change. Kachru, B. (Ed.). 1995. *Culture, Ideologies and the Dictionary*: 297-313.
6. Gouws, R.H. 1999. Situating a Dictionary of English on Historical Principles within a More Comprehensive Lexicographic Process. *Lexikos* 9: 269-282.
7. Gouws, R.H. and F.A. Povelis. 1992. The Development and the Lexicographic Tradition. Zgusta, L. (Ed.). 1992. *History, Languages and Lexicographers*: 77-104.
8. Johnson, S. 1747. *The Plan of a Dictionary of the English Language*. Facsimile Edition 1970. Menston: The Scholar Press. Mojela, V.M. 2007. Standardization or Stigmatization? Challenges Confronting Lexicography and Terminography in Sesotho sa Leboa. *Lexikos* 18: 119-130.
9. D.J. Prinsloo. 2002. Loan Words versus Indigenous Words in Northern Sotho: A Lexicographic Perspective. *Lexikos* 12: 1-20.
10. Tarp, S. 2008. *Lexicography in the Borderland between Knowledge and Non-K*