RESEARCH ARTICLE OPEN ACCESS

Cognitive-Discursive Approach To Designing New-Type Dictionaries

Nigmatova Lola Xamidovna

Professor at Bukhara state university, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

This article examines the cognitive-discursive approach to the development of innovative dictionaries, contending that modern lexicography should transcend the conventional emphasis on decontextualised word meanings and adopt a framework that systematically incorporates conceptual frameworks and discourse conventions. Utilising perspectives from cognitive linguistics and discourse analysis, the paper validates the necessity of depicting lexical units not merely as entities with semantic attributes but also as interconnected nodes within a framework of frames, scenarios, communicative roles, and genre-specific manifestations. The research suggests a cohesive lexicographic framework wherein the dictionary's macrostructure is arranged by conceptual domains and discourse spheres, and the microstructure of each entry encompasses conceptual, semantic, collocational, syntagmatic, pragmatic, and genre-discursive dimensions. The methodology integrates corpus-based analysis, frame-semantic modelling, discourse profiling, and user-centric lexicographic design. The findings are delineated as a prototype description of dictionary entries that embody cognitive salience, conventional conceptual metaphors, evaluative profiles, discourse functions, and multimodal textual evidence. It is contended that these dictionaries are especially pertinent for advanced language learners, translators, and specialists engaged in intercultural communication, requiring structured information on the influence of lexical units on discourse and vice versa. The conclusion underscores the methodological benefits and obstacles of the cognitive-discursive approach while delineating opportunities for the advancement of digital, adaptive, and personalised lexicographic resources.

Keywords: Cognitive-discursive approach; lexicography; new-type dictionary; cognitive semantics; discourse analysis; dictionary design; corpus-based lexicography.

Introduction

Lexicography has historically been linked to the codification of lexical meanings and the establishment of literary conventions. Traditional bilingual and explanatory dictionaries usually show lexical units as stable things with short definitions, a small number of examples, and not much information on how to use them. This model, despite its undeniable successes, increasingly falls short of the needs of contemporary users who operate within intricate multilingual and multimodal contexts, engage in varied discourse practices, and must decipher meanings that are profoundly context-sensitive and ideologically charged. The growth of digital communication, global media flows, and extensive corpora of natural language has illuminated the dynamic, gradient, and discourse-sensitive characteristics of lexical meaning.

In linguistics, cognitive semantics and discourse studies have undergone concurrent advancements. Cognitive linguistics has highlighted the significance of conceptualisation, embodiment, prototype effects, metaphor, and metonymy in the construction of meaning. Discourse analysis has demonstrated that lexical units attain their complete communicative significance solely within expansive textual, pragmatic, and sociocultural frameworks, where they serve as indicators of stance,

identity, evaluation, and interactional alignment. The integration of these two research domains has resulted in the development of a cognitive-discursive framework, which regards lexical units as components of a distributed cognitive-semiotic system functioning within discourse.

From this perspective, a dictionary is not just a collection of words and definitions; it is also a model of how a language community organises its ideas and conversations. New-type dictionaries are anticipated to provide users with a more comprehensive depiction of lexical items, illustrating their role in structuring experiences, framing events, and engaging in standard communicative contexts. These types of dictionaries need to show the cognitive foundations of meaning and the patterns of usage in discourse, such as collocational patterns, genre-specific realisations, implicit evaluative and ideological components, and cross-cultural differences.

However, even though corpus lexicography is growing quickly and people are becoming more interested in cognitive and discourse-oriented approaches, lexicographic practice still mostly follows traditional descriptive rules. Many current dictionaries integrate corpus data solely as supplementary examples, while their macrostructure and microstructure remain fundamentally unaltered. There exists a significant disparity between theoretical progress in cognitive-discursive studies and their methodical application in lexicographic design.

The objective of this article is to formulate a cognitive-discursive framework for the design of innovative dictionaries and to suggest a corresponding model for dictionary structure. The main question is how to combine cognitive and discursive information in lexicographic descriptions so that they are clearer, easier to use, and more useful. To this end, the paper first talks about the methodological foundations of the cognitive-discursive approach. Then it talks about the materials and methods used to model dictionary entries. Finally, it talks about the main structural parts of the proposed dictionary type and its pros and cons.

The study's methodological foundation is constructed from three synergistic traditions: cognitive semantics, frame-based and construction-based grammatical models, and discourse-analytical approaches that examine the interplay between language, context, and social practices. This combination lets us think about lexical meaning as both a conceptual structure and a part of discourse at the same time.

The empirical data is presumed to be sourced from extensive balanced corpora of contemporary English, encompassing national reference corpora, specialised subcorpora that reflect specific discourse domains such as media, academic writing, and social media, in addition to learner corpora that record non-native usage. These corpora offer genuine instances of lexical units across diverse genres, registers, and communicative contexts, which is crucial for elucidating their cognitive and discursive characteristics. Other sources include parallel corpora and translation databases, which can be used to show differences between languages and cultures that are important for bilingual or multilingual dictionary projects.

The study employs a synthesis of corpus-driven and corpus-based methodologies. Frequency analysis is employed to discern central and peripheral senses, typical collocations, and syntagmatic preferences. Concordance analysis facilitates the reconstruction of recurring discourse patterns, argument structures, and evaluative frameworks. Frame-semantic analysis assists in modelling the conceptual structure of lexical units through frames, roles, and scenarios, whereas metaphor and metonymy analysis uncovers underlying conceptual mappings and cultural models.

In terms of discourse, we look at how lexical units are spread out across different genres and types of discourse, how they are used in speech acts and interactional moves, how they help shape social identities and stances, and how they are involved in intertextual relationships. For this objective, qualitative discourse analysis is integrated with quantitative corpus methodologies, encompassing clustering and collostructional analysis. The outcomes of these analyses are subsequently converted into lexicographic categories and labels, which are integrated into the macrostructure and microstructure of the dictionary.

The procedural steps consist of a series of actions that start with picking out target lexical units in a certain conceptual domain or discourse field. For every unit, corpus data are gathered to recreate its sense inventory, collocational network, and discourse profiles. After that, these data are analysed using a cognitive-semantic framework to find prototypes, radial categories, and metaphorical extensions. At the same time, discourse functions and genre-specific realisations are looked at to figure out which parts of usage

should be emphasised in the dictionary entry. Lastly, a lexicographic model is created that shows how information about concepts, semantics, collocations, discourse, and pragmatics will be organised and shown to the user.

The main outcome of the study is a model for a new kind of dictionary that is based on the cognitive-discursive approach. This model has an effect on both the macrostructure, which decides how the whole dictionary is put together, and the microstructure, which decides how each entry is put together.

The dictionary is organised at the macrostructural level around conceptual domains and discourse spheres, not just in alphabetical order. Users can still use the alphabetic access as a way to get around, but they can also look at lexical units through concept-oriented clusters and discourse-oriented sections. For instance, a conceptual cluster may bring together words that have to do with feelings, movement, or communication, with each word connected by shared frames and situations. A discourse cluster may compile elements typical of scholarly writing, political discourse, or casual conversation. This dual organisation embodies the notion that lexical units are concurrently integrated within cognitive frameworks and discourse conventions.

The microstructure of each entry in this macrostructure is meant to give a multi-layered picture of the lexical unit. The conceptual-semantic core is the first layer. It gives a definition in cognitive-semantic terms. The dictionary doesn't just list different senses; it gives a prototypical meaning along with descriptions of radial extensions and how they relate to each other. The prototypical sense is determined by its frequency, cognitive prominence, and centrality within the pertinent conceptual framework. Each additional sense is articulated in relation to the prototype, clarifying whether it signifies a metaphorical extension, a metonymic shift, a specialisation, a generalisation, or a conventionalised inference.

The second layer is the frame-semantic and scenario-based representation. The lexical unit is situated within its distinctive frame, encompassing frame elements, typical participants, and the temporal and causal structure of related events. For example, a verb of communication is connected to a communicative frame that includes roles like speaker, addressee, message, and channel. A noun that has to do with institutional structures is connected to frames of governance, education, or healthcare. Scenario

descriptions depict standard sequences of events and inferential patterns, aiding users in reconstructing background knowledge frequently left implicit in discourse.

The third layer is the profile of collocations and syntagmas. Corpus evidence is utilised to ascertain high-frequency collocates, favoured syntactic constructions, and recurring phraseological units. These are not presented as separate lists, but as patterns that show how discourse works and how people tend to judge things. There are short comments next to adjective-noun combinations, verb-object pairs, and prepositional phrases that explain how they help with construal, stance, and text type. Special attention is given to recurring phraseological frames and lexical bundles that serve as indicators of genre and register.

The fourth layer is the characterisation of discourse and pragmatics. This section of the entry talks about the lexical unit's usual roles in discourse, how it is used in different types of writing, how it is used in speech acts, and how it takes a stance. For instance, the entry might say that a certain adverb is often used in argumentative writing to show evaluation, or that a certain verb is common in casual conversation and shows closeness or distance. The dictionary emphasises ideological and cultural aspects, including the correlation of particular lexical items with distinct political or moral stances.

The fifth layer is the mapping across languages and cultures. This is especially important for bilingual or multilingual dictionaries. In this case, equivalents in other languages are not just direct translations; they also come with notes about how the concepts don't match up, how the metaphors don't work, and how the way people talk is different. This helps people not make the wrong assumption that words in different languages are completely the same and makes them pay attention to small differences in meaning and use.

Lastly, the sixth layer talks about the dictionary's digital and multimodal parts. Examples can be short, out-of-context sentences, but they can also be parts of real texts, conversations, headlines, and social media posts. These examples are shown in a way that keeps their structure and emphasises important aspects like co-text, punctuation, typography, and, when possible, visual elements. Hyperlinks link entries to bigger corpus concordances, specialised discourse collections, and outside sources, which lets the user do more in-depth research.

When you put all of these layers together, you get a complicated but clear picture of lexical units as cognitive-discursive entities. The dictionary is now a tool for not only figuring out what words mean, but also for learning how language organises knowledge and helps people talk to each other.

The suggested cognitive-discursive model of dictionary design has significant ramifications for lexicographic theory and practice. First, it questions the long-standing division between semantics and pragmatics that has influenced many dictionaries. The dictionary recognises that meaning is dynamically constructed within specific communicative contexts and cannot be fully encapsulated by decontextualised definitions, by integrating conceptual structures with discourse functions. This changes the focus from representing meaning in a fixed way to seeing meaning as a process of understanding, interpreting, and negotiating.

Second, the model changes how corpus data is used. In traditional corpus-based lexicography, corpora mainly provide examples and frequency data, while the dictionary's overall structure stays the same. In a cognitive-discursive dictionary, corpus analysis is essential for reconstructing frames, scenarios, and discourse profiles. Frequency and distribution patterns are analysed both quantitatively and qualitatively, serving as indicators of cognitive salience, prototype status, and genre affiliation. This brings lexicography more in line with modern empirical linguistics.

Third, the model better meets the needs of different groups of users. Advanced learners of a foreign language frequently encounter nuanced pragmatic distinctions, collocational preferences, genre-specific phraseology, and culture-bound metaphors, which are seldom explicitly addressed in conventional dictionaries. Translators and interpreters need to know about differences in ideas and ways of speaking in different languages. Researchers and educators are intrigued by the discursive existence of lexical items and their function in shaping identities, ideologies, and evaluative stances. A cognitive-discursive dictionary offers these groups enhanced and more systematically structured information, thereby facilitating both practical language application and metalinguistic contemplation.

At the same time, putting such a model into action comes with a number of problems. One is that dictionary entries could be very complicated, which could make them hard for users to understand if they aren't carefully designed. Adding multiple layers of information makes it hard to decide what to show first, how to see it, and how to get around. Adaptive interfaces that let users get information at different levels of detail based on their needs and skills are needed. So, making intuitive visual cues, expandable sections, and interactive elements is an important part of cognitive-discursive lexicography.

Another challenge is finding the right balance between how complicated the theory is and how easy it is to use. Cognitive and discourse-analytic frameworks provide robust instruments for elucidating lexical meaning; however, they occasionally employ technical jargon that may not be readily comprehensible to non-experts. Lexicographers must convert theoretical insights into lucid and accessible explanations without trivialising intricate phenomena. This might mean making new metalanguage that is specific to lexicographic needs, as well as glosses and mini-introductions that are meant to help students learn.

The suggested method also brings up issues of standardisation and making things easier to compare. If dictionary entries are organised by frames, scenarios, and discourse profiles, there must be a set of rules for how to find and describe these things in the whole dictionary. If not, the dictionary might seem random or uneven. Creating these kinds of standards requires lexicographers, corpus linguists, cognitive and discourse researchers to work together, as well as the development of shared ontologies and annotation schemes.

Lastly, the cognitive-discursive dictionary should be thought of as a digital resource that changes over time, not as a printed book that stays the same. The content is expected to change as language use changes, new ways of talking come up, and users give feedback. Because of how quickly things change, we need flexible architectures, modular updates, and constant empirical monitoring. It also encourages the use of computational methods like automatic extraction of collocations, semantic vector models, and machine learning-based clustering. These can help but not replace human analytical judgement.

Even with these problems, the cognitive-discursive approach is a promising way to modernise lexicography. It connects linguistic theory with lexicographic practice, uses the power of digital technologies and corpus data, and

makes sure that dictionary design fits with how people communicate today.

The article contends that the design of innovative dictionaries ought to be founded on a cognitive-discursive framework that amalgamates conceptual and discourse aspects of lexical meaning. This approach reimagines the dictionary as a framework for understanding how language shapes experience and facilitates social interaction, rather than simply a compilation of words and definitions. The proposed model better meets the needs of modern users by reorganising the macrostructure around conceptual domains and discourse spheres and adding layered information on frames, scenarios, collocations, discourse functions, cross-linguistic contrasts, and multimodal evidence to the microstructure.

In a time when people communicate through digital means, speak multiple languages, and see rapid changes in society and culture, the cognitive-discursive dictionary is especially useful because it gives users detailed and context-sensitive information about meaning. At the same time, it needs to be carefully thought out when it comes to usability, standardisation, visual design, and long-term updates. Future advancements may encompass the development of prototype dictionaries tailored to specific conceptual domains, the incorporation of adaptive interfaces and intelligent search systems, and the utilisation of user behaviour data to enhance lexicographic descriptions.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the cognitive-discursive approach offers a productive framework for reevaluating lexicographic practice and for creating dictionaries that not only document language but also elucidate the cognitive and discursive processes through which meaning is generated.

REFERENCES

1. Apresjan Ju. D. Integral'noe opisanie jazyka i sistemnaja leksikografija. – Moskva: Jazyki russkoj kul'tury, 1995. – 472 s.

2. Atkins B. T. S., Rundell M. The Oxford Guide to Practical Lexicography. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. – 552 p.

3. Cruse D. A. Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics. – 3rd ed. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011. – 424 p.

4. Fillmore Ch. J., Atkins B. T. S. Describing polysemy: The case of "crawl" // Polysemy: Theoretical and Computational Approaches / Ed. by Ya. Ravin, C. Leacock. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. – P. 91–110.

5. Halliday M. A. K., Hasan R. Cohesion in English. – London: Longman, 1976. – 374 p.

6. Lakoff G. Women, Fire and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987. – 614 p.

7. Langacker R. W. Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Vol. 1: Theoretical Prerequisites. – Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987. – 540 p.

8. Sinclair J. Corpus, Concordance, Collocation. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991. – 179 p.

9. Stubbs M. Words and Phrases: Corpus Studies of Lexical Semantics. – Oxford: Blackwell, 2001. – 288 p.

10. Wierzbicka A. Understanding Cultures through their Key Words: English, Russian, Polish, German, and Japanese. – New York: Oxford University Press, 1997. – 328 p.

11. Zvegincev V. A. Teorija jazyka. – Moskva: Vysshaja shkola, 1996. – 384 s.

12. Viktorova E. Ju. Kognitivno-diskursivnyj podhod k opisaniu leksiki: ot semanticheskih setej k leksikograficheskoj stat'e // Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Serija 9: Filologija. – 2010. – № 4. – S. 45–59.

13. Gak V. G. Teorija sopostavitel'noj leksikologii. – Moskva: Mezhdunarodnye otnoshenija, 1977. – 312 s.

14. Evans V., Green M. Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction. – Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006. – 830 p.

15. Biber D., Conrad S., Reppen R. Corpus Linguistics: Investigating Language Structure and Use. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. – 320

p.

16. Kubrjakova E. S. Jazyk i znanie: Na puti poluchenija znanij o jazyke: Chasti rechi s kognitivnoj tochki zrenija. Rol' jazyka v poznanii mira. – Moskva: Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury, 2004. – 560 s.

17. Kozlova N. V. Diskursivnye harakteristiki slova v sovremennoj russkoj leksikografii // Voprosy jazykoznanija. – 2015. – № 1. – S. 82–101.

18. Tognini-Bonelli E. Corpus Linguistics at Work. – Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2001. – 230 p.

19. Svensén B. A Handbook of Lexicography: The Theory and Practice of Dictionary-Making. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. – 472 p.

20. Van Dijk T. A. Discourse and Context: A Sociocognitive Approach. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. – 276 p.