

Obsolete Words In “Webster's Dictionary”

 Ulugbek Rakhmonov

Associate Professor, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology (PhD), Andijan State Pedagogical Institute, Uzbekistan

Received: 13 October 2025; **Accepted:** 05 November 2025; **Published:** 10 December 2025

Abstract: This article analyzes one of the most difficult problems facing lexicography in compiling a modern literary language dictionary, using Webster's Dictionary as an example: the inclusion and classification of obsolete and obsolete words. It emphasizes that the principles of lexical coverage in Webster's dictionary are scientifically based and accurately reflect the real state of the current English literary language.

Keywords: Lexicography, obsolete words, archaisms, lexical content, chronological limit.

Introduction: It is known that the vocabulary of any language is constantly improving and changing. The economic, cultural, and scientific development of society, the dynamics of social relations, lead to the emergence of new meanings in the language, the formation of new terms, and the transition of some words to the passive level. Therefore, studying the lexical composition of the language, systematically describing its modern and ancient states is one of the important tasks of the sciences of lexicology and lexicography. The inclusion of outdated vocabulary in today's literary language, and exactly which ones, is strictly dictated and determined by the literature currently being read by this society. However, an important distinction must be made between obsolete words of a language and words that have fallen out of the vocabulary of that language.

“The obsolete word still lives on and is compared (contrasted) with the “ordinary” word in the sense that it is used in modern language with various stylistic subtleties. A word that has fallen out of the dictionary is contrasted with the entire lexicon of the literary language as a word that is not currently in use....” [2. 42].

Obsolete words (for example, English: brow - forehead, forehead; ire - anger, hatred, wrath, anger, anger; yclept - named; wight - person; eftsoons - after that (from that, from that); even - evening etc.) are still used in modern literary language, especially widely - in poetry, for various stylistic purposes.

Words that have fallen out of the language (for

example, gressible - able to walk; grievable - causing grief; abbotric - abbey (a Catholic monastery and its property); abastard - to humiliate, belittle, insult, strike to the ground, and so on.) are not archaisms from the point of view of modern literary English, but rather inaccuracies, mistakes, incomprehensible, incomprehensible, incomprehensible, difficult to understand errors [4. 60], words that go beyond the boundaries of modern vocabulary.

Obsolete and outdated words, although they are rarely found in the wide language communication, although their field of use is constantly narrowing, nevertheless, they live in the language, and words that have fallen out of current use are alien to the current lexicon. It can be said that they are a foreign body in the living system of language.

The Large Explanatory Dictionary of the Modern Literary Language should certainly include obsolete and rare words in their entirety, accepted, albeit somewhat archaic, as the norm of the language for poetic and some other works. Otherwise, such a dictionary would not have provided society with the opportunity to read and understand the most necessary literature. Of course, such words should be given in the dictionary with the appropriate symbols.

As for words that have fallen out of use, then we completely agree with the opinion of E.E. Birzhakova and A.M. Babkin: these words should be “objects of separate dictionaries-reference books” [1. 31], for example, special historical dictionaries, dictionaries of classic writers, etc. This idea was once expressed by L.V. Shcherba also said. [4. 60]

But the problem is that such dictionaries almost do not exist yet, they are just beginning to be created [5]. That's why dictionaries of modern languages are sometimes the only source where you can find the explanation of words that have fallen out of the language.

Therefore, on the one hand, lexicography as a science faces the task of definitively solving the problem of words that have fallen out of the dictionaries of the modern literary language.

This is how Webster's Dictionary solves this problem?

As the dictionary's editor-in-chief, Ph.B. Gove, states in his preface, the dictionary includes words that have been in the English language since 1755. Words that had fallen out of the language by 1755 were not recorded by the dictionary as a rule [8. 6a].

However, the "Introduction" to Webster's Dictionary states that, as an exception, some words that had fallen out of use by 1755 but "occur in the widely known works of several great writers" were added to the Dictionary [8. 6a]. An analysis of dictionary sources has shown that these are mainly the greatest English classic writers: Chaucer, Shakespeare, Milton, Bunyan, Dryden, and others.

Thus, the Dictionary's instructions to include a portion of vocabulary that had fallen out of use by 1755, but was found in the works of English classics (from the second half of the 14th century onwards), allowed the Dictionary to include a number of words that are completely out of use in modern English.

If the date of 1755, as we have already shown above, is sufficiently accurate and justified as establishing a chronological boundary for inclusion in the dictionary of the modern literary English language, then the inclusion of words that had fallen out of use in the Dictionary by 1755 is unjustified for a modern literary language dictionary (Webster's Dictionary of 1961 is such a dictionary), which would expand the historical scope of the vocabulary.

Our comparison of Webster's Dictionary with The Oxford English Dictionary [6] and The Shorter Oxford Dictionary [7] shows that this figure is about 3-5% of the total number of words in the Dictionary.

These include words that have long since fallen into disuse: to behight (1513), belamour (1603), ramage (1639), to abject (1640), to recure (1647), to sacre (1648), to abastardize (1651), to obfirm (1689), abhorrency (1709), and many others.

All these (and similar) words are, as a general rule, given the mark obs. ("out of use") in Webster's 1961 Dictionary.

This number (3-5%) does not include words that are

outdated, but are still used in the language with a certain stylistic load, such as perchance, steed, whilom, whilst, (to) handlock, whileas, questant, (to) sacrate, oaken, (to) obambulate, eftsoon, and many others. These words are usually accompanied by the words "archaic" or "rare" in the dictionary.

Words and historicisms that refer to objects from the historical past occupy a large place in the dictionary. These are, for example: longbow - a large beech (black birch); halberd - a type of collar; crosstow, arbalest - a crossbow (ancient weapon similar to a bow); halberd - ax (ancient weapon of war); musket - a musket (ancient musket rifle); gauntlet - armor (iron) glove; visor - a visor of a helmet (the part of a helmet that is lowered over the face), etc.

The historicisms mentioned above, like all historicisms in general, should be distinguished from obsolete words (in this case, we are not talking about the obsolescence of a word, but about the obsolescence of the concept of a phenomenon, of an object). In our opinion, the objects, ideas, and events of the distant past are part of the current English language in the right of terminology and special lexicon.

Therefore, the problem of selecting them for the explanatory dictionary of the modern language leads to the problem of selecting special vocabulary for the modern literary language dictionary.

The historical nature of such words is usually indicated in the Webster's Dictionary in the footnote itself (compare: longbow ... a longbow of medieval England...; halberd ... a weapon used in the 15th and 17th centuries...)

However, the decision of the compilers to include in the Dictionary a certain number of words that had fallen out of use before 1755, but were found in the works of the greatest English writers, has led to the fact that the Dictionary contains about 3-5% of words that fell out of current use long ago and, as a result, are not considered to be facts and facts of the modern English language.

Since these words are not part of the current English lexicon, they should not be listed in the dictionary of the current literary English language. Webster's Dictionary is one such dictionary.

This contradiction (contradiction) is solved by the fact that in the Dictionary there is a clear and principled distinction between obsolete words and words that have fallen out of the language.

Obsolete words are marked as archaic or rare, while obsolete words are marked as obsolete.

Based on the analyzed materials, the following conclusions can be drawn. Chronological coverage of lexical material in Webster's Dictionary (all words from

1755 are included).

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it can be said that Webster's dictionary presents a high-level lexicographical solution as an explanatory dictionary of the modern English literary language, relying on clear and scientifically based criteria for the classification of obsolete and obsolete lexemes.

REFERENCES

1. Биржакова Е.Э., Бабкин А. М. Рецензия на "Wörterbuch der deutschen Gegenwartssprache". ВЯ, 1962.
2. Филин Ф.П. Заметки по лексикологии и лексикографии (некоторые вопросы подбора слов для большого Словаря русского языка АН СССР). ЛС, 1957. вып.1, -С. 36-57.
3. Чернышев В.И. Принципы построения академического словаря современного русского языка. Рус. яз. в шк., 1939. №2, -С. 50-53.
4. Щерба Л.В. Опыт общей теории лексикографии. Избранные работы по русскому языку. -М., Аспект Пресс, 2007. С. 252.
5. Onions C.T. A Shakespeare's Glossary. Alpha Editions, 2019. P. 276.
6. The Oxford English Dictionary. Vols I -XII with Supplement and Bibliography. Clarendon Press, 1989.
7. The Shorter Oxford Dictionary. -Oxford: 1956.
8. Webster's third new international dictionary of the English language. Unabridged. Editor in chief: Philip B. Gove. Merriam-Webster, 2002. P. 2783.