Fundamentals Of Creating An Electronic Encyclopedic Dictionary Of Linguistic Terms

Shahobiddinova Shohida Hoshimovna[1], Rustamova Dilrabo Abdurakhimovna[2], Miralimova Shahzoda Khasanboevna[3]

[1]Doctor of philology, professor, Andijan State University, Uzbekistan.
[2]PhD, associate professor. Andijan State University, Uzbekistan.
[3]teacher, master, Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages.

Abstract. The article highlights the fundamentals of creating an electronic encyclopedic dictionary of linguistic terms. In world and Uzbek linguistics, research objects and interpretations of these objects are emerging that were unimaginable a few decades ago. In particular, areas such as neurolinguistics, artificial intelligence, linguistic expertise, extreme linguistics, speech influence, corpus linguistics, linguoculturalolology, have not been sufficiently studied not only in Uzbek, but also in world linguistics. Although there is a lot of research done in some areas and it claims to be called academic research, the lack of a consistent system of terms shows that it is still too early to make such an assessment. Also, there is no modern, relatively complete explanatory dictionary of linguistic terms in Uzbek lexicology. Existing dictionaries are outdated and lack words. The vocabulary of the largest dictionaries of this type is less than 2000. Also, there is no electronic dictionary of linguistic terms at all. In this article we pointed our view to the need of creating an electronic encyclopedic dictionary of linguistic terms.

Keywords: terminology, linguistic terms, terms, electronic dictionary, explanatory dictionary, encyclopedic dictionary, linguistic dictionary, lexicography.

Introduction

Over the next hundred years, Uzbek linguistic terminology underwent regular evolutionary changes and several revolutionary changes. In the early period of modern linguistics, linguistic terms were mainly borrowed from Russian or directly. Not all of these terms correspond to the nature of the Uzbek language: parts of speech, apostrophe, infinitive, declining suffix, formative suffix, compound numbers... Later, these and other terms underwent a number of revisions. Not all of these reforms were successful. There are places where one member of the term nest has been edited and the others have not been edited for some reason. For example, the term root has been replaced by the term base, with very active use. As a result, terms such as cognates, one-roots, etc., which form an associative series with it, have fallen out of use.

As a word, the term root was less active than the base and had more scope than the base in delimiting the scope of input. The confusion with terms such as sentence base and grammatical base is also an obstacle to strengthening the status of this word as a term. A number of terms such as compact sentence, sentence patterns, the word being expanded, expanding word, semi-stop (comma), sequence of words, sequence of sentences, parts of speech, lexicology, general words, specific words, local words have been recommended in the studies conducted by linguists and even although it was included in school textbooks which didn't become popular. Even theoretically interesting recommendations are often not fully implemented. In particular, views on the issue of the main parts of the sentence have not been fully resolved for several decades. Descriptive changes that should occur in the definition of different language units after taking part of the sentence as the main part are not reflected in the system of terms, that is, in the description of language levels. In particular, what are the sentences that have been combined:

simple sentence or compound sentence? Such cases are common.

Materials and methods

Uzbek theoretical linguistics is absorbing all the achievements of world linguistics in the next period. In world linguistics, research objects and interpretations of these objects are emerging that were unimaginable a few decades ago. In particular, areas such as neurolinguistics, artificial intelligence, linguistic expertise, extreme linguistics, speech influence, corpus linguistics, linguoculturalology, have not been sufficiently studied in a monographic plan, not only in Uzbek, but also in world linguistics. Although there is a lot of research done in some areas and it claims to be called academic research, the lack of a consistent system of terms shows that it is still too early to make such an assessment. In particular, in some of the listed directions, there are dozens of explanations of terms such as concept, linguistic landscape of the world, linguistic model of the world, frame, gestalt, construct, constant, script, etc., which are actively used. The term must be unambiguous. Also, there is no modern, relatively complete explanatory dictionary of linguistic terms in Uzbek lexicology. Existing dictionaries are outdated and lack words. The vocabulary of the largest dictionaries of this type is less than 2000. Also, there is no electronic dictionary of linguistic terms at all. What has been said shows the need to create an electronic encyclopedic dictionary of linguistic terms.

An encyclopedic dictionary is a dictionary that describes an object, person, event, or concept with one or another word. In contrast, a linguistic dictionary provides information about the meaning and usage of a word. A linguistic dictionary also displays a list of words based on the analysis of natural language texts and their systematization. An encyclopedic dictionary describes a concept, while linguistic units are explained in a linguistic dictionary. Linguistic dictionaries are usually contrasted with encyclopedic dictionaries. But this approach is not always correct. For example, the dictionaries of the Larousse group in French, Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current

English in English, and Webster's dictionaries in America are of the linguistic dictionary type and have an encyclopedic character. Mythological, onomastic (dictionaries of toponyms, anthroponyms, pseudonyms), linguistics dictionaries have the status of "intermediate third" between encyclopedic and linguistic dictionaries.

Unlike an encyclopedic dictionary, a terminological dictionary is a special type of glossary of terms related to a particular field or discipline, these terms are usually explanatory rather than indexed. Distinguishing a particular type of dictionary depends on the content and form of the information stored in it.

The first problem in lexicography is the problem of classification of dictionaries: it always serves to solve some problems from a theoretical and practical point of view. L.V. Sherba was the first in Russian linguistics to pay attention to the typology of dictionaries. He presented his classification based on 6 differences. L.V. Shcherba's opinion about the classification of dictionaries remains relevant even now.

1. First difference: academic type dictionary / dictionary-reference. First of all, we need to clarify our idea of an academic dictionary or a normative dictionary and a reference dictionary.

An academic dictionary is considered normative and describes the lexical system of a given language. L.V. Sherba believes that it cannot contain facts that contradict the current literary language. In contrast to the academic dictionary, dictionary-references can cover a relatively wider range of information about the word, its definitions do not conform to the standards of the literary language, and are not subject to the limits of the lexical layer of the language.

2. The second difference: encyclopedic dictionary/general dictionary. An encyclopedic dictionary describes a thing, event and reality, while a linguistic dictionary explains a word.

3. The third difference: thesaurus/simple (explanatory or translation) dictionary. A thesaurus is cited even if a word exists in that language and is used only once.

4. The fourth difference: simple (explanatory or translation) dictionary/ideological (ideographic) dictionary. In an ideological dictionary, words are required to be given in order.

5. The fifth difference: explanatory / non-explanatory dictionary.

6. The sixth difference: historical / modern dictionary.

From the given classification of L.V.Sherba, it is clear that the scientist differentiates in the dictionary material according to the presentation of information and other features and contrasts encyclopedic dictionaries with general dictionaries. So, in general, encyclopedic dictionaries are different from general dictionaries.

Another definition distinguishes linguistic and encyclopedic dictionaries as follows: "Encyclopedic dictionaries describe concepts, providing a larger or smaller set of information, depending on the size and purpose of the dictionary. Linguistic meanings are reflected in annotated dictionaries. Many vocabulary articles can be found in encyclopedic dictionaries. The first word of a dictionary article (unlike philological dictionaries) also consists of proper nouns. The differences between the two definitions given above can be shown as follows. Let's compare: in the encyclopedic dictionary, "the sun" is defined as a natural phenomenon from the point of view of astronomy and physics. Information about the concept is given // the explanatory (linguistic) dictionary contains the proper and figurative meanings of this word, primary and plural meanings, and illustrative examples. Basically, the meanings of the word are revealed.

There are also such definitions: The encyclopedia is not a dictionary, it has nothing to do with lexicography. The only reason to call it a dictionary is that the concepts are presented in the same order as in the dictionary. But today lexicographers support another point of view: "The main "hero" of the linguistic dictionary is the word; the "protagonist" of the encyclopedic dictionary is the thing, reality and its signs. Linguists describe the essence of words, explain their form and meaning, and encyclopedia authors systematize existence and its objects with time/space and other properties. But it is not correct to put a wall between these two phenomena: just as linguists refer to things, encyclopedists also feel the need for words. The border between "thing" and "word" exists only in our mind, and in reality it is difficult to feel the difference between them emotionally.

According to V.P.Petushkov, V.N.Sergeev, in some cases, in linguistic academic dictionaries, when explaining some words (special lexicon), signs characteristic of an encyclopedic dictionary are found. Researchers assess such an approach as unsuccessful. It works best for each dictionary to use its own method of definition. The "philological" interpretation of special words in such academic dictionaries shows that there are flaws in the interpretation of the term. We believe that it is a wrong approach to provide an encyclopedic definition in annotated dictionaries. It is emphasized that the word "Sun" is an astronomical term and the scientific definition of the term is given. In our opinion, it is better that the definitions in the explanatory dictionaries are popular. More precisely, it is appropriate to use the national language in describing the lexicon of the literary language, and philological dictionaries should be built in this way. But the introduction of new terms into the vocabulary of explanatory dictionaries creates the obligation to explain the special lexis as well. For this purpose, it is necessary to develop a methodology for interpreting special lexis in philological dictionaries.

V.P.Petushkov and V.N.Sergeev write about the distinction and classification of dictionaries and encyclopedias in their article entitled "O klassifikatsii slovarey": "First of all, before creating the vocabulary and explanation of the dictionary, it is necessary to determine the audience that will read the dictionary. For some reason, there are views that philological dictionaries are intended for people with secondary education. Determining the readership audience of not only philological dictionaries, but also any dictionary helps to formulate the tasks of a specific dictionary guide, to determine the method of presentation of lexical material.

Therefore, the need for scientific classification of dictionaries (potential possibility, theoretical preparation for realization) is urgent.

Discussion

Rapidly developing information technologies lead to the emergence of new types of dictionaries. Information technology is building the descriptor and thesaurus dictionaries required to perform its tasks. For example, the thesaurus adds the ability to provide automatic synonyms in the Word text editor. Such dictionaries are naturally different from encyclopedic dictionaries.

L.V. Sherba distinguishes the concept of "summarnye slovari" - general dictionaries. Under the term general dictionaries, the scientist understood BSE, MSE, universal publications in the Encyclopedic dictionary series (type), dictionaries devoted to a larger field of science, covering related, small fields. For example, Large or short medical encyclopedias cover anatomy, psychology, pharmacology, hygiene and other fields. Agricultural encyclopedias cover fields such as agronomy, veterinary medicine, soil science, and botany. Technical encyclopedia explains the concepts of technical sciences. In addition to being an encyclopedia, such dictionaries are also called "field dictionaries".

When discussing the interpretation of terms in the general dictionaries of the literary language, linguists cannot fail to remember L. V. Sherba's study "Opyt obshchey teorii lexikographii". In L.V. Sherba's distinction between encyclopedic and philological dictionaries, this contradiction is based on the object of description and definition. The scientist claims that the descriptive object of the encyclopedic dictionary is a scientific concept, and the descriptive object of the philological dictionary is the linguistic meaning. The meaning of the term is not equal in the popular and scientific style of the literary language. In the scientific style, the scientific meaning is reflected in the popular style, and in the Arabic language, the imagination in everyday life is reflected. For example, a straight line is understood as "a short distance between two points" in geometry. Naturally, in the literary language, this concept has a different meaning. In the literary language (in the linguistic landscape of the Uzbek world), a straight line is a "straight line that does not turn to the right or to the left." Therefore, the encyclopedic and philological definitions differ.

Lexicographers have always drawn a clear line between encyclopedic and philological dictionaries.

When we consider many definitions, it seems that there is no difference in the description of the special lexicon that is part of the philological dictionary. Encyclopedic definitions, impossible in general dictionaries, logical explanations like in Casares' dictionary, historical explanations like in Doroshevsky's dictionary, explanation of relations, verbal character of definitions characteristic of scientific method seem to lead to non-differentiation of terms in philological and encyclopedic dictionaries. However, the definition of the term remains scientific, no matter which dictionary it is in, it should receive its scientific description, find its value in the terminological system. Such a definition is considered a formal explanation and should not be confused with the meaning of the concept. So, what we said above, should the scientificity of the explanation of the word "sun" remain? No, we are talking about a special lexicon. The lexeme of the sun should only have a description in the Uzbek linguistic world in the explanatory dictionary. In the mind of the representative of the nation, there is only a linguistic definition, the scientific definition remains related to science.

True, distinguishing the term requires a logical solution. The most correct (scientific) way to do this is to base this term on the signs of the related group. But such an approach is suitable for some groups of terms, in particular, this approach is appropriate for words representing objects. This method of description can be used because the terms belonging to one semantic group belong to a certain system of the lexical structure of the language, and they can be included in one logical-thematic group.

According to L.L. Kutina, general dictionaries are not based on any special principles of selection of concepts and terms, sometimes they are simply neglected when

compiling an encyclopedic dictionary: not much attention is paid to the question of which concept to get/not to get.

The encyclopedia defines the concept and its relationship with various (other) concepts and terms, but it is not based on the classification of the main and additional meanings of the concept/term. For example, in the latest editions of BSE, the definition of the term (not a concept!) is more systematic, shorter, but the character of the definition is different: Etymological, substantive, scientific, based on the concept of everyday life.

A general (philological) dictionary is built on the basis of a catalog of many thousands of texts, in which various experiences are expressed: achievements, mistakes, knowledge and lack of knowledge (phenomenon not defined in science), various stages of knowledge, various system concepts and various political views. A comment targeting a term that is included in one system may be rejected in another system.

According to F.V.Juravlev, V.Doroshevsky, writing about the academic dictionary mentioned above, explains that it cannot be an encyclopedic dictionary as follows: "in the definition of the word telephone, it is not written in what year it was invented." True, such is the requirement of an explanatory dictionary. But if the dictionary is historical, all the facts related to the word are required to be given. Such a dictionary studies all lexical-semantic phenomena in chronological order. It is important to note that the historical features of the word are also related to its etymology. When providing such material, it is necessary to proceed from the requirement of an encyclopedic and philological dictionary. In general dictionaries, most of the historisms related to the field of culture specialize in providing information on the cultural-historical background. For example, in the description of concepts and terms such as freemasonry, cubism, teratological style, the above-mentioned approach is appropriate.

So, based on L.V. Sherba's antithesis, encyclopedic / philological dictionaries differ. Although this famous classification of the scientist was later modified, the approach to distinguishing encyclopedic dictionaries still remains relevant. This modification appeared in the later period under the influence of new trends based on the relationship between the literary language and special lexicon. Contrasting the encyclopedic dictionary with the philological dictionary, the difference between the content of the material and the method of presentation in them is related to the interpretation of scientific terms.

Results

An encyclopedic dictionary differs from a general dictionary in several features. In distinguishing between these two dictionaries, it is necessary to pay attention to the issue of proper nouns. Many argue that personal nouns are explained only in encyclopedic dictionaries, they are not included in the general dictionary. It is true that personal nouns are defined in encyclopedic dictionaries, but they also have the right to be used as words in general dictionaries, because proper nouns also have meanings.

According to L. V. Sherba, the information given in the encyclopedic dictionary does not concern the meaning of the word, it does not reveal the meaning of the word. It is not necessary for such words to be popular, in which case there would be no need for encyclopedic dictionaries. The task of the dictionary compilation team is to define a common mandatory minimum. According to the approach of L.V.Sherba, this is minimal - giving a concept or definition that fully explains the given object. The task of the sample general dictionary is also to determine the secondary meaning of personal nouns. Definition of famous nouns requires special attention: it takes into account the linguistic world of the society where the dictionary is created. For example, the word Newton can be defined in the Russian literary language as "Uchenyy", "uchenyy myslitel", "angliyskiy uacheniy", "osnovopolojnik sovremennoy mechaniki". L.V. Sherba gives another definition, which indicates that he is ready to argue for his opinion: "odin iz genialneyshikh umov chelovechestva, zalojivshiy osnovy sovremennogo znaniya v oblasti tochnyx nauk".

The scientist is not a supporter of including all common nouns in general dictionaries, they are always in encyclopedic dictionaries, he believes that it is enough to explain in general dictionaries only common nouns that have acquired social significance for the representatives of this society. Among such problems are the problems of interpreting words such as nicknames. Since this problem is not within the scope of our research, we will leave aside the issue of the definition of such nouns in the encyclopedic and general dictionaries of the Uzbek language and move on to the review of other general problems.

Definition of terms in the encyclopedic dictionary/common dictionary conflict is also a factor to consider. Many terms do not belong to the general lexicon, they belong to the special lexicon layer. Such units are explained in technical encyclopedias, because encyclopedias have the capacity to provide relevant information. But many terms are included in the literary language. Such units have a different meaning in the general lexicon layer, and a different meaning as a special lexicon. In the Uzbek language, words such as root, arrow, body, corner have a different meaning as a simple word in the literary language, and a special meaning within various disciplines. For example, the words body, root, and axis are terms in biology, and root and axis are terms in mathematics and express a completely different meaning. While the meanings of these words are given in the explanatory dictionary, they are separated as semes of the lexeme and short definitions are given. But encyclopedic dictionaries give a page or more of material about them.

The interpretation of terms in philological and encyclopedic dictionaries is different, the definition is not related to what the object is. Representation of the same unit in different types of dictionaries is considered at different levels of knowledge. If the encyclopedic dictionary focuses on expressing the modern position of the term (the current scientific view), the philological dictionary is the opposite. Because the philological (general) dictionary has two tasks: first, it should serve as a means of providing information. Secondly, the dictionary reflects the "typical" knowledge of the language society of the time in which it lives.

In some cases, there may be no difference between the scientific definitions and the meaning (interpretation) used in everyday life. Such a situation occurs among historical terms.

Conclusion

Thus, encyclopedic and philological dictionaries differ in interpretation and quality of material. A terminological dictionary differs from other dictionaries in its compositional structure: the main, supplementary part, the rule of classification of the dictionary article, and the systematic presentation of the special lexical information sheet are very important. Encyclopedic vocabulary composition is manifested in mega-, macro-, media- and micro structures. General, partial, operational, combinational, link provider, description of the term, encyclopedic definition differ in in Tepminography.

The bibliography

1. Берков В.П. Заметки об определениях терминов в филологических и энциклопедических словарях / Проблематика определений терминов в словарях разных типов. Под. ред. С.Бархударова, В.Петушкова, Ф.Сороколетова. − Ленинград: Наука, 1976. − 267 с. – С. 114.
2. Журавлев Ф.В. По поводу определений в формальной логике, в сборниках рекомендуемых терминов, терминологических стандартах, толковых словарях и энциклопедиях / Проблематика определений терминов в словарях разных типов. Под. ред. С.Бархударова, В.Петушкова, Ф.Сороколетова. − Ленинград: Наука, 1976. − 267 с. – С. 114.
3. Кутина Л.Л. Термин в филологических словарях (к антитезе: энциклопедическое − филологическое) / Проблематика определений терминов в словарях разных типов. Под. ред. С.Бархударова, В.Петушкова, Ф.Сороколетова. − Ленинград: Наука, 1976. − 267 с. – С. 19-20.

4. Петушков В.П., Сергеев В.Н. О классификации словарей / Проблематика определений терминов в словарях разных типов. Под. ред. С.Бархударова, В.Петушкова, Ф.Сороколетова. − Ленинград: Наука, 1976. − 267 с. − 13-14-б.

5. Щерба Л.В. Опыт общей теории лексикографии / Щерба Л.В. Избранные работы по языкознанию и фонетике. − т. 1. − Л., 1958.

6. https://www.ruthenia.ru/apr/textes/sherba/sherba9.htm