

## **Fundamentals of Creating an Electronic Encyclopedic Dictionary of Linguistic Terms**

**Shahobiddinova Shohida Hoshimovna**

Doctor of philology, professor, Andijan State University, Uzbekistan

**Rustamova Dilrabo Abdurakhimovna**

PhD, Associate Professor. Andijan State University, Uzbekistan

**Miralimova Shahzoda Khasanboevna**

Teacher, master, Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages, Uzbekistan

**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, linguoculturalology, have not been sufficiently studied not only in Uzbek, but also in world linguistics. 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 For example, the term root has been replaced by the term base, with very active use.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.

### **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.

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.

## **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".

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.

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.

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.

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.Петушкива, 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.Петушкиова, 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.Петушкиова, Ф.Сороколетова. – Ленинград: Наука, 1976. – 267 с. – С. 19-20.
4. Петушкиов В.П., Сергеев В.Н. О классификации словарей / Проблематика определений терминов в словарях разных типов. Под. ред. С.Бархударова, В.Петушкиова, Ф.Сороколетова. – Ленинград: Наука, 1976. – 267 с. – 13-14-6.
5. Щерба Л.В. Опыт общей теории лексикографии / Щерба Л.В. Избранные работы по языкоznанию и фонетике. – т. 1. – Л. 1958.
6. <https://www.ruthenia.ru/apr/textes/sherba/sherba9.htm>