

The concept of compiling translation dictionaries at the turn of the 20th - 21st centuries

Aglamov Tohir Khusayinovich

Bukhara State University

ABSTRACT

The article gives a critical analysis of the original approaches of modern leading Russian lexicographers towards the development of an optimal model of a monolingual dictionary.

Key words: *dictionary, lexically oriented reference work, lexicographic parametrization, lexicography, lexicology, type of dictionary, typology of dictionaries, word.*

Introduction

A fairly detailed and quite generally accepted definition of a dictionary in Russian linguistics is presented in an article in LES, compiled by V.G. Gak, who interprets the dictionary as a reference book, which includes words, as well as morphemes, idioms and phrases that are arranged in a certain order (different for different types of dictionaries), reveals the meanings of these units, accompanying them with information about both the units themselves and the objects named by them [7, p. 462]. Perhaps, relying on the above definition, A.S. Gerd proposed a shorter, but very capacious definition of a dictionary: "A dictionary is a collection of units of a natural or artificial language, usually supplied with one or another semantic information and arranged in a certain order (more often in alphabetical or ideographic "[1, p. 202]. However, the characteristic of the dictionary as a source of additional information about the units described in it and the fragments of reality lying behind them, which is contained in the definition of VG Gak, is not noted here.

In this regard, it should be noted that the named characteristic of the dictionary is emphasized in the interpretation of this concept by N.G. Karaulov. The researcher emphasizes that the dictionary is a convenient form of generalization and fixation of knowledge both about all linguistic units in their statics and dynamics, retrospective and perspective, and about the "picture of the world" in all its diversity. This indicates that the initial concept of a dictionary as a work in which words are registered and their meanings are interpreted is blurred, which indirectly explains the known imperfections of existing dictionary typologies [6, p. 140141].

At the same time, the dictionary can also be presented in other terms, since it simultaneously acts as not only an object of lexicography practice, or, more broadly, lexicographic activity (semantic inventory of a language or sublanguage), but also a subject of study in the theory of lexicography. Dictionaries are intended for both linguistic and extralinguistic purposes. Based on this idea, lexicography in the broadest sense encompasses the whole set, or the totality of inventories of linguistic units, together with the information that is attributed to them through an inventory of semantic facts, or the compilation of a known set of semantic inventories - dictionaries. Semantic inventory is a list of all semantic objects related to a certain class and registered with a given accuracy and explicitness by means of a given

metalanguage, ordered in a known manner, and characterized by the uniformity of the fixed objects, the completeness of their coverage, the uniformity of the degree of their description, the same distinguishability using the metalanguage of their description [2, p. 5, 7, 9, 12-14]. In another term, a dictionary as a reference book containing linguistic units systematized in a certain way and information about them is a product of national culture and an achievement of science at a certain stage in the development of a given society, fixing the level of development of production, as well as philosophical, religious, political and scientific and technical thoughts of that ethnic group, which is the bearer of the language registered in the dictionary, and acts as a vector of the ideology of society and social institution, regulating the use of words and the life of this language within the accepted linguistic norm, being a reference book on the culture of speech [5, p. 16-17, 19, 125].

A dictionary can also be considered as a special text, the creation of which is a certain process of forming a known thought or a whole complex of thoughts as ideal entities, which occurs in three discrete stages: (1) a thought / a complex of thoughts ^ (2) a word as an object of lexicographic description ^ (3) a dictionary as a complex of verbal and non-verbal signs, embodied in the form of a book or in electronic form [3, p. 272]. Moreover, in continuation of the above idea, the dictionary can also be interpreted as a collection of autonomous intertext units - dictionary entries, where the intertext is understood as "a set of invariant features, the allocation of which makes it possible to establish relations of derivational community between segments of the content structure of different texts (their fragments, representatives) "[9, p. 580].

Summarizing the above, the following are the most essential features of the dictionary as a special linguistic phenomenon:

1) in the aspect of terminology, a dictionary is a reference book, a collection of linguistic units, a form of generalization and recording of knowledge about all linguistic units, a set of inventories of linguistic units, a work of national culture and the achievement of science, a special text as a complex of verbal and non-verbal signs, a collection of autonomous intertext units ;

2) in the aspect of the content of the concept, which is indicated by the above terms, the dictionary contains all types of linguistic units - morphemes, words, phraseological units, paremias, which are arranged in a certain order and are provided with semantic information both about themselves and about the fragments lying behind them reality, generalizing and fixing, thereby, knowledge about the "picture of the world" in the system of semantic inventories, representing information about the philosophical, religious, political and scientific-technical thought of the corresponding ethnic group, acting as a vector of the ideology of society and as a social institution that is designed to regulate life of this language and form complexes of thoughts in the form of a text as a result of the process of intertextual derivation of dictionary entries.

In Uzbek linguistics, in addition to the generally accepted term "lukat" (dictionary), the broader term "tavsiya ethylgan lukatlar" "lexical recommended work (dictionaries)" is also noted, which roughly corresponds to the Russian term "lexicographic reference book". This interpretation practically unites all the essential differential features of the dictionary as a linguistic phenomenon summarized above. But the dictionaries of the Uzbek lexicography do not have such an interpretation and definition. Most of the dictionaries of the Uzbek language are called simply dictionaries (lukat) for their intended purpose.

All of the above allows you to move on to the concept of "type of dictionary". Obviously, the typologization of dictionaries, like any other linguistic and linguistic phenomena, should be based on the sum of their essential differential characteristics that form the type of dictionary, which, however, should not be identified with the names of the dictionaries themselves, although such names may reflect the characteristics of the dictionary or the whole a number of its properties. In this regard, the approaches of the following well-known theorists and practitioners of modern lexicography - Yu. N. Karaulov, B. Yu. Gorodetsky, A. S. Gerda and V. V. Dubichinsky and V. V. Morkovkin.

From the general lexicographic approach of Yu. N. Karaulov to the interpretation of the type of dictionary, the most significant are the following theoretical positions, which we set out in the logical order we have adopted [6, p. 142-143, 146, 151-153].

The content of the concept "type of dictionary" needs to be clarified, since, firstly, the concept of a dictionary itself is also rather vague, and, secondly, the dominant characteristic of the dictionary, on the basis of which the type of dictionary should be determined, is not quite clear. Moreover, in most of the existing typologies of dictionaries, this dominant typologizing characteristic, as a rule, coincides with the names of dictionaries in their given classification. In other words, many of the proposed typologies of dictionaries are to a large extent nothing more than a typology of the names of these dictionaries. At the same time, it is obvious that the information contained in dictionaries of different types partially overlaps or overlaps, and the areas of intersection of lexicographic information in different types of dictionaries can be very significant, which complicates their typology. All this makes it legitimate to ask about the "minimum unit of linguistic information", or about the "parameter of the linguistic structure," or about the "lexicographic parameter," which should be reflected in the dictionary. The solution to this issue will make it possible to carry out the lexicographic parametrization of the language and, in this regard, to provide a meaningful basis for the typology of dictionaries based on the "calculus of lexicographic possibilities" of the dictionary, which is realized in the understanding of the type of the dictionary as a combination of its certain lexicographic parameters. Then it is possible, by means of such techniques as "morphological box" and "discovery matrix", that is, the basis of the dictionary, to construct new types of dictionaries, selecting from the entire system of established lexicographic parameters that set of them that will most optimally correspond to the predetermined target settings of the dictionary.

To solve these problems, it is advisable to proceed from the definition of a lexicographic parameter as a quantum of lexicographic information, acting in combination with other information quanta (lexicographic parameters), having a meaning, depth of disclosure, a way of its assignment and receiving a specific expression in the dictionary. Here, in a centripetal sense, it is possible to combine all the identified independent lexicographic parameters to create one universal dictionary of a given language; in the centrifugal plan, the construction of language dictionaries based on only one parameter. For the lexicographic parameterization of the language, a set of 65 possible parameters is proposed, on the basis of which it is possible to create a universal dictionary of the Russian language, of which the following are most relevant for ethnosociolexicography: language, entry into the dictionary (alphabetical, semantic, etc.), chronological, spelling, stress, pronunciation, part of speech, number, degrees of comparison of adjectives, kind of verb, transitivity, control, voice, other moods, past tense, morphological division of a word, derivational, abbreviations, ambiguity-unambiguity, semantheme (semantic equivalent, definition), areal, syntagmatic (free compatibility) and phraseological (non-free

compatibility), lexical compatibility, illustrative, stylistic, emotional-evaluative, normative (parameter of permissible variability), statistical (frequency), linguo-historical (history of the word), linguistic and regional (ethnocultural-historical), onomastic, terminological cue, etymological (genetic), borrowing, synonymous, antonymic, paronymic, associative, semantic field, thematic group, bibliographic (indicating research on a given word), lexicographic (indicating dictionaries containing information about a given word) parameters.

In this approach, all positions are important for sociolexicography and ethnosociolexicography, but the most significant is the following statement: the basis of the typology of dictionaries should be based on the calculus of the lexicographic possibilities of the dictionary, which is realized in the understanding of the type of the dictionary as a combination of its certain lexicographic parameters, where the lexicographic parameter is a quantum of lexicographic information that gets a specific expression in the dictionary. This leaves the opportunity both to create new types of dictionaries and to find their place in classifications.

To a certain extent, the opinion of B. Yu. Gorodetsky adjoins the position of Yu. N. Karaulov, who notes the need to develop an integral system of requirements for a dictionary and the possibility of calculating them, which can serve as a basis for the classification of dictionaries. At the same time, the range of such dictionary information should go beyond the definition as the core of dictionary information and cover all system-linguistic, conceptual-logical and comparative-typological information about the word. In this regard, and within the framework of the above definition of the dictionary given by B. Yu. Gorodetsky, the author proposes a number of typological features that characterize the information presented in dictionaries and outline a solution to the problem of the validity of this lexicographic information. Let us present them in the logical format we have adopted: 1) the type of information about the unit of the dictionary description: a) only formal; b) formal and semantic; 2) the type of semantic inventory of the language, reflected in the dictionary: A) information of the morphosemantic level: a) in the paradigmatic aspect, b) in the syntagmatic aspect; B) information of the lexical-semantic level: a) in the paradigmatic aspect, b) in the syntagmatic aspect; 3) vocabulary: a) normative, b) descriptive; 4) the chronological period covered by the dictionary; 5) the type of the linguistic form reflected in the dictionary: a) the entire language as a whole, b) a separate socio-territorial sublanguage or sublanguages; 6) the degree of coverage of the lexical system of the language or sublanguage; 7) the type and amount of grammatical information supplied to the registered language units; 8) types of stylistic labels used in the dictionary; 9) types of interpretations used in the dictionary: a) definitions, b) definitions; 10) the presence or absence of encyclopedic information in the dictionary; 11) the presence or absence of explanations of the motivation of the fixed unit; 12) the degree of accounting for semantic relations; 13) the presence or absence of examples illustrating the implementation of the described units in the context; 14) the presence or absence of an indication of the origin and history of the development of linguistic units; 15) the presence or absence of statistical data on the functioning of units and their values; 16) the order of arrangement of linguistic units in the dictionary corpus: a) according to the formal principle, b) according to the semantic principle; 17) the presence or absence of pointers in the dictionary; 18) the presence or absence of metalinguistic information in the dictionary (the history of the study of this unit, its various interpretations); 19) the presence or absence of genetic information about language units [2, p. 6-7].

B. Yu. Gorodetsky did not formulate the definition of the term "type of dictionary", nevertheless, his ideas, especially the typological features of dictionaries outlined by him, are also very important for socio-lexicography and ethno-socio-lexicography. At the same time, it should be noted that the following provision is the most significant here: the typologization of dictionaries should be based on the sum of all system-linguistic, conceptual and comparative-typological information about the word, which are reflected in the corresponding dictionary.

According to V.V.Dubichinsky, the concept of a dictionary type can be based on the nature and volume of the linguistic material presented in it, the goals and methods of its lexicographic description. In this regard, the author proposes the following definition of the lexicographic parameter - this is "the way (principle) of the dictionary description of the lexical unit; special dictionary representation of the structural features of the language "; or in a more detailed formulation: "the way of lexicographic interpretation of one or another structural element or functional phenomenon of the language and their extralinguistic correspondences." Developing his thought, the scientist notes that the problem of lexicographic parameters is directly related to the problem of lexicographic universals, since the complexes of lexicographic parameters personify, to a certain extent, the very universal way of registering and describing linguistic units in the dictionary. In this regard, the lexicographer suggests, following G. N. Sklyarevskaya, to distinguish all lexicographic or vocabulary parameters into theoretical, or conceptual, and empirical, or pragmatic. Theoretical lexicographic parameters are represented by the object of description, typological features of the dictionary, its place in the dictionary system and reflect the concept on the basis of which the dictionaries were created and built. Empirical lexicographic parameters, as the implementation of theoretical parameters, are determined by the latter and form the actual text of the dictionary; they cover the addressee of the dictionary, the rationale for its vocabulary, the chronological framework of texts, the standardization of the empirical base, its sources, functional and stylistic qualifications, principles of illustration, the amount of semantic information, the structure of the dictionary, etc. [4, p. 64; 6, p. 33].

V. V. Dubichinsky also did not formulate the definition of the term "type of dictionary". However, his idea is to base the concept of a dictionary type on the nature and volume of the linguistic material presented in it, the goals and methods of its lexicographic description, carried out, as we see it, also through the lexicographic parameter as a way of lexicographic interpretation of a known structural element or extralinguistic fact of linguistic functioning, and the subsequent the correlation of parameters with lexicographic universals, which makes it possible to distinguish all lexicographic parameters into conceptual and pragmatic ones, is a very significant addition to the ideas on typologization of dictionaries expressed by Yu. N. Karaulov and B. Yu. Gorodetsky.

In his interpretation of the concept of "type of dictionary", A.S. Gerd proceeds from the following, as he put it, undisputable postulates: 1) dictionaries are delimited into philological, describing words and other elements of a given language system, and encyclopedic, describing objects and concepts denoted by words and other linguistic units; 2) the units of the lexicographic description in the dictionary can be morpheme words, separate words, word combinations, abbreviations of words and word combinations and sentences; 3) units of the vocabulary description are supplied with known semantic information, which can be represented explicitly in the form of definitions and implicitly in thesauri, concordances, etc .; 4) the exclusion of one of the above postulates leads to the exclusion from the class of dictionaries of the corresponding dictionaries of both types named above. On this basis, the

author identifies the following 11 vocabulary-type features: 1) "a fairly simple and clear, visual observable general structure, the severity of the presentation of various features, parameters, aspects of the description of parameterization; potential reversibility of data even in book form: the presence of a number of entries in the dictionary text; 3) the structure of dictionary entries, the variety of forms and types of data presentation about a word (object); laconicism of metalanguage; 4) the ability to operate simultaneously with different data within the same book; 5) the ability to selectively refer to individual parameters without detailed entry into the entire text of the dictionary; 6) a high degree of formalization of the entire structure, which facilitates the transfer of the dictionary to a computer; 7) consistency, type of dictionary classification of the material; a vocabulary is a combination of macrostructure and microstructure; 8) an abundance of encyclopedic information in compressed form; 9) the variety of the description parameters themselves; 10) the ability to show different types of connections between facts, objects; 11) freedom of vocabulary "[1, p. 201-202]. In this regard, the scientist sees the specifics of a dictionary as a type of data representation in its structure and metalanguage, not in the very characteristic of the described unit, but in how this characteristic is presented in a book called a dictionary, that is, in different types of dictionaries. In his approach, A.S. Gerd also did not formulate a clear definition of the concept of "type of dictionary", however, taking into account the 11 features of the dictionary type, the structure of the dictionary, its metalanguage, and the way of describing the linguistic unit significantly complement the understanding of the dictionary type.

The interpretation of A.S. Gerd is closely related to the basis of the genre-typological classification of dictionaries proposed by V.V. Morkovkin, which shows the specifics of the description of the material in the dictionary and involves taking into account the following 8 signs of the dictionary type: 1) the general target setting of lexicography, its prevailing orientation - (a) predominantly linguocentric dictionaries and (b) predominantly anthropocentric dictionaries; 2) measures of the aspectual diversity of the information registered in the dictionary - (a) multi-aspect dictionaries (for example, explanatory) and (b) aspect dictionaries (for example, synonymous); 3) methods of detecting or presenting information - (a) explanatory dictionaries (for example, monolingual explanatory) and (b) demonstrating dictionaries (for example, ideographic); 4) the type of speech activity, which is provided by the dictionary or which the dictionary is aimed at - (a) dictionaries of the receptive (passive) type, (b) dictionaries of the productive (active) type, (c) dictionaries of the receptive-productive type; 5) measures of showing the history of the language units described in the dictionary - (a) diachronic and (b) synchronous dictionaries; 6) the nature of the arrangement or presentation of units in the dictionary - (a) formally ordered dictionaries (alphabetic - direct and reverse), (b) meaningfully ordered dictionaries (ideographic and nested); 7) the way of existence of the dictionary - (a) stand-alone dictionaries (published in a separate book) and (b) included dictionaries (dismembered and undivided in the text of the printed publication); 8) attitudes towards other media training dictionaries - (a) independent and (b) incorporated educational dictionaries [8, p. 33-36].

In his approach, V.V. Morkovkin also did not give a direct definition of the concept of "type of dictionary", however, the 8 features of a dictionary type proposed by him very significantly complement the understanding of a dictionary type.

Completing the analysis of interpretations of the concept of "type of dictionary", we can recognize the legitimacy of constructing a definition of this concept on the basis of the above-specified concepts of "lexicographic parameter" and "attribute of a dictionary type" we have adopted and consider the type

of dictionary as a set of leading lexicographic parameters that act as differential features of a specific dictionary, which this dictionary fully answers.

A number of these parameters are very significant, but finite and quantifiable. The creation of a complete list of lexicographic parameters for the formation of a universal dictionary of the literary language is the task of a special study in the field of the theory of general lexicography, in the theory and practice of sociolexicography and ethnosociolexicography.

List of references

1. Герд А. С. К определению понятия «словарь» // Проблемы лексикографии: Сб. ст. / под ред. А. С. Герда и В. Н. Сергеева. - СПб.: Изд-во СПбГУ, 1997. - С. 191-203.
2. Городецкий Б. Ю. Проблемы и методы современной лексикографии // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. - М.: Прогресс, 1983. - Вып. XIV. Проблемы и методы лексикографии. - С. 5-22.
3. Григорович Л. Современное состояние и тенденции развития учебной лексикографии // Грани слова: Сборник научных статей к 65-летию проф. В. М. Мокиенко. -М.: Эллис, 2005. - С. 265-274.
4. Дубичинский В. В. Искусство создания словарей: Конспекты по лексикографии. - Харьков: ХПУ, 1994.
5. Дубичинский В. В. Теоретическая и прикладная лексикография. - Вена; Харьков: Gesellschaft fur Forderung slawistischer Studien, 1998.
6. Караулов Ю. Н. Об одной тенденции в современной лексикографической практике // Русский язык. Проблемы художественной речи. Лексикология и лексикография. Виноградовские чтения. IX-X. - М.: Наука, 1981. - С. 135-153.
7. Сидоренко К. П. Интертекст в жаргонографии // Слово в словаре и дискурсе: Сб. научн. ст. к 50-летию Харри Вальтера. - М.: Эллис, 2006. - С. 580-583.
8. 8.Khodjayeva N. S., Mamurova D. I., Nafisa A. IMPORTANCE IN PEDAGOGICAL TECHNIQUES AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITY //International Engineering Journal For Research & Development. – 2020. – Т. 5. – №. CONGRESS. – С. 5-5.
9. 9.Мамурова Д. И., Мамурова Ф. И. Соотношения навыков черчения с опытом психологического исследования //Вестник по педагогике и психологии Южной Сибири. – 2015. – №. 1.
10. 10. Salimovich, Sharipov Sohib, and Nematova Mohibegim Fazliddinovna. "Dictionaries in Modern Life." International Journal on Integrated Education 2.6: 166-168.
11. 11. S Sharipov. Modern Scientific challenges and trends, 34-37; INNOVATIVE METHODS AND APPROACHES IN VOCABULARY TEACHING