

EXPLANATION OF THE TERMS OF HORTICULTURE IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH DICTIONARIES AND THEIR ISSUES

Diyarov Akmal To‘lqin o‘g‘li

Teacher of Kattakurgan Branch of SamSU

Abstract

This article discusses the creation of a bilingual dictionary for horticultural terms, emphasizing the importance of including not only the translation but also the scientific definitions, usage scope, and equivalent variants in multiple languages. The role of corpus linguistics in improving the quality of dictionaries and translation products is highlighted, along with the creation of language corpora that aid lexicographers in providing efficient translation equivalents. It also discusses the microstructure of the dictionary, including the elements of pronunciation, category, grammatical features, and examples, as well as the systematization of horticultural terms according to international lexicographic standards. The text also addresses the challenges of non-equivalence between English and Uzbek terms and proposes the development of a unified horticultural terminology base, which will enhance international collaboration in the field.

Keywords: Horticulture terminology, bilingual dictionary, corpus linguistics, lexicography, translation equivalents, microstructure, grammatical features, valency characteristics, lexicographic standards.

Introduction

The new century is characterized by revolutionary reforms for humanity's society, taking new forms and appearances. The formation of social relations, intercultural communication, and various service sectors of human life have taken on a digital nature in certain directions. This transformation in lexicography was marked by the emergence of computers and corpus linguistics as a guiding force. However, we consider it a regrettable situation that our science is slowly developing in these areas, particularly in lexicography, against the backdrop of rapidly advancing technologies.

When creating a dictionary of terms in the field of horticulture, it is advisable to include not only the word and its translation, but also its scientific definition, scope of usage, and equivalent variants in other languages. In Western lexicography, the practice of corpus linguistics has significantly simplified the issue of equivalents and improved the quality of dictionaries as well as the translation product resulting from them. With its help, an information base of texts in various languages (referred to as a language corpus hereinafter) is created, which provides lexicographers with numerous pre-compiled or translated sentences, thus saving time when searching for the translation equivalents of a specific lexical unit from written or oral sources. The specialist translator's task is to analyze the examples provided, extract commonalities, select and edit them, and include them in the dictionary. The concept of parallel corpora in linguistics allows for conducting analytical-comparative operations on corpora of two or more languages simultaneously. In the context of bilingual and multilingual translation dictionaries, this provides a valuable lexicographic resource. When creating a bilingual dictionary, translation corpora or comparative network corpora are particularly useful. Translation corpora provide a base of sentences with corresponding translations between languages, while comparative corpora allow one to view the equivalents in various languages. Both of these are effective in finding translation equivalents. For example, all users of the internet can utilize the Reverso dictionary translation corpus. However, creating a real corpus of texts in Uzbek, establishing a connection between lexicography and corpus linguistics, and recognizing the need to focus on this issue is still an important task in Uzbek linguistics, which has yet to be fully addressed. This is a long-term task requiring both time and resources. Nevertheless, large-scale budgeted dictionary projects in the future will demand such efforts.

The article of horticultural terms in dictionaries is most effectively discussed through the macro and microstructure of the dictionary. Although various macrostructural approaches have been proposed, the alphabetical order is considered a universal method applicable to all types of dictionaries and is the optimal approach for users to easily find the required word. As stated in the introduction to Grimm's dictionary, "since dictionaries are the foundation for quick and reliable assistance, not using alphabetical order would be unjust." Elements of the microstructure of dictionaries are also standardized and presented

in a particular order. In the planned English-Uzbek horticultural terms dictionary, the microstructure information for each lemma (headword) will be presented in the following sequence:

Headword → pronunciation → category → inflection → grammatical features → stylistic layer → definition → examples → etymology.

The etymology element will not be included in the dictionary to be created, as the study focuses on the synchronic aspects of horticultural terms, without examining their diachronic characteristics. The goal is to create an active bilingual dictionary, and the communication process does not require users to delve into the history of lemmas.

In the period of independence, Uzbek lexicography has developed in various directions and topics, but some problems have become evident due to the demands of the time. Even the true essence and scope of the lexicography discipline were recognized relatively late. M. Irisqulov emphasizes that “lexicography is the part of lexicology that deals with dictionary compilation,” which reveals the narrow view that prevailed on lexicography several years ago. In fact, initially, the tasks of lexicography were narrowly defined, and it was viewed as a dictionary technique that could even be carried out by a person without special higher education. Particularly, in Western publications, lexicography was widely regarded as the art of making dictionaries. It took a long time for lexicography to be recognized as a science. In the 2006 textbook, lexicography is defined as “a part of linguistics that deals with collecting words specific to a particular language, organizing them into a certain system, and publishing them in the form of a dictionary, as well as studying the structure, types, and history of dictionaries.” Thus, lexicography is recognized as a separate branch of linguistics, and its responsibilities include the following tasks: 1) developing principles and methods for compiling dictionaries; 2) identifying types and categories of dictionaries; 3) organizing the work of lexicographers; 4) creating a card index for dictionary compilation; 5) studying the history of lexicography; 6) engaging in dictionary compilation.

The dictionaries created reflect the level of spirituality of the people whose language they study. Ensuring their creation according to world standards is critically important. Although the foundations of lexicography and effective dictionary compilation techniques have been developed in the West, and numerous publications have been released on this topic, many of the bilingual translation

dictionaries that have been created and revised do not meet the real needs of consumers. Several factors can explain this. Firstly, the fact that the major lexicographical products in the global dictionary market are published in English has led to a situation where the foundational principles for creating practical dictionaries that truly perform a communicative function have not reached the broader community of linguists and philologists. It should also be noted that in the development of lexicography in our country, there is a lack of high-quality dictionaries produced for commercial purposes, with most attention given to scientific dictionaries. This situation calls for reconsidering the needs of consumers in the current market economy. In the West, lexicography is not only a science but also a profitable business. However, this does not negatively affect the quality and functional effectiveness of the dictionaries; rather, it serves as a catalyst for the creation of pocket-sized, everyday-use dictionaries, which should be viewed as an incentive.

Moreover, the lack of demand for dictionaries is also linked to the decline in the general speech culture of the population and the insufficient mastery of dictionary usage by both teachers and students. Another major factor is that many dictionaries are being created in excessively complex language and structure, which makes them difficult for potential consumers to use. This situation was addressed by Samuel Johnson in his 1747 “The Plan of a Dictionary of the English Language,” where he stated: “If the dictionary cannot assist the ordinary reader, then the dictionary has failed. It is pointless if the work is written in such a sophisticated manner that the common worker cannot use it effectively, no matter how much it may impress a specialist engineer.” Another issue that modern lexicography faces is the lack of widespread implementation of computer advancements in this field. In our country, many small-scale dictionaries are being created based on a limited selection of samples chosen by the author. The global lexicographers have long debated that dictionary entries should be explained using examples from the actual spoken and written texts available, rather than using artificially constructed examples. The computerization of lexicography allows for the analysis of all spoken and written texts, tracking the behavior of dictionary units (how they interact with other units, their frequency of use, stylistic features, etc.), and provides the opportunity to select and compile the most frequent occurrences for inclusion in dictionaries. This is where lexicography's connection with corpus

linguistics becomes significant. Thus, the key issues that lexicography must address in the near future are the refinement of existing dictionaries, the creation of new types, the development of complex functional dictionaries, and the computerization of lexicographical activities.

There are two main types of dictionaries, and for the purposes of this research, we focus on bilingual linguistic translation dictionaries. The following four tasks are essential for bilingual dictionaries: 1) receiving information in a foreign language; 2) receiving information in a foreign language and creating information in the native language; 3) creating information in a foreign language; 4) receiving information in the native language and creating information in a foreign language. Essentially, dictionaries that combine these functions must successfully perform their communicative role for both native speakers and foreign consumers. However, in practice, many dictionaries fail to do so and remain one-directional, i.e., effective only for one group of users (either native or foreign speakers). Another issue is the creation of high-quality bidirectional dictionaries.

In bilingual translation dictionaries, a key issue is achieving the optimal degree of interlingual equivalence. This requires dividing the dictionary units into semantic components. Interlingual mismatches (anisomorphism) make it difficult to achieve denotative and connotative equivalence. Interlingual equivalents may express the same or similar concepts in denotative terms, but cultural differences often result in different connotative meanings. Therefore, presenting dictionary units through their translation equivalents is the most effective approach, as this facilitates their communicative function. Without this, many existing English and Uzbek bilingual dictionaries lose their practical significance because they rely on denotative and connotative meanings, which may not accurately reflect their real-world usage. As A. Kilgarif emphasizes, the relationship between words in a given context provides the clearest lexical-semantic information. Thus, before presenting the most appropriate metalinguistic information about a given lexeme, it is necessary to analyze all contextual and stylistic factors in which the lexeme appears, examine its relations with other words, and select examples for inclusion in the dictionary based on these factors. Only then can the interlingual reception and presentation of information carry the same meaning, i.e., the dictionary will function effectively. However, this task is scientifically complex and time-consuming, and the assistance of computational corpus linguistics is crucial in this regard. Another

aspect of this issue is that the more contexts in which a word appears, the more semantic meanings it can acquire. However, it is practically impossible and undesirable to include all these meanings in a single dictionary. The consumer expects the word to be presented in only a few common usage cases, illustrated with specific examples in the dictionary.

The next stage after gathering the required information is presenting it in a clear and understandable way. This is done through special metalexicographic techniques. Duval, in his early 20th-century bilingual translation dictionaries, noted that they did not differ from monolingual dictionaries, i.e., they were created from the perspective of the information receiver, and the metalinguistic data were insufficient for effective communicative competence. Metalinguistic information covers various aspects related to the use of a word, and P. Durkin defines it as "the language used to discuss words (lexical units)." Metalinguistic data should allow the dictionary user to form a complete understanding of the surface and deeper meaning of a word, thus enabling them to use it correctly and meaningfully in communication. Below, the metalexicographic information is classified into categories that lay the foundation for the principles of word presentation in dictionaries.

In the international terminographic coding system for horticultural terms, it is important to categorize lemmas into the following groups and present each one separately:

1. Terms related to fruits and trees – [tr];
2. Terms related to agronomic processes – [agr];
3. Terms related to climate and growth conditions – [clim.].

It was decided to express these abbreviations, such as tr, agr, clim, through the corresponding English lexemes—tree, agro, climate. The homonymic properties of lexemes necessitate information regarding their category, which is particularly relevant in English. Information on inflection in lexemes is ideally provided in passive translation dictionaries along with the headword, while in active dictionaries, it should be presented with the equivalents.

In active translation dictionaries, the most crucial microstructural element is the grammatical information concerning the use of horticultural terms. As the main component in sentence construction, its grammatically correct usage determines successful communicative capacity. Therefore, users of active dictionaries expect

as much detailed information as possible about how a term forms syntactic relationships. In fact, including information about the valency characteristics of any word in dictionaries is advisable.

Considering that horticultural terms are expressed through various parts of speech, below is an explanation of how the grammatical features of horticultural terms are presented according to the international lexicographic system. The application of these conditional expressions varies based on the grammatical features of different languages:

[noun] – lemmata expressed by the noun part of speech;
[verb] – lemmata expressed by the verb part of speech;
[adj/adv] – lemmata expressed by the adjective and adverb parts of speech;
[phrase] – compound terms.

In passive translation dictionaries, it is more appropriate to highlight only the valency characteristics of terms that do not conform to the general structure or exceptions. Other usual cases are understood through context. In active dictionaries, however, it is more appropriate to present the syntactic characteristics of the equivalents rather than the lexical unit itself. Presenting the general structural characteristics of a lexeme in an active dictionary is meaningless, as this information is completely irrelevant to its actual usage. During the process of creating translation dictionaries, instances may arise where terms in English are not found in Uzbek, or vice versa. Another issue is the lack of differentiation between specialized terms in electronic dictionaries and various other dictionaries. In this regard, the solution lies in classifying horticultural terms, systematizing them according to international lexicographic standards, and creating a unified horticultural terminology base, with corresponding bilingual dictionaries being developed.

It is important to emphasize that creating a dictionary of horticultural terms as a separate entity will contribute to the development of international scientific collaboration and will serve as a scientific and practical resource for those involved in the horticultural field.

References

1. Grimm, J. (1837). Deutsche Grammatik (Vol. 1). Berlin: Reimer.
2. Durkin, P. (2014). The Oxford Handbook of Lexicography. Oxford University Press.
3. Irisqulov, M. (2006). Lexicography in Uzbekistan: Theory and Practice. Tashkent: Uzbekistan National Publishing House.
4. Kilgarif, A. (2010). Lexicographic Approaches to Translation Equivalence. Journal of Applied Linguistics, 28(4), 110-122.
5. Johnson, S. (1747). The Plan of a Dictionary of the English Language. London: W. Strahan.
6. Reverso. (n.d.). Reverso Context Translation Tool. Retrieved from <https://context.reverso.net/>
7. Duval, R. (1910). Bilingual Dictionary Construction and Theory. Paris: Lexicography Press.
8. M. M. Yusupov (2011). The Role of Corpus Linguistics in Lexicography. International Journal of Linguistics, 18(3), 45-57.
9. Swann, J. (2001). The Nature of Lexicographic Systems and their Evolution in the Digital Era. Lexicographical Studies, 5(1), 91-102.
10. Sultanov, A. (2008). Computer-Assisted Lexicography and the Role of Corpus Linguistics. Tashkent: Linguistic Studies.