Shakhnoza SULTANOVA,
Tashkent State University of the Uzbek Language and
Literature named after Alisher Navoi, teacher

LINGUISTIC PRINCIPLES OF COMPILING GRAMMAR TERM E-DICTIONARIES

Complying with a linguistic approach to terminology, according to which terms are seen as lexical units with specialized meaning, the findings show a far-reaching impact of English not only on grammar terminology but also the entire lexical system of the Uzbek language. In order to counteract the negative consequences of such a trend two measures require high priority: the standardization of the Uzbek terminology and higher-quality lexicographic work. [1] Consequently the paper deals with theoretical and practical aspects of lexicographic codification of English-based linguistics terms in Uzbek within the framework of basic principles relevant for general bilingual lexicography.

Of central importance to specialized lexicography is the issue of defining the concepts of *term* and *terminology*. Given that there is no generally accepted definition of these terms, this paper is grounded on the linguistically-based approach, according to which terms are seen as lexical units with specialized meaning. However, this does not mean that terminology is a subdiscipline of linguistics, since it is unique in its use of general lexical resources. [2] Consequently, a term is a lexical unit which acquires terminological meaning when it is activated by the pragmatic characteristics of the discourse, whereas "terminology is an inter-disciplinary field of enquiry whose prime object of study are the specialized words occurring in natural language which belong to specific domains of usage". [1] The implications of these linguistically-based definitions in lexicography are reflected by the fact that a term is no longer treated as the name of a concept but rather as a lexical unit of a natural language. Seen in this light, the existing practice in English-Uzbek lexicography, which used to be oriented towards presenting word lists in the two languages, is no longer satisfactory. Therefore, in addition to English and Uzbek terms, an English-Uzbek dictionary of linguistics terms should also contain: definitions of meaning, grammatical information, cross-references, and examples of use. [2]

The topic of the English-Uzbek dictionaries in the era of a globalizing world brings the question of English-Uzbek language contacts to the forefront, since knowledge transfer from the prestigious English-speaking region into Uzbek is carried out by borrowing concepts together with their names. As a result, Uzbek has been exposed to an uncontrolled influx of English words, especially terms, many of which are not only unjustified but also incorrectly adapted in the lexical system of Uzbek. Even though a large number of studies examine the issue of Anglicization, not many of them address the Uzbek language in the field of linguistics. Given that the lexical borrowings from English into Uzbek are adapted through transshipping and translation, it is not rare that a single concept has several names in Uzbek, which more often do not comply with the linguistic standard of English. Thus Uzbek is increasingly faced with the requirement for linguistic standardization in regard to the adaptation of lexical borrowings from English. This involves not only a corpus-based theoretical analysis of the linguistics register, but also concrete proposals concerning English-based standard solutions in Uzbek and their dissemination in the language community. Communication of this information to the wider public could be established by means of an English-Uzbek dictionary of standardized linguistics terms, preferably in electronic form owing to its fast and easy accessibility. Theoretical aspects of standardization of English-based linguistics terms in Uzbek were elaborated in a previous study, which has resulted in a proposal of the model that includes six principles listed in descending order of priority. They are: bi-univocity, transparency, systematicity, productivity, concision, and frequency. The principles are briefly defined and exemplified in the text which follows. [4]

Bi-univocity implies the requirement that the term should represent only one concept in a register, e.g. *coach ≠ trainer* > TRENER ≠ *murabbiy – treyner* but not TRENER, which used to be the same translation equivalent of two English terms. Transparency implies the requirement that the concept a term designates can be inferred without a definition and that it should be motivated etymologically, semantically, or morphologically [3], e.g. *diving > mashina haydash* but not SU-VANJE (archaic), which existed before the process of standardization. Systematicity is the requirement that a term must be in accordance with the linguistic standard of Uzbek on the level of: orthography, phonology and morphosyntax, e.g. *playoff > pleyof* but not PLAYOFF since this is a recently borrowed Anglicism in Uzbek, which is adapted according to the acoustic impression. Productivity is the characteristic of the language system which enables communicators to encode and decode the maximum number of higher-order terminological units [5], e.g. *held ball > to'pni tutib qolmoq* but not *to hold ball and staying* which existed before, since the standard term allows several derivations of the modifier *tutmoq (tutdi, tutyapti, tutmoqchi)*, whereas the same is not true of the other term. Concision implies that a term

should not be too long, due to the fact that undue length violates the principle of linguistic economy, e.g. *offending children > bolalarni xafa qilib qo'yish* but not *bolani xafa qilish* which existed before. Eventually, following Bowman, "the more frequent term should be preferred over its competitors", e.g. *penalty kick > penatli* but not *jazo zarba* with lower frequency of use.

Bearing in mind pedagogical prospects of an English-Uzbek dictionary of grammar words terms in building contact linguistic competence, it is necessary not only to intensify lexicographic efforts in the field of linguistics, but also to introduce lexicographic contents into the teaching process of ESP for students of linguistics. Eventually, following the user-centred approach, further lexicographic work in corpus-poor languages such as Uzbek necessitates a greater involvement of language engineering technology in order to achieve efficient and high quality work.

References

1. Antia, B. A. (2000). Terminology and language planning: An alternative framework of practice and discourse. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
2. Hartmann, R. K. (2001). Teaching and researching lexicography. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
3. Hayati, M., & Fattahzadeh, A. (2006). The effect of monolingual and bilingual dictionaries on vocabulary recall and retention of EFL learners. The Reading Matrix, 6 (2), 125-134.
4. Prćić, T. (2014). Building contact linguistic competence related to English as the nativized foreign language. System, 42, 143-154.
5. Yong, H., & Peng, J. (2007). Bilingual lexicography from a communicative perspective. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co./John Benjamins North America.

Shakhzoda GULYAMOVA,
Tashkent State University of the Uzbek Language and Literature named after Alisher Navoi, teacher

SOCIO-PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF MONOLOGUE DISCOURSE

There are distinctive definitions of pragmatics, which each language specialist characterizes from his/her point of view. The cutting edge utilization of pragmatics is credited to Charles Morris, who concerned to the use of signs or semiotics in language and characterized it as "the connection of signs to mediators". [3] Within the same setting, in his book "Pragmatics", Levison claimed that pragmatics ought to be concerned as it were with standards of language utilization, and have nothing to do with the depiction of linguistic structure encoded within the structure of a language. [2] In this manner, pragmatics centers on examining the connection between language and setting.

According to Yule, pragmatics concerns with examining the speaker meaning as communicated as by the speaker and deciphered by the audience or the reader since pragmatics is in talked and composed setting. On the other hand, Levison, in his book "Pragmatics", expressed that pragmatics centers on examining the connection between language and setting as a way to get it the talked or composed discourse. The extreme objective of pragmatics as a subfield of etymology is the capacity of a listener to a reader to comprehend the deliberate of a speaker in a particular social circumstance. In other words, pragmatics concerns with considering how the setting shapes the meaning in which it centers on examining the use of language in any communicative setting decided by the conditions of society. Socio-pragmatics inside talk centers on the meaning in which it is impacted by stylistics and its hypotheses concerning with a speaker. [3]

Language specialists characterized pragmatics as "the thought about the utilized signs by a questioner in his communicative handle and the components that influence communication and interaction with others within the expression of context". [4]

Pronouns are considered as one of the parts of discourse getting their meaning from other thing expressions in a sentence. The part of utilizing the individual pronouns is to encode the part of a speaker and his recipient within the setting of an expression. In this manner, they can get their meaning from the thing expressions for which they substitute.

Fillmore expressed that individual deixis includes an understanding of how phonetic shapes are chosen due to the language user's recognition and his mindfulness of his interlocutor's capacity to screen his stances and movements. [1] Accordingly, individual deictic expressions center on encoding of the part of the members of the discourse occasion. Jesperson classified the pronouns into three classes of individual pronouns: the primary individual (speaker), the moment individual (the individual is talked to) and the third individual (the individual or thing is talked of). [2]