

## On the Definition of Technical Terms and Terminological Dictionaries

Abdullaeva Fotima Bakhromovna,<sup>1</sup> Rasulova Zukhra Bakhromovna,<sup>2</sup> Isarov Oman  
Risaliyevich<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2,3</sup> Jizzakh State Pedagogical Institute, Uzbekistan1

### Abstract

*The article analyzes the existing shortcomings and flaws in the field of linguistics, in particular, the definition of technical terms and the problems related to terminological dictionaries. Such concepts as professional words, professionalisms, special vocabulary, terminological system, terminological lexicon, technical terminology are elucidated and the differences among them are singled out. The authors' personal definition for the technical term has also been formulated.*

**Keywords:** *terminology, term, definition, dictionary, lexicon, profession, occupation, professionalism, technical, system, expression (denotation), synonymy.*

### 1 Introduction:

One of the contentious issues that has been debated so far is to determine which professions' and occupations' "property" should be considered as a term and which professions' and occupations' "property" should not be considered as a term.

In defining the term, A.A.Reformatskiy concludes that "terms are special words" [1]. The Dictionary of the Russian Language (Vol. IV) defines the term as "a word (or a combination of words) that can serve as a clear expression of certain concepts in a particular field of science, technology, art, social life, etc." [2]. Proceeding from the definitions analyzed out of other similar sources, it is clear that the term is a special word. Therefore, it is assumed that only the terms applied in the fields of science, technology, manufacturing, etc., may obtain the status of a term. For example, the linguist A.V. Kalinin regards the words used in certain disciplines, professions as "a special vocabulary" and divides it into two groups: "1. Special vocabulary includes, first of all, terms. A term is a word or combination of words that is used in technical, agricultural, and other fields" [3]; "2. In addition to terms, special vocabulary includes professionalism" [4].

The principle of dividing the "special lexicon" into two groups in the same way is applied in Uzbek linguistics. For example: "The terms refer to concepts related to science and technology, as well as to concepts related to the profession. Accordingly, the terms can be broadly divided into two major types: professional terms and scientific terms" [5].

"Words pertinent to a profession are called professionalism, and the sum of professionalisms is called professional vocabulary".

"The term is a word or a fixed expression that denotes a specific concept in the field of science, technology, art" [6].

One of the linguists D.K.Zelenin called the various tools involved in agriculture and in the household as "term-names" [7]. Moreover, in the works of such linguists as G.E.Kochin, M.A.Sokolova, F.G.Filin, E.N.Tolikina, M.I.Litvinova similar words are called terms and have been specially studied.

Although Prof. S.Ibragimov titled his works as “Professional Lexicon of Fergana Dialects”, in the course of his work he used folk terms, terms, word-terms, names. For example, when studying occupational terms in a thematic group, they are called: terms denoting raw materials, names of workplaces and equipment, names of furnace parts, terms referring to tools, terms referring to labor processes, terms referring to pottery, and etc. [8].

Other Uzbek terminologists often refer to these types of lexical units as word-terms [9]. The third type of languages is limited to call them just as names [10].

Prof. S.Usmanov, on the other hand, suggests calling all such lexical units as only professional lexicons and tries to prove that the terms are different from professional lexicons. He’s drawn a conclusion: “So it would be appropriate to separate professional words from terminological lexicon” [11].

A.V.Kalinin tries to justify the difference between the term and professionalism as follows: “The difference between the term and professionalism is that the term is an expression of a completely formal, accepted and legalized concept in a particular science, industry, agriculture, technology, name, professionalism and a profession is a semi-formal word that is often spoken in the living language among the professions, in fact, it does not have a firm, scientific description of the concept” [12].

If we apply these ideas in practice, for example, such words of the Uzbek language as *арава, омбир, кетмон, дам, кўра, ковия, искана, андиза* are attributed to the professional lexicon; such words of the Uzbek language as *машина, самолёт, паровоз, станок, механик*, etc. can be addressed as technical terms.

It is known that professionals have long been smelting metals and making various weapons and tools from them, which carried out specific technological processes. These processes are, of course, signified in words. These include modeling, cutting, sharpening, hammering, sharpening, and welding. Even today, by carrying out similar technological processes, the necessary product is created. Surprisingly, modeling, hammering, grinding, brazing, etc. still serve as the name of technological processes. However, the first group of such words, in the opinion of the above scholars, and according to prof. S.Ibragimov, they are treated as lexical units related to the profession. V.N.Kostrov calls all such terms as technical terminology.

From the above two quotations and the examples we have given by interpreting them from our own point of view, it is clear that the words used in production, which existed a hundred or more years ago and are now preserved only in some places, are not a term but a profession-related units because they are “semi-formal words that do not have a firm, scientific description of the concept” (A.V.Kalinin). On the contrary, in the words of the same scholar, which is now used in the relevant literature and included in special dictionaries, it is the term “expression, name of any concept that is completely formal, accepted, canonized, and legitimized”.

Now it’s necessary to determine what words are included in the technical terminology system. The definition of the term technique itself also responds to this question in some way. In the “Great Soviet Encyclopedia” the word technique is defined as: “The means of labor that develop in the system of social production” [14]. Based on this definition, the technical terminological system can include: the names of any weapons, tools, equipment, equipment, devices, machines and mechanisms involved in social production and facilitating human labor; names that represent the process of creating these tools and using them in production, the main figure involved in this process - the names of individuals, etc. Since all the tools and means of production that facilitate human labor are included in technology, it is necessary to call them as technical terms.

Summarizing this view, we believe that the following definition is appropriate for technical terms: technical objects (i.e., all technical means and their details), processes, industries and trends, individuals, places, and properties, total words and phrases that perform a nominative function are (labeled as) technical terms. A set of these terms makes up the technical terminology. In addition to special dictionaries dedicated to certain areas of science and technology in Uzbek terminology, terminological dictionaries for certain areas of science and industry have been published, one of which includes more and the other less, technical terms of those areas and provided with appropriate equivalents. Naturally, we are interested in the fact how technical terms in the given dictionaries are expressed in Uzbek. What are the qualities of dictionaries in terms of expressing technical terms?

1. In dictionaries, English and Russian international terms are accepted as Uzbek terms, i.e. as equivalents. For example: *machine*-*машина* – *машина*; *generator* – *генератор* – *генератор*; *escalator* – *эскалатор* – *эскалатор*; *excavator* – *экскаватор* – *экскаватор*, etc. This principle is mostly applicable and very true in terms of translational practice. Because, in addition to the above amount, there are thousands of other terms in the technique, the expression of which by the Uzbek language means, firstly, misrepresentation of the concept, secondly, the escalation of homonymous, polysemantic phenomena and a number of other ambiguities.

2. The choice of the Uzbek equivalent is always justified when the English and Russian terms can be expressed by the means of the Uzbek language, that is, when the concept of the term is correctly expressed. Accordingly, in dictionaries such terms as *pusher* – *толкатель* – *итаргич*; *evaporator* – *испаритель* – *буғлатгич*; *circumscriber* – *описатель* – *тавсифлагич*; *transformer (converter mex.)* – *преобразователь* – *ўзгартиргич (айлантиргич)*; *admixture* – *примесь* – *аралашма* are evaluated as correct variants.

3. The correct expression of English and Russian compound(complex)- terms in Uzbek is a more complicated issue. Despite this difficulty, a number of compound-(combination)-terms in dictionaries are adequately expressed in Uzbek: *rotive power* – *движущая сила* – *ҳаракатлантирувчи куч*; *spatial mechanism (gear)* – *пространственный механизм* – *фазовий механизм*; *instant significance* – *мгновенное значение* – *онийқиймат*, etc.

Further attempts of linguists and translators of technical discourse to properly denote English and Russian terms in Uzbek can assist in eliminating confusions in technical terminology. However, a number of errors and fallacies in technical terminological system of the Uzbek language still have been affecting these dictionaries and translations to some extent. As a result, some of the confusion and misrepresentations have been remaining unchanged, and other shortcomings have been inflicted by author-translators. More apparent ones are:

1. One of the most confusing and unresolved issues in modern terminology is the expression of the relative adjectives in the Uzbek language in the composition of English and Russian compound terms. Due to this, in the dictionaries and translated literature, it must be admitted that many English and Russian compound terms are misexpressed in Uzbek. The most visible of such shortcomings are as follows:

a) the English and Russian combinations are expressed in the Uzbek language in the form of a type II isafet, i.e. a noun with the possessive suffix.

b) the English and Russian compound-term was translated into Uzbek as a relative adjective+noun, but the relative adjective suffix chosen for this purpose distorted the meaning.

2. In all dictionaries, it is often the case that English and Russian terms are borrowed automatically, even when it is possible to create a term based on the inner capacity of the Uzbek language. We've suggested considering this in two aspects:

a) while scanning the literature related to technical translation, one may encounter that even when it is possible to find Uzbek equivalent for a certain English or Russian technical term both linguists and translators prefer and tend to apply the loan translation (calque) method instead of finding the right lexeme in target language and prescribing a relevant meaning to it. In other words, one can notice the effective and versatile application of loan translation (calque) method. And, it should be stressed that such a method has proven itself in many instances in practice. In this regard, if we look in dictionaries, we often find Uzbek words that can serve as an equivalent to English and Russian terms; thus, instead of using the foreign term directly we may load native language lexicon with the same necessary semantic function which will avail to purpose as well.

b) in the reviewed dictionaries it is often the case that word formation of the Uzbek language are neglected in terms of borrowing English and Russian technical terms automatically. What we mean here is that the English, Russian and other terms themselves are taken even when it is possible to restructure the English and Russian terms in Uzbek by means of calque-structuring.

3. Dictionaries often propose the wrong equivalent for a certain English or Russian technical term.

4. Another dearth of dictionaries is that for some reason they do not present an equivalent for some technical terms, but give an explanation for that term. Both translators and dictionary users inevitably suffer from this flaw.

5. It is also stated in many projects: "...synonyms (doublets), i.e. the existence of different several terms that represent a single technical concept is not permitted" [15]. Dictionaries, on the other hand, allow for a wide range of synonyms. We consider it necessary to depict the issue of synonymy in dictionaries in two different ways:

a) the synonymy of lexical units, i.e. the synonymy of terms;

b) the synonymy of term-forming suffixes. This issue is also a peculiar "disease" like the synonymy of lexical units which is prevalent in technical terminology.

6. Another shortcoming of terminological dictionaries relevant to technical sphere is that they also include terms that do not belong to those spheres.

The most crucial errands in the reviewed and analyzed dictionaries and translations are, in brief, as has been stated above. We believe that the most essential task, not only in terminology, but also in the compilation of other dictionaries, is to address these shortcomings and seriously deal with the work of regulating technical terms in terms of translation theory and practice.

## References:

1. Reformatskiy A.A. Introduction to Linguistics.- M., 1955.- P. 80.
2. The Dictionary of the Russian Language.Vol. IV, - M., 1961.- P. 483.
3. Kalinin A.V. Vocabulary of the Russian Language, ed. MGU, 1971, - P. 135.
4. Kalinin A.V. The cited work.- P. 141.
5. Pinxasov Y. Modern Vocabulary. - T., 1960.- P. 57.

6. Mirzaev M., Usmonov S., Rasulov I. The Uzbek Language. - T., 1960.- P. 57.
7. Zelenin D.K. «Collection ORYS», vol.76, №2.- P. 15.
8. Ibroximov S. Professional Lexicon of Fergana Dialects. - P. 250.
9. Mamatov N. Some Comments on the Definition of the Term. “Uzbek language and literature”, 1966, issue 1, - P. 65-68.
10. Ikromova N. Words that Represent Dish Names. “The Uzbek Language and Literature”, 1964, issue 4.
11. Usmonov S. Some Issues of the Uzbek Terminology. - P. 17.
12. Kalinin A.V. The sited work. - P. 141.
13. Kostrov V.N. The History of the Theory and Practice of Building and Streamlining Russian Technical Terminology. ADD, - M., 1956.
14. The Great Soviet Encyclopedia. Vol.42.
15. Scientific-Technical Terminology. Abstract Information. 1973, №8.