



DOI: **10.5958/2249-7137.2021.01829.2**

## IMPROVING THE DESCRIPTIONS OF LEGAL TERMS IN THE ANNOTATED DICTIONARIES

Ezoza Shuhratkizi Sabirova\*

\*Lecturer,  
Specialized Branch of Tashkent State University of Law,  
UZBEKISTAN

### ABSTRACT

*This article discusses the issue of improving the definition of legal terms in the existing Uzbek dictionary. Recommendations are given to improve the interpretation using examples. The norm of the dictionary is that it recommends the norms of spelling, pronunciation, word formation and its use in literary language. But it is not an easy task to notice the norm, to distinguish the normative cases. In particular, in the example of terms related to the field of law, which is the object of our research, we can say that the right mentioned in this explanatory dictionary. In the absence of signs indicating the legality of the lexical unit, which is the key word, or in the absence of these special signs, some cases related to the presence of words or phrases related to jurisprudence in the commentary were identified. But the terms 3types of criminal, given in the same line, are also given without the same lexical pometa as the same units (criminal and criminal). The logical conclusion is that these should also be considered legal terms, but in legal terminology these units do not occur. Thus, the presence of words and phrases in the dictionary, indicating the relevance of the field, which does not exclude the need to use a special sign as a unit.*

**KEYWORDS:** Annotation, Lexical Pometa (Sign), Dictionary Article, Semantic Description, Legal Term

### INTRODUCTION

The issues of legal regulation of public life, recognition of law as a branch of culture, the formation and development of legal consciousness among members of society depend in many respects on the level of legal knowledge of the population living in the country. Everyone is always a participant in some legal process, whether they like it or not. So, as there is a constant

need for legal knowledge, it is important not only for linguistics, but also for any field responsible for the acceleration of public life, to systematically study the terms in this field, to give it in dictionaries, to develop the principles of selection for general philological dictionaries. is calculated.

Despite the fact that the normative dictionary of the Uzbek language, the Annotated Dictionary of the Uzbek language, was recently revised, it can be seen that the shortcomings in the previous edition have not been eliminated. In particular, in the example of terms related to the field of law, which is the object of our research, we can say that the right mentioned in this explanatory dictionary. pometal terms are also unedited - given in their old form. It should also be noted that this new edition, which acknowledges the introduction of new lexemes, does not contain any neo-terminological units other than the existing legal terms in the 2008 edition. Naturally, the terminological units in the field of law, which is one of the most important areas of public life, are listed in the dictionary - less than the total lexical quantity, which is supposed to reflect the general lexical treasury of the Uzbek language. If the interpretation of legal terms contains words expressing legal concepts, the right. taking into account the units not given by the pometal, there are 377 legal terms in the dictionary. But that also means less terms compared to the total. This chapter contains comments and suggestions on the interpretation of existing legal terms in this glossary. There is also a list of legal terms that express new legal concepts that exist in the life of society today, as well as those that are actively used.

While acknowledging that this explanatory dictionary is the result of many years of hard work of linguists and a number of specialists in the field, it should be noted that based on the analysis of the above chapters, the terms are selected, selected from the legal terminology system for the dictionary there are also some shortcomings regarding the use of lexical pometal. The opinion supporting this opinion is also expressed in the dictionary: "The main task of the dictionary is to collect and describe the vocabulary of the modern Uzbek literary language, as well as to define and stabilize its norms. At the same time, it also contributes to the rise of speech culture. The norm of the dictionary is that it recommends the norms of spelling, pronunciation, word formation and its use in literary language. But it is not an easy task to notice the norm, to distinguish the normative cases. Therefore, it is natural that there are some shortcomings in the definition of literary language norms in the dictionary, controversial, controversial. We believe that the emergence of the dictionary will not only strengthen the norms of literary language, but also help to identify and eliminate unresolved issues.

The dictionary consists of lexical units included in it and dictionary articles structured on them. These lexical units are selected from general and limited vocabulary. Commentary on the lexical unit given as a keyword - etymological information in the formation of a dictionary article, sometimes the pronunciation form of the unit, its conditional form as a literary norm, additional semantic-descriptive features, illustrative examples to illustrate its meaning, fiction, scientific literature, as well as newspapers and journal materials were used.

A specific criterion for the selection of terms from the limited lexicon of the Uzbek language is not given in the dictionary description.

Vocabulary units, in particular, clearly, accurately and completely define the meaning of terms, interpret the meanings of lexical units, sort them on the basis of interdependence, record them sequentially is one of the most difficult and basic processes of explanatory lexicography and

requires in-depth knowledge and great skill. The value and success of a dictionary is also determined by the extent to which this task is accomplished. It should also be noted that there are some shortcomings in this regard, without denying the work and achievements of lexicographers.

For example,

In 2 volumes

ADVOCATE

2 spoken lang. Counselor.

In 5 volumes

ADVOCATE [lot. advocatus<advocare - to call for help] 1 A lawyer who provides legal assistance (advice) to the defendant in court, defends the defendant (accused); justifying, himoyachi. The lawyer, as a party, shall have equal rights with all participants in the proceedings at all stages of the proceedings. From the newspaper.

2 spoken lang Consultant; protector.

The negative stylistic sign of this unit mentioned in the dictionary article is much weaker today in the sense that it represents the lawyer's lexical unit. True, it is also used in colloquial language, but its active use in the defensive sense can be observed in live communication. It is advisable to consider in the next edition that it means to be a defender in a neutral position, not a defense in a negative sense.

One of the issues related to the assignment of terms in annotated dictionaries is the use of pometas. In general dictionaries of different types, the system of sign-signs, which serves for the lexicographic description of the terminological lexicon, includes special and general signs. Special characters indicate that the word belongs to a particular field of technology, economy, science. In the two-volume OTIL, the terminological units of law are jur., And in the 5 volumes, the law. we see that it is used with the pomet. These characters in the terminology imply that this unit belongs to jurisprudence. It is also noted that these lexical pometas are used when the commentary does not contain a reference word or phrase indicating belonging to a particular field of science. Conversely, if lexical units are used in the definition of a term to indicate that it belongs to a field, these lexical units can replace the corresponding special sign, but there is no need to use this sign.

There is controversy in our research objects about the use of a special sign in the terminological unit, which is the key word. In the absence of signs indicating the legality of the lexical unit, which is the key word, or in the absence of these special signs, some cases related to the presence of words or phrases related to jurisprudence in the commentary were identified. The definition of terms such as legal, jurisdiction, jurisprudence, jurisprudence, lawyer, jurisprudence contains words such as law, law, court, norm, which refer to jurisprudence. Lexical pometas were not used. As an Uzbek alternative of these terms, it is also right in such units as offender, offender, lawyer, and jurist. pometas were not used. Due to the fact that they are given in alphabetical order, the dictionary units are listed in the following order: law, offender, and offense, legal, legal, without law, lawlessness, lawyer, jurisprudence. From this sequence, only the word law is

right. pometa is given, and the word jur is used in legal terms in a two-volume dictionary. pometas were used.

Pometa was not used from the word law to the word jurisprudence, which concludes the sequence of cognates (the word legal is an exception, because it used a legal pomet, not a law). It can be concluded that all of these cohorts are considered a term related to the field due to the presence of units referring to the law in their commentary. However, while the terms lawlessness and lawlessness, which appear among these cohorts, seem to belong to jurisprudence at first glance, they are not in fact used as a term denoting a specific concept of law within this field. At first glance, the term legal is similar to the term that implies the existence of a right. His commentary also proves this:

**NO RIGHT** Having no right. After Murtaz's speech about freedom, free, disenfranchised people were resurrected. N.Safarov Fire tracks.

It is clear from the commentary that, indeed, this unit implies that a particular right does not exist and is applied in that sense. However, in the bases of normative-legal documents related to jurisprudence, none of the procedural documents of the industry encounters the use of this unit as a term. Because the absence of law is expressed in the legal terminology of the Uzbek language using a compound term: lack of rights, such as deprivation of rights. The same analysis applies to the dictionary unit of lawlessness. Thus, the presence of words and phrases in the dictionary, indicating the relevance of the field, which does not exclude the need to use a special sign as a unit. The use of lexical pometa in the succession of cognates is, of course, necessary. Otherwise, the dictionary user may get the wrong impression that a single unit belongs to a field, which in turn can lead to an error in the application of the unit. This situation can lead to the artificial introduction of terms into the language and to the existing unit representing the same concept, a terminological synonymy (arguably inappropriate synonymy) that is not artificially considered a positive phenomenon in linguistics. In addition, the five-volume dictionary contains related words from criminal lexical unit to criminal. According to the rule that was applied in the compilation of the dictionary, it has the same rights as the nest of right-handed members. the pomet should not have been given. But it cannot be said to be based on the same criteria here. After all, only the first three of these units, which are located in a series, such as criminal, criminal-procedural, criminal, criminal, criminal, criminal, criminal, are entitled. pometas are given. It is not difficult to see that these units are legal, even if the explanation of the words offender and criminal is given very briefly or is directed to another word. But the terms 3types of criminal, given in the same line, are also given without the same lexical pomet as the same units (criminal and criminal). The logical conclusion is that these should also be considered legal terms, but in legal terminology these units do not occur. Hence, the meaning of the units in this series of cognates should also be clarified through lexical pometas, thereby eliminating the confusion in the perception of meaning.

#### REFERENCES:

1. Sviridova E. N. For clarity and practice of terminology in jurisprudence // Problems of law, 2009. – №11. – C. 20-28.

2. Seregina O. L., Filimonova N. Yu. Sintaksicheskayaiyazykovayastrukturaiskovogozayavleniyakakyuridicheskogodokumenta // Bulletin VolSU. Series 5: Jurisprudence. – T.1, – №5 (14). – 2011. – C.138-142.
3. Superanskaya A. V., Podolskaya N. V., Vasileva N. V. Common terminology. Issues of theory. – M., 1989.
4. Annotated dictionary of the Uzbek language. 2 volumes. Volume 1 - 2. Tashkent: National Encyclopedia of Uzbekistan, **1981**.
5. Annotated dictionary of the Uzbek language. 5 volumes. Volume 1 - 5. Tashkent: National Encyclopedia of Uzbekistan, **2006**.
6. Rasuljanovna, I. N. (2020). The concept of “lacuna” in translation studies. *Asian Journal of Multidimensional Research (AJMR)*, 9(4), 123-129.