FEATURES OF THE COMPILATION OF MODERN EXPLANATORY DICTIONARIES

Lola Khodzhikulovna Bobomurodova
(Bukhara State University)

Article history:		Abstract:
Received: **Accepted:** **Published:**	20th February 2021 2th March 2021 20th March 2021	The article examines the role of dictionaries and their content, and, in particular, defines the role of explanatory dictionaries, from their compilation to their semantic meaning. Examples of lexical units and their meanings are given. Attention is drawn to the structure of explanatory dictionaries as a constituent part of the dictionaries as a whole.

"Dictionaries are like clocks: having the worst of them is better than not having any; but even the best of them, we cannot say that they are absolutely accurate. " Samuel Johnson

Lexicography is a dynamically developing branch of linguistics. Today in the arsenal of lexicographers there is a huge variety of explanatory dictionaries of various types and genres. According to the purpose and characteristics of the presentation of the material, we propose to divide them conditionally into three groups: language dictionaries, speech dictionaries and discourse dictionaries. In the article, we set ourselves the task of analyzing the difference between the three named types of dictionaries, tracing the relationship between them and identifying the prospects for the development of discursive lexicography. Throughout its existence, vocabulary work moves "from meaning to meaning." This direction of development is connected, first of all, with the fact that, as A. Rey correctly noted, the object of description in the explanatory dictionary "can be two different realities, which entails two possible types of descriptions." We are talking about the dictionaries of the system (or its elements: words, phraseological units) and dictionaries of usage. "This difference is fundamental for monolingual lexicography. An explanatory dictionary can either be constructed as a description of the lexical component of the language system, or it can be aimed at a broader study, covering the action of this system in various spheres of its use "[1, p. 264-265]. For a long time (almost the entire XX century), lexicographers tried to reflect in the explanatory dictionaries of various types, first of all, the meaning of the given vocabulary units. In the search for examples of use, they mainly turned to contexts from the works of art of classical Russian literature, choosing from them the meanings typical, the most traditional, coinciding with the "center". This was quite justified, given the purpose of creating dictionaries and their printed form, which initially hindered the expansion of the illustrative component. If we use, slightly modifying and reducing, the criteria for determining the features and expediency of the dictionary, proposed by B. Yu. Gorodetsky [2, p. 6-7], then the dictionaries of the language can be characterized as follows: 1) the dictionaries reflect the semantic information about the unit of description (given its meaning or several meanings); 2) the dictionary is normative (in relation to the period that it describes; 3) in the dictionary entry, the motivation of the vocabulary unit, its origin can be described; 4) the dictionary shows the contextual implementation of units in the minimum amount necessary to understand the meaning of the word / phraseological unit. The absolute majority of such dictionaries in the 19th – 20th centuries. As an exception, we can name, perhaps, the dictionary of V. I. Dahl, which does not correspond to the named characteristics, since it does not pretend to be normative; it is intended to show the richness of the Russian language in all its forms and spheres of use and contains a large number of examples of the functioning of vocabulary units. It is this task, set by V.I.Dal, that modern researchers are trying to implement in the last decades of the 20th century.

So, today lexicography is faced with the question: how to reflect the variety of meanings that arise in speech in the process of using words and / or phraseological units? The antinomy of Ferdinand de Saussure "language-speech" in this aspect has become a stumbling block of modern lexicography. The dictionary, which originally arose as a means (or form) of reflecting the static meaning of linguistic (systemic) elements, pretends to demonstrate not so much language as speech, i.e. features of semantic changes in words / phraseological units in use. Paradoxically, this is a realizable task today. Solving it, lexicographers initially created a number of dictionaries showing the features of the use of linguistic units in colloquial speech: V.P Belyanin "Live speech. Dictionary of colloquial expressions "[3], V. Yu. Melikyan" Emotionally expressive turns of living speech "[4], Dictionary of the meanings of Living Russian Speech [5], VV Chemist" Large dictionary of Russian colloquial speech "[6] and etc. However, these dictionaries, striving to reflect speech, for the most part remained dictionaries of meanings (i.e., dictionaries of the language). An

exception to this rule was, perhaps, the dictionary of V.V. Chemist, which really contains a large number of examples of the use of words and phraseological units, which allows the reader to get an idea of the peculiarities of using a particular vocabulary unit in live conversational communication. But even in such a voluminous dictionary, the number of usage contexts is limited. Nevertheless, despite the scope of the printed format of editions, the authors and compilers of lexicographic materials emphasize the inclusion in the dictionary of the maximum number of "contextual, discursively conditioned word usage" [7, p. 37]. The desire to fully trace the features of the functioning of words / phraseological units in speech became possible thanks to the development of corpus linguistics and the development of computer dictionaries. This approach explains the increased interest of researchers in the lexicographic description of official, incomplete words, which are reflected in the dictionaries "A Guide to Discursive Words of the Russian Language" [8], "Discursive Words of the Russian Language" [9], "Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian Language". Dictionary entries of the latter contain two parts: explanatory (information about the peculiarities of use, detailed interpretation, information on compatibility, synonyms, antonyms) and demonstrating (examples of use in speech) [10]. Discursive words manifest all their properties exclusively in the process of communication, therefore, it is very problematic to reflect their features in the dictionary of the language. This requires a speech dictionary. And publications of this kind are not unique. However, not only dictionaries of discursive words have become dictionaries of speech (or dictionaries of usage). Lexicographic editions have appeared, which make it possible to trace at the level of a word or phraseological unit changes due to the specifics of the functioning of the named units in discourse as in the "actually pronounced text" (term by T. A. Van Dyuck). The authors and compilers of such dictionaries generally pay attention to the communicative and pragmatic properties of vocabulary units, since the pragmatics of a dictionary entry is perceived as a significant, defining part of it. "Provides the conditions for the lexicographic implementation of the semantics of the word" [11, p. 142]. Such works include the dictionary "Life of Russian phraseology in artistic speech", in which, in addition to the usual normative contexts, examples of the individual author's use of phraseological units are given, a contextual difference in the style of phraseological units is shown [12, p. 104].

How are speech dictionaries (usage dictionaries) fundamentally different from language dictionaries? 1) in speech dictionaries, semantic information about a unit of description is reflected in the fullest possible extent, depending on the capabilities of each specific unit to enter into syntagmatic relations in the process of speech functioning; 2) the vocabulary of speech is descriptive; 3) in such a dictionary, the motivation of the vocabulary unit, its origin can be described; 4) in the dictionary of speech, the contextual implementation of units is shown to the fullest extent (taking into account texts of different genres, styles, examples of ordinary and author's uses, etc.). Considering these features, it must be admitted that in modern lexicography one can find publications that, positioning themselves as dictionaries of speech, remain, nevertheless, dictionaries of the language, for example: Dictionary-reference book "Culture of Russian speech" [13] or "Dictionary of correct Russian speech "[14]. In recent years, there has been a new trend associated with the creation of not just a speech dictionary (or a dictionary of usage). Lexicographers began developing discourse dictionaries. This task seems to be extremely difficult, but promising, and its actualization is a natural phenomenon. For a long time, researchers have agreed that a dictionary is a special metatext ("metalinguistic text" (S. A. Zhuravlev), "text of a metasemiotic nature" (A. Rey)). This means that its potential is much richer than just a reflection of the variants of the use of vocabulary units. Each new meaning that a native speaker puts into the words or phraseological units used is born not only in a specific communicative situation. It is conditioned simultaneously by experience, goals, personal attitudes and psychological characteristics of the speaker and listener, cultural meanings, connotations caused by the specifics of relations between the subjects of communication, etc. In other words, new meanings can be explained not only (and not so much) within the text, but within the discourse, taking into account the situation and conditions of their generation. Consequently, the task of a modern dictionary is to become a means of cognition (and not just displaying) the process of verbal communication. How to do this is not yet entirely clear. Methods of lexicographic recording of this kind of information have not yet been developed, there is no experimental model of a discourse dictionary. However, lexicographers are actively working in this direction, offering two options for the lexicographic description of units. In the first of them, the authors and compilers of dictionaries strive to fully reflect the diverse, diverse information about words / phraseological units, revealing not only the meaning of units, but also trying to convey the entire range of semantic shades and connotations. At the same time, stylistic, grammatical, cultural, cognitive characteristics, etc. are given. Paradoxically, this is a realizable task today. Solving it, lexicographers initially created a number of dictionaries showing the features of the use of linguistic units in colloquial speech: V.P. Belyanin "Live speech. Dictionary of colloquial expressions "[3], V. Yu. Melikyan" Emotionally expressive turns of living speech "[4], Dictionary of the meanings of Living Russian Speech [5], V.V. Chemist" Large dictionary of Russian colloquial speech "[6] and etc.

However, these dictionaries, striving to reflect speech, for the most part remained dictionaries of meanings (i.e., dictionaries of the language). An exception to this rule was, perhaps, the dictionary of V.V. Chemist, which really contains a large number of examples of the use of words and phraseological units, which allows the reader to get an idea of the peculiarities of using a particular vocabulary unit in live conversational communication. But even in such a voluminous dictionary, the number of usage contexts is limited. Nevertheless, despite the scope of the printed format of editions, the authors and compilers of lexicographic materials emphasize the inclusion in the dictionary of the maximum number of "contextual, discursively conditioned word usage" [7, p. 37]. The desire to

fully trace the features of the functioning of words / phraseological units in speech became possible thanks to the development of corpus linguistics and the development of computer dictionaries. This approach explains the increased interest of researchers in the lexicographic description of official, incomplete words, which are reflected in the dictionaries "A Guide to Discursive Words of the Russian Language" [8], "Discursive Words of the Russian Language" [9], "Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian Language". Dictionary entries of the latter contain two parts: explanatory (information about the peculiarities of use, detailed interpretation, information on compatibility, synonyms, antonyms) and demonstrating (examples of use in speech) [10]. Discursive words manifest all their properties exclusively in the process of communication, therefore, it is very problematic to reflect their features in the dictionary of the language. This requires a speech dictionary. And publications of this kind are not unique. However, not only dictionaries of discursive words have become dictionaries of speech (or dictionaries of usage). Lexicographic editions have appeared, which make it possible to trace at the level of a word or phraseological unit changes due to the specifics of the functioning of the named units in discourse as in the "actually pronounced text" (term by T. A. Van Dyck). The authors and compilers of such dictionaries generally pay attention to the communicative and pragmatic properties of vocabulary units, since the pragmatics of a dictionary entry is perceived as a significant, defining part of it. "Provides the conditions for the lexicographic implementation of the semantics of the word" [11, p. 142]. Such works include the dictionary "Life of Russian phraseology in artistic speech", in which, in addition to the usual normative contexts, examples of the individual author's use of phraseological units are given, a contextual difference in the style of phraseological units is shown [12, p. 104]. How are speech dictionaries (usage dictionaries) fundamentally different from language dictionaries? 1) in speech dictionaries, semantic information about a unit of description is reflected in the fullest possible extent, depending on the capabilities of each specific unit to enter into syntagmatic relations in the process of speech functioning; 2) the vocabulary of speech is descriptive; 3) in such a dictionary, the motivation of the vocabulary unit, its origin can be described; 4) in the dictionary of speech, the contextual implementation of units is shown to the fullest extent (taking into account texts of different genres, styles, examples of ordinary and author's uses, etc.). Considering these features, it must be admitted that in modern lexicography one can find publications that, positioning themselves as dictionaries of speech, remain, nevertheless, dictionaries of the language, for example: Dictionary-reference book "Culture of Russian speech" [13] or "Dictionary of correct Russian speech "[14]. In recent years, there has been a new trend associated with the creation of not just a speech dictionary (or a dictionary of usage). Lexicographers began developing discourse dictionaries.

This task seems to be extremely difficult, but promising, and its actualization is a natural phenomenon. For a long time, researchers have agreed that a dictionary is a special metatext ("metalinguistic text" (S. A. Zhuravlev), "text of a metasemiotic nature" (A. Rey)). This means that its potential is much richer than just a reflection of the variants of the use of vocabulary units.   Each new meaning that a native speaker puts into the words or phraseological units used is born not only in a specific communicative situation. It is conditioned simultaneously by experience, goals, personal attitudes and psychological characteristics of the speaker and listener, cultural meanings, connotations caused by the specifics of relations between the subjects of communication, etc. In other words, new meanings can be explained not only (and not so much) within the text, but within the discourse, taking into account the situation and conditions of their generation. Consequently, the task of a modern dictionary is to become a means of cognition (and not just displaying) the process of verbal communication. How to do this is not yet entirely clear. Methods of lexicographic recording of this kind of information have not yet been developed, there is no experimental model of a discourse dictionary. However, lexicographers are actively working in this direction, offering two options for the lexicographic description of units. In the first of them, the authors and compilers of dictionaries strive to fully reflect the diverse, diverse information about words / phraseological units, revealing not only the meaning of units, but also trying to convey the entire range of semantic shades and connotations. At the same time, stylistic, grammatical, cultural, cognitive characteristics, etc. are given. Paradoxically, this is a realizable task today. Solving it, lexicographers initially created a number of dictionaries showing the features of the use of linguistic units in colloquial speech: V.P. Belyanin "Live speech. Dictionary of colloquial expressions "[3], V. Yu. Melikyan" Emotionally expressive turns of living speech "[4], Dictionary of the meanings of Living Russian Speech [5], V.V. Chemist" Large dictionary of Russian colloquial speech "[6] and etc. However, these dictionaries, striving to reflect speech, for the most part remained dictionaries of meanings (i.e., dictionaries of the language). An exception to this rule was, perhaps, the dictionary of V.V. Chemist, which really contains a large number of examples of the use of words and phraseological units, which allows the reader to get an idea of   the peculiarities of using a particular vocabulary unit in live conversational communication. But even in such a voluminous dictionary, the number of usage contexts is limited. Nevertheless, despite the scope of the printed format of editions, the authors and compilers of lexicographic materials emphasize the inclusion in the dictionary of the maximum number of "contextual, discursively conditioned word usage" [7, p. 37]. The desire to fully trace the features of the functioning of words / phraseological units in speech became possible thanks to the development of corpus linguistics and the development of computer dictionaries. This approach explains the increased interest of researchers in the lexicographic description of official, incomplete words, which are reflected in the dictionaries "A Guide to Discursive Words of the Russian Language" [8], "Discursive Words of the Russian Language" [9], "Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian Language". Dictionary entries of the latter contain two parts: explanatory (information about the peculiarities of use, detailed interpretation, information on compatibility, synonyms, antonyms) and demonstrating (examples of use in speech) [10]. Discursive words manifest

_____

all their properties exclusively in the process of communication, therefore, it is very problematic to reflect their features in the dictionary of the language. This requires a speech dictionary.

And publications of this kind are not unique. However, not only dictionaries of discursive words have become dictionaries of speech (or dictionaries of usage). Lexicographic editions have appeared, which make it possible to trace at the level of a word or phraseological unit changes due to the specifics of the functioning of the named units in discourse as in the "actually pronounced text" (term by T. A. Van Dyuck). The authors and compilers of such dictionaries generally pay attention to the communicative and pragmatic properties of vocabulary units, since the pragmatics of a dictionary entry is perceived as a significant, defining part of it. "Provides the conditions for the lexicographic implementation of the semantics of the word" [11, p. 142]. Such works include the dictionary "Life of Russian phraseology in artistic speech", which, in addition to the usual normative contexts, gives examples of the individual author's use of phraseological units, shows the contextual difference in the style of phraseological units [12, p. 104]. How are speech dictionaries (usage dictionaries) fundamentally different from language dictionaries? 1) in speech dictionaries, semantic information about a unit of description is reflected in the fullest possible extent, depending on the capabilities of each specific unit to enter into syntagmatic relations in the process of speech functioning; 2) the vocabulary of speech is descriptive; 3) in such a dictionary, the motivation of the vocabulary unit, its origin can be described; 4) in the dictionary of speech, the contextual implementation of units is shown to the fullest extent (taking into account texts of different genres, styles, examples of ordinary and author's uses, etc.). Considering these features, it must be admitted that in modern lexicography one can find publications that, positioning themselves as dictionaries of speech, remain, nevertheless, dictionaries of the language, for example: Dictionary-reference book "Culture of Russian speech" [13] or "Dictionary of correct Russian speech ”[14]. In recent years, there has been a new trend associated with the creation of not just a speech dictionary (or a dictionary of usage). Lexicographers began developing discourse dictionaries. This task seems to be extremely difficult, but promising, and its actualization is a natural phenomenon. Researchers have long agreed that a dictionary is a special metatext (“metalinguistic text” (S. A. Zhuravlev), “text of a metasemiotic nature” (A. Rey)). This means that its potential is much richer than just a reflection of the variants of the use of vocabulary units. Each new meaning that a native speaker puts into the words or phraseological units used is born not only in a specific communicative situation. It is conditioned simultaneously by experience, goals, personal attitudes and psychological characteristics of the speaker and listener, cultural meanings, connotations caused by the specifics of relations between the subjects of communication, etc. In other words, new meanings can be explained not only (and not so much) within the text, but within the limits of discourse, taking into account the situation and conditions of their generation. Consequently, the task of a modern dictionary is to become a means of cognition (and not just displaying) the process of verbal communication. How to do this is not yet entirely clear. Methods of lexicographic recording of this kind of information have not yet been developed, there is no experimental model of a discourse dictionary. However, lexicographers are actively working in this direction, offering two options for the lexicographic description of units. In the first of them, the authors and compilers of dictionaries strive to fully reflect the diverse, diverse information about words / phraseological units, revealing not only the meaning of units, but also trying to convey the entire range of semantic shades and connotations. At the same time, stylistic, grammatical, cultural, cognitive characteristics, etc. are given.

In our opinion, the Phraseological Dictionary of N. Alefirenko and L. Zolotykh "Cultural and Cognitive Space of Russian Idioms", whose dictionary entries reflect the most typical connections of phrasemes in the text, communicatively pragmatic properties of phrasemes, their cognitive and logically-cultural content [15, p. 2]. In the second version of discursive dictionaries, additional information is involved, allowing the reader to hear the peculiarities of the functioning of the vocabulary unit in speech. Most of these publications are still in the project, requiring additional development and accompaniment of the text with audio materials (for example, "The Sound Dictionary of the Discursive Words of the Russian Language" [16]). However, in Russian lexicography there are already unique examples of "living" dictionaries of discourse - the Angarsk Dictionary, the authors of which accompanied the dictionary entries with video recordings of conversations with native speakers of the Angara dialect, songs, etc. [17]. What are the distinctive features of discursive dictionaries: 1) semantic information about a unit of description is reflected in dictionaries (its meaning or several meanings are given, additional connotative meanings that appear in the context are described); 2) the dictionary is descriptive; 3) it can describe the motivation of the vocabulary unit, its origin, cognitive and cultural components, other additional metalinguistic information necessary for the interpretation of the meanings arising from a word or phraseological unit in discourse; 4) the dictionary shows the contextual implementation of units to the fullest extent (taking into account texts of different genres, styles, examples of conventional and author's uses, etc.). It is worth noting that a dictionary in a computer form can fully meet these requirements, since the printed version of the publication limits the lexicographer in the volume of the presented material (our remark in no way means that the printed edition of the dictionary cannot be discursive). But even a computerized dictionary version cannot be perfect. Speech is extremely rich in meanings. In each new communicative situation, all new metalinguistic information can be used. In this respect, we agree with B. Yu. Gorodetsky, who believes that “an absolutely complete description of the semantic structure of a language is possible only ideally: the existing difficulties are associated with both depth and breadth of description. Therefore, real descriptions are limited [2, p. 12]. At the moment we can create more or less optimal versions of dictionaries. Achieving the ideal is a matter for the future. Note 1 Following the researchers, by discourse we mean “speech

immersed in life" (N.D. Arutyunova), "speech inscribed in a communicative situation" (Z. Harris), "process and result of speech activity" (S.S. Sharipova). The course appears as "a complex phenomenon associated not only with the act of creating a certain text, but also with a significant number of extralinguistic factors - knowledge about the world, intentions, attitudes and specific goals of the speaker, who is the creator of the discursive text [18, p. 6]. It is this understanding of discourse that is used in our work.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. 1.Рей, А. Проблемы и антиномии лексикографии / А. Рей, С. Делесаль // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. – М. : Прогресс, 1983. – Вып. 14. Проблемы и методы лексикографии. – С. 260–299.
2. Городецкий, Б. Ю. Проблемы и методы современной лексикографии / Б. Ю. Городецкий // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. – М. : Прогресс, 1983. – Вып. 14. Проблемы и методы лексикографии. – С. 5–23.
3. Белянин, В. П. Живая речь. Словарь разговорных выражений / В. П. Белянин, И. А. Бутенко. – М. : ПАИМС, 1994. – 192 с.
4. Меликян, В. Ю. Эмоционально-экспрессивные обороты живой речи : словарь / В. Ю. Меликян. – М. : Флинта, 2011. – 240 с.
5. Словарь значений Живой Русской Речи (Научно-популярная сокращенная версия Смыслового Толкового Словаря Живого Русского Языка). – Екатеринбург. 2008. – 122 с.
6. Химик, В. В. Большой словарь русской разговорной речи / В. В. Химик. – СПб. : Норинт, 2004. – 708 с.
7. Леденев, Ю. И. Дискурсивный подход к лексикографии неполнозначных слов / Ю. И. Леднев // Язык. Текст. Дискурс. – 2008. – № 6. – С. 34–39.
8. Путеводитель по дискурсивным словам русского языка / А. Н. Баранов [и др.] ; Рос. АН, Ин-т рус. яз. – М. : Помовский и партнеры, 1993. – 207 с.
9. Дискурсивные слова русского языка: опыт контекстносемантического описания / А. Н. Баранов [и др.] ; под ред. К. Киселевой и Д. Пайара ; МГУ им. М. В. Ломоносова, Филол. фак. – М. : Метатекст, 1998. – 446 с.
10. Объяснительный словарь русского языка: Структурные слова: предлоги, союзы, частицы, междометия, вводные слова, местоимения, числительные, связочные глаголы: Около 1200 единиц / В. В. Морковкин [и др.] ; под ред. В. В. Морковкина. – М. : ООО «Изд-во Астрель» : ООО «Изд-во АСТ», 2002. – 432 с.
11. Журавлев, С. А. Дискурсивная интерпретация феномена толкового словаря / С. А. Журавлев // II Международные Бодуэновские чтения: Казанская лингвистическая школа: традиции и современность : тр. и материалы, Казань, 11–13 декабря 2003 г. : в 2 т. ; под общ. ред. К. Р. Галиуллина, Г. А. Николаева. – Казань : Изд-во Казан. ун-та, 2003. – Т. 1.– С. 142–144.
12. Мелерович, А. М. Трансформационный потенциал фразеологических единиц различных структурно-семантических типов (по материалам проспекта учебного словаря «Жизнь русских фразеологизмов в художественной речи». Кострома, 2006)
13. Соловьев, Н. В. Словарь правильной русской речи / Н. В. Соловьев. – М. : АСТ, Астрель, Хранитель, 2006. – 960 с.
14. Алефиренко, Н. Ф. Фразеологический словарь : Культурно-познавательное пространство русской идиоматики / Н. Ф. Алефиренко, Л. Г. Золотых. – М. : ЭЛПИС, 2008. – 472 с.
15. S.S. Salimovich: LEXICOLOGY AND LEXICOGRAPHY IN CENTRAL ASIA: TRADITIONS AND MODERNITY…; MAIN PROBLEMS OF TRANSLATION
16. 16.Khodieva, Orzigul Shodimurodovna, and Sohib Salimovich Sharipov. "The history of the creation of the author's lexicography." *Middle European Scientific Bulletin* 9 (2021).
17. Salimovich, Sharipov Sohib, and Nematova Mohibegim Fazliddinovna. "Dictionaries in Modern Life." *International Journal on Integrated Education* 2.6: 166-168.
18. Islamovna M.F., Umedullaevna S.S. SHADOW FORMATION IN PERSPECTIVE //International Engineering Journal For Research & Development. – 2020. – Т. 5. – №. 4. – С. 5-5.
19. 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.
20. Kodirovich, Mamatov Dilshod, and Azimova Mukhayo Barotovna. "THE SOUL OF THE ARTIST." *Euro-Asia Conferences*. Vol. 1. No. 1. 2021.
21. Джураева, З. Р., and Л. Х. Нигматова. "Психологическое восприятие фонетического уровня поэтического текста." *Наука. Мысль: электронный периодический журнал* 10 (2014).
22. Абдуллаев С. С., Рафиева Н. А. Искусства Древней Руси и Средней Азии в духовном диалоге (исторический экскурс) //Вестник науки и образования. – 2020. – №. 21-2 (99).
23. Muzafarovna, A. N., S. S. Umidullayevna, and I. Ilhamovna. "Harmonization of types of fabric art processing to students." *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation* 24.4 (2020): 176-184.
24. Нигматова, Лола Хамидовна. "ЛЕКСИКОГРАФИЯ ТАРИХИДАН ИЗ ИСТОРИИ ЛЕКСИКОГРАФИИ FROM THE HISTORY OF LEXICOGRAPHY." *ANIQ VA TABIIY FANLAR*: 93.