

**O‘ZBEKISTON RESPUBLIKASI
OLIIY TA’LIM, FAN VA INNOVATSIYALAR VAZIRLIGI
SAMARQAND DAVLAT CHET TILLAR INSTITUTI**



ZAMONAVIY TILSHUNOSLIK VA DERIVATSION QONUNIYATLAR

**Respublika ilmiy-amaliy anjumani
MATERIALLARI**

Samarqand, 2024-yil 16-oktabr



O‘ZBEKISTON RESPUBLIKASI
OLIY TA’LIM, FAN VA INNOVATSIYALAR VAZIRLIGI
SAMARQAND DAVLAT CHET TILLAR INSTITUTI

ZAMONAVIY TILSHUNOSLIK VA DERIVATION QONUNIYATLAR

Respublika ilmiy-amaliy anjumani
MATERIALLARI

Samarqand shahri, 2024-yil, 16-oktabr

*(Anjuman Samarqand derivatologiya maktabi asoschisi professor
Ne’mat Qayumovich Turniyozovning 85 yillik yubileyiga bag‘ishlanadi.)*

UO‘K: 74.202.2, 81.2.(-5)-9

Zamonaviy tilshunoslik va derivatsion qonuniyatlar. Respublika ilmiy-amaliy anjumani materiallari. – Samarqand: “SamDCHTI” nashriyoti, 2024. – 175 bet.

Ushbu to‘plamdan “Zamonaviy tilshunoslik va derivatsion qonuniyatlar” mavzusidagi respublika ilmiy-amaliy anjumani ishtirokchilarining maqolalari o‘rin olgan bo‘lib, undan barcha tilshunos, adabiyotshunos va pedagoglar foydalanishi mumkin.

Tahrir hay’ati:

Professor v.b. B.A.Xolikov	rais
Professor O.G‘aybullayev	rais o‘rinbosari
Professor Sh.S.Safarov	a‘zo
Professor T.A. Bushuy	a‘zo
Professor X.Z.Xayrullayev	a‘zo
Professor A.M.Turobov	a‘zo
Dotsent B.Turniyozov	a‘zo
Dotsent Sh.N.Turniyazova	mas’ul muharrir
Dotsent M.A.Xalova	mas’ul kotib

To‘plamdan o‘rin olgan maqolalarning saviyasi, sifati va ilmiy dalillarning haqqoniyligi hamda mazmuni uchun mualliflar mas’ul.

выражают данные полярные значения, т.е. эксплицитно или имплицитно. Причем фразеологизмы, как единицы, обладающие целостным значением, предполагают и тот факт, что противоположность значения создается не только за счет лексем антонимов, но через их комплексное восприятие.

Проявляемый интерес к фразеологической антонимической парадигме в современном языкознании представляет собой вполне закономерное явление. Семантические исследования всегда составляли основу различных языковедческих школ и направлений. Проводимое исследование необходимо для объективного представления о сложившейся в настоящее время картины репрезентации антонимической фразеологии в словаре контрастивного типа.

Современные двуязычные словари фиксируют следующие типы ФЕ-антонимов: 1) ФЕ, содержащие противоположные лексические компоненты, 2) фразеологизмы-компаративы, в которых начальные компоненты выступают в антонимических отношениях, а последующие нет, 3) квазиантонимы, 4) контекстные фразеологизмы-антонимы, 5) ФЕ антонимы, имеющие грамматические противопоставления, 6) энантиосемия (когда во фразеологической единице содержится два прямо противоположных значения).

Литература:

1. Русско-белорусский словарь: В 2-х т. / К.К. Атрахович. – Изд. 2-е, доп. и перераб. – Минск: БСЭ, 1982. – I, 648 с.; II, 636 с.
2. Русско-грузинский словарь: В 3-х т. / К.В. Ломтатидзе и др. – Тбилиси, 1956-1959. Т. I – 1956 – 800 с.; Т. II – 1958 – 830 с.; Т. III – 1959 – 820 с.
3. Русско-карачаево-балкарский словарь / Под ред. Х.И. Суюнчева и др. – М.: СЭ, 1965. – 744 с.
4. Русско-немецкий словарь: 10-е изд., испр. и доп. / Под. ред. К. Лейна. – М.: Рус. яз., 1989. – 736 с.
5. Русско-таджикский словарь / Под ред. М.С. Асимова. – М.: Рус. яз., 1985. – 1279 с.
6. Русско-туркменский словарь. М.: Рус. яз., 1986. – 880 с.
7. Русско-узбекский словарь: В 2-х т. / Ред. I т. С.Ф. Ақобиров; ред. II т. Н.М. Маматов. – Ташкент: УСЭ. – Т. I – 1983 – 808 с.; Т. II – 1984 – 798 с.

Amirova Nigorakhon Saidgani kizi
Lecturer at the Higher School of Turkology,
Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies

OBSERVER IN THE MODELING OF A VISUAL PERCEPTION SITUATION IN THE TURKISH LINGUISTIC WORLDVIEW

Abstract. This article is devoted to the study of the role of the observer in the dynamic aspect, i.e. within the framework of the interpretation of the linguistic worldview as a process of perception and cognition of the surrounding world through language. At the same time, two types of ‘portraiture’ of the observation situation are considered, the first is associated with the verbs of the *bakmak* (to look) and *görmek* (to see) groups; the second is based on the relationship of all components of a typical situation. It should be noted that within the two types of ‘portraiture’ there are subgroups that differ from each other in semantic terms, also based on the observer’s position in this situation.

Key words: factor of observer, linguistic worldview, observer’s position, typical perception situation, perception proper valence on the observer, ‘portraying’ the observation situation, verbs of the *bakmak* (to look) group.

It is widely posited that each natural language corresponds to a distinct linguistic worldview. According to A.Vezhbitskaya, the ‘linguistic worldview’ refers to the historically developed set

of conceptualizations about the world, as understood within the everyday consciousness of a particular linguistic community and reflected in its language. [1] This notion of the linguistic worldview draws upon the ideas of W.von Humboldt and neo-Humboldtians regarding the inner form of language, on one hand, and the principles of American ethnolinguistics, particularly the so-called Sapir-Whorf hypothesis of linguistic relativity, on the other. [2] In contemporary discussions surrounding the linguistic worldview, Yu.D.Apresyan employs the term 'naive worldview', indicating that such naive knowledge is derived from the linguistic units of a given language. [3]

It is important to note that research on the linguistic worldview encompasses various approaches to this phenomenon. In the initial stages of studying this concept, several scholars view the linguistic worldview as a 'product of human thought about the world,' serving as the foundation that encapsulates the subjective representation of real-world objects within a language. [4,5,6] Since the second half of the 20th century, research on the linguistic worldview has taken a new direction. At this stage, the concept is not interpreted as a 'product' of human representations of the surrounding world within language, but rather as a 'process' of understanding the world through the lens of language. [7,8,9] In this context, the linguistic worldview as a 'process' possesses a bidirectional nature. On one hand, it involves human representations of the surrounding world expressed through language; on the other hand, it encompasses the perception of actual reality facilitated by language. [10,11]

Alongside this, a significant focus in contemporary research is the study of the individual within language, who not only perceives and comprehends the world but also actively lives in it. As a result, language expresses not only objective reality but also the individual as a knowing subject. Thus, the emphasis on the human factor in the organization of language and in all cognitive processes indicates that language reflects not only a particular vision of the world but also *'the observer's position within it.'* [12] Various terms are used to denote this phenomenon, including *viewpoint*, *angle*, *focus*, *perspective*, and *observer factor*. The *viewpoint* represents the position of the subject in evaluating the events occurring around them. The *angle*, on the other hand, refers to the external aspect of the *viewpoint*, while the *focus* pertains to its internal aspect. *Perspective* involves the relative placement of the object, observer, light source, and the boundaries of the observable space. As for the *observer factor*, it encompasses all the aforementioned aspects. In this framework, the observer perceives the world from all sides comprehensively. Consequently, this study will utilize the term *observer factor*.

The observer is understood as an invisible participant in a typical situation, necessary for adequately conveying the meanings of words and grammatical categories. [13]

The role of the observer in this work will be examined in what is referred to as the dynamic aspect, that is, within the framework of interpreting the linguistic worldview as a process of perceiving and understanding the surrounding world through language.

It is well-known that perception of the world occurs through five senses: visual, gustatory, auditory, olfactory, and tactile perceptions. Among these, visual perception provides the most information about the environment. V.P. Zinchenko emphasized the advantages of visual images, stating that:

"Visual images, in contrast to auditory ones, are characterized by subjective simultaneity, allowing for the instant *grasping* of relationships that exist between various elements of the perceived situation. The visual image is extraordinarily rich, as it simultaneously reflects information about the color, spatial, dynamic, and figurative characteristics of objects. Finally, it is highly plastic." [14]

Alongside this, the transmission of visual perception in language, like any form of perception, is primarily associated with the construction of a typical situation, that is, a standard situation that encompasses all the essential common properties characteristic of all situations of that type. Based on the selection of significant properties of the typical situation, the necessary components and their interrelations are determined. For instance, in the context of visual perception, the important properties include: 1) the observer, 2) the object of observation, and 3)

the relationship of observation, as illustrated by the example: *Adam gökyüzüne bakıyor* (lit., *The man is looking at the sky*).

Additionally, the observer factor plays a significant role in constructing the situation of visual perception, as it describes the same extralinguistic reality from different angles, leading to the formation of various interpretations of the same situation. For example:

1. *Necdet karşısındakini görüyor* (lit., *Necdet sees the person opposite him*).
2. *Necdet karşısındaki kapıyı görüyor* (lit., *Necdet sees the door in front of him*).
3. *Kapı görünüyor* (lit., *The door is visible*).

In this context, the valence of the observer can be integrated into the semantics of one of the three components, denoting either the perceiving subject, the perceived object, or the act of perception itself, each represented in varying ways.

It is important to note that, in most cases, the valence of the observer is embedded in the situation of perception itself, denoted by the verbs from the group *bakmak* (to look) and *görmek* (to see). The former realizes visual perception as directed from the subject to the object of perception, which is associated with the transformation of internal experience into external manifestations, wherein our representations gain material embodiment. In contrast, the latter models the relationship from the object to the subject of perception, relating to the assimilation of what could be termed external experience and its conversion into internal understanding. [15] In other words, the verbs from the group *görmek* (to see) describe the state of the subject in relation to the object. In this case, the observer's position is primarily passive. Due to its distinctive nature, this type of situation requires separate examination. Consequently, this study focuses exclusively on the group of verbs *bakmak* (to look). As for the verbs from the group *bakmak* (to look), the subject exhibits active engagement with the object in terms of observation.

In addition, there are several verbs that, while not directly classified as verbs of visual perception in a semantic sense, acquire this meaning within the context of other components of the observation process. Accordingly, we can identify two types of portrayal of the observation situation, related to the following:

- a) the situation is conveyed by the verbs from the groups *bakmak* and *görmek*, which embed the valence of the observer in their semantics;
- b) in its representation, verbs from this group are not employed, and the valence of the observer is embedded in the semantics of each component of the utterance.

Let us consider the first type of portrayal of the observation situation. As previously mentioned, the verbs from the group *bakmak* (to look) possess the valence of the observer in their semantics, which manifests in an active manner. The verb *bakmak*, which signifies direct observation, is fundamental in a semantic sense, as seen in the example: *Adam gökyüzüne bakıyor* (lit., *The man is looking at the sky*). This statement indicates the observing subject (Adam), the object of perception (gökyüzü), and the act of perception (*bakmak*). Here, the observer seems to stand outside the extralinguistic situation, describing it from an external perspective.

It is important to note that, from a semantic standpoint, the verbs in the *bakmak* group can be divided into four subgroups that express: ‘direct observation’ (*bakmak, izlemek, seyretmek*), ‘observation for the purpose of study’ (*bakınmak, gözden geçirmek, incelemek*), ‘observation with intent’ (*dikizlemek, gözetlemek, gözlemek*), ‘observation accompanied by the actualization of certain aspects of the object of perception’ (*dikkat etmek, gözlemlemek, gözlemek*).

In the utterance featuring the verb *bakmak*, there is an indication that the object lies within the field of vision of the observing subject, as illustrated in the previously provided example: *Adam gökyüzüne bakıyor* (lit., *The man is looking at the sky*). Regarding utterances with the verbs *izlemek* and *seyretmek*, it is essential to note a certain semantic complication. For instance: 1. *Babam kaşları çatılmış, başını sallayarak izliyor bizi* (lit., *Father is watching us, frowning and shaking his head*), which implies ‘to look and evaluate’; 2. *Melek yoldan geçen insanları seyrediyor* (lit., *Melek is watching passersby*), indicating ‘to look and enjoy.’

In constructions featuring verbs from the second subgroup, there is information that implies the observation has a particular objective in mind. For example, with the verb *bakınmak* (to look

around), it is evident that the observation is intentional: Etrafına fotoğrafçıları çağırmak için *bakındı* (lit., He looked around to call the photographers). In the sentence with the verb *gözden geçirmek* (to review), there is a sense of systematic familiarization with the object as a whole, without detailing it: Yazarlar toplam 395 katılımcıyla 9 çalışmayı *gözden geçirdi* (lit., The authors reviewed nine studies involving a total of 395 participants). Similarly, in the utterance with the verb *incelemek* (to study), the semantics of observation is further complicated by the indication of detailed examination: Bilgi toplamak için aşağıdaki dergileri *inceledik* (lit., We reviewed these journals to collect information).

In the utterances with verbs from the third subgroup, two variants of semantic complication emerge: an indication of a current action and of a repeated action. For example: 1. Asıl yaptığı ise, şuradaki sarışınları *dikizlemek* (lit., What he is actually doing is spying on the blonde over there), suggesting that the subject observes the object secretly and without its knowledge, with a specific intention: a current action; 2. İşimiz, şu evi *gözetlemek* (lit., Our job is to watch that house); 3. Kuzum, bana kim gelip gidiyor, hep böyle *gözlüyor musun?* (lit., My lamb, do you always watch who comes and goes to me?): a repeated action.

In the sentences with verbs from the fourth subgroup, the observation emphasizes a particular characteristic of the object, resulting in its detailing. For example: 1. Caddenin kesiştiği yerdeki arabalara *dikkat et* (lit., Watch out for the cars at the intersection of the street); 2. Bu niyetle asistanların, doçent ve profesörlerle ilişkilerini *gözlemliyordu* (lit., With this intention, he was observing the relationships between the assistants, associate professors, and professors); 3. Hava değişikliklerini *gözlemek* havacılık için önemli bir iştir (lit., Monitoring weather changes is an important task for aviation).

Let us now examine the second type of portrayal of the observation situation, in which it is expressed not by a perception verb but through the interrelation of all components of the utterance. Here, the observer remains somewhat out of the frame. For example: 1. Müdür yeni projede hata olmaması için dosyaları kendisi *inceledi* (lit., The director reviewed the files to ensure there were no errors in the new project), where the semantics of the observation verb suggests the presence of an observer, as in *incelemek* (to review), meaning ‘document by document in a specific sequence.’ 2. Gemi dalgalarda sallanarak ufuk altında *kayboldu* (lit., The ship, rocking on the waves, disappeared over the horizon). 3. Üzün yolun sonunda karşısında mühteşem malikane *duruyordu* (lit., At the end of the long road stood a magnificent mansion), where, unlike the previously discussed utterance, the observer’s position is expressed implicitly, meaning that the observation is described from two perspectives: as an unfolding event (2) and as a present state (3).

Thus, in modeling the observation situation, the observer factor plays a crucial role. This factor can manifest in various ways. In this study, the influence of the observer factor on the representation of visual perception situations was examined through the lens of verbs from the *bakmak* group, in which this situation is interpreted as a deliberate, goal-oriented action. Future research is planned to explore the impact of this factor on the representation of visual perception situations using verbs from the *görmek* group, which are interpreted as the ‘state’ in which the perceiving subject is immersed.

References

1. Вежбицкая А. Языковая картина мира как особый способ репрезентации образа мира в сознании человека // Вопросы языкознания. №6. 2000. С. 35.
2. Рубец М.В. Восприятие и языковая картина мира (на материале китайского языка). Диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата философских наук. Москва, 2015. С.17.
3. Апресян Ю. Д. Избранные труды. Т.2. Интегральное описание языка и системная лексикография. Москва: Языки русской культуры., 1995. С.348.
4. Вайсгербер Й. Л. Родной язык и формирование духа / пер. с нем. М.: Изд-во МГУ, 1993. 232 с.

5. Сепир, Э. Статус лингвистики как науки // Языки как образ мира. М. СПб: Terra Fantastica, 2003. 131 с.
6. Уорф, Б.Л. Наука и языкознание // Языки как образ мира. М.СПб: Terra Fantastica, 2003. С. 214.
7. Апресян Ю. Д. Образ человека по данным языка: попытка системного описания // Вопросы языкознания. 1995. № 1. С.187.
8. Вежбицкая А. Языковая картина мира как особый способ репрезентации образа мира в сознании человека // Вопросы языкознания. №6. 2000. С. 33-38.
9. Казыдуб, Н.Н. Дискурсивное пространство как фрагмент языковой картины мира (теоретическая модель). Иркутск: ИГЛУ, 2006. 216 с.
10. Хомский А. Язык и мышление. Перевод с английского Б.Ю. Городецкого. М.: Изд. МГУ, 1972. С.54.
11. Дейк, ван Т.А. Язык. Познание. Коммуникация. Б.: БГК им. И. А. Бодуэна де Куртенэ, 2000. С.201.
12. Кубрякова Е.С. Языковое сознание и языковая картина мира // Филология и культура: материалы межд. конф. Тамбов, 1999. С. 7.
13. Падучева Е.В. Наблюдатель: типология и возможные трактовки // Труды международной конференции // ДИАЛОГ. М., Изд-во РГГУ, 2006. С.4037.
14. Буданцева Н.А. Глагольная таксономическая модель концепта зрительное восприятие (на материале английского и французского языков). Диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук. Тамбов, 2014. С.12.
15. Исламджанова Х. Языковая концептуализация визуального восприятия в русском языке // Ўзбекистон Республикаси Олий ва ўрта махсус таълим вазирлиги Фарғона давлат университети Тил ва жаҳон ҳамжамияти халқаро илмий-амалий анжуман материаллари. Фарғона, 2004. С.38.

***Mardiyev To‘lqin Kulibayevich
filol.(PhD), dotsent SamISI;
Kulibayev Faxriddin To‘lqinovich
SamISI 1-kurs magistranti***

TIL – MADANIYAT VA XALQ TUSHUNCHALARINING UZVIY BOG‘LIQLIGI

Annotatsiya: Ushbu maqola o‘z ichiga til, madaniyat va xalq tushunchalarining o‘zaro aloqalarini olib, ularning bevosita o‘zviy bir-biri bilan bog‘liqligini namoyon etadi.

Jumladan, bu vaziyatda til ko‘proq madaniyat bilan bog‘liq bo‘lgan hamda ularni yuzaga chiqaruvchi, vujudga keltiruvchi vosita sanaladi. Bular ichida til hukmron hisoblanadi. Bunda tilning noyobliligi shundaki, u keltirilgan tushunchalar bilan uzviy bog‘lanadi.

Kalit so‘zlar: til, madaniyat, etnik, etnos, ijtimoiy, tarixiy, milliy, his-tuyg‘u, ong, mentalitet, dunyoqarash, moddiy va ma’naviy, tafakkur, kundalik hayotdagi.

Ma’lumki, ijtimoiy fanlarda etnos tushunchasini xalq ma’nosida ham qo‘llaydilar. Bu tushuncha madaniyat, til tushunchalari bilan bevosita bog‘langan, shuning uchun ham ruscha - o‘zbekcha lug‘atda “etnik” yoki “etnos” atamasi biror bir xalqqa va uning madaniyatiga oid tushuncha deb qaraladi. “Etnogenez” esa biror xalqning kelib chiqishi deb tushunilgan [O‘ZSE. 1983:770]. Etnos insonlar yoki insonlarga xos tushunchalar majmuidir. Inson tabiatan ijtimoiy mavjudotdir [Abdurozzqova Sh., 1989:30].

Darvoqe, *madaniyat* ana shu etnos (xalq)ning ijtimoiy va tarixiy jarayonida vujudga kelgan, jamiyat taraqqiyotida tarixan erishilgan, sivilizatsiya bosqichini xarakterlaydigan moddiy va ma’naviy xususiyatlarning majmuidir. Chunonchi, falsafa lug‘atida madaniyatga shunday ta’rif beriladi, “Madaniyat (lotincha *cultura* parvarish qilish, ishlov berish) – ijtimoiy tarixiy amaliyot jarayonida insoniyat yaratgan va yaratayotgan hamda jamiyat taraqqiyotida tarixan erishilgan bosqichni xarakterlaydigan moddiy va ma’naviy boyliklar majmuidir” [G‘ofurov Z., 1976:275].

MUNDARIJA

I SHO‘BA

TIL TARAQQIYOTINING DERIVATSION QONUNIYATLARI

B.A.Xolikov. Zabardast olim	3
Hamidulla Dadaboyev. Ne‘mat Turniyozov – O‘zbek derivatologiyasi quruvchisi	5
I.K.Murzaev. Дериват, деривация, дериватология	8
A.Э.Маматов. Ўзбек дериватологиясининг сардори	10
X.З.Хайруллаев. Атоқли олим, меҳрибон устоз, камтарин инсон	12
S.Mirzayeva. O‘zbek derivatologiyasining asoschisi	14
A.Tyurobov. Тил илмини “булбул қилиб сайратган” олим (<i>ёҳуд устозга таъзим ўрнида портретга чизилар</i>)	14
Sh.N.Turniyazova. Dadam haqida	16
Ш.Буриева. Бобом ҳақида хотираларим	17

II SHO‘BA

SISTEM VA STRUKTUR TILSHUNOSLIK MUAMMOLARI

M.X.Hakimov., D.M.Komilova. Deyksis va anafora hodisalari	18
R.R.Bobokalonov. Neyropsixolingvistika - zamonaviy fanlardan biri	22
A.A.Ғаффоров. Иловали қурилмаларнинг шаклланишида тенг боғловчиларнинг ўрни	27
D.Sh.Mamirova. Nutqiy aktlarning reklama matnlarida ifodalanishi	30
M.F.Zayniddinov. Til va nutqning tarixan shakllanishi. nutqiy faoliyat masalasi xususida	32
F.Sadinov. O‘zbek tili veterinariya terminlarida eponimlarning qo‘llanilishi	33
I.Ernazarova., S.Bozorov. Yasama so‘zlarning kognitiv tahlili (Eshqobil Shukur ijodi misolida)	38
G.B.Berdiyeva., Y.A.Rahmatova. Sociolinguistics of youth language	41
E.B.Фалеева. Английские термины-неологизмы в современных словарях	44
D.M.Khudaiberdieva. Formation of students' linguistic competence in teaching the russian language	47
Д.Ш.Сафун. Особенности построения электронных словарных статей в netzverb online-wörterbuch	49
X.U.Sultanova. Xurshid Davron ijodida deyksisning ifodalanishi	52

III SHO‘BA

KOGNITIV, PRAGMATIK TILSHUNOSLIK MASALALARI

Бушуй Т.А. Лексикографическое представление оппозиционных конструкций фразеологических комплексов	57
N.S.Amirova. Observer in the modeling of a visual perception situation in the turkish linguistic worldview	59
T.K.Mardiyev., F.T.Kulibayev. Til – madaniyat va xalq tushunchalarining uzviy bog‘liqligi	63
A.V.Faleeva. Differentiation of colloquial rhymed constructions with humorous names of colloquial numerals	66
Г.М. Каримова. Кўчиш жараёни - таржимадаги нозик кира сифатида	68
G.Xasanova. Noverbal vositalarning vazifalari xususida ayrim mulohazalar	69
U.U.Sattarov. Elektron o‘quv adabiyotlarning metodik xususiyatlari	72
S.D.Shabanova. Zamonaviy tilshunoslikda lingvistik modellarning o‘rni	74
T.Y.Oydinov. Fonemalarning differensial va integral belgilari	76
G.B.Berdiyeva., E.R.Elmurodov. Influence of digital media on word games	78
M.U.Kamarova. Xorijiy til sifatida koreys tilining asosiy o‘qitish uslublari	80
E.B.Фалеева. Неология и неография английского языка XXI века	82
Z.D.Djurayeva. Turizm reklama matnlarining pragmatik xususiyatlari	86
K.Laura. The age criterion in derivation of argots in french language	87