



**“FILOLOGIK KOMPARATIVISTIKA VA  
TARJIMASHUNOSLIK MASALALARI”**  
*mavzusidagi xalqaro ilmiy-amaliy konferensiya*  
*2025-yil, 12-13-noyabr*

**“PROBLEMS OF COMPARATIVE  
PHILOLOGY AND TRANSLATION  
STUDIES”**  
*international scientific and practical conference*  
*November 12-13, 2025*



O‘ZBEKISTON RESPUBLIKASI OLIY TA’LIM, FAN VA  
INNOVATSIYALAR VAZIRLIGI

ALISHER NAVOIY NOMIDAGI  
TOSHKENT DAVLAT O‘ZBEK TILI VA ADABIYOTI  
UNIVERSITETI

TARJIMA NAZARIYASI VA AMALIYOTI KAFEDRASI

**“FILOLOGIK KOMPARATIVISTIKA VA  
TARJIMASHUNOSLIK MASALALARI”**

*mavzusidagi xalqaro ilmiy-amaliy konferensiya to‘plami*

*2025-yil, 12-13-noyabr*

THE MINISTRY OF HIGHER EDUCATION, SCIENCE AND  
INNOVATIONS OF THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN

ALISHER NAVO‘I TASHKENT STATE UNIVERSITY  
OF UZBEK LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

THE DEPARTMENT OF “TRANSLATION THEORY AND PRACTICE”

*Proceedings of the International Scientific and Practical Conference titled*

**“PROBLEMS OF COMPARATIVE PHILOLOGY  
AND TRANSLATION STUDIES”**

*November 12-13, 2025*

Tashkent – 2025

**UO‘K 845.711.05**

**KBK 133.585.3** “Filologik komparativistika va tarjimashunoslik masalalari” mavzusidagi xalqaro ilmiy-amaliy konferensiya to‘plami. – Toshkent, 2025. – 889 b.

ISBN 978-9910-8871-6-1

**Mas’ul muharrir:**  
**Shuhrat SIROJIDDINOV**  
akademik

Alisher Navoiy nomidagi Toshkent davlat o‘zbek tili va adabiyoti universiteti rektori

**Tahrir hay’ati:**

Nozliya Normurodova (O‘zbekiston), Zuhridin Isomiddinov (O‘zbekiston), Elizabetta Ragagnin (Italiya), Gabriela Shtoecli (Shveytsariya), Qosimboy Mamurov (O‘zbekiston), Sayed Mohamed Ahmad Korayem (Misr), Uzoq Jo‘raqulov (O‘zbekiston), Gulnoz Xalliyeva (O‘zbekiston), Yurgen Yakob Beker (Germaniya), Kemal Yavuz Ataman (Turkiya), Xurram Raximov (O‘zbekiston), Natalya Filimonova (Rossiya), Nedim Bakirci (Turkiya), Farhad Rahimi (Eron), Xayrulla Hamidov (O‘zbekiston), Elmira Adilbekova (Qozog‘iston), Sag‘inbek O‘rinboev (Qirg‘iziston), Zulxumor Xolmanova (O‘zbekiston), Mahmadiyor Asadov (O‘zbekiston), Ziyodaxon Teshaboyeva (O‘zbekiston), Dilnavoz Yusupova (O‘zbekiston), Islomjon Yakubov (O‘zbekiston), Nargiza Rashidova (O‘zbekiston), Sabohat Qahharova (O‘zbekiston), Hafiza Qo‘chqorova (O‘zbekiston,) Nigora Sulaymonova (O‘zbekiston), Dilafruz Muhammadiyeva (O‘zbekiston), Dostonbek Ahmadov (O‘zbekiston), Dilnoza Shonazarova (O‘zbekiston).

Mazkur xalqaro konferensiya materiali filologik komparativistika va tarjimashunoslikning dolzarb nazariy hamda amaliy masalalarini zamonaviy ilmiy yondashuvlar asosida yoritishga bag‘ishlanadi. To‘plamda turli milliy adabiyotlar, tillar va madaniyatlar o‘rtasidagi o‘zaro ta’sir, adabiyotlararo aloqalar, qiyosiy-tipologik va qiyosiy-genetik tadqiqotlar, badiiy va maxsus matnlarni tarjima qilish muammolari, tarjima strategiyalari va ekvivalentlik masalalari tahlil qilinadi. Shuningdek, konferensiya materiallarida tarjima nazariyasining zamonaviy konsepsiyalari, tarjimon kompetensiyasini shakllantirish, tarjimoni o‘qitish metodikasi, madaniyatlararo kommunikatsiya hamda globallashuv sharoitida tarjimaning ijtimoiy-madaniy ahamiyati kabi masalalar keng yoritiladi. Ilmiy maqolalar filologik komparativistika va tarjimashunoslik sohalarida faoliyat yuritayotgan olimlar, tadqiqotchilar, doktorantlar, magistrantlar hamda talabalar uchun mo‘ljallangan bo‘lib, fanlararo integratsiyani kuchaytirishga hamda nazariya va amaliyot uyg‘unligini ta’minlashga xizmat qiladi.

*Mualliflar qarashi va asarlar nomlaridagi imlo tahririyat nuqtayi nazaridan farqlanishi mumkin.*

To‘plam Alisher Navoiy nomidagi Toshkent davlat o‘zbek tili va adabiyoti universiteti Ilmiy-texnik kengashining 2025-yil 17-dekabrda 6-sonli yig‘ilish qaroriga asosan nashrga tavsiya etilgan.

**UO‘K 845.711.05**

**KBK 133.585.3** Proceedings of the International Scientific-Practical Conference on the topic “Problems of comparative philology and translation studies”. – Tashkent, 2025. – 889 p.

ISBN 978-9910-8871-6-1

**Editor-in-Chief:**

**Shuhrat SIROJIDDINOV**

Academician

Rector of Alisher Navo'i Tashkent State University of Uzbek Language and Literature

**Editorial Board:**

Nozliya Normurodova (Uzbekiston), Zuhridin Isomiddinov (Uzbekiston), Elizabetta Ragagnin (Italy), Gabriela Stöckli (Switzerland), Qosimboy Mamurov (Uzbekiston), Sayed Mohamed Ahmad Korayem (Egypt), Uzok Djoraqulov (Uzbekiston), Gulnoz Khallieva (Uzbekiston), Jürgen Yakob Beker (Germany), Kemal Yavuz Ataman (Turkiye), Khurram Rakhimov (Uzbekiston), Natalya Filimonova (Russia), Nedim Bakirci (Turkiye), Farhad Rahimi (Iran), Khayrulla Hamidov (Uzbekiston), Elmira Adilbekova (Kazakhstan), Sag‘inbek O‘rinboev (Kyrgyzstan), Zulxumor Xolmanova (Uzbekiston), Mahmadiyor Asadov (Uzbekiston), Ziyodakhon Teshaboyeva (Uzbekiston), Dilnavoz Yusupova (Uzbekiston), Islomjon Yakubov (Uzbekiston), Nargiza Rashidova (Uzbekiston), Sabohat Qahharova (Uzbekiston), Hafiza Qo‘chqorova (Uzbekiston,) Nigora Sulaymonova (Uzbekiston), Dilafruz Muhammadiyeva (Uzbekiston), Dostonbek Akhmadov (Uzbekiston), Dilnoza Shonazarova (Uzbekiston).

This international conference articles are dedicated to illuminating the current theoretical and practical issues in philological comparativistics and translation studies based on the modern scientific approaches. The collection analyzes of mutual influences between different national literatures, languages and cultures; interliterary connections; comparative-typological and comparative-genetic studies; the issues of translating literary and specialized texts; translation strategies and problems of equivalence. Furthermore, the conference materials extensively cover the topics such as: contemporary concepts in translation theory, the formation of a translator competence, methodologies for teaching translation, intercultural communication and socio-cultural significance of translation in the context of globalization. The given scientific articles are intended to scientists, researchers, doctoral students, master’s students and undergraduate students who actively working in the fields of philological comparativistics and translation studies and they serve to strengthen interdisciplinary integration as well as to ensure the harmony between theory and practice.

*The views expressed in the articles do not necessarily reflect those of the editorial board.*

The publication was recommended by the Scientific and Technical Council of Alisher Navo'i Tashkent State University of Uzbek Language and Literature on December 17, 2025.

## THE EVOLUTION OF THE VERB “TO BE” FROM PROTO-INDO-EUROPEAN TO PROTO-GERMANIC

*Gulzoda Suyunova,  
Independent researcher (PhD) at Samarkand  
State Institute of Foreign Languages*

**Abstract.** The verb *to be* represents one of the most complex and historically significant elements of the Germanic verbal system. Its development from Proto-Indo-European (PIE) reveals a multi-layered paradigm formed by the interaction of several roots, including *es-* (‘to be, exist’), *bhū-* (‘to become, grow’), and *wes-* (‘to remain, dwell’). Unlike Italic, Hellenic, and Indo-Iranian languages, which preserved more cohesive paradigmatic structures, the Germanic languages exhibit a high degree of suppletion, combining forms of different origins into a single verb system. The analysis of morphological stratification, phonological change, and analogical restructuring demonstrates how static (existence) and dynamic (becoming) semantics merged within the Germanic tradition. Gothic, Old English, and other early Germanic languages provide evidence of these processes, revealing continuity with PIE while also showing innovation in plural and preterite forms. This study underscores the verb *to be* as a central focus in historical linguistics, illustrating the interplay of morphology, semantics, and syntax in language evolution.

**Keywords:** *Proto-Indo-European (PIE), Proto-germanic, germanic languages, verb to be, suppletion, es-, bhū-, wes- roots, morphological stratification, phonological change, Old English, Gothic.*

**Annotatsiya.** “Bo‘lmoq” fe‘li german tillari fe‘l tizimining eng murakkab va tarixan eng muhim unsurlaridan biridir. Uning hind-yevropa dastlabki tilidan (PIE) rivojlanish jarayoni bir nechta ildizlarning o‘zaro ta’siri natijasida shakllangan ko‘p qatlamli paradigmmani namoyon etadi. Bu ildizlarga *es-* (‘bo‘lmoq, mavjud bo‘lmoq’), *bhū-* (‘bo‘lish, o‘smoq’) va *wes-* (‘qolmoq, yashamoq’) kiradi. Italik, Ellin (yunon) va Hind-eron tillarida paradigmatik tuzilmalar yaxlit holda saqlanib qolgan bo‘lsa, german tillarida yuqori darajadagi **suppletsiya** kuzatiladi, ya’ni turli kelib chiqishga ega shakllar yagona fe‘l tizimida birlashgan. Morfologik qatlamlanish, fonologik o‘zgarish va analogik qayta tuzilish tahlili natijasida statik (mavjudlikni bildiruvchi) va dinamik (o‘zgarish yoki bo‘lish jarayonini bildiruvchi) ma’nolar german an’anasi doirasida birlashgani aniqlanadi. Gotika, qadimgi ingliz tili va boshqa ilk german tillari bu jarayonlarga oid dalillarni ko‘rsatib, PIE bilan davomiylikni saqlagan holda ko‘plik va o‘tgan zamon shakllarida yangiliklar yaratganini namoyon etadi. Ushbu tadqiqot “bo‘lmoq” fe‘lini tarixiy tilshunoslikdagi markaziy mavzu sifatida yoritib, til evolyutsiyasida morfologiya, semantika va sintaksis o‘rtasidagi o‘zaro bog‘liqlikni ko‘rsatadi.

**Kalit so‘zlar:** *hind-yevropa dastlabki tili (PIE), dastlabki german tili, german tillari, “bo‘lmoq” fe‘li, suppletsiya, es-, bhū-, wes- ildizlari, morfologik qatlamlanish, fonologik o‘zgarish, qadimgi ingliz tili, gotika.*

**Introduction.** In the history of Indo-European languages, no verb has attracted as much scholarly attention as the verb *to be*. Essential for expressing existence, identity, and grammatical relations, it forms the backbone of verbal systems across the Indo-European family. In Proto-Indo-European (PIE), *to be* was not originally suppletive but rather reflected distinct roots with different semantic functions: *es-* denoting static existence, *bhū-* indicating dynamic processes of becoming, and *wes-* expressing continuity or dwelling. Over time, Germanic languages integrated these roots into a single paradigmatic system, producing one of the most morphologically irregular and semantically layered verbs in their lexicons. The evolution of *to be* in Germanic is marked by suppletion, analogical leveling, and morphological incorporation. Gothic preserves PIE alternations in singular and plural forms but also introduces innovations such as the use of preterite-present suffixes and restructuring of plural paradigms. Old English exhibits parallel complexity, combining forms from multiple roots into the modern English system (*am, is, are, was, were, be, been*). Comparisons with other Indo-European branches Latin, Greek, Sanskrit, and Hittite demonstrate both the shared inheritance of PIE roots and the unique pathways Germanic languages followed in their evolution. This paper, therefore explores the historical development of the verb *to be* from PIE through Germanic, emphasizing the layered morphology, phonological alternations, and semantic

duality that characterize its modern forms. By tracing these processes, we gain insights not only into the evolution of a single verb but also into the mechanisms of linguistic change more broadly.

**Literature reviews and methods. The historical development of the verb *to be*.** In Germanic languages, the verb «to be» is essential, and linguistic scholars consider its historical evolution to be a significant topic. Even though this verb did not have suppletion in Indo-European languages at first, historical events led to its development into a complicated paradigmatic system that combines a variety of morphological levels and origins. The verb «to be» in Indo-European languages did not initially have a suppletive paradigm. Thus, determining its historical evolution in several languages is a crucial undertaking. Different methods of suppletion are used in Germanic languages. The intrinsic rules of language evolution determined whether suppletion was preserved or vanished. The present indicative paradigm contains the verb «to be» in its most suppletive form. Accordingly, the generalisation of the ē/a ablaut in Hittite reinforced the number opposition in inflection to emphasise the difference between singular and plural. Gothic uses distinct roots for the single and plural forms of the verb «to be,» exhibiting a comparable pattern. It was dissimilative suppletion that led to this distribution [J. P. Mallory and D. Q. Adams 2006:63].

Weak suppletion is a different type of dissimilative suppletion that is seen in Greek. The third-person singular *estí(n)* and third-person plural *eisí(n)* are often the most used forms, and their high usage frequency is linked to their stability. Analogies that are based on the speaker-listener interaction are also evident in Latin. However, the West Germanic branch of the Germanic language family has the most common suppletive forms of the verb «to be.»

One of the most common and grammatically complex verbs in English is «to be.» Expressing the ideas of existence, emergence, or occurrence is linked to its primary semantic purpose. The following characteristics of this verb can be described from a linguistic standpoint:

1. Inconsistency in morphology: The verb «to be» has a very erratic paradigmatic system and may be found in a variety of forms, including *am, is, are, was, were, be, and been*. The phenomenon of substitution has led to the development of this variety of forms.

2. Functional dualism: This verb serves as an auxiliary verb in addition to a lexical verb. It represents the sense of «existence» as a lexical verb, but it marks tense and voice categories as an auxiliary verb (e.g., *is running, was done*).

3. The statement: «She is happy» requires a complement since the word «to be» is a copular verb.

4. Subjectless constructions: This verb is used to indicate existence or status by the use of dummy subjects, namely *there* and *it* (*There is a book on the table*). *Rain is falling*.

5. Diversification of morphology: This verb has displayed a broad variety of morphological and phonological variations due to historical evolution. Old English, along with other Germanic languages, influenced its current forms.

Consequently, the verb «to be» is one of the most intricate and important linguistic components, not just grammatically but also semantically and syntactically [J. P. Mallory and D. Q. Adams 2006:64].

The verb *be* is one of the most important and commonly used verbs in Germanic languages. It has a complicated formation process that includes many historical phases. This verb's evolution was characterised by morphological layers, phonological shifts, and root alternations. Furthermore, the main characteristics of its development are reflected in its present, preterite, and participial forms.

R. Lass claims that the verb «be» has not yet been fully explained in terms of its historical evolution. Ancient developments, outside influences, and analogous shifts all influenced its different forms. The Proto-Indo-European (PIE) root *es-* is thought to be the origin of the majority of modern

forms, according to scholars. Originally appearing in singular forms as *és-*, this root was mostly employed in athematic verbs. The third-person singular *és-ti*, for instance, is equivalent to the Lithuanian *ēst*, the Latin *est*, the Greek *ἔστί*, and the Sanskrit *ásti*. However, the zero-grade PIE root *s-* is where the plural forms originate. Sanskrit *sánti*, Doric Greek *ἐντί*, and Latin *sunt*, for example, all resemble the third person plural *s-énti*. Understanding the historical development of the verb «be» in Germanic languages is thought to be largely dependent on the alternations and stratifications found within this paradigm. The development of *be* therefore shows how PIE roots changed in later times as well as the morphology of the Germanic languages [Lass.R 1994:98].

The verb *be* in Germanic languages experienced a complicated route of paradigmatic evolution, originating from the Proto-Indo-European root. Its development was influenced by morphological advances, phonetic alterations, and analogical adjustments at various times, according to experts. The Indo-European verb forms were consistently maintained in Gothic in the first, second, and third person singulars as well as in the third person plural, as Beekes points out. Nonetheless, in order to remove contradictions within the paradigm, the first and second person plural forms were reorganised based on the third person plural form. Preterite-present verb suffixes were added to these forms, which also incorporated the prefix *si-*. When this innovation first occurred, the inherited Indo-European plural forms seemed out of place in the Proto-Germanic paradigm [Beekes, R.S.P. 2011: 89].

The predicted *sinth* is replaced in Gothic with the third-person plural word *sind*. This shift is explained as a phonological process by Bennett, who connects it to the voicing of voiceless consonants brought on by the verb being spoken in a weakly stressed position [Bennett, W.H. 1972:16].

However, Ringe and Taylor use paradigm extension to explain this occurrence. The Proto-Germanic era saw the addition of suffixes common to preterite-present verbs and the shift of the vowel *i* from the singular forms into the plural forms. This led to the creation of forms like *izum*, *izuth*, and *izunth*. The second and third person singular forms were retained as *es*, but the vowel *i* changed to *e* in Proto-Norse in the next stage. However, the inventive form *er* had supplanted the Proto-Norse third person singular form by the twelfth century [Ringe, D., & A. Taylor 2014:518].

Krahe and Meid claimed that the PIE root *es-* lacked imperative forms. In Gothic, the imperative was expressed using subjunctive forms, but in other Germanic languages, the imperative forms were derived from the present root *wes-* and the future/conditional root *bī-* [Krahe and Meid 1969:98].

The Old English word *eom*, which means «I am,» has a complicated morphology and was likely derived from the root *bēo-*, which denoted future or habitual activity, according to Prokosch. According to additional research, this version was heard with a short vowel rather than a long diphthong. [Prokosch 1978:39].

There was no perfect form of the Proto-Indo-European (PIE) verb *es-*; instead, preterite forms were created independently in a number of Indo-European languages. According to this view, the verb *wesanan* was frequently used to produce the preterite forms in Germanic languages. Lühr states that this verb is a member of Class V and may be found in single forms with the suffix *-a-*, as well as in plural and dual forms with the suffix *-ē-*. The Proto-Germanic form of *sanþ-*, which evolved from the PIE participle *s-ont-*, gave rise to Old Icelandic *sannr* and Old English *sōð*. The meaning of «truth, reality» is expressed in these forms.<sup>1</sup> The single forms of Germanic verbs are derived from the PIE root *es-*, whilst the plural and future forms are derived from Class V and Class B roots. This allows Germanic verbs to concurrently represent many roots and morphological layers. This highlights the intricacy and multi-layered structure of the verbal system by demonstrating the historical morphological evolution of verbs in the Germanic languages: a single verb was generated in parallel from many morphological systems and roots. As a result, the differences between preterite and perfect

forms in Old English, Old Icelandic, and other Germanic languages are explained using morphological and historical foundations in addition to phonetic or lexical ones [Lühr, R. 2016:63].

**Results and discussions. The paradigmatic complexity of the verb *to be* in Indo-European and Germanic Languages.** The verb «be» has a complicated historical evolution that shows its essential importance in Germanic languages and its employment as a core lexical verb in terms of semantics, according to R.D. Fulk’s analysis.<sup>3</sup> Proto-Indo-European (PIE) roots, the Proto-Germanic morphological system, and Proto-Norse strata all had a significant part in the derivation of this verb’s morphology and functions, which were shaped throughout numerous historical layers. Accordingly, the development of the present, preterite, and participial forms may be explained by the fusion of morphological and semantic layers rather than only phonological change. The plural and future forms, for example, evolved from Proto-Germanic Class V and Class B roots, but the singular forms are derived from PIE roots. In this sense, the verb *be* emphasises the verbal system’s intricate, layered structure and development in addition to the syntactic and semantic prominence seen in Germanic languages. Thus, the verb *be* is an important source for studying the etymology of the present and preterite forms as well as for historical linguistic research. In the Germanic languages, this verb served as a key component that had a direct impact on the morphological and semantic evolution of other verbs [R.D. Fulk 2018: 325].

The verb that expresses existence and identity has been paradigmatically reconstructed in Proto-Indo-European (PIE). The following are examples of its primary forms:

PIE	Old English	Gothic	Latin	Greek	Sanskrit
<i>h<sub>1</sub>ésmi</i>	<i>eom</i> (am)	<i>im</i>	<i>sum</i>	<i>eimi</i>	<i>asmi</i>
<i>h<sub>1</sub>ési</i>	<i>art</i> (art)	<i>is</i>	<i>es</i>	<i>ei</i>	<i>asi</i>
<i>h<sub>1</sub>ésti</i>	<i>is</i> (is)	<i>ist</i>	<i>est</i>	<i>esti</i>	<i>asti</i>
<i>h<sub>1</sub>s-més</i>	<i>sindon</i> (are)	<i>sijum</i>	<i>sumus</i>	<i>esmen</i>	<i>smas</i>
<i>h<sub>1</sub>s-té</i>	<i>sindon</i> (are)	<i>sijup</i>	<i>estis</i>	<i>este</i>	<i>stha</i>
<i>h<sub>1</sub>s-énti</i>	<i>sindon</i> (are)	<i>sind</i>	<i>sunt</i>	<i>eisi</i>	<i>santi</i>

As a result of diachronic evolution, this paradigm saw morphological and phonetic alterations in a number of Indo-European languages. Genealogical distinction explains the formation of the verb *to be* in PIE through numerous suppletive roots. The PIE roots *bhew-* (‘to become, to grow’) and *wes-* (‘to remain, to live’) transmitted states of motion and change, whereas the root *h<sub>1</sub>es-* (‘to be, to exist’) represented existence. These many roots were incorporated into the morphological paradigms of the Germanic languages, meaning that several roots were merged into a single verbal paradigm. In contrast, despite phonetic changes, the Italic, Hellenic, and Indo-Iranian languages maintained a more cohesive paradigmatic structure morphologically.

According to the research, the evolution of the verb *to be*, starting with PIE, resulted in changes to phonetics, morphology, and syntax in many languages. The following is a summary of this developmental process: 1. Several morphosyntactic changes led to the segmentation of the PIE paradigm. 2. Multiple suppletive roots are integrated into a single verbal paradigm in the Germanic languages, such as Old English and Gothic. 3. Despite their differences in phonetics, the Italic, Hellenic, and Indo-Iranian languages maintained a same morphological framework. 4. The verb *to be*’s genealogical evolution was significantly influenced by the process of suppletion, which is especially noticeable in Germanic languages. As a result, this study demonstrates the morphological

intricacy of the verbal paradigm and offers a clearer understanding of the historical history of the verb to be, following its growth from PIE roots to its forms in current languages [Гамкрелидзе-Иванов 1984: 18].

In Indo-European languages, verbs that indicate the main external states of the subject are classified into two categories based on morphological and semantic differences, according to study by Gamkrelidze and Ivanov. Conventionally, these kinds of conjugations are classified as «active» (athematic) and «non-active» (thematic, mediopassive, or Hittite -hi-type). According to this viewpoint, verbs that convey how these roots differ from one another. According to this viewpoint, verbs that conveyed the idea of «being» also depended on the two primary roots, *es-* and *bhū-*. Both their morphological and semantic characteristics show how these roots differ from one another. In general, the athematic (active) root *es-* indicates direct and lasting presence. Many Indo-European languages have forms derived from this root that served as counterparts to the present tense. Semantically, the root *es-* asserts existence, highlighting the subject's state's continuity and stability; in other words, it conveys a static meaning. For instance, this root is the source of the following forms: Sanskrit *ásti*, which means «he/she/it is,» Hittite *eszi*, which means «he/she/it is,» Greek *eim(i)* «I am,» Latin *est*, which means «he/she/it is,» Lithuanian *ėsti*, which means «he/she/it is,» Old Church Slavonic *ієсть*, which means «he/she/it is,» and Gothic *ist*, which means «he/she/it is. However, the root *bhū-* is of the «non-active» kind and has a thematic or mediopassive character. This root mainly means to enter a new state, to come into existence, or to go through a transformation process. *Bhū-* is therefore seen semantically as a dynamic verb root as it indicates process and development rather than confirming existence. For example, this root is the source of the Latin *fui*, which means «I was,» the Lithuanian *buvaũ*, which means «I was,» the Sanskrit *bhāvati*, which means «he/she/it becomes, comes into being,» and the Greek *phū*, which means «to grow, to develop.» The dynamic and processual semantics of this root are confirmed by etymological study, which reveals that the Greek word *phū* originally meant «to grow, to develop.» The ancient meanings of the root *bhū-*, which means «growth, natural development,» are similarly reflected in the Slavic term *бълие*, which means «grass, herbage.» It's interesting to note that this Slavic form shares phonemes with the Greek *phyllon* («leaf»), indicating that the root *bhū-*'s original meaning was intimately associated to the growth and development of plants. Therefore, the verb «to be» was articulated in Indo-European languages using two different roots: *es-*, which indicated static existence and the stability of a state, and *bhū-*, which indicated dynamic process and the transition into a new state or coming into being. According to Gamkrelidze and Ivanov, an activity–inactivity (active–inactive) contrast alone is insufficient to describe the semantic opposition between these roots. Instead, their antagonism is founded on the difference between «existence» (*es-*) and «entering into a state or development» (*bhū-*), which sheds light on the semantic differentiation process within the Indo-European languages' verbal system [Гамкрелидзе-Иванов 1984:23].

Franz Bopp argues that grammatical systems and verbal forms should be prioritised above lexical objects when assessing linguistic kinship. Some notable phonetic and morphological similarities between the comparable forms of «is» and «are» in Sanskrit, Latin, and Gothic are as follows: The root in all three languages starts with the phoneme *s*; in the «is» forms, *s* comes after a short vowel, while in the «are» forms, *s* comes directly after a word. The «is» forms have the phoneme *t* in their morphemic structure, while the «are» forms have the sequence short vowel + *n* + *t/d*. Given the statistically extremely low likelihood that such an isomorphism would have developed by accident, these traits are regarded as remnants of a shared proto-language. According to genealogical categorisation, these linguistic entities might be referred to as «sister languages.» Such linguistic data serves as the basis for the genealogical classification process in linguistics, which consists of

identifying language families, breaking them down into smaller groupings, and using the comparative approach to reconstruct the proto-language’s phonological and morphological system [Bopp, Franz 1854:12].

When considering the regular phonological changes that have occurred, John Algeo claims that the personal endings of verbs in the Indo-European languages show genetic consistency. The present indicative paradigm of the Sanskrit verb *bhar-* («to carry, to bear») is a prime example of this consistency. The morphological exception to this paradigm is the first-person singular ending *-mi*. This ending was initially reserved for athematic verbs in Sanskrit that did not include a thematic vowel, but it was eventually expanded to include verbs that did. The stem, to which the person-number endings are subsequently connected, is formed by the combination of the thematic vowel (for instance, the *-a* added to the root *bhar-*) and the root and ending. «Athematic» refers to verbs that do not have a thematic vowel. A remnant of the first-person singular ending in Proto-Indo-European athematic verbs is the English verb *am*’s *-m* ending. As a result, several morphological components of Modern English verb forms, such as the *-m* in *am*, reflect the Proto-Indo-European verbal system’s archaic layer and provide crucial proof of the historical connections between languages [John Algeo 2010:65].

John Algeo maintained that compared to Modern English, the morphological system of Old English was far more intricate and multi-layered. Copular verbs like *bēon* (“to be”) are syntactically aligned with the nominative case; the widespread use of case inflections and the complex forms of personal pronouns all show how sophisticated this system is. This suggests that morphological and syntactic units in Old English were highly dependent on one another both paradigmatically and functionally [John Algeo 2010:92].

Conclusion. The historical development of the verb *to be* in the Germanic languages illustrates the extraordinary complexity that can arise from the convergence of multiple morphological and semantic layers. Originating in the PIE roots *es-*, *bhū-*, and *wes-*, the verb underwent extensive suppletion, phonological change, and analogical restructuring as it evolved into the paradigms of Gothic, Old English, and later Germanic languages. While Indo-European languages such as Greek, Latin, and Sanskrit maintained a relatively cohesive paradigm, Germanic developed a system in which singular, plural, and preterite forms reflect different roots and morphological strata. The modern English verb *to be*—with forms such as *am*, *is*, *are*, *was*, *were*, *be*, and *been*—embodies this layered history, combining PIE inheritance with Germanic innovations. Beyond morphology, it functions as both a lexical and auxiliary verb, a copula, and a marker of tense and voice, underscoring its central grammatical and semantic role. Thus, the verb *to be* stands not only as one of the most irregular and suppletive verbs in Germanic languages but also as a vital subject for historical linguistic inquiry. Its evolution from PIE through Germanic highlights the dynamic interplay of suppletion, phonological development, and semantic distinction, offering a paradigmatic example of how language history is shaped by both inherited structures and innovative reanalysis.

### References

1. Beekes, R.S.P. *Comparative Indo-European linguistics: an introduction*. 2nd ed. Amsterdam. Translated from *Vergelijkende taalwetenschap. Een inleiding in de vergelijkende Indoeuropese taalwetenschap*, Utrecht. 2011, 441p.
2. Bennett, W.H. Prosodic features in Proto-Germanic. In van Coetsem & Kufner 1972: 100p.
3. Bopp, Franz. *A Comparative Grammar of the Sanscrit, Zend, Greek, Latin, Lithuanian, Gothic, German and Slavonic Languages*. London: Routledge, 1854.
4. Crystal, D. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge University Press. 2010

5. J. P. Mallory and D. Q. Adams. *The Oxford Introduction to Proto-Indo-European and the Proto-Indo-European*. New York. 2006, 619p
6. John Algeo *The Origins and Development of the English Language: Sixth Edition* Boston, USA. 2010, 365 p.
7. Krahe, H., & W. Meid. *Germanische Sprachwissenschaft*. 3 vols. Berlin 1969
8. Lass, R. *Phonology and Morphology*. Cambridge University Press. 1992
9. Lass, R. *Old English: a historical linguistic companion*. Cambridge. 1994
10. Lühr, R. 2016. Indogermanistik und Germanistik. *HS* 129.233–63
11. Prokosch, E. Forchhammers Akzenttheorie und die germanische Lautverschiebung. *JEGP* 1.1–9 1978, 271p.
12. Pyles, T. & Algeo, *The Origins and Development of the English Language*. Harcourt Brace, Company. 1992
13. R.D. Fulk *Grammar of the Early Germanic Languages* Studies in Germanic Linguistics .John Benjamins Publishing Company/Amsterdam / Philadelphia . 2018, 376 p.
14. Ringe, D., & A. Taylor. *The development of Old English*. Oxford 2014
15. Гамкрелидзе-Иванов 1984 – Гамкрелидзе Т.В., Иванов Вяч.Вс. Индоевропейский язык и индоевропейцы. Тт. 1–2. Тбилиси

<b>MUNDARIJA</b>		
<b>I SHO‘BA.</b> <b>TARJIMASHUNOSLIKNING DOLZARB MASALALARI</b>		
1.	<b>Zuhriddin ISOMIDDINOV.</b> Bizdagi tarjima muammolari	5
2.	<b>Uzoq JO‘RAQULOV.</b> O‘zbek tarjimachiligi istiqbollari	9
3.	<b>Xurram RAHIMOV.</b> Alisher Navoiyning “Munojot” asari tarixi, tabdili va tarjimalari xususida	14
4.	<b>Олимджон КАСИМОВ, Мартаба СУЛТОНЗОДА.</b> Некоторые лингвистические особенности перевода лексем «Шахнаме» на русский язык	17
5.	<b>Ne‘matilla OTAJONOV.</b> Eiji Mano – boburshunos olim	22
6.	<b>Rukhsana IFTIKHAR.</b> Beautification of Mughal women	26
7.	<b>Наталья ФИЛИМОНОВА.</b> Возможности перевода при работе иностранных учащихся с художественным текстом: начальный этап изучения русского языка	30
8.	<b>Kosimboy MAMUROV, Nargiza TILAKOVA</b> Functional syntax and mystical semantics: correlating syntaxemes with sufi concepts in Alisher Navai’s Uzbek and English ghazals	34
9.	<b>Xayrulla HAMIDOV.</b> Muslimbek Yo‘ldoshevning tarjimonlik mahorati	38
10.	<b>Ирода СИДДИКОВА.</b> К вопросу взаимосвязи психолингвистики и художественного перевода	43
11.	<b>Xayrulla HAMIDOV, Zulfizarxon QORAXO‘JAYEVA.</b> Nafisiyning “Jannatning yarim yo‘lida” asaridagi personaj portretining tarjimada berilishi	46
12.	<b>Абдумажид МАДРАИМОВ, Аскарый МАДРАИМОВ.</b> Вопросы перевода научного наследия Захириддина Мухаммада Бабур и традиция перевода в библиотеке Акбара в XVI веке	51
13.	<b>Supriya BANERJEE, Iroda UMAROVA</b> Reimagining classics: Tagore, translation and the global reader	54
14.	<b>Ziyodaxon TESHABOYEVA.</b> “Boburnoma”da milliy-madaniy xususiyatli til birliklar va ularning inglizcha tarjimalari	58
15.	<b>Zulhumor MIRZAEVA.</b> Politics under the mask of poetics: Chulpon’s translations in the 1920s-1930s	62
16.	<b>Abdumajid MAMADALIYEV.</b> Badiiy matn tarjimasida milliy koloritni ifodalash muammosi	72
17.	<b>Muhammadjon ABDUVALIYEV.</b> Sinxron tarjimashunoslikning zamonaviy masalalari	74
18.	<b>Мұратбек БАҒИЛА, Кәмшат АЙМАҒАМБЕТОВА.</b> Қазақ тілін оқыту әдістемесінің жаңа парадигмалары	80
19.	<b>Shermurod SUBHON.</b> Ijodiy kengashlarda	84

20.	<b>Shermurod SUBHON.</b> Kitobxon oldida mas’uliyat	97
21.	<b>Murtazo SAYDUMAROV, Mahmudaxon SAYDUMAROVA.</b> O‘zbek adabiyotining ilk romani tarjimalarida lingvomadaniy xususiyatlar va semantik o‘zgarishlar	100
22.	<b>Mahmadiyor ASADOV.</b> Tarjima – qiyosiy adabiyotshunoslikning tadqiqot obyekti	107
23.	<b>Toshtemir ALIMOV.</b> Gender as a linguistic and cultural parameter in literary translation	113
24.	<b>Tozagul MATYOQUBOVA.</b> Ilk hasbi hol qasida va uning o‘zbek tarjimoni	116
25.	<b>Dilafruz MUHAMMADIYEVA.</b> “Boburnoma”ning turkcha tarjimasi bilan bog‘liq muammolar	120
26.	<b>Umida TURAeva.</b> Some challenges of translating forensic terminology between English and Uzbek	125
27.	<b>Елена ПАНОВА.</b> Мифопоэтическая традиция и проблемы перевода и функционирования онимов в волшебной повести «Алиса в стране чудес» Л. Кэрролла	128
28.	<b>Gulnoz MAMARASULOVA.</b> Siyosiy matn tarjimasining lingvokulturologik jihatlari	137
29.	<b>Эльнора БАГАВОВА.</b> Эволюция переводческих теорий: от традиционных подходов к современным тенденциям	140
30.	<b>Dilfuza KHUDAIBERDIEVA.</b> Translation studies: traditional and modern approaches	144
31.	<b>Gulnoz MAMARASULOVA, Ruxshona CHO‘LIYEVA.</b> Diplomatiik matnlarning tarjimada ifodalanishi	148
32.	<b>Dilshod AMIRQULOV.</b> Tarjimashunoslikda til tipologiyasi asosida komparativ yondashuv	151
33.	<b>Tozagul NASRULLAEVA.</b> Literary translation as interpretation: on the basis of Dreiser’s literary works	154
34.	<b>Мохира ЭШКУВАТОВА, Достонбек АХМАДОВ.</b> Роль лингвострановедческого компонента в обучении переводу	156
35.	<b>Islom TURDIYEV.</b> Ingliz va o‘zbek tillaridagi ayrim ish yuritish terminlarining tarjima talqinidagi muammolari	160
36.	<b>Фотима УМИРЗАКОВА.</b> Проблемы традиционных и современных подходов в немецком переводе	163
37.	<b>Shohsanam BEKMURATOVA.</b> Maqollar tarjimasida tarjimonlarining lingvomadaniy yondashuvlari	166
<b>II SHO‘BA.</b> <b>QIYOSIY TILSHUNOSLIK MASALALARI</b>		
38.	<b>Sayed Mohamed Ahmad KORAYEM.</b> Principles for developing comparative linguistic studies	171
39.	<b>Nedim BAKIRCI.</b> Milli kimlik in’şasinda halk biliminin işlevi	183
40.	<b>Farhad RAHIMI.</b> Beş, bel, bilek, elik/ el ve ilik kelimelerinin etimolojik ve anlamsal bağlantilari	190

41.	<b>Farhad RAHIMI.</b> Nezrali'nin Çağatay türkçesi sözlüğünün yanlıslari üzerine iii	196
42.	<b>Сырга ОРУНБАЕВА, Долон МАЛДЫБАЕВ, Сагынбек ОРУНБАЕВ, Минаим МЫРЗАКМАТОВА, Жумакадыр КАРАМОЛДОЕВ.</b> Горы и их лингвистические особенности: типология высот и культурных различий	215
43.	<b>Saodat MUHAMMEDOVA, Kosimboy MAMUROV.</b> Reforming the Uzbek latin alphabet: balancing phonology and global usability	221
44.	<b>Jamoliddin YOQUBOV.</b> O‘zbek va fransuz tillarida “ona” leksemasi ifodalanishining lingvomadaniy xususiyatlari	223
45.	<b>Valijon VOSITOV.</b> Inkor kategoriyasi lingvistik voqelik sifatida	228
46.	<b>Khushnuda SAMIGOVA.</b> Identifying the semantic component of affectionate form	230
47.	<b>Nargiza DOSBAYEVA.</b> Specific features of intercultural interaction in the course of teaching foreign languages	234
48.	<b>Наргиза РАШИДОВА.</b> Арабские заимствования в узбекском языке	237
49.	<b>Ulugbek KARIMOV.</b> Evolution of the cyborg in 21st-century science fiction	240
50.	<b>Kamola ABDULLOEVA.</b> Diskursiv shaxsning grafik vositalar orqali aks etishi	243
51.	<b>Malohat BADALBAYEVA.</b> The special lexicon of emergency situations in global linguistics	246
52.	<b>Nargiza MIRZALIYEVA.</b> Abdulla Qahhor va Ernest Xeminguey hikoyalari qahramonlarining o‘ziga xos xususiyatlari: badiiy tahlil va qiyosiy yondashuv	250
53.	<b>Azizjon SHARIPOV.</b> Yozma manbalarda Hirotning tarixiy toponimikasiga doir ma’lumotlar: Shohrux Mirzo davri	253
54.	<b>Марина ИСКАКОВА.</b> Тюркоязычный мир от древности	263
55.	<b>Nargiza YUSUPOVA.</b> The impact of artificial intelligence on comparative philology and translation studies	268
56.	<b>Feruzaxon KARIMOVA.</b> Aksiolingvistikada ma’naviy qadriyatlar talqini	272
57.	<b>Zebiniso BEKMURADOVA.</b> O‘zbek va fransuz maqollaridagi xiazmlarning stilistik, semantik va lingvokulturologik tahlili	276
58.	<b>Sabohat QAHHAROVA.</b> Yassaviy hikmatlarining lingvokulturologik tahlili	279
59.	<b>Dildora KENJAYEVA.</b> “Boburnoma”da antroponimlarning etimologik o‘ziga xosligi	283
60.	<b>Gulchexra IBRAGIMOVA.</b> Ingliz tilida abbreviatura va akronimlarning lingvistik tahlili	287
61.	<b>Asror YUSUPOV.</b> Lug‘at maqolasi strukturasi nazariyasining rivojlanishi	289

<b>III SHO‘BA.</b> <b>QIYOSIY ADABIYOTSHUNOSLIK MASALALARI</b>		
62.	<b>Islamjan YAKUBOV.</b> Rudakiy adabiy-estetik qarashlari va lirik qahramon kechinmalari	293
63.	<b>Islamjan YAKUBOV.</b> Tragik konflikt, tragik holat va tragik qahramon	299
64.	<b>Dilnavoz YUSUPOVA, Kemal Yavuz ATAMAN.</b> Uch tazkira qiyosi	308
65.	<b>Gulnoz XALLIEVA, Sitora SHAHOBOVA.</b> “Middlemarch” va “Anna Karenina” asarlarida ayol obrazining o‘rni	316
66.	<b>Bahodir XOLIQOV.</b> Britaniya adabiyoti va o‘zbek mifologiyasida daydi yog‘dularning badiiy xususiyatlari	320
67.	<b>Gulnoz XALLIYEVA, Farangizbonu ADAMOVA.</b> “Jek Raymond” romanida Jek obrazi tahlili	323
68.	<b>Nuriddin ALTINBOYEV.</b> Qiyosiy tahlilda tipologiya va ta’sir fenomeni	326
69.	<b>Gulnoz XALLIYEVA, Iroda ABDULLAYEVA.</b> The nature of satirical characters in the works of Jonathan Swift	330
70.	<b>Mohinur SOTVOLDIYEVA, Gulnoz KHALLIEVA.</b> The poetics and typology of father figures in world literature: a comparative study	333
71.	<b>Xafiza KUCHKAROVA.</b> Badiiy adabiyotda peyzajning o‘rni	336
72.	<b>Dilafro‘z QAHNAROVA.</b> Zamonaviy o‘zbek qissachiligi: xalq an’analari va yangi badiiy shakllar	340
73.	<b>Elmira HAZRATQULOVA.</b> Temuriylar davri adabiy muhitida ustoz-shogird munosabatlari	344
74.	<b>Тоҳир ТУРДИБОЕВ, Нигора ЖЎРАЕВА.</b> Беҳбудий таълимотида ижтимоий-маърифий масалалар	347
75.	<b>Ma’suma OBIDJONOVA.</b> Ingliz va o‘zbek adabiyotida ilmiy fantastikaning narratologik asoslari	351
76.	<b>Эльмира АДИБЕКОВА, Сўлтан САНИЯТ.</b> Türk masallarında hayvan motifleri: geyik motifinin kültürel yansimalari	357
77.	<b>Эльмира АДИБЕКОВА, Сая БЕРІКҚЫЗЫ.</b> Türk-islam kimliginin sembolü olarak Носа Ahmet Yesevi türbesi	368
78.	<b>Эльмира АДИБЕКОВА, Гүлнұр ЕСЕНГЕЛДІ.</b> Karaşaş Ana türbesi ve halk inançlarında kadın Evliya imgesi	375
79.	<b>Дильфуза МАМЕТОВА, Малика ПРИСТАЕВА.</b> Keloğlan ile padişahin kizi masalinin Anadolu, Uygur, Gagavuz varyantlarında kahraman ideali	383
80.	<b>Карлыгаш БОРБАСОВА, Какимжан БИШМАНОВ, Мира БАЛТЫМОВА.</b> Сравнительный анализ текстов Корана, Библии и Торы по проблеме межрелигиозного диалога и укрепления общенационального единства	394
81.	<b>Улжан ТУНГАТОВА, Алуа АЛШЕР.</b> Сравнительный анализ идей толерантности в Коране и Библии	400
82.	<b>Ляззат АЛИЕВА, Möldir NIŞANHAN.</b> Masalların mitolojik mirasi: şamanizm ve islam’in izleri	404

83.	<b>Ынтымакгул НУРМАГОМБЕТОВА.</b> Бейсенбай Кенжебаев зерттеулеріндегі қазақ және түркі әдеби мұраларының тарихи-филологиялық зерделенуі	412
84.	<b>Saltanat YERALIYEVA.</b> The writing of Khoja Akhmet Yasawi’s “Diwani hikmet” in turkic language	420
85.	<b>Yorqinoy ISMONOVA.</b> Bola timsolining roman obrazlari tizimidagi o‘rni	423
86.	<b>Динара САЗАНОВА.</b> “Диуани хикмет” мәтініндегі сопылық терминдердің рухани-философиялық мағынасы	427
87.	<b>Шахноза КАРИМОВА, Жұлдыз МҮСІРКЕП.</b> Akbura Evliya türbesi: türk-islam mimarisi ve halk inanci arasindaki bağ	433
88.	<b>Bahodir ABSAMADOV.</b> Shekspirning “Venetsiya savdogari” asarida komik adolat va axloqiy kinoya	440
89.	<b>Ghalib ZEYAD.</b> The evolution of Uzbek language, literature, and culture: the enduring legacy of Alisher Navai	445
90.	<b>Axror QODIROV.</b> O‘zbek qissachiligida xarakter va kolliziya: Qo‘Chqor Norqobil ijodi misolida XX–XXI asr badiiy talqinlarining evolyutsiyasi	451
91.	<b>Мұратбек БАҒИЛА, Қанзада ЖҮБАНЫШЕВА.</b> Тілді деңгейлік оқыту жүйесінің ғылыми негіздері	457
92.	<b>Sevinchoy YOQUBOVA.</b> G‘oyaviy-badiiy konsepsiya va poetik obrazlar hissiy tonalligi	461
93.	<b>Munira KARIMOVA.</b> The poetics of human and animal characters in Uzbek prose	472
<p><b>IV SHO‘BA.</b>  <b>KOMPARATIVISTIKA VA METODIKA:</b>  <b>TIL, ADABIYOT TA’LIMI TIPOLOGIYASI</b></p>		
94.	<b>Назаркул ИШЕКЕЕВ, Рима ЗАЙЫРКУЛОВА.</b> Ааламдашуу доорунда медициналык багытта окуп жаткан чет элдик студенттерге «Манас» эпосу жана «Махабхарата» эпосундагы идеяларды салыштыруу менен тарбиялоонун мүмкүнчүлүктөрү	480
95.	<b>Ирина ЯНОВСКАЯ.</b> Формирование риторической компетенции в системе профессиональной подготовки студентов нефилологических специальностей	487
96.	<b>Лариса БАСОВА, Светлана ДРАЧЕВА.</b> Повышение качества обучения русскому языку в странах постсоветского пространства: опыт Тюменского государственного университета	490
97.	<b>Айгул АЙТБЕНБЕТОВА, Нургул ЖОЛДАСОВА.</b> Қазақ тілін оқытудағы цифрлық ресурстар: тиімділігі мен болашағы	494
98.	<b>Muxabbat MATQURBONOVA, Umida YANGIBOYEVA.</b> Ikki tillilik sharoitida o‘zbek tili ta’limining komparativ tahlili	498
99.	<b>Зулхумар ЖУМАНОВА.</b> Роль алгоритмов в формировании навыков устной и письменной речи студентов	500
100.	<b>Максим ЧИКОВ, Диляра ЗАРИПОВА.</b> Проблемы подготовки специалистов в тройке языков русский-английский-узбекский и пути решения	504
101.	<b>Раъно ИСАМУТДИНОВА.</b> Система упражнений для развития навыков устной речи на занятиях по русскому как иностранному	509

102.	<b>Зулфия КУРБАНОВА.</b> Методика работы с текстом на занятиях по русскому как иностранному	513
103.	<b>Nilufar BURIYEVA.</b> Sun’iy intellekt vositalari asosida o’quvchilarning lingvokulturologik kompetentligini rivojlantirish metodikasi	516
104.	<b>Шахло УРИНОВА.</b> Методика формирования лексической компетенции студентов в процессе изучения русского как иностранного	520
105.	<b>Gulnoz MAMARASULOVA.</b> Geopolitical meanings in media discourse	524
	<b>V SHO’BA.</b> <b>КОМПАРАТИВИСТИКА</b> <b>YOSH TADQIQOTCHILAR NIGOHIDA</b>	
106.	<b>Saida SULTANOVA.</b> Badiiy tarjimaga o’rgatishda an’anaviy va zamonaviy yondashuvlarning ahamiyati	529
107.	<b>Зухра МОЛДАБАЕВА, Айжан ЖАНҒЫЛЫШ.</b> Коммуникативтік құзыреттілікті қалыптастырудағы инновациялық әдістер	533
108.	<b>Barno ABDULLAYEVA.</b> “Boburnoma”ning xorijiy tillarga tarjima qilinishi	539
109.	<b>Zilola ERGASHEVA.</b> The transformation of translation practices through artificial intelligence technologies	544
110.	<b>Dilfuza ZOYIROVA, Aziza YORIQULOVA.</b> Tarjima jarayonida ekvivalentlik tamoyilining an’anaviy talqinlari	547
111.	<b>Anvar MIRZAQULOV.</b> Ikkinchi jahon urushidan so’ng sinxron tarjimaning paydo bo’lishi va rivojlanishi	549
112.	<b>Shuhrat MULADJANOV.</b> Different approaches to the lingua-stylistic analysis in literary translation	552
113.	<b>Gulshan ERGASHEVA.</b> Tarjimashunoslikda an’anaviy va zamonaviy yondashuvlar: o’zbek va nemis tilidagi frazeologizmlar talqinida	555
114.	<b>Dilnoza SHONAZAROVA.</b> Xabarlar tarjimasi va lokalizatsiyasi	559
115.	<b>Умида МУХАММАДИЕВА.</b> Язык и культура: трудности перевода национально-культурных особенностей	562
116.	<b>Gulnoza XUDAYQULOVA.</b> Badiiy asarlarni tarjima qilishda uchraydigan ba’zi frazeologik muammolar	567
117.	<b>Shoira XODJAYEVA.</b> Bilvosita tarjimaning muammolari: an’anaviy va zamonaviy yondashuvlar	570
118.	<b>Djamila BEGJANOVA.</b> Paremiologik birliklar tarjimasida lingvokulturologik ekvivalentlik	573
119.	<b>Shaxnoza IBRAGIMOVA.</b> Linguistic representations of characters and peculiarities of translating their original names in “A farewell to arms”	577
120.	<b>Fazilat XABIBULLAYEVA.</b> Mumtoz adabiy manbalar tarjimasida: arxaiik leksika jahon tarjimashunosligi kontekstida	580
121.	<b>Maftuna RO’ZMETOVA.</b> Fentezi adabiyoti tarjimasida madaniy konnotatsiyalarning ifodalanishi	584
122.	<b>Maftuna SAPAROVA.</b> “Al-qistosu-l-mustaqim fi ilmi-l-arud” asarining ingliz tilidagi tarjimasida xususida	588

123.	<b>Zuhra ZOKIROVA.</b> Jorj Oruel “Molxona” asaridagi satirik jumlar tarjimasining madaniy jihatdan moslashtirilganligi	591
124.	<b>Mokhinur GELDIEVA.</b> “Kecha va kunduz” romani inglizcha tarjimasida leksik-semantik hamda sintaktik o‘ziga xoslik	593
125.	<b>Dilnoza OLIMOVA.</b> Ritm va takorlash: “Alpomish” dostonining Qosimboy Ma’urov tarjimasida sintaktik-semantik transformatsiyalar	596
126.	<b>Mohichehraxon ANVAROVA.</b> Zamonaviy texnologik terminlarni tarjima qilish usullari	599
127.	<b>Xosiyatxon QO‘CHQORALIYEVA.</b> The role of Reynold Nicholson and John Arberry’s translation in the study of sufi literature	603
128.	<b>Nargizaxon MIRAXATOVA.</b> Dariy tilidagi ba’zi somatizmlar qatnashgan maqollarning o‘zbek tiliga tarjima qilish masalasi	606
129.	<b>Munisa NAZIROVA.</b> O‘zbek va ingliz tilidagi idiomalarning qiyosiy tarjimalari	609
130.	<b>Муниса ТОШБОЕВА.</b> Стратегии транскреации и адаптации политических реалий в узбекском цифровом медиадискурсе	612
131.	<b>Mahliyo FAYZULLAYEVA.</b> Sinxron tarjimada ekvivalentlik va muqobillik masalasi	615
132.	<b>Достонбек АХМАДОВ.</b> Первый шаг к академической истории перевода	618
133.	<b>Sevinch MIRZALIYEVA.</b> Badiiy tarjimada leksik-stilistik bo‘yoqdorlik muammolari	623
134.	<b>Nozima QAYUMOVA.</b> The impact of artificial intelligence on the translation process and the transformation of the translation profession	626
135.	<b>Ситора ТУРСУНБОЕВА.</b> Грамматические и лексические трансформации в художественном переводе	629
136.	<b>Миннура ЮЛДАШЕВА.</b> Об узбекских переводах произведений Чингиза Айтматова	633
137.	<b>Раънохон ХОЛОВА.</b> Роль невербальной коммуникации в синхронном переводе с русского на узбекский	636
138.	<b>Aziza MAHAMMATOVA.</b> Bilvosita tarjimada tarjimon mahoratining namoyon bo‘lishi	640
139.	<b>Mashhuraxon MAHAMMADALIYEVA.</b> Tarjimashunoslik: an’anaviy va zamonaviy yondashuvlar	644
140.	<b>Nozima ABDURAHMONOVA.</b> Tibbiy terminlarni tarjima qilishda so‘zma-so‘z va erkin yondashuvlarning o‘zaro ta’siri	646
141.	<b>Azimjon AXMEDOV.</b> Frazeologiya va frazeografiya tarixiga umumiy nazar	649
142.	<b>Madinabonu OLLABERGANOVA.</b> Comparative-methodology and typology in language and literature education	654
143.	<b>Мўхаббат МАССАДИКОВА, Akerke ALTINBEKOVA.</b> Masallarda toplumsal normlar bag‘lamida adalet ve ceza kavrami	657
144.	<b>A’zamxon SOBITOV.</b> Zoonimlarning etnolingvistik va madaniy konnotatsiyalari	665
145.	<b>Vazira ABDIEVA.</b> The essential role of intercultural communication competence in various fields	668

146.	<b>Oyshajon USMONOVA.</b> Structural and semantic aspects of legal terminology in the context of linguistic comparativism	670
147.	<b>Diyora AKRAMOVA.</b> The use of labor-related euphemisms in English and Uzbek linguistics	675
148.	<b>Zebuniso FAYZULLAYEVA.</b> Nemis va o‘zbek tillaridagi fe’l mayllarining chog‘ishtirma tadqiqi	679
149.	<b>Dilnoza NURULLAYEVA.</b> Ma’dan komponentli frazeologik birliklarda insonga xos xususiyatlar	683
150.	<b>Dilorom KHURRAMOVA.</b> Semantic features of mimetic words in Uzbek and Korean	686
151.	<b>Munisa KARIMOVA.</b> Ingliz fe’llari aspektualligini belgilashda funksional-semantik yondashuv va harakat turlari (aktionsart)	690
152.	<b>Gulzoda SUYUNOVA.</b> The evolution of the verb “to be” from Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Germanic	693
153.	<b>Temur ASHUROV.</b> Realia as cognitive and linguocultural anchors in multilingual communication: towards a new integrative model	700
154.	<b>Shahnoza NAZAROVA.</b> O‘zbek va nemis tillarida tanqid nutqiy akti: lingvopragmatik xususiyatlar	703
155.	<b>Shoxida NAZAROVA.</b> Bilvosita nutqning pragmatik jihatlari	706
156.	<b>Lobar RAHIMQULOVA.</b> Ijtimoiy tarmoq matnlarini lingvistik tahlil qilishning ahamiyati	710
157.	<b>Farrukh ABDUSAMATOV.</b> How speech act theory (sat) is applied in discourse analysis	713
158.	<b>Gulmira ERGASHEVA.</b> Davlat boshqaruvi terminlari xususida ayrim ilmiy-nazariy qarashlar	717
159.	<b>Nodira BEKMATOVA.</b> The lexicon of the machine: decoding the new language of AI	720
160.	<b>Munisa DUSTBERDIYEVA.</b> Causative syntaxemes, the use of preposition “under”	724
161.	<b>Nigora ISMATULLAYEVA.</b> Globallashuv konseptining semantik qirralari	727
162.	<b>Mahliyo JALISHOVA.</b> Persuazivlik argumentatsiya va manipulyatsiya o‘rtasida: mediadiskursdagi kommunikativ-pragmatik jihatlari	730
163.	<b>Ozoda QURBONOVA.</b> O‘zbek tilida gidrometeorologik terminlar sinonimiyasi	733
164.	<b>Guljahon RAHMATULLAYEVA.</b> Ruhiiy holatlarni ifodalovchi leksik birliklarning semantik tarmoqlanishi	736
165.	<b>Yulduz SATTOROVA.</b> Siyosiy diskursda aforistik ifodalarning kognitiv qiyosiy tahlili: ingliz va o‘zbek tillari misolida	743
166.	<b>Umida ELMURATOVA.</b> O‘zbek va koreys tillarida shaxs konseptosferasining periferik birliklari	746
167.	<b>Nafosat RAIMOVA.</b> Ijtimoiy chegaralangan leksikaning struktur va semantik xususiyatlari	749
168.	<b>Dilnura YULDASHEVA.</b> Ingliz tilidagi ayrim siyosiy terminlarning etimologik tahlili	751

169.	<b>Maftuna AZIMOVA.</b> Language, context, and intention: a linguapragmatic analysis of code-switching in Uzbek-English conversations	754
170.	<b>Samira RAXIMOVA.</b> Konseptual metaforalar milliy tafakkurning aks-sadosi sifatida: ingliz va o‘zbek tillarining qiyosiy tahlili	759
171.	<b>Gulrom ABDULLAYEVA.</b> Koreya va o‘zbek madaniyatida ota-onaga sadoqat tushunchasining lingvokulturologik tahlili	764
172.	<b>Мубинабону МАМАЛАТИПОВА.</b> Этимология русских числительных	766
173.	<b>Durdona XO‘JAMURODOVA.</b> Lingvistik komparativistikaning taraqqiyot omillari	771
174.	<b>Зохида КИЛИЧЕВА.</b> Отражение общественной жизни в романе А. С. Пушкина «Евгений Онегин»	774
175.	<b>Zilola ISLOMOVA.</b> Ingliz va o‘zbek tillarida qo‘shma so‘zlar yasalishi	780
176.	<b>Nasiba JUMAeva.</b> Literary representation of globalization challenges in contemporary Turkish fiction	785
177.	<b>Gulhayo ORTIQOVA.</b> Charlz Dikens ijodida ramziylik, an’analar va ma’naviy munosabatlarning aks etishi	787
178.	<b>Malohat AYDARALIYEVA.</b> XX asr G‘arb va Sharq adabiyotida ayol obrazi tasvirlanishining o‘ziga xos jihatlari	790
179.	<b>Bahora ABDIYEVA.</b> XVI asrga oid nemis masallari tahlili hamda ularda hasad, ochko‘zlik, beodoblik va sabrsizlik kabilarning tasviri	793
180.	<b>Мунаввара ХАСАНОВА.</b> Проблема нравственного совершенствования личности в творчестве Л. Н. Толстого	795
181.	<b>Shahnoza IKROMOVA.</b> Eastern and Western mentality: a structural comparison of “Mehrobdan chayon” and “Pride and prejudice”	800
182.	<b>Umida PIRNAPASOVA.</b> Functional approach to teaching language	804
183.	<b>Maftuna ASKAROVA.</b> Kognitiv tamoyillar nazariyasining shakllanishi	807
184.	<b>Dilnoza SHONAZAROVA, Gulchehra YO‘LDASHEVA.</b> Maktabgacha ta’limda elektron doska orqali ingliz tilini o‘rgatish samaradorligi	811
185.	<b>Abdurauf BOZOROV.</b> A comparative analysis of pedagogical models focusing on the transition from traditional to digital methodologies	815
186.	<b>Айдана ҚУАНЫШ.</b> Ертегілердегі диалог құрылымының стилистикалық ерекшелігі	818
187.	<b>Shirinoy YAKHSHIMURATOVA.</b> The method of cross-cultural comparison in foreign language lessons	826
188.	<b>Sevinch XUDOYBERDIYEVA.</b> Constructive and behavioral methods in teaching English as a second language	829
189.	<b>Зухра МОЛДАБАЕВА, Нурсая КАДЫРОВА.</b> Қазақ тілін оқытудағы тілдік орта мен мотивация факторы	832
190.	<b>Aziza JALOLOVA.</b> Chet tilini o‘qitishda talabalarning tarjima ko‘nikmalarini rivojlantirishda interfaol usullarning roli	836
191.	<b>Инобатхон УМАРОВА.</b> Роль когнитивистики в обучении русскому языку узбекских студентов	839
192.	<b>Mubina GANIYEVA.</b> Comparative analsis of speech etiquette in hisrorical and modern educational contexts	844

193.	<b>Гулсевар САИДОВА.</b> Языковые особенности творчества А. С. Пушкина и их использование в преподавании ТРКИ	846
194.	<b>Садокат ОЛИМЖОНОВА.</b> Изучение творчества А. С. Пушкина в преподавании русского языка как иностранного	853
195.	<b>Sokina IRISBAYEVA.</b> Moral and ethical values in Uzbek and English proverbs: a comparative study	860
196.	<b>Музаффар ХОДЖАХАНОВ.</b> Структурный и синтаксический анализ терминов статистики в английском и русском языках	864
197.	<b>Shahnozabonu NEMATOVA.</b> The Interconnection Between Gender and Language: A Historical and Sociolinguistic Perspective	866
198.	<b>Мохира ЭШКУВАТОВА.</b> Роль грамматического комментария в преподавании русского как иностранного	870
199.	<b>Nazokat G‘offorova.</b> Zulfiya she’rlari tarjimasida metaforalar tarjimasining o‘ziga xos xususiyatlari	873
200.	<b>Адолат Бобо-Хожаева.</b> Тюркские заимствования в русском языке: пространство билингвизма и историческая перспектива	877