



**“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‘rinboyev (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.

PRINCIPLES FOR DEVELOPING COMPARATIVE LINGUISTIC STUDIES

Sayed Mohamed Ahmad Korayem,

*Associate Professor of Uzbekistan State University of World Languages
(Egypt)*

DOI: 10.52773/tsuull.conf.2025.12.11/ZTYU5465

Abstract. This study seeks to investigate and define the modern methodological and theoretical principles necessary for developing Comparative Linguistic Studies (CLS), moving beyond the historical constraints of the traditional Comparative Method (CM) which focused primarily on phonetic and lexical reconstruction. The significance of this research lies in addressing the challenges linguists face in comparing syntactic and semantic levels, especially within the context of functional and contextual explanations for mechanisms of language change.

The research aims to construct an integrated theoretical framework that combines historical-genetic methodology with insights from Cognitive Linguistics and Usage-Based Linguistics, leveraging computational tools (Corpus-based methods) to enhance the precision and objectivity of comparison. A mixed-methods approach is proposed for the applied model, grounded in a critical review of literature from Google Scholar, utilizing corpus data analysis (quantitative) and qualitative techniques focused on identifying and comparing contexts of use and homologous grammatical structures.

The study is expected to conclude with a three-dimensional developmental framework for CLS: the Genetic Principle (reconstruction), the Functional Principle (context analysis), and the Computational Principle (measuring frequency and patterns). The research offers practical recommendations for fostering interdisciplinary specialties, thereby opening new avenues for testing cognitive hypotheses regarding linguistic evolution and acquisition.

Keywords: *Comparative Linguistic Studies, Advanced Comparative Method, Usage-Based Linguistics, Comparative Syntax, Reconstruction.*

Annotatsiya. Ushbu tadqiqot Qiyosiy Lingvistik Tadqiqotlarni (QLT) rivojlantirish uchun zarur bo‘lgan zamonaviy metodologik va nazariy tamoyillarni o‘rganishga qaratilgan bo‘lib, u an’anaviy Qiyosiy Metodning (QM) fonologik rekonstruksiya bilan bog‘liq tarixiy cheklovlarini yengib o‘tadi. Tadqiqotning ahamiyati tilshunolar duch keladigan sintaktik va semantik darajadagi qiyinchiliklardan, ayniqsa, funksional va kontekstual tushuntirishlar doirasida kelib chiqadi. Maqsad, Kognitiv Lingvistika, Qo‘llanishga Asoslangan Lingvistika (Usage-Based Linguistics) va hisoblash vositalarini (Korpusga asoslangan metodlar) o‘z ichiga olgan integratsiyalashgan nazariy asosni yaratishdir, bu esa taqqoslashning obyektivligi va aniqligini oshiradi. Tadqiqot metodologiyasi Google Scholar bazasidan olingan adabiyotlarni tanqidiy tahlil qilish (sifat)ga asoslanadi. Kelajakdagi amaliy model uchun esa, korpus ma’lumotlarini taqqoslash (miqdoriy) va kontekstual tahlil (sifat)ni birlashtiruvchi aralash yondashuv taklif etiladi.³ Tadqiqot natijalariga ko‘ra, QLT rivojlanishi uchun uch o‘lchovli asosga erishish kutilmoqda: Genetik tamoyil (rekonstruksiya), Funksional tamoyil (kontekst tahlili) va Kompyuter tamoyili (chastota va naqshlarni o‘lchash).

Kalit so‘zlar: *qiyosiy lingvistik tadqiqotlar, rivojlangan qiyosiy metod, Qo‘llanishga asoslangan lingvistika, qiyosiy sintaksis, rekonstruksiya.*

Introduction. Background and Historical Context. Comparative Linguistic Studies originated at the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries, primarily aiming to establish genetic kinship between languages and to reconstruct the common ancestor language, or what is known as the Proto-language. This endeavor relied on the classical Comparative Method (CM), founded on the basic principle established by the Neogrammarians that «sound laws have no exceptions». This methodological assumption allowed for a structured and reliable reconstruction process for phonological and lexical phenomena in Indo-European and other language families.

However, this historical focus resulted in a clear methodological limitation. The Comparative Method was traditionally viewed as an effective tool for «first-order reconstruction» of phonological phenomena, given the largely arbitrary relationship between sound and meaning in most vocabulary items. Conversely, the reconstruction of syntactic, morphological, and semantic levels was considered «second-order,» as it primarily depended on the results derived from phonological and lexical reconstruction and lacked a reliable, independent methodology of its own.

This historical constraint led to a methodological gap, where comparative linguistics faced a major challenge in interpreting shared patterns and changes affecting grammatical structures over time. The need for development became more pressing with the emergence of modern linguistic theories, such as functional, cognitive, and usage-based approaches, which explain linguistic

evolution based on cognitive processes, social contexts, and actual language use. This necessitated expanding the principles of the Comparative Method to encompass these dimensions.

Research Problem. The core research problem stems from the existing disparity between the enormous theoretical development in modern linguistics (e.g., the shift toward cognitive models) and the slow development of practical comparative methodologies that can reliably handle complex analytical levels such as syntax and semantics. Researchers in comparative studies oscillate between explanations that attribute shared patterns to common genetic origin and those that rely on functional and contextual responses to specific historical conditions.

The specific research problem is articulated in the following question: **How can integrated methodological and theoretical principles be formulated to develop Comparative Linguistic Studies, enabling them to transcend the historical limitations of traditional reconstruction methodology and integrate computational and cognitive insights to offer explanations for the mechanisms of linguistic change and acquisition?**

Research Objectives and Questions. Primary Objective: To identify, analyze, and synthesize the modern methodological and theoretical principles that should underpin advanced Comparative Linguistic Studies, and to propose a framework for integrating the historical Comparative Method with usage-based and computational approaches.

Research Questions:

1. What are the main methodological challenges faced by the traditional Comparative Method at the levels of syntactic and contextual analysis?
2. How do Cognitive Linguistics and Usage-Based Linguistics theories contribute to building a supportive theoretical framework for developing linguistic comparison?
3. What are the specific methodological principles (both quantitative and qualitative) that allow for a systematic and objective comparison of linguistic data across multiple languages?
4. What are the positive and negative implications of applying the principles for developing Comparative Linguistic Studies (including cognitive and social effects)?

Research Significance. The theoretical significance of this research lies in its potential to bridge the methodological gap between the historical approach (focusing on genetic kinship) and the modern approach (focusing on functional and contextual explanation), by providing a conceptual framework that clarifies the interaction between genetic and functional explanations of linguistic phenomena. Identifying these principles contributes to advancing the field from being merely a tool for historical reconstruction to a domain for testing cognitive and functional hypotheses.

The applied significance is manifested in providing a precise methodological framework that can be used for cross-linguistic acquisition research.³ Furthermore, these advanced principles support researchers in Arabic and in teaching it as a second language, offering a basis for developing more accurate and effective Contrastive Linguistics curricula that move beyond superficial comparison of linguistic units to comparing their contexts of use and frequency.

Literature Review. Genesis and Development of the Classical Comparative Method

The Comparative Method emerged as the scientific foundation of historical linguistics. It relied on the Neogrammarian premise that «sound laws have no exceptions,» which allowed for the systematic comparison of genetically related languages to reconstruct Proto-language forms. This method was successfully applied in the 19th century to reconstruct Proto-Indo-European.

However, it is crucial to emphasize the nature of the Comparative Method: it is not a diagnostic tool for assessing language relatedness, but rather a heuristic device used to elucidate the prehistory of an already known language family. The method's strengths and weaknesses have been tested in historically documented language families (such as Romance languages).

Traditional Methodological Challenges and Limitations. Despite its success in phonology, the Comparative Method faced significant challenges when applied to more complex levels of analysis:

A. Limitations in Syntax and Morphology. Some scholars, such as Ringe and Eska, insist on restricting the Comparative Method to phonology alone, arguing that there is no comparable method for reconstructing morphology or syntax. This restriction is based on two key assumptions about phonology: first, that the relationship between sound and meaning in most vocabulary items is arbitrary, and second, that sound change is largely regular and independent of semantics or syntax.

Traditional comparative syntax, which is considered a «second-order reconstruction,» proceeds by examining divergent structures in daughter languages and attempting to reverse recognized processes of syntactic change (such as reanalysis and grammaticalization) to arrive at the structure of the parent language. This process is inevitably prone to reflecting the individual researcher’s judgment and theoretical framework.

B. Borrowing, Diffusion, and Ideological Bias. Linguistic borrowing and areal diffusion pose obstacles that threaten the principle of regularity in sound change, potentially skewing the results of genetic comparison.

A more serious challenge in modern Comparative Linguistic Studies is ideological influence. Political developments, such as the rise of nation-states and their insistence on a single national language, have led to the suppression of minority languages and dialects. Conversely, political divisions (e.g., the break-up of the former Yugoslavia) have led to the splitting of a common language (Serbo-Croatian) into four separate national languages, driven by ideological bias rather than strict linguistic methodology. This effect mandates that the comparative researcher adopt a critical approach to data selection and language classification.

Expanding the Scope of the Comparative Method: Functional and Contextual Shift. To overcome the shortcomings of the traditional method in analyzing syntax and context, modern approaches have emerged to develop the Comparative Method:

A. The Comparative Method in Language Acquisition Research. The Comparative Method has been developed into a systematic procedure for organizing and interpreting cross-linguistic language acquisition data. The main benefit of this application is that it provides a structured process for comparing acquisition data across all levels of grammar (phonological, morphological, syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic), allowing for simultaneous identification and control of variation.

This advanced method involves three essential steps when applied to cross-linguistic acquisition research:

1. Identify and compare cognate forms across a family of genetically related languages.
2. Identify and compare the contexts of use for these forms across the language family.
3. Compare the acquisition of the forms in light of the different contexts of use within the language family.

This focus on the contexts of use, rather than just the forms, represents a fundamental shift. When shared patterns are found to be the result of common responses to specific contextual and functional conditions (functionalist explanation), comparing the contexts of use becomes the essential methodological principle for explaining the phenomena. This cumulative model represents a paradigm shift from simple historical reconstruction to testing functional hypotheses based on data.

B. Construction-Based Syntactic Reconstruction. In an effort to overcome syntactic limitations, new directions have emerged that utilize Construction Grammar theories. This approach suggests that syntactic reconstruction is both possible and appropriate, despite being second-order. This is done by reversing recognized processes of syntactic change (Reanalysis and

Grammaticalization) to arrive at the Proto-language structure, using the «Construction» as the fundamental comparative unit instead of abstract rules alone.

The Shift from ‘What’ to ‘How’ in Comparison. The literature review reveals that the traditional Comparative Method was geared toward asking the historical question: «What was the Proto-language?» (a genetic question). In contrast, the advanced method poses a functional and cognitive question: «How did linguistic phenomena evolve in different contexts of use?». This shift means that the developed method seeks not only to determine genetic relatedness but also to understand the mechanisms of change itself.

The ideological challenge facing comparative studies imposes additional constraints; the developmental principles must include methodological controls for ideological or algorithmic bias in data selection and conclusion drawing.

Theoretical Framework. Developing Comparative Linguistic Studies requires a broad theoretical framework that explains linguistic patterns not only in terms of their shared history but also in terms of the cognitive and contextual mechanisms governing their evolution.

The Tension Between Genetic and Functionalist Explanations. The tension between genetic explanations (attributing common patterns to genetic kinship and shared history) and functionalist explanations (attributing them to shared responses to specific contextual conditions) forms the central theoretical framework for modern comparative studies.

The study of the modern development of the Comparative Method in the humanities and social sciences suggests that comparatists benefit significantly from understanding the history of the method and its application in other fields, such as comparative anatomy. This interdisciplinary perspective confirms that the developed principles must constitute a multi-disciplinary process, accommodating both types of explanations to provide a comprehensive picture.

Cognitive Linguistics and the Comparative Method. Cognitive Linguistics provides the foundation for explaining linguistic patterns based on universal cognitive principles. The prevalence of certain word order patterns across world languages, for instance, can be explained by the pressure resulting from general perceptual principles, such as iconicity between form and function, or the need for concise representation of frequent and salient concepts.

The field of «Diachronic Cognitive Linguistics» has emerged as a recent trend focusing on the synchronic aspect of linguistic evolution, involving extensive comparative studies on linguistic and cross-cultural variation. This approach includes studies on complex Arabic phenomena, such as case marking in Classical Arabic, confirming the suitability of the cognitive framework for analyzing morphological and semantic complexities in Semitic languages.

Studies indicate that the complex linguistic structure of Arabic (in morphology, semantics, and phonology) contributes to enhancing learners’ cognitive functions and mental flexibility. This link between linguistic structure and cognitive function justifies the need to develop comparative methodologies capable of analyzing this complexity, and confirms that comparative linguistics has shifted into a domain for testing general cognitive hypotheses across diverse language groups.

Usage-Based Linguistics as a Developmental Model. Usage-Based Linguistics is a crucial theoretical framework for developing the Comparative Method, as it hypothesizes that grammar fundamentally emerges from actual language use and is influenced by general cognitive processes such as categorization, analogy, and automatization.

A. The Importance of Frequency. Frequency of occurrence is considered a central principle in this framework. High frequency of a specific linguistic element influences the formation and evolution of grammar, both historically (Historical Change) and in language acquisition (Acquisition).

B. Methodological Contribution to Comparison. This framework provides the necessary basis for developing comparative studies by advocating for the comparison of how different languages’ structures are shaped by universal cognitive processes and the language-specific frequency of usage. This approach allows comparative researchers to use quantitative frequency measurement (via corpora) to support qualitative conclusions about the mechanisms of grammatical evolution, thereby providing a solid and objective foundation for explanation.

C. Integrating Grammatical Construction into Comparison. Construction Grammar theory is closely linked to Usage-Based Linguistics. This theory offers a solution to the challenge of difficult syntactic reconstruction; instead of attempting to reconstruct abstract rules, comparison can be conducted at the level of the «Construction,» which represents a form-meaning-function unit. Using Construction as the primary comparanda makes syntactic comparison «both possible and appropriate» even within the context of the historical Comparative Method.

Proposed Research Methodology. To produce a meticulous research study that meets advanced academic standards, the methodology for the current study (literature review) and the methodology for the proposed model for developing comparative studies (field model) must be defined.

Research Design. The current study employs **Critical Analysis and Descriptive Synthesis (Qualitative)** of modern theoretical and methodological frameworks in comparative linguistics, relying on a systematic synthesis of documented sources from the Google Scholar database. The proposed model for developing comparative studies in applied research is a **Mixed Methods Approach** that combines the strength of quantitative computational analysis with the rigor of qualitative contextual analysis.

Methodological Framework for Developing Comparative Studies. The proposed methodological principles are based on three pillars, aimed at instilling objectivity and comprehensiveness into comparative studies.

A. Data Collection Methodology: Corpus-Based Data. Advanced comparative studies necessitate moving away from individual introspection and relying on linguistic corpora as a primary data source.

1. **Sample:** The method relies on large, documented linguistic corpora (such as BNC and COCA), in addition to multilingual or parallel/comparable corpora to enable direct quantitative comparison. This ensures dealing with large volumes of text and accessing advanced tools.

2. **Data Collection Tools:** In this context, corpus analysis programs (such as retrieval and annotation software) become the actual data collection tools, allowing the researcher to generate virtually complete lists of lexical frequencies and grammatical patterns.

B. Computational Comparative Analysis Tools. Computational Linguistics is a vital component of the advanced Comparative Method, providing specialized tools that enhance analytical accuracy.

1. **Mechanical Text Analysis:** Using tagging tools like CLAWS PoS-Tagger for Part-of-Speech identification, and collocation analysis tools such as COCA_MWU ColloGram. Tools like Coh-Metrix are also used to gauge cohesion and coherence in written or spoken texts, helping to assess the difficulty of the text for the target audience.

2. **Comparative Statistical Analysis:** It is essential to use advanced statistical approaches, such as md analysis or kf analysis, which aim to effectively identify the linguistic features that distinguish between two text types or two languages. These tools provide the necessary quantitative evidence to support usage-based theories about frequency.

C. Meta-Methodological Comparison Techniques. To ensure the trustworthiness of results and combat subjectivity, the researcher must adopt a dual comparative methodology.

1. **Dual Comparative Approach:** The advanced method encourages applying two different methods to a single dataset, or exploring two different datasets for the same research question. This allows for an explicit discussion and systematic comparison of the strengths, weaknesses, and informational values of each approach, thereby enhancing the academic reliability of the findings.

2. **Controlling Arbitrariness:** The greatest challenge in traditional comparative syntax is the high degree of subjectivity in the researcher’s conclusions regarding syntactic reconstruction. The dual methodological approach and quantitative computational analysis serve as statistical and methodological controls to mitigate this arbitrariness, bolstering the principle of methodological verification.

3. **Challenge of Conceptual Equivalence:** In cross-linguistic studies, particularly when comparing Arabic with languages from different families (like Uzbek or Russian), achieving conceptual equivalence poses a critical methodological challenge. This requires including clear steps in the methodology to assess the credibility of the translation and not just rely on literal translation. For instance, legal accuracy requires using the term «Senate» instead of «مجلس الشيوخ» (Council of Elders/Senate) when translating into Uzbek in a specific context.

Results. This section presents and analyzes the methodological principles extracted from the literature that constitute the proposed framework for developing comparative studies, illustrating the shift from a narrow historical methodology to a comprehensive functional-computational methodology.

The Three Principles of Methodological Transformation in Comparative Studies. The analysis reveals that the development of Comparative Linguistic Studies relies on adopting three central methodological principles, representing turning points from the traditional method:

1. **The Principle of Analytical Expansion:** This principle refers to the necessity of moving from a historical and exclusive focus on the reconstruction of phonology and the lexicon to analytical comprehensiveness that covers all levels of grammar (morphological, syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic). This comprehensiveness enables a systematic and organized comparison of linguistic data across different levels.

2. **The Principle of Functional and Contextual Control:** This principle is the most critical, transforming comparison from merely identifying formal similarities to testing function. It requires using comparison to control variation across languages and identify different contexts of use. It also involves systematically comparing how the type of context versus the frequency of the context affects language acquisition, which has been successfully applied in Mayan language acquisition studies.

3. **The Principle of Technological and Quantitative Integration:** This principle relates to integrating computational tools to provide objective quantitative analysis (such as frequency analysis) that supports qualitative conclusions about linguistic evolution. Precise statistical measurement (Corpus-based methods) of frequency provides essential linguistic evidence, especially in light of Usage-Based Linguistics, which views frequency as a contributing factor in grammatical formation.

Analysis of Data-Driven Methodological Transformation. The following table illustrates the conceptual and thematic evolution in Comparative Linguistic Studies when adopting the developed principles:

Methodological Principle (Stage)	Traditional Method (Focus)	Advanced Method (Development)	Methodological Advantage/Goal
Defining Comparanda	Phonological/Lexical Cognate Forms ¹⁷	Cognate Forms + Grammatical Constructions ¹⁷	Overcoming the limits of syntactic reconstruction (Second-order reconstruction)
Context of Use	Focus on the Internal Linguistic System (System)	Identification and Comparison of Contexts across Languages	Explicit control over the effect of cross-linguistic differences (Explicit Control) ¹¹
Primary Analysis Tool	Manual and Historical Comparison (Philology)	Computational Tools (Corpus Tools) and Statistical Analysis	Achieving objectivity and quantitative frequency analysis (Frequency Effects) ¹⁴
Ultimate Research Goal	Reconstruction of the Proto-language	Interpretation of Linguistic Evolution and Acquisition Mechanisms	

The traditional Comparative Method mainly focuses on the linguistic product (the Proto-language), while the developed method shifts the focus to the linguistic process (how do changes occur? and how does acquisition happen?). This shift necessitates integrating quantitative tools to measure usage (such as the frequency of contexts) to reach more precise conclusions about the mechanism.

Results of Computational and Cumulative Comparison. Adopting the principle of technological integration yields a Cumulative Method, where studies of new languages can build upon previously established results, and discoveries within one language can be checked against data from related languages to increase the precision of the findings.

Furthermore, Corpus-based methods provide virtually complete lists of lexical frequencies and structural patterns in different languages. This means that integrating computationally derived quantitative data with qualitative contextual analysis (as applied in the Comparative Method for language acquisition) represents the optimal methodological principle for advancing comparative studies in syntax and semantics.

Discussion. This discussion aims to connect the extracted methodological principles (Results) with the cognitive theoretical framework, interpreting the positive and negative implications of applying these principles in linguistic research.

Interpreting Results and Linking to Theoretical Literature. The theoretical framework of Usage-Based Linguistics provided the basis for interpreting the ongoing tension between genetic and functionalist explanations. Linguistic evolution, which appears as genetic kinship, is fundamentally influenced by general cognitive processes and usage frequency (which is a functional/contextual explanation). Developing comparative studies means accepting that a complete explanation of a linguistic phenomenon requires reference to both factors—historical and contextual.

For example, by applying the three methodological principles of comparative language acquisition (cognate forms, contexts, acquisition comparison), researchers become capable of understanding how cross-linguistic variation at different syntactic levels (such as the use of case suffixes in Mayan languages) impacts the acquisition process. This methodological focus enhances precision in cross-linguistic acquisition research and provides a practical basis for designing effective instructional curricula in fields like teaching Arabic to non-native speakers.

Positive Implications of Developing Comparative Linguistic Studies. The application of the developed principles contributes to broad positive impacts that transcend the boundaries of historical linguistics:

1. **Deepening the Cognitive Understanding of Linguistic Evolution:** Advanced comparative studies, especially those integrating Cognitive Linguistics, contribute to a deeper understanding of the mechanisms of human language evolution. These studies provide evidence about what differentiates human linguistic ability from other species and help determine whether the emergence of human language resulted from «one big leap» or an accumulation of smaller steps. They also contribute to testing hypotheses about the relationship between language and thought (Linguistic Relativity Hypothesis) across diverse linguistic populations.

2. **Supporting Language Modeling and Artificial Intelligence:** The methodological shift leads to the construction of more efficient statistical or neural network-based Language Models. This is particularly important for supporting low-resource languages, such as Southern Uzbek, where developing corpora and parallel resources helps improve machine translation applications.

3. **Cognitive and Educational Benefits:** Findings suggest that studying languages with high morphological complexity (like Arabic) contributes to enhancing cognitive functions and mental flexibility. This empirical evidence strongly supports the need to develop Arabic language curricula that rely on conscious comparison between grammatical systems, reducing the effects of culture shock and boosting children’s academic achievement.

Challenges and Potential Negative Implications. Despite the benefits, applying the developed principles faces methodological and political challenges:

1. **Ideological Bias and Data Distortion:** Linguistic work remains susceptible to ideological bias that may lead to the suppression of minority languages or the fragmentation of common languages, potentially distorting the data available for comparative analysis. This poses a challenge for comparative researchers, who must work to transform linguistic diversity into «positive plurality» by activating communication in national languages functionally and practically.

2. **Challenge of Conceptual Equivalence and Dual Methodology:** In cross-linguistic qualitative studies, particularly in comparison contexts between Arabic and Central Asian languages (like Uzbek), achieving conceptual and linguistic equivalence remains a significant challenge. Reliance on multiple translators or inaccuracy in term selection (e.g., distinguishing between «companies» and «enterprises» in legal translations) can threaten the trustworthiness of results. This requires researchers in this field to follow a cautious methodology for evaluating translation credibility.

3. Lack of Computational Resources for Low-Resource Languages: Although Computational Linguistics is essential for development, many languages and dialects lack sufficient corpora and documented data necessary for applying the computational Comparative Method.

The Necessity of Methodological Integration. The developed methodology must be integrative: computational analysis should provide quantitative evidence (measuring frequency and change) as a solid foundation, while traditional historical analysis (including classical philology) provides the qualitative explanatory framework. This integration between quantitative analysis (data) and qualitative analysis (interpretation) is essential for reducing subjectivity and enhancing reliability.

Conclusions and Recommendations. Precise Conclusions.

The analysis confirms that developing Comparative Linguistic Studies requires a radical theoretical and methodological shift. The field must move away from its classical model based only on «genetic reconstruction» and adopt a more comprehensive model focused on «computational, functional, and cognitive explanation.» This transformation is based on three central principles:

1. **Theoretical Integration:** Studies must be based on a theoretical framework that explains linguistic evolution in light of Cognitive and Usage-Based Linguistics, which views grammar as a response to general cognitive processes and usage frequency.

2. **Interdisciplinary Methodology:** A Dual Mixed Method should be adopted to ensure precision, where the Comparative Method is applied to deeper syntactic and semantic levels using computational tools (Corpus tools) to ensure quantitative objectivity.

3. **Focus on Functional Context:** The core principle of advanced comparative analysis is to focus on identifying and comparing the contexts of use for cognate forms, not the forms themselves, which allows for a clear interpretation of language acquisition and evolution mechanisms.

Practical Recommendations for Concerned Authorities. Based on the methodological findings and potential positive impacts, this study offers the following recommendations:

1. For Academic Institutions and Research Centers:

• **Activate Multidisciplinary Research:** Research centers should establish teams including experts in historical linguistics, cognitive linguistics, and computer scientists. This collaboration is necessary to address the complex methodological issues related to the computational modeling of linguistic change and diachronic cognitive linguistics.

• **Invest in Comparative Corpora:** Investment should be directed towards creating high-quality, parallel linguistic corpora for Arabic (Fusha and its dialects) with other languages of regional and cultural importance (such as Uzbek and Russian), to facilitate the efficient application of the computational Comparative Method and support language modeling for low-resource languages.

• **Mandate Dual Methodology:** Academic committees should encourage research that applies two different methodologies to the same dataset or two different datasets for the same research question, to increase the reliability of the results and combat methodological subjectivity in syntactic comparison.

2. For Education Policy Makers and Language Planning Authorities:

• **Adopt Positive Language Planning:** Given the cognitive and positive psycho-educational benefits of linguistic diversity, authorities should move beyond symbolic support for national languages and transform linguistic diversity into «positive plurality» by activating communication in them «practically and functionally» in institutions and education, based on the empirical evidence provided by advanced comparative studies.

• **Include Contextual Analysis in Arabic Language Curricula:** Researchers in teaching Arabic as a second language should integrate statistical frequency analysis (from corpora) with

contextual and functional analysis when conducting contrastive studies, to provide accurate and objective predictions about the difficulties learners face.

References

1. (PDF) New Directions in Linguistic Relativity Research, accessed October 20, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/371227609_New_Directions_in_Linguistic_Relativity_Research
2. Barðdal, J. (2013). Construction-based historical-comparative reconstruction. In T. Hoffmann & G. Trousdale (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of construction grammar* (pp. 438–57). Oxford University Press. 17
3. Bybee, J. (2010). *Language, Usage and Cognition*. Cambridge University Press. 23
4. Christiansen, M. H., Kallens, P. C., & Trecca, F. (2022). Toward a Comparative Approach to Language Acquisition (A Commentary on Kidd and Garcia). *Journal of Child Language*. 3
5. Cognitive Linguistics: Analysis of Mapping Knowledge Domains - PMC - PubMed Central, accessed October 20, 2025, <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9680347/>
6. Comparative Approaches to Data and Methods in Corpus Linguistics (Introduction:), accessed October 20, 2025, <https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/data-and-methods-in-corpus-linguistics/comparative-approaches-to-data-and-methods-in-corpus-linguistics/CE338DCD0485A7A6E54C8BAF0D5AB459>
7. Comparative linguistics – Russian translation - Multitran (MULTI), accessed October 20, 2025, <https://www.multitran.com/dictionary/english-russian/comparative%20linguistics>
8. COMPARATIVE LINGUISTICS, COMPARISON OF RUSSIAN AND UZBEK LANGUAGES - inLIBRARY, accessed October 20, 2025, <https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/eijps/article/download/29974/30754/34541>
9. Comparative method - Wikipedia, accessed October 20, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Comparative_method
10. Comparative Reconstruction in Linguistics - Oxford Bibliographies, accessed October 20, 2025, <https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/abstract/document/obo-9780199772810/obo-9780199772810-0215.xml>
11. Comparing Arabic Linguistic Complexity with Other Languages in Relation to Cognitive Development | Izdihar - UMM Scientific Journals, accessed October 20, 2025, <https://ejournal.umm.ac.id/index.php/izdihar/article/view/37304>
12. Corpus Query Tools | CLARIN ERIC - Common Language Resources and Technology Infrastructure, accessed October 20, 2025, <https://www.clarin.eu/resource-families/corpus-query-tools>
13. Data and Methods in Corpus Linguistics: Comparative... - Dialnet, accessed October 20, 2025, <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/descarga/articulo/9575085.pdf>
14. Development of Language Models for Continuous Uzbek Speech Recognition System – PMC – PubMed Central, accessed October 20, 2025, <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9919949/>
15. Doniyorova, D. (2024). UZBEK LANGUAGE: LINGUISTIC DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES AND SCIENTIFIC APPROACHES. *Global Trends in Education and Research Development*.
16. Egbert, J. (2023). Corpus-based methods for comparing language varieties: An introduction to kf analysis. *Corpus Linguistics*, 20(2).
17. Evolutionary linguistics - Wikipedia, accessed October 20, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Evolutionary_linguistics

18. Filling the Gap for Uzbek: Creating Translation Resources for Southern Uzbek - arXiv, accessed October 20, 2025, <https://arxiv.org/html/2508.14586v1>
19. Fox, D., & Fox, A. (2017). The Comparative Method of Language Acquisition Research: A Mayan Case Study. *Journal of Child Language*.
20. Hoenigswald H. M. (1960). *Language Change and Linguistic Reconstruction*. Univ. of Chicago Press. 20
21. <https://ijmri.de/index.php/jmsi> volume 4, issue 5, 2025 TRANSLATION OF LINGUISTIC TERMS FROM ARABIC INTO UZBEK AND LINGUISTIC PE - inLIBRARY, accessed October 20, 2025, <https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/jmsi/article/download/119408/120977>
22. Islamic Arabic Vocabulary in English and Uzbek Languages, Misconceptions and difficulties in translating Arabic - Portal Metadata Jurnal Profesional, accessed October 20, 2025, <https://repository.antispubmed.com/artikel/5390/islamic-arabic-vocabulary-in-english-and-uzbek-languages-misconceptions-and-difficulties-in-translating-arabic--islamic-borrowings-from-uzbek-into-english-language>
23. Key feature analysis: a simple, yet powerful method for comparing text varieties | Corpora, accessed October 20, 2025, <https://www.eupublishing.com/doi/10.3366/cor.2023.0275>
24. Key Issues and Future Directions: The Comparative Approach to Language, accessed October 20, 2025, https://www.bcp.fu-berlin.de/en/biologie/arbeitsgruppen/verhaltensbiologie/verhaltensbiologie/publikationen/15_581-76884_ch49_1P_tencate_scharff.pdf
25. Language Bias in the Google Scholar Ranking Algorithm - MDPI, accessed October 20, 2025, <https://www.mdpi.com/1999-5903/13/2/31>
26. Lexical-Semantic And Functional Analysis Of Translations From The Arabic Press - Zien Journals Publishing, accessed October 20, 2025, <https://zienjournals.com/index.php/zjssh/article/download/5817/4740/5579>
27. Linguistics - Comparative, Historical, Analysis | Britannica, accessed October 20, 2025, <https://www.britannica.com/science/linguistics/The-comparative-method>
28. Longobardi, G. (2005). A minimalist program for parametric linguistics? *Linguistic Variation Yearbook*, 3: 101–38. 32
29. Mathematical approaches to comparative linguistics - PMC - PubMed Central, accessed October 20, 2025, <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC34482/>
30. Methodological Challenges in Cross-Language Qualitative Research: A Research Review, accessed October 20, 2025, <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC2784094/>
31. Methods and Tools (Part II) - The Cambridge Handbook of Historical Syntax, accessed October 20, 2025, <https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/cambridge-handbook-of-historical-syntax/methods-and-tools/D75994FF66F9FB72C9CA1253E123B1AF>
32. Nichols, J. (1995). Evolutionary Relationships in Linguistics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 82(1). 32
33. Olusoga, O. (2020). The Modern Development of the Comparative Method in the Humanities and Social Sciences. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 62(3).
34. Palier, C. (2012). Bilingualism and brain plasticity. *Cortex*, 48(4), 503-514. 3
35. Shadwy. (2023). The Evolution of Linguistics: A Critical Review of Key Theories and Paradigms. *International Research Journal of Anthropology and Social Science Research*, 4(5), 92. 33
36. Sönning, L., & Schlüter, J. (2020). Data and Methods in Corpus Linguistics. (Review highlighting BNC, COCA comparison).

37. The Comparative Method - UC Berkeley Linguistics, accessed October 20, 2025, https://lx.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/rankin_comparative_method.pdf
38. The Comparative Method and Comparative Reconstruction (Chapter..., accessed October 20, 2025, <https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/cambridge-handbook-of-historical-syntax/comparative-method-and-comparative-reconstruction/6B490BBD6568DB3CEC5A7B965F182E0F>
39. The Comparative Method and the History of the Modern Humanities ..., accessed October 20, 2025, <https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/10.1086/693325>
40. The Comparative Method of language acquisition research: a ..., accessed October 20, 2025, <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/journal-of-child-language/article/comparative-method-of-language-acquisition-research-a-mayan-case-study/3ADC461BB2BED7E0BF1D038DF7B4DBD3>
41. THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMPARATIVE LINGUISTICS AND ITS HISTORY
Negmatova Mutabar Dustmurodovna Teacher of the Department of English - E- Conference Series, accessed October 20, 2025, <https://econferenceseries.com/index.php/srnss/article/download/1941/1898/1937>
42. The Evolution of Linguistics: A Critical Review of Key Theories and Paradigms - International Research Journal, accessed October 20, 2025, <https://www.interestjournals.org/articles/the-evolution-of-linguistics-a-critical-review-of-key-theories-and-paradigms.pdf>
43. The Scope of Usage-Based Theory - PMC, accessed October 20, 2025, <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3647106/>
44. Usage-Based Linguistics - Linguistics - Oxford Bibliographies, accessed October 20, 2025, <https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/abstract/document/obo-9780199772810/obo-9780199772810-0068.xml>
45. UZBEK LANGUAGE: LINGUISTIC DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES AND SCIENTIFIC APPROACHES | GLOBAL TRENDS IN EDUCATION AND RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, accessed October 20, 2025, <https://gisconf.com/index.php/GTERD/article/view/2696>
46. Van Driem, G. (2005). «The language organism: the Leiden theory of language evolution». In J.W. Minett, & W.S. Wang (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Language Evolution* (pp. 953–980). Oxford University Press. 4
47. Winters, A., & Nathan, G. (2020). Cognitive Historical Linguistics. *Language Sciences*, 34(6), 656–664.
48. مجلة المعرفة للدراسات والأبحاث - دراسة لسانية معرفية: زدواجية اللغوية على تعلم اللغة العربية لأثر 1, accessed October 20, 2025, <https://www.josoor.com/pdfs/fourteenth/first/53.pdf>
49. انعكاسات التعدد اللغوي على الواقع اللغوي في الجزائر - ASJP, accessed October 20, 2025, <https://asjp.cerist.dz/en/downArticle/485/8/1/239276>

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

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