



**“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.

IDENTIFYING THE SEMANTIC COMPONENT OF AFFECTIONATE FORM

Khushnuda Samigova,

professor of Uzbekistan State World languages University

DOI: 10.52773/tsuull.conf.2025.12.11/MQHK3645

Annotatsiya. Ushbu maqola komponent tahlil usuli asosida ingliz va o‘zbek tillarida mehr-muhabbatni ifodalovchi leksik birliklarning arxisema, integral va farqlovchi semalari aniqlanishi masalasini yoritadi. Tadqiqotda lug‘aviy ta’riflarning ochiq va yashirin ifoda usullari solishtirilib, kontekst orqali aniqlanadigan mehr bildiruvchi semalar ham tahlil qilinadi. Natijalar FSFAning chuqur semantik tabiatini ko‘rsatadi.

Kalit so‘zlar: *komponent tahlil, arxisema, integral sema, farqlovchi sema, FSFA, kontekst, semantika.*

Abstract. This article examines the identification of archisemes, integral semes, and distinguishing semes in English and Uzbek lexical units expressing affection through the method of component analysis. It compares explicit and implicit definitional strategies and analyzes affection-related semes derived from contextual meanings. The findings demonstrate the complex semantic structure of FSFA and highlight the need to rely not only on dictionaries but also on broader linguistic data.

Keywords: *component analysis, archiseme, integral seme, distinguishing seme, FSFA, context, semantics.*

The term “Component analysis” was first used by U. Gudenaf (W. Goodenough) and F. Lonsbiri (F. Lounsbury)¹.

The meaning of a word consists of a set of distinguishing semas. A sema is the smallest unit constituting the meaning of a word. In the process of component analysis, it is necessary to identify the diminutive indicating arkhiseme and integral semas in the semantic explanations of words in the compared languages.

Arkhiseme is considered a means that creates cohesion in the grouping of words. In linguistics, arkhiseme is sometimes used through the term “general sema”².

Arkhiseme is a sema present in the explanations of all lexical units belonging to one field, while integral semas are similar or related semas. They may appear in the explanation of one word but not in that of another.

Integral semas, in turn, are divided into distinguishing semas. The phenomenon of differentiation goes deeper into the semantics of language units and aims to find their specific meanings, setting the goal of fully understanding and analyzing the object in the “semantic and lexico-grammatical field”³.

So, a distinguishing sema is a sema that helps to group lexical units belonging to a specific field based on certain features and characteristics.

The arkhiseme and integral semas present in the lexical definition of a word are clarified through two methods: explicit and implicit expression. If the arkhiseme, integral semas, and *pometa* (index words) are clearly present in the lexical definition, this is called explicit clarification. If these units are not clearly stated in the lexical meaning, then a multi-level method is used. The

¹ Muminov O.M. Lexicology of the English Language (oлий ўқув юртларининг инглиз филологияси, таржимонлик факультети талабалари, магистрлари учун дарслик). – Тошкент: Меҳридарё, 2006. – РР. 33-144.

² Ҳожиёв А. Тилшunoslik терминларининг изоҳли луғати. – Т.: Ўзбекистон миллий энциклопедияси, 2002. – Б. 51; 22. Нарзиева М.Ж. Ўзбек тилида шахсни ёш жиҳатдан тавсифловчи отларнинг маъно таркиби. Филол. фан. номз. ...дис. – Бухоро: Ф. Хўжаев номидаги БДУ, 1992. – Б.106; Ҳакимова Г.Э. Зоонимик компонентли фразеологик бирликларнинг структуравий ва семантик хусусиятлари (инглиз тили материаллари асосида). Филол. фан. номз. ...дис. – Тошкент: М. Улуғбек номидаги ЎзМУ, 2008. – Б. 65-67.

³ Ҳакимова Г.Э. Зоонимик компонентли фразеологик бирликларнинг структуравий ва семантик хусусиятлари (инглиз тили материаллари асосида). Филол. фан. номз. ...дис. – Тошкент: М. Улуғбек номидаги ЎзМУ, 2008. – Б. 72.

distinguishing sema of a word can be identified at several stages of multi-level definitional analysis. This is called implicit clarification ¹.

To analyze the cognitive features of FSFA, it is necessary to thoroughly study the sema structure of each word in the relevant word definitions, to compare the components forming their lexical series with other words, and to identify the arkhiseme, integral, and distinguishing semas within them. For this purpose, dictionaries in the English and Uzbek languages were used.

To clarify the semas in the lexical definitions of existing English words, let us consider several examples of component analysis:

sugar (shakar) – (informal, especially name) a way of addressing smb. that you like or love like *sweetheart*;

chickabiddy (jo‘ja) – 1) a chicken; 2) a trivial term of endearment for a child;

dove (kabutar) – 1) a pigeon of the genus *Columba* and various related genera; 2) a word of endearment for one regarded as pure and gentle.

In the above analysis, in the definition of the words *sugar*, *chickabiddy*, *dove* and other similar words *dear*, *sweetheart*, *lover*, *sweetheart* semas as well as the *endearment* marker words were identified through the explicit expression method.

In the following example, the sema was identified through the implicit expression method:

laddie (bolakay) – 1) a young lad; 2) a male person of any age between early boyhood and maternity; BOY, YOUTH. 3) fellow, chap.

In the above given definition, there is no sema indicating endearment, but according to the component analysis of the word *boy*, we can find *the sweetheart* -integral sema:

a boy (bola) – 1) a male child from birth to adulthood; 2) son; 3) an immature male, separate the men from the boys; 4) **sweetheart**, beau.

Thus, in the component analysis of the word *laddie*, the indicator sema was identified at the second level (*laddie* → a boy → *sweetheart*).

If the sema *love* in English is accepted as the arkhiseme of lexical units belonging to FSFA in their lexical semantic explanations (definitions), then the semas of *darling*, *sweetheart*, *dear*, *lovable*, *lover*, *endearment* and *affection* marker words in dictionaries are accepted as integral semas. Words possessing these integral semas in their semantic structure unite into one group according to the *love* arkhiseme. For example:

sweetheart (jonim) – one who is **loved**;

darling (jonim, azizim) – dearly **loved** person, favorite;

dear (azizim) – 1) a **loved** one; 2) a lovable person;

lover (sevuvchi) – a person in **love**; esp. a man in love with a woman.

Using English dictionaries, the number of collected examples amounted to 200. Of these, 66 (33%) were identified through explicit expression, 104 (52%) through implicit expression, and 30 (15%) through pometas. The activity level of integral semas and marker words identified based on component analysis is as follows:

sweetheart – 107 (53%), *darling* – 12 (6%), *dear* – 7 (3.5%), *love* – 34 (17%), *endearment* – 15 (7.5%), *affection* – 15 (7.5%).

According to the component analysis conducted in Uzbek, lexical units expressing *affection* collected from dictionaries amounted to 225. The *sevish* arkhiseme and semas such as *sevikli*, *sevimli*, *sevgili*, *sevuvchi* were accepted as integral semas. Marker words like *erkalatib*, *erkalab*, *erkalatish*

¹ Ирискулов М.Т. Тилшуносликка кириш (иккинчи нашри). Филология: Бакалаврият таълими йўналиши талабалари учун дарслик. – Т.: ЎзДЖТУ, 2008. – Б. 219.

present in dictionary definitions were also included in FSFA. These integral semas and marker words unite in the arkhiseme formed by words based on *sevish*. For example:

sevgili – 1) kishining ko‘ngil qo‘ygan dildori, yor, ma‘shuqa, mahub; 2) **sevikli**, suyakli, **sevimli**.

sevimli – sevikli, suyakli, **sevimli**.

Let’s observe the component analysis of several examples:

qo‘zichoq – 1) Qo‘yning emadigan bolasi; 2) (1-sh., egalik formasida) bolalarga *erkalatib* murojaat etish formasi;

qulun – 1) bir yoshga to‘lmagan toycha, (-choq); 2) (1-sh., egalik formasida) o‘g‘il bolalarni *erkalatish* yoki *erkalatib* murojaat qilish formasi;

nigor – 1) *sevgili*, go‘zal; 2) Nigor (xotin-qizlar ismi);

nuri diyda – 1) ko‘z nuri; 2) *sevikli* farzand.

The integral semas such as *sevimli*, *sevgili*, *sevikli* identified through explicit expression in these examples were clearly present in some word definitions collected during our study.

Of the examples, 37 (16.4%) were found by marker words, 25 (11.1%) by explicit, and 163 (72.5%) by implicit expression. The activity level of integral semas and marker words identified by component analysis is as follows:

erkalash (*erkalatish*, *erkalatib*) – 123 (60%), *sevikli* (*sevimli*, *suyukli*) – 18 (8.5%), *sevuvchi* – 66 (33%), *sevgili* – 18 (8.5%).

In English and Uzbek, lexical units expressing affectionate meaning do not contain semas explicitly showing endearment in their lexical definitions, but based on their contextual meanings, they were included in FSFA. For example, from Shakespeare’s tragedy “Othello,” Brabantio uses the word *jewel* (qimmatbaho tosh) for his daughter Desdemona:

*Brabantio (to Desdemona): I would keep from thee. For your sake, jewel,
I am glad at soul I have no other child¹.*

*Brabasio (Dezdemonaga): – Eshit, durdonam,
Xayriyatki, sendan o‘zga zuryodim yo‘qdir...²*

In Uzbek explanatory dictionaries, several words such as *asal*, *novvot*, *shakar* do not have marker words denoting affection in their figurative meanings. However, in Uzbek, these words are used in this meaning. For example:

– *Bu boshqa gap, asalim! – mazax qildi Yusuf aka³.*

...*Bu yorug‘ dunyoda yo‘g‘u-borimsan,*

Tilimning ostida novvot-zarimsan⁴.

Buvim puf deb nosni tuflab, tomga qarab:

– *O‘g‘rigina bolam, hoy o‘g‘rigina bolam, hoynahoy biror tiriklikning kuyida tomga chiqqan ko‘rinasan...⁵.*

In the phrase *o‘g‘rigina bolam - gina* and *-im* first person singular possessive suffixes are present. However, according to the meaning of the text, the speaker is not caressing or fondling the thief who entered the house, but rather addressing him with scolding or reproach and pity. Of course,

¹ Shakespeare. W. Othello (The Moor of Venice). – Moscow: Издательское товарищество иностранных рабочих, 1936. – P.25.

² Шекспир В. Сайланма (Жамол Камол таржимаси). 3 жилдли. – Т.: ЎзР ФА “Фан” нашриёти, 2008. Ж. 2. – Б.178.

³ Каримова Л. Муҳаббат изтироблари. – Т.: Ф. Фулом номидаги нашриёт матбаа ижодий уюшмаси, 2004. – Б.20.

⁴ Муҳаммад Ю. Улғимсан Ватаним. – Т.: Ижод дунёси, 2004. – Б. 21.

⁵ Muhiddinova X.S., Salisheva Z.I., Po‘latova X.S. O‘zbek tili (oliy o‘Kuv yurtlari bakalavriatining rusiyazabon guruhlariga uchun). – Т.: O‘Kituvchi, 2006. – Б. 169-170.

scolding has a distinct tone and intonation compared to foundling. Here, the meaning of scolding predominates over foundling.

To conclude we can say that the research showed that materials available in dictionaries of the compared languages are insufficient for deep linguistic analysis of FSFA. It became clear that relying on materials collected from literary works, newspapers and magazines, radio and television, the Internet, surveys from informants, and other sources in both English and Uzbek helps to more accurately illuminate the topic under study.

The list of used literature

1. Ирискулов М.Т. Тилшуносликка кириш (иккинчи нашри). Филология: Бакалаврият таълими йўналиши талабалари учун дарслик. – Т.: ЎзДЖТУ, 2008. – Б.
2. Shakespeare. W. Othello (The Moor of Venice). – Moscow: Издательское товарищество иностранных рабочих, 1936. – P.25.
3. Каримова Л. Муҳаббат изтироблари. – Т.: Ф. Фулом номидаги нашриёт матбаа ижодий уюшмаси, 2004. – Б.20.
4. Muminov O.M. Lexicology of the English Language (олий ўқув юртларининг инглиз филологияси, таржимонлик факультети талабалари, магистрлари учун дарслик). – Тошкент: Мехридарё, 2006. – PP. 33-144.
5. Муҳаммад Ю. Улғимсан Ватаним. – Т.: Ижод дунёси, 2004. – Б. 21.
6. Нарзиева М.Ж. Ўзбек тилида шахсни ёш жиҳатдан тавсифловчи отларнинг маъно таркиби. Филол. фан. номз. ...дис. – Бухоро: Ф. Хўжаев номидаги БДУ, 1992. – Б.106;
7. Ҳақимова Г.Э. Зоонимик компонентли фразеологик бирликларнинг структуравий ва семантик хусусиятлари (инглиз тили материаллари асосида). Филол. фан. номз. ...дис. – Тошкент: М. Улуғбек номидаги ЎЗМУ, 2008. – Б. 65-67.
8. Ҳожиёв А. Тилшунослик терминларининг изоҳли луғати. – Т.: Ўзбекистон миллий энциклопедияси, 2002. – Б. 51; 22.
9. Шекспир В. Сайланма (Жамол Камол таржимаси). 3 жилдли. – Т.: ЎзР ФА “Фан” нашриёти, 2008. Ж. 2. – Б.178.
10. Teshaboyeva, Z. (2016). TRANSLATIONS OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS AND PROVERBS OF" BOBURNOMA" INTO ENGLISH. *Paradigmata poznani*, (3), 74-78.
11. Qodirovna, T. Z. (2019). Scientific and Theoretical Study of “Baburname” and Its ‘translations into the World Languages. *Journal of Critical Reviews*, 7(3), 2020.
12. Mahmadiyor Asadov. (2025). A Brief Review Of Vilen Komissarov’s Theory Of Equivalence. *International Journal Of Literature And Languages*, 5(12), 86–89.

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 inʼsasında halk biliminin işlevi	183
40.	Farhad RAHIMI. Beş, bel, bilek, elik/ el ve ilik kelimelerinin etimolojik ve anlamsal bağlantıları	190

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