O‘ZBEKISTON RESPUBLIKASI TA’LIM VA ILM-FAN VAZIRLIGI

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



“O‘ZBEK TILINING GLOBAL MAQOMI VA NUFUZINI OSHIRISH ISTIQBOLLARI”

MAVZUSIDAGI XALQARO ILMIY-AMALIY KONFERENSIYA MATERIALLARI







2026-yil
16-oktabr

QUANTITATIVE NORM IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH LINGUOCULTURES UNDER GLOBALIZATION

GLOBALLASHUV SHAROITIDA O‘ZBEK VA INGLIZ LINGVOMADANIYATIDA MIQDORIY ME’YOR

DOI: 10.52773/tsuull.conf.2026.10.16/TYTT2270

Turgunboeva Dilnoza Akmal kizi
PhD student, Alisher Navoi
Tashkent State University of Uzbek
Language and Literature
E-mail: dilnozaturgunboeva97@gmail.com.

Abstract. *The relationship between language and culture becomes especially visible in lexical units that express evaluation rather than only objective information. Quantity belongs to such conceptual domains because linguistic expressions of abundance, scarcity, sufficiency and excess frequently contain culturally conditioned attitudes. This article examines the linguocultural interpretation of quantitative norm in Uzbek and English. The analysis focuses on lexical units, phraseological expressions and proverbs representing the semantic relations of much–little, enough–insufficient and moderate–excessive. Particular attention is paid to the way quantitative meanings acquire positive or negative evaluation in the two languages. The comparison shows that Uzbek and English share universal principles concerning moderation, sufficiency and the undesirable consequences of excess. At the same time, Uzbek quantitative expressions often connect quantity with collective experience, solidarity, hospitality and the traditional idea of qanoat, whereas English expressions frequently foreground practicality, efficiency and situational judgment. In the context of globalization, the preservation and interpretation of such meanings are important because lexical equivalence between languages does not always mean cultural equivalence.*

Keywords: *quantity, quantitative norm, linguoculture, abundance, scarcity, sufficiency, excess.*

Globalization has intensified communication between speakers of different languages and has created wider possibilities for cultural exchange. At the same time, intensive contact between languages may weaken or simplify meanings that

are closely connected with national experience. Language does not merely name objects and events; it also preserves the ways in which a community classifies, evaluates and interprets reality. For this reason, the study of culturally marked lexical meanings is significant for understanding how national values continue to function in a global linguistic environment. Kramsch notes that language expresses, embodies and symbolizes cultural reality [Kramsch, 1998: 3]. This observation is particularly relevant to the vocabulary of quantity, because apparently neutral words denoting amount may also communicate approval, criticism, satisfaction, limitation or excess. Uzbek ko‘p, oz, kam, yetarli, mo‘l and ortiqcha, as well as English many, much, few, little, enough, plenty and excessive, do more than indicate amount: in appropriate contexts they express a speaker’s evaluation of what is socially, materially or ethically acceptable.

Quantity is usually discussed as a numerical, grammatical or semantic category, yet its lexical realization is considerably broader than exact counting. A speaker may indicate an indefinite amount, a sufficient amount, a shortage, an abundance or a quantity exceeding an accepted limit. The interpretation of such meanings depends on context. The same objective amount can be considered adequate in one situation, insufficient in another and excessive in a third. Quantitative norm may therefore be understood as a culturally and contextually determined point of balance at which a certain amount is regarded as appropriate. This norm is not fixed once and for all: it changes according to communicative purpose, material conditions, social expectations and cultural experience. The linguocultural approach is useful here because it reveals not only what a word denotes, but also which associations and values are activated when the word is used in conventional expressions, proverbs or evaluative discourse. Wierzbicka argues that culturally significant words provide access to characteristic values and attitudes of particular communities [Wierzbicka, 1997: 1]. Quantitative vocabulary can be treated in the same way when its meanings regularly participate in culturally stable judgments.

The conceptual interpretation of quantity is also connected with metaphorical thinking. Lakoff and Johnson demonstrate that abstract experience is commonly organized through recurring metaphorical structures [Lakoff, Johnson, 1980: 3]. Quantity is frequently conceptualized through images of fullness, accumulation, increase and expansion, while small quantity is associated with reduction, emptiness or limitation. However, the cultural evaluation of these images is not automatically positive or negative. More may

suggest prosperity, strength and opportunity, but it may also imply disorder, waste and excess. Less may indicate poverty or insufficiency, yet it can equally represent restraint, economy and moderation. The decisive factor is the relation between the actual quantity and the norm expected in a particular situation. This explains why quantitative vocabulary is closely linked with axiological meaning: an amount is rarely evaluated independently of human needs and social experience.

Uzbek linguistic material clearly shows the positive cultural interpretation of abundance when plurality is associated with collective strength. Expressions such as ko‘pning kuchi and ko‘pning duosi ko‘l bo‘lur present numerical plurality as a source of power, support and blessing. Their meaning cannot be reduced to the statement that many people are present. The cultural value emerges from the idea that collective participation creates a result that is difficult to achieve individually. The proverb Birlikda baraka bor similarly connects plurality with unity and social cohesion. In these examples, quantity acquires a positive meaning because the group is imagined as cooperative and mutually supportive. Such expressions preserve the experience of a community in which family, neighbourhood, collective labour and social solidarity traditionally play an important role. The positive meaning of ko‘p is therefore inseparable from the social relations represented by the word.

English also contains proverbial models in which plurality receives a positive evaluation. Two heads are better than one expresses the practical advantage of cooperation and shared reasoning. Although the proverb contains the exact numeral two, its communicative meaning is not mathematical. The numeral symbolizes the transition from an individual perspective to joint intellectual effort. Uzbek and English thus share an important cultural pattern: an increase in human resources can produce greater ability, knowledge or effectiveness. At the same time, the two languages also warn that plurality becomes undesirable when it exceeds a functional norm. The Uzbek proverb Ko‘p gap elni buzar presents excessive speech as socially harmful, while the English proverb Too many cooks spoil the broth represents excessive participation as a cause of disorder. In both cases the problem is not plurality itself but uncontrolled plurality. These expressions clearly demonstrate that abundance and excess should be distinguished. Abundance describes a large amount, whereas excess presupposes the existence of a limit that has been crossed.

The semantic field of small quantity is equally complex. Uzbek oz and kam and English few and little may indicate a quantity below expectation, but they do not always convey a negative meaning. When a limited amount prevents the satisfaction of a necessary need, scarcity is interpreted as deficiency. Uzbek kam, yetishmaslik and English insufficient, not enough, too little directly represent this model. Yet small quantity may also receive a positive interpretation when it is connected with moderation, regularity or economy. The Uzbek proverb Oz-oz ye, doim ye is a clear example. Here oz does not represent deprivation. It conveys restraint and continuity: a smaller amount used regularly is presented as preferable to excessive consumption followed by shortage. The quantitative meaning is therefore interpreted within a temporal and ethical frame. The proverb indirectly values self-control and the ability to maintain a reasonable norm.

A related idea appears in the English proverb Half a loaf is better than none. Its evaluation is based on comparison rather than on the absolute size of the available amount. Half is objectively less than a whole loaf, but it is positively valued because the alternative is total absence. The cultural logic of the proverb is pragmatic: a limited benefit is preferable to no benefit at all. This principle is also found in many cultures, including Uzbek, but the English formulation foregrounds practical calculation particularly clearly. The two examples show that scarcity cannot be interpreted as an exclusively negative concept. Its evaluation depends on the relevant standard, available alternatives and the purpose for which the quantity is assessed. In linguocultural analysis, therefore, words denoting small amount should be examined together with the evaluative environment in which they occur.

Sufficiency occupies a central position between scarcity and excess. Uzbek yetarli and English enough indicate that a required quantitative threshold has been reached. Their semantics appears simple, but their cultural use reveals an important principle: the amount regarded as sufficient does not always need to be increased. The English proverb Enough is as good as a feast rejects the assumption that more necessarily produces greater value. It presents adequacy as a desirable state and places a limit on accumulation. A comparable cultural orientation is expressed in Uzbek through the concept of qanoat. Although qanoat is not a quantitative adjective and cannot be translated simply as enough, it is closely connected with the positive evaluation of sufficiency, restraint and contentment. In traditional ethical discourse, a person who recognizes what is sufficient is often evaluated more positively than a person whose desire for more has no limit. Thus,

quantitative norm may interact with moral categories and become part of a wider cultural worldview.

This relationship is especially important because the boundary between enough and not enough is partly objective and partly culturally constructed. Human beings have biological and material needs, but societies differ in how they define an acceptable level of possession, consumption, generosity or economy. Hospitality provides a good example. In Uzbek culture, offering food in abundance can function as a sign of respect toward a guest. In such a context, an amount exceeding the guest’s immediate need may not be interpreted as unnecessary excess; it may instead symbolize generosity and honour. The same physical quantity could receive a different evaluation in a context organized around economy or individual portioning. This does not mean that one culture values excess and another rejects it. Rather, it shows that the quantitative norm is shaped by the communicative situation and the cultural value attached to it.

Excess represents movement beyond an accepted norm and is therefore more explicitly evaluative than simple abundance. Uzbek ortiqcha, haddan tashqari and me’yoridan ortiq, as well as English excessive, too much and too many, signal that a quantitative boundary has been crossed. The English expression too much of a good thing is especially revealing because it demonstrates that even a positively valued phenomenon may become undesirable when its amount is disproportionate. The source of the negative evaluation is not quality but quantity. Uzbek proverbial and everyday speech follows the same logic when excessive talking, eating, spending or interfering is criticized. Consequently, both linguocultures recognize a general model according to which positive quality does not justify unlimited quantity. The principle of measure functions as an evaluative regulator.

An important common feature of Uzbek and English quantitative conceptualization is therefore the preference for balance. More is useful only while it serves a purpose; less is problematic only when it prevents the fulfilment of a need. Sufficiency acts as the central zone between the two extremes. Such a model can be represented as a continuum extending from shortage through adequacy to abundance and finally to excess. The lexical units used at each point of this continuum differ in semantic intensity, stylistic value and cultural associations. For instance, English plenty of generally conveys an ample but acceptable amount, while too much introduces an explicitly negative judgment. Uzbek mo‘l similarly suggests abundance and availability, whereas ortiqcha

marks an amount that has lost its functional justification. These distinctions are important in translation because formally similar quantitative words do not always activate identical evaluative associations.

The comparative material also reveals differences of emphasis. Uzbek proverbs and phraseological expressions frequently connect quantity with collective experience, social solidarity, generosity, continuity and the moral value of moderation. A large quantity of people may symbolize strength; a modest quantity of material goods may become positive when associated with qanoat; abundance in hospitality may represent respect. English expressions also value cooperation and moderation, but many conventional formulations foreground effectiveness, practical judgment and the comparison of alternatives. Half a loaf is better than none evaluates a limited result through practical choice, while Enough is as good as a feast formulates sufficiency as a rational limit to further accumulation. These observations should not be treated as rigid oppositions between two national characters. No linguistic community is culturally homogeneous, and the same culture may contain competing evaluations. The differences are better understood as recurrent tendencies in conventional linguistic material.

The distinction between semantic equivalence and cultural equivalence becomes particularly important under globalization. International communication encourages direct lexical matching, but a dictionary equivalent may not transmit the whole cultural meaning of a word. Uzbek qanoat, for example, can be rendered by English contentment or satisfaction in many contexts, yet these equivalents may not automatically reproduce all ethical, social and traditional associations of the Uzbek concept. Similarly, an English proverbial expression built around efficiency or individual practical choice may require interpretation when transferred into another cultural environment. Translation therefore involves not only replacing a quantitative unit with a formally corresponding word but also identifying the evaluative norm and cultural frame in which that unit functions.

Phraseological dictionaries, collections of proverbs and literary texts are especially valuable for the study and preservation of such meanings. Stable expressions retain cultural knowledge that is not always visible in the isolated lexical meaning of a word. Uzbek phraseological material demonstrates the close connection between figurative meaning and conventional cultural knowledge [Rahmatullayev, Mahmudov, 2022: 7–10]. From this perspective, preserving a national language means more than maintaining its vocabulary and grammar. It

also means preserving the network of associations through which ordinary words acquire culturally specific interpretations. When speakers use ko‘p, oz, yetarli or ortiqcha in culturally conventional contexts, they reproduce judgments about collectivity, moderation, generosity, need and measure that have developed through social experience.

Globalization does not necessarily eliminate these meanings. On the contrary, comparative study can make them more visible. A semantic feature that appears ordinary within one language often becomes analytically significant when it is compared with another. Uzbek-English comparison shows that both languages organize quantitative evaluation around a general human need for balance, but they may attach different cultural associations to particular points of the quantitative scale. Such research can contribute to intercultural competence because it helps speakers and translators recognize why a formally correct equivalent may sound culturally weak, overly direct or insufficiently expressive. It can also support the preservation of national semantic heritage by documenting the meanings encoded in proverbs, phraseological units and traditional lexical usage.

The analysis confirms that quantity is not limited to numerical information. Lexical units denoting abundance, scarcity, sufficiency and excess participate in culturally conditioned evaluation and reflect established attitudes toward social relations, material resources and human behaviour. Uzbek and English share several basic principles: beneficial abundance is distinguished from harmful excess, scarcity may represent either deficiency or moderation, and sufficiency often functions as a desirable state of balance. At the same time, Uzbek material frequently associates quantitative meaning with collective experience, solidarity, hospitality and qanoat, while English material often highlights practical judgment, effectiveness and the evaluation of alternatives. These tendencies are not absolute cultural divisions, but they show how universal concepts are shaped by particular linguistic communities. In the context of globalization, the preservation of these culturally encoded meanings is an important part of maintaining linguistic identity. Further comparative research on quantifiers, numeratives, somatic measures, metaphorical expressions and proverbs can deepen the description of quantitative norm and clarify the interaction between universal semantic structures and national cultural experience.

REFERENCES

1. Kramsch C. Language and Culture. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998. – 134 p.

2. Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphors We Live By. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980. – 242 p.

3. Rahmatullayev Sh., Mahmudov N. O‘zbek tili frazeologik lug‘ati. – Toshkent: G‘afur G‘ulom nomidagi nashriyot-matbaa ijodiy uyi, 2022.

4. Sharifian F. Cultural Linguistics: Cultural Conceptualisations and Language. – Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2017. – 724 p.

5. Wierzbicka A. Understanding Cultures through Their Key Words: English, Russian, Polish, German, and Japanese. – New York: Oxford University Press, 1997. – 317 p.

6. Mieder W. Proverbs: A Handbook. – Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2004. – 304 p.

7. Huddleston R., Pullum G. K. The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. – 1842 p.

8. Quirk R., Greenbaum S., Leech G., Svartvik J. A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language. – London: Longman, 1985. – 1779 p.

MUNDARIJA

KIRISH SO‘ZI		
Sirojiddinov Sh.S.	O‘zbek tilining xalqaro nufuzini oshirish zarurati	**6**
I. O‘ZBEK TILINING JAHON TILLARI TIZIMIDAGI O‘RNI VA RIVOJLANISH TENDENSIYALARI		
Xolmanova Z.	O‘zbek tilining jahon tillari tizimidagi mavqeyini belgilashda lingvodidaktikaning o‘rni	**9**
Abdushukurov B.	Alisher Navoiy asarlaridagi qadimgi turkiy fe’llar semantikasi	**16**
Xudoyberdiyev J.	Mahmud Koshg‘ariy – singarmonizmning birinchi nazariyotchisi va ovrupolik olimlarning singarmonizm haqidagi xato qarashlari	**30**
Abdurahmanova M.	Alisher Navoiy merosi psixolingvistik talqinda	**45**
Xolmurodova M.	“Nasoyim ul-muhabbat” asaridagi tabobatga doir ayrim arabcha so‘zlar	**51**
O‘razova I.	Ot frazemalarning grammatik funksiyasi (Alisher Navoiy “Xamsa”sidagi frazemalar misolida)	**56**
Maxkamova D.	O‘zbek tili axborot-kommunikatsiya texnologiyalari	**60**

	terminologiyasi taraqqiyoti va tadqiqi	
Oripova M.	Sinestezik metaforalarda sezgilar interperatsiyasi	**66**
Muratova N.	Tilak va tabrik nutqiy aktlarida kommunikativ taktikaning tanlanish xususiyatlari	**72**
Abdullayeva G.	Folklor diskursida o‘xshatishlarning semantik-struktur va kognitiv tahlili	**78**
Xayrullayeva R.	Kichraytirish-erkalash shakllarining pragmatik ifodalanishi	**86**
Jumaniyozova Ch.	Sifat so‘z turkumida obyektiv va subyektiv belgilarning ifodalanishi	**90**
Abduvaliyeva K.	“Shajarayi turk” asaridagi ba’zi urug‘ nomlarining etnotoponim sifatidagi tahlili	**95**
Mullaboyeva Sh.	O‘zbek tilida o‘xshatishlar asosida estetik bahoning ifodalanishi	**107**
Mamadoliyeva M.	Graduallik kategoriyasining lingvistik tabiati va uning turdosh hodisalar bilan munosabati (Xayriddin Sultonov va Iqbol Mirzo asarlari misolida)	**115**
Mamarasulova M.	O‘zbek tili fonosemantik tahlilining fonologik asoslari	**130**
Siddiqova N.	O‘zbek xalq maqollaridagi eskirgan leksika: tarkibi,	**132**

	variantlanishi va lingvopoetik vazifalari	
Yusupova A.	Konseptlarning metaforik ifodalanishi va tahlil shakllari	**144**
O‘ralova N.	O‘zbek tilshunosligida parsellyatsiya hodisasi, uning sintaktik tavsifi va ega-kesim munosabatidagi o‘rni	**150**
Maxmudova M.	Kelishik kategoriyasining o‘rganilish tarixiga doir ayrim mulohazalar	**158**
Nurmatova S.	O‘zbek tilida rang ifodalovchi birliklarning lingvokognitiv strukturasi va konseptualizatsiya masalalari	**168**
Keldiyorova Z.	O‘zbek tilidagi shikoyat matnlarida nutqiy aktlarning ifodalanishi	**174**
Aliqulova Z.	Toponimlarning axborotni saqlash va uzatish xususiyatlari	**178**
Jurayeva Sh.	Hurmat kategoriyasining lisoniy birliklar bilan ifodalanishi	**183**
Karimova U.	Kultegin bitiktoshidagi xarakter-xususiyat bildiruvchi sifatlar tahlili	**188**
II. O‘ZBEK TILINI XALQARO MAYDONDA TARG‘IB QILISH STRATEGIYALARI		
Shamsiyeva M.	Peyzaj matnlari orqali turizmni rivojlantirish istiqbollari	**194**

Jo‘rayeva M.	Matnni tushunishda asar sarlavhasining ahamiyati	**201**
III. GLOBALLASHUV SHAROITIDA MILLIY TIL VA MADANIYATNI SAQLASH MASALALARI		
Ashirboyev S.	Adstrat sharoitidagi turkiy shevalarning o‘zaro ta’siri masalasi	**205**
Farhad Rahimi	Yakşı/ ĥoş, yap/ lap, ķop/ köp/ ĥob, appaķ/ pāk kelimeleri üzerine On the words yakşı/ ĥoş, yap/ lap, ķop/ köp/ ĥob, appaķ/ pāk	**210**
Xakimova M.	O‘zbek tilidagi metaforik konseptuallashtirishning milliy xususiyatlari	**232**
Abbozov O.	So‘x toponimlarining lingvomadaniy xususiyatlari	**238**
Komilova G.	O‘zbek tilida qadriyatlar tipologiyasining lingvistik verbalizatsiyasi	**245**
Xomidova M.	Zamonaviy o‘zbek badiiy matnlarida ertak elementlarining intertekstual xususiyatlari	**253**
Həsənzadə Səmra	Qrammatik metaforun türk dillərində reallaşması (özbək dilinin materiallari əsasinda)	**261**
Davronova Z.	Antroponimik freymlarda registrdan og‘ish fenomini (Cho‘lponning “Kecha va kunduz” romani misolida)	**272**

Tursinbayeva Sh.	Badiiy matnda onomastik birliklarning lingvomadaniy imkoniyatlari	**276**
Bekmuradova I.	O‘zbek tilidagi ijobiy fe’l-atvor leksemalarining semantik tasnifi	**283**
Imomova I.	Fitratning dramatik asarlarida maqollarning qo‘llanilishi va funksional-semantik xususiyatlari	**291**
Turgunboeva D.	Globallashuv sharoitida o‘zbek va ingliz lingvomadaniyatida miqdoriy me’yor	**297**
Amrullayeva M.	O‘zbek tilida inson xarakterini ifodalovchi frazemalarning semantik mikromaydonlari	**305**
Abdug‘afurova A.	Lingvomadaniy kodlarning poetik faollashuvi: Faxriyor va Ulug‘bek Hamdam she’riyati qiyosida	**312**
Muzaffarova Z.	Badiiy matnda qo‘llangan metaftonimik birliklarning kognitiv xususiyatlari	**322**
Jumayeva M.	Son komponentli lug‘aviy birliklarning lingvokulturologik tahlili	**327**
Xolmo‘minova H.	Frazemalarning lingvomadaniy tahlili	**333**
IV. O‘ZBEK TILINI O‘QITISHNING ZAMONAVIY METODLARI VA XORIJIY TAJRIBA		

Xusanova N.	Raqamli ta’lim muhitida o‘qish savodxonligi transformatsiyasi vositasida boshlang‘ich o‘quvchilarning kreativligini shakllantirish	**337**
Mamirova X.	Bolalarda ko‘p ma’noli so‘zlarni o‘zlashtirishning psixolingvistik mexanizmlari va til ta’limiga ta’siri	**344**
Arolova N.	Maktabgacha yoshdagi o‘zbek bolalari nutqida sintaktik tejamkorlik	**351**
Mirnosirova D.	Nutqiy ijod haqidagi nazariy qarashlar talqini	**356**
Nurboboyeva R.	Erta yoshdagi bolalar ta’limida adabiyotning tutgan o‘rni	**363**
Keldiboyeva M.	O‘zbek tili omonimlarini o‘zlashtirishda kontekst va assotsiatsiyaning psixolingvistik roli	**369**
V. TARJIMA VA LINGVOMADANIY ALOQALAR: XALQARO HAMKORLIKNING MUHIM OMILI SIFATIDA		
Mustafa Said Arslan	Türkiye türkçesi ve özbek türkçesi arasindaki yakinliğin öğretimdeki yansimalari: özbek türkçesi öğretiminde karşilaşilan sorunlar ve öneriler	**378**
Kalanova D.	O‘.Hoshimov “Dunyoning ishlari” asarining koreyscha tarjimasida milliy-madaniy realiyalarning berilishi	**389**

Muhammadiyeva D.	Ko‘p tilli parallel korpusning tarjima birliklarini qiyosiy o‘rganishdagi imkoniyatlari	**400**
Abbasova Ş.	Özbek Yazı Dili ve Azerbaycan Türkçesi'nin Ağızlarında Akrabalık Terimleri	**411**
Qarshiyev K.	Badiiy tarjimaning adabiy-estetik tafakkur evolyutsiyasiga ta’siri (Jamol Kamolning tarjimonlik faoliyati misolida)	**418**
Rahimova Z.	Parallel korpuslarning tarjimashunoslik va qiyosiy tilshunoslikdagi ilmiy ahamiyati	**428**
Bozorova S.	Rus tilidagi ayrim gippologik birliklar tadqiqiga doir	**433**
Axmedova N.	O‘zbek va ingliz tillarida ruhiy holat birliklarining semantik farqlari va kontekstual tarjimasi	**442**
Davlatova R.	Sun’iy intellekt asrida inson nutqi, tilni idrok etish va psixolingvistik jarayonlar	**448**
Turdiyeva R.	Ingliz, qoraqalpoq va o‘zbek tillaridagi maqollarda zoonimlarning lingvokognitiv tahlili (“bo‘ri” misolida)	**462**
Ataniyazova S.	O‘zbek va ingliz tillarida mayl, zamon va modallikning muloqot xulqidagi funksional-uslubiy imkoniyatlari	**466**
Sayfiyeva K.	O‘zbek va ingliz fitonim komponentli maqollarida inson	**472**

	konseptining kognitiv metaforik modellari	
Tillayeva O.	O‘zbek va turk maqollarida erkak konseptining semantik maydoni	**485**
Musurmankova Sh., **Abdullayeva D.**	“Ikki eshik orasi” romanidagi murojaat birliklarining lingvomadaniy xususiyatlari va tarjima muammolari	**495**
Abdullayeva M.	Ingliz va o‘zbek maqollarida nutqiy antonimiyaning lingvokognitiv xususiyatlari	**502**
VI. AXBOROT TEXNOLOGIYALARI VA RAQAMLI MUHITDA O‘ZBEK TILINING RIVOJI		
Abjalova M.	O‘zbek tili multikorpusida aksentologik korpus va uning ahamiyati	**513**
Elova D.	O‘zbek normativ-huquqiy matnlarini lingvo-mantiqiy annotatsiyalash mezonlari	**524**
Kasimova Z.	O‘zbek tili iboralar korpusini yaratishning lingvistik va kompyuter asoslari	**534**
Nurullayeva O.	Barqaror birikmalar resurslari va parallel korpus uchun baza tuzish mezonlari	**542**
Musulmonova K.	Lingvistik ekspertologiyada matn identifikatsiyasi bo’yicha ekspert xulosalarini shakllantirishning nazariy va amaliy asoslari	**550**

Umarova Sh.	Kollokatsiyalarni korpus asosida aniqlashning nazariy va metodologik asoslari	**556**
Akramdjanova M.	Parallel korpusning madaniyatlararo kommunikatsiyadagi o‘rni	**564**
Buronova R.	Raqamli muhitda o‘zbek tilidagi neologizmlarning shakllanishi	**570**
Shodmonaliyeva Y.	Sentiment tahlilda tasdiq-inkor emojlarining diskursiv va pragmatik funksiyalari	**576**
Rayimjonova M.	Rauf Parfi she’riyatining leksik-statistik xususiyatlari	**591**
VII. XALQARO TA’LIM DASTURLARI VA O‘ZBEK TILI: IMKONIYAT VA ISTIQBOLLAR		
Mirzəli Məleykə	Azərbaycanda özbək dilinin tədrisi: təcrübə və perspektivlər (bakı slavyan universitetinin timsalında)	**595**
Iskandarova G.	O‘zbek tilini ikkinchi til sifatida o‘rganishda so‘z ma’nolarini o‘zlashtirish	**603**
VIII. O‘ZBEK TILI VA DIPLOMATIYA: XALQARO MUNOSABATLARDA TILNING O‘RNI		
Темирова Б., **Темирова М.**	Кыргыз, өзбек тилдери жана алардын адабий-маданий байланыштардагы ролу	**610**

Nazarov Q.	O‘zbek diplomatik diskursida metaforalarning kommunikativ-pragmatik xususiyatlari	**620**
IX. ILMIY TADQIQOTLAR VA LINGVISTIKADA XALQARO HAMKORLIK MASALALARI		
Berdak Yusuf	O‘zbek tilining shakllanish jarayoni va eski o‘zbek tili terminlari	**626**
Qurbonova M.	Xarizmatik nutq haqidagi nazariy qarashlar talqini	**632**
Umurzoqova M.	Erkin A’zam asarlarida lisoniy shaxs tiplari	**640**
Mirzaali Malika	O‘zbek tılının mavsumıy marosımlar leksıkasıda turkıy areal mavqeyı	**646**
Məmmədova A.	Xarəzm Türkcəsində Və Müasir Özbək Dilində Qohumluq Terminlərində Cins Kateqoriyasinin İfadəsi	**661**
Tuxtasinova M.	L.Z.Budagov lug‘atidagi umumturkiy leksik fond: “tur.” pometali leksemalarning tarixiy-qiyosiy tahlili	**670**
Abdullayeva S.	So‘z yasalishını qıyosıy-tıpologık tadqıq etısh metodologıyası va tahlıl mezonları	**681**
Xasanova G.	Kinesikaning lingvistik tadqiqi: shakllanish tarixi va kommunikativ funksiyalari	**688**

Rajabov N.	O‘zbek tilida ng fonemasining talaffuzi, imlosi va tarixiy taraqqiyoti	**695**
Mirzayeva G.	O‘zbek tilida tovush o‘zgarishlarining neyrolingvistik asoslari	**699**
Arislanova M.	She’riy matnning konseptual tizimi va lingvokognitiv xususiyatlari (Erkin Vohidov ijodi misolida)	**706**
Muhammadiyeva M.	“Shum Bola” qissasidagi ba’zi polisemantik leksemalar tahlili	**717**
Abdullayev G‘.	Fitrat she’riyatidagi turkiy so‘zlarning emotsional-ekspressiv xususiyatlari	**722**
Tursunova S.	Ironiyada implikatura fenomeni va yashirin ma’no mexanizmlari	**726**
Turobova N.	Badiiy diskursda morfologik vositalarning pragmatik xususiyatlari	**737**
Utegenova O‘.	O‘zbek tilida tasviriy ifodalarning badiiy matnda qo‘llanilishi	**744**
Komilova G.	Tarixiy-badiiy matnlar korpuslarini yaratish zarurati va ularni semantik modellashtirish masalalari	**749**
Haydaraliyeva Sh., Mo‘minova M.	O‘zbek tili leksikasining taraqqiyot tamoyillari va semema tushunchasi	**759**

Axmedova M.	Diskurs tushunchasining lingvistik talqini: nazariy yondashuv va ilmiy qarashlar	**768**
Komilova Sh.	Lingvokultrologiyada evfemizm va milliy mentalitet: ayollar nutqi misolida nazariy talqinlar	**774**
Suyunova D.	“Boburnoma” dagi leksik qatlamlarning “Boburiynoma”da badiiy qayta faollashuvi: leksik-semantik va funksional-uslubiy tahlil	**780**
Maqsudaliyeva Y.	Lingvistik ekspertiza va lingvokriminalistik tahlil: nazariya va amaliyot	**786**
Abdurasulova D.	O‘zbek qizlari nutqidagi neonim va slenglarning pragmalingvistik tadqiqi	**792**
Majidova M.	Tibbiy soha rahbarlari kinesik nutqining lingvosomatik tadqiqi	**797**
Abdullayeva I.	Gender qadriyatlarning aksiolingvistik tahlili	**802**
X. O‘ZBEK TILINING OMMAVIY AXBOROT VOSITALARI VA MEDIA MAKONIDAGI O‘RNI		
Saydaliyeva M.	Kinodiskurs multimediali muloqot tizimi sifatida	**809**
Otaxonova S.	Mediamatnlarda antroponimlarning pragmatik imkoniyatlari	**813**