

ACTUAL PROBLEMS OF MODERN SCIENCE, EDUCATION AND TRAINING









CONTENTS

			PROBL				
OF THE D	EVEI	LOPMENT	MAMAJO OF ECONO JCATIONAL	MIC CO	OMPET	ENCE OF S	TUDENTS
TEACHER	RS FO	R ARTISTI	BAKHTIY C GAFUR SCHOOL	ABDUR	AKHM	ANOV ANA	LYSIS OF
TECHNOI	LOGY	OF CREA	MAKHSU ATING ELE CHNOLOGI	CTRON	NIC ED	UCATIONA	L TOOLS
METHOD	OLOG	Y OF TEA	SHAVKATO CHING THE TIVE TECI	E SCIEN	NCE "A	CCESS TO	SCIENCE"
OF CURRI	CULU	JM IN FOR	UKHTORO MATION O NTS	F INTE	RCULT	URAL COM	PETENCE
RESEARC	HING	THE LI	ERKINOVNA FESTYLE	OF ST	UDENT	S IN THE	HIGHER
Section	2.	MODERN	PROBLI	EMS	OF 1	PHILOLOG	Y AND
RAKHIMI ASPECT	BAEV OF D	MUSOBE ATABASE	K KOMIL. DESIGN S WORKS	JON O' IN CR	G'LI // EATING	THE LI	NGUISTIC CTRONIC
			COMPAR UZBEK TE				
APPROAC	CHES	TO THE	IGOR BA CONCEPT	OF SE	MANTI	C FIELD I	N UZBEK
QUTLIYE GRAMMA	VA M	IUKHAYO L STUDY	GULOMO OF ECON	VNA /// OMIC	LEXIC FERMS	AL-SEMAN BORROW	NTIC AND ED FROM
SABIROV	A DIL	OROM /// U	UNIQUENES ") BY ULUC	SS OF T	HE FIC	TION STYI	LE IN THE

Section 3. ACTUAL PROBLEMS IN MODERN ART ANI ARCHITECTURE
SALAKHIDINOV MASUDDIN SADRIDDINOVICH /// SCIENTIFIC THEORETICAL ASPECTS OF STUDYING THE DEVELOPMENT OF INDUSTRIAL AND INTERIOR DESIGN65
YUNUSKHODZHAYEVA KHAIRINISA MALLAEVNA YUNUSKHODZHAYEVA LILUFAR DANIYAROVNA //// CONSTRUCTIVE PARAMETERS OF PRODUCTS IN ERGONOMIC DESIGN OF SPECIAL CLOTHES
Section 4. ACTUAL PROBLEMS OF NATURAL SCIENCES7
DJUMABAYEVA SALOMAT KAMILJANOVNA /// STEPS OF TEACHING STATISTICAL METHODS IN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL GEOGRAPHY71
KHALILLAYEV MURAD MUKHAMADSHARIFOVICH, AZIZJANOV KHUSHNUD MAXSUDOVICH, KHASANOV SHODLIK BEKPULATOVICH KHUDOYBERGANOV OYBEK IKROMOVICH, ABDULLAYEVA ZUBAYDA SHAVKATOVNA /// SYNTHESIS AND CRYSTAL STRUCTURE OF THE Zn (II) ION COMPLEX WITH PARACETAMOL AND GLYCINE
SOPORBOEV ZOKIR, ESHCHANOV KHUSHNUDBEK ODILBEKOVICH DUSHAMOV DILSHOD AZADOVICH /// EVALUATION OF THE REACTION OF UREA WITH O-SUBSTITUTED AROMATIC AMINES USING QUANTUM CHEMICAL CALCULATIONS
MAJIDOVA GULNOZA NURMUXAMEDOVNA /// EFFECT OF MAGNETIC FIELD ON VOLT-AMPERE CHARACTERISTICS OF P-N JUNCTION DIODES
UKTAMOVA MUNIRA KOMILJON QIZI /// A NEW MODEL FOR CALCULATING THE TOTAL CURRENT IN A TUNNEL DIODE94
KHIDIRALIYEV KOMIL ESANOVICH, MADRAKHIMOVA ZULFIYA NURMATOVNA /// AGRICULTURE IS A PRIORITY SECTOR OF THE NATIONAL ECONOMY: PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS100



The following models are used in thesauruses: SD – semantic domain, SF – semantic field, SSF - semantic subfield, SM - semantic microfield. When dividing words into semantic fields, it is first approached from the "concept field". According to this approach, each word belongs to a certain "concept group", that is, the semantic field, and none of them remains in the intermediate position. The historical development of the meaning of "z" is interpreted as the re-partitioning of an unchanging field, so the belonging of the word to the semantic field has a synchronic character, and periods can undergo significant changes. It is also noted that the words are not related to each other in the semantic field. The non-adherence of word meanings is a relative concept, and etymological analyzes show that lexemes belonging to different fields can be semantically connected. [4]

Discussion. Researching the semantic fields of words in Uzbek linguistics was an unknown and unexplored field until the 80s of the last century. Only by extracting words from a certain semantic field, it was approached in other directions of semasiology. Due to the efforts of linguists, the study of the semantic fields of words on a linguistic basis entered Uzbek linguistics only from the 90s of the 20th century.

If we analyze the opinions about the semantic field by interpreting concepts such as sema, semema, the terms semema and lexical meaning mean the same concept. Semema does not consist of an indivisible unit, but has a structural member. R. Yunusov, Sh. Khojayeva mention this element of lexical meaning as sema. The word in the lexical unit state is used as lexeme, the lexical meaning is semema, the components of the lexical meaning are used as sema. In each national language, lexemes are gathered and clustered in one place based on certain rules. In the course of the unique historical development of the language, these lexical-semantic groups are constantly changing in terms of quality and quantity. [3]

Conclusion. Studying language as a field helps to understand the dialectical relationship between the world, consciousness and language on a scientific basis, to create ideographic dictionaries, to fully understand the main collection of lexical combinations used in a certain field by language owners, to use the most necessary of them in the process of communication, in application, it helps to connect lexical compounds with each other in terms of content.

References:

- [1]. Begmatov, E. Lexical layers of the modern Uzbek literary language. Tashkent: Science, 1985.
- [2]. Nematov H, Rasulov, R. Fundamentals of Uzbek language system lexicology. Tashkent: Teacher, 1995.
- [3]. Iskanderova Sh. Approach to the language system based on the content field. Tashkent: Science. 2007.
- [4]. Kholmanova Z.T. Semantic field and semantic web possibilities. Computer Linguistics: Problems, Solutions, Prospects International Scientific and Practical Conference. Vol. 1 no. 01. 2022. - pp.37-43.
- [5]. Magdalena NGONGO, Akhmedova Mehrinigor. A Systemic Functional Linguistic Analysis of Clauses Relationship in Luke Gospel Text, Janji Baru Using Kupang Malay. Studies in Media and Communication Journal. Vol.11, 2023. - P. 33-40.

52

- [6]. Fitria Nur Hasanah, Rahmania Sri Untari, Shofiyah Al Idrus, and Akhmedova Mehrinigor Bahodirovna. Excel in Critical and Creative Thinking in Object-Oriented Programming. H. Ku et al. (Eds.): ICARSE 2022, ASSEHR 748, 2023. P. 301–305. [7]. Hazim Hazim, Ratih Puspita Anggraenni, Akhmedova Mehrinigor Bahodirovna. Altruistic Actions in COVID-19 Corpses Care: Empathy, Modeling, and More. International Conference on Advance Research in Social and Economic Science (ICARSE 2022), 2023/4/27. P.476-484
- [8]. ISLOMOV ELDOR YUSUPOVICH, AHMEDOVA MEHRINIGOR BAHODIROVNA. THE ESSENCE OF SPIRITUALITY IN THE UZBEK LANGUAGE. XIII МЕЖДУНАРОДНАЯ НАУЧНО-ПРАКТИЧЕСКАЯ КОНФЕРЕНЦИЯ " ЯЗЫК И КУЛЬТУРА" Челябинск, 26 апреля 2018 года. Р.12-15
- [9]. Akhmedova Mekhrinigor Bahodirovna. "ANALYSIS AND DIFFERENT INTERPRETATIONS OF THE CONCEPT OF SPIRITUALITY". Indonesian Journal of Innovation Studies, Vol. 18, May 2022, doi:10.21070/ijins.v18i.590.
- [10]. Akhmedova Mekhrinigor Bakhodirovna. "SPIRITUALITY' LANGUAGE CATEGORY AND ITS CONTENT". Middle European Scientific Bulletin, vol. 6, Nov. 2020, pp. 57-59, doi:10.47494/mesb.2020.6.115.

UDC: 811.1

LEXICAL-SEMANTIC AND GRAMMATICAL STUDY OF ECONOMIC TERMS BORROWED FROM OTHER LANGUAGES

Qutliyeva Mukhayo Gulomovna Teacher of the interfaculty foreign language department Bukhara State University qutliyevamuhayyo@gmail.com

Аннотация. Лексический пласт английского языка, обслуживающий сферу экономических знаний, обширен и разнообразен, поскольку сама экономическая реальность чрезвычайно сложна и противоречива. По данным экономических словарей, он насчитывает около 70 тысяч терминологических единиц.

Ключевые слова: экономические знания, экономические словари, терминологические единицы, экономическая лексика, политическая экономия, экономические отношения.

Abstract – The lexical layer of the English language, which serves the sphere of economic knowledge, is vast and diverse, since economic reality itself is extremely complex and contradictory. According to economic dictionaries, it has about 70 thousand terminological units.

Key words: economic knowledge, economic dictionaries, terminological units, economic vocabulary, political economy, economic relations.

Introduction. Economic vocabulary is not a simple mechanical combination of language names. They are in certain cause-and-effect relationships in accordance with the relationships that arise between economic concepts, and form, based on the latter,



aggregates with a characteristic internal structure. In order to determine the initial principles for the analysis of these aggregates in an economic dictionary, to identify the patterns of their formation, and also to isolate those parts of them that are united by systemic relations, and among them - the terminological system of political economy, it is necessary to briefly dwell on the subject of science "political economy"; because the form of the language is not indifferent to the content of the science itself.

Literature review. The founders of Marxism-Leninism emphasized the need to distinguish between two groups of relations between people in material production: technical production and social production. Therefore, K. Marx noted, "political economy is not a technology." V. I. Lenin wrote, "political economy is not concerned with "production" at all, but with the social relations of people in production, with the social system of production."

Production (or economic) relations between people are the subject of political economy in the scientific, Marxist-Leninist understanding. In a complexly subordinated system of economic relations, the primacy belongs to the relations of the sphere of the direct production process (primarily the ownership of the means of production), and distribution, exchange and consumption are derivatives. Relations with nature and technical-production relations, as you know, do not constitute the subject of political economy, they serve as an object of study in the natural, technical and concrete economic sciences.

Analysis. Bourgeois political economy is distinguished by extreme eclecticism, a subjective-idealistic approach to the definition of its subject matter. In some theories, the subject of political economy is declared to be technological processes, in others - frugality, as the relationship of man to nature. In addition, those theories that declare distribution, exchange or consumption by the object of their study, exclude from it, like all other bourgeois economic theories, the social relations of material production.

The system of production relations, penetrating its cause-and-effect relationships, formed the conceptual apparatus of political economy. Nevertheless, since this science took shape in a class-antagonistic capitalist society and therefore developed as a bourgeois, petty bourgeois and proletarian (Marxist-Leninist) political economy, the vocabulary serving the field of economic knowledge could not be homogeneous. It is a specific set of linguistic units denoting the concepts of each of these three class-defined economic theories.

Consequently, the logical basis on which the lexical means of the language of science are grouped in the sublanguage of political economy was fixed primarily in the differentiation of the corresponding vocabulary of the English language into two radically separate terminological systems. Within each of them, there is its own structure of lexical layers, which is characterized by the combination of non-terminological vocabulary (external layer) with terminological vocabulary (within which the core consisting of basic or categorical terms should be highlighted).

The specificity of bourgeois economic vocabulary lies in its heterogeneity, namely, in the multitude of terminological systems that form it, generated by the existence of various eclectic schools and directions of bourgeois economic thought. Some of these term systems correlate with each other as basic and derivative, others intersect, a significant part of them are not outwardly interconnected. The same



relationships characterize the cores of these term systems, and their share in each term system is relatively small.

Tracing the specifics of these lexical sets, emphasizing the predominance of the features that distinguish them from each other, at the same time, it is necessary to dwell on some features common to them. Therefore, the language units included in the non-terminological vocabulary are largely common; these are official and some full-valued words. The former include unions, allied adverbs, modal words that serve as means of communication between elements of an economic text. Significant words denote technical, technological, organizational, economic, monetary, financial, and other concepts, as well as everyday concepts involved in political and economic analysis: агеа (район, площадь), girmnik (рекламный прием), judge (арбитр, эксперт), key (шифр, код), lapse (промах, ошибка), list (список), member (член), number (число, показатель), sort (вид,сорт), vehicle (автотранспортное средство) and etc.

In the terminological vocabulary of both lexical sets, the following are also similar: some general scientific concepts: abstraction (абстракция), analysis (анализ), division (разделение), form (форма), method (метод), movement (движение), quality (качество), quantity (количество), structure (структура), system (система) and etc.; a limited number of special political economy concepts, including the main ones (but the similarity here is mainly only in terms of expression): ассиmulation(накопление), bank (банк), capital (капитал), commodity (товар), labour (труд), market (рынок), money (деньги), production (производство) and etc.

Differences in the lexical means of Marxist-Leninist and bourgeois political economy exist both in the sign expression of concepts and in terms of the content of terms. This is most clearly seen when the terms are not considered in isolation, but in a number of other terms linked through a definition.

Thus, each of the term systems includes the term economic cycle (economic cycle), the content of the concept denoted by this term is revealed most fully through the definitions of the terms of the phases of the cycle. In Marxist political economy, this is a crisis (кризис), depression (депрессия), recovery (оживление), boom (подъем); in the bourgeois - contraction (сжатие), revival (оживление), expansion (экспансия), peak (подъем).

Discussion. In official documents in the United States (for example, the National Bureau of Economic Research), terminological confusion is allowed. Therefore, instead of the term contraction, the term recession (recession) is often used and at the same time, it sometimes replaces the term peak.

Differences in terminology between Marxist-Leninist and bourgeois political economies relate primarily to terminological fields.

The main macro-field in the terminological system of Marxist-Leninist political economy is the "System of production relations", which includes the following micro-fields: "Relations in the direct process of production", "Relations of distribution", "Relations of exchange", "Relations of consumption". Each of these microfields has its own specific internal structure, which is formed by smaller conceptual groups included in them, and individual concepts. So, for example, the microfield "Relations in the direct process of production" covers "Relations of ownership of the means of



production", "The position of classes and social groups in production and the exchange of activities between them."

In the terminological system of bourgeois political economy, the main macro-field is "Distribution and exchange", which in turn consists of many micro-fields, small conceptual formations and separate concepts, the boundaries between which are often blurred, fuzzy.

So, for example, "Value", "Demand and supply", "Marginal utility", "Abstention", "Economic entity", "Psychological properties and inclinations of the subject", "Eternal laws", etc.

The theoretical analysis of the term systems of the English language, their place in the structure of the English economic vocabulary, must be supplemented by a special consideration of the important issue of classifying terms according to their value status (i.e., according to their place in the hierarchy of linguistic conceptual means) and, on this basis, the selection of units in basic lists of terms of Marxist-Leninist and bourgeois political economy.

The main list of terms allows us to single out from their total mass those units that denote concepts that make up the conceptual core of science and carry the greatest semantic load. Relying on the conceptual principle of terminology analysis at the forefront put forward the semantic criterion for selecting terms in the main list (formal criteria play a subordinate role here).

In science, several different classifications of concepts are used: in terms of their content, real existence and the number of objects covered by these concepts, as well as the relationships that are established between these concepts, etc. In our study, we took the classification of concepts according to their content as a starting point. On this basis, concepts differ from each other as basic (initial, key), derivative and complex (built on the basis of the main ones); basic, i.e. borrowed from other sciences underlying this one; attracted (concepts borrowed by this science from related fields of knowledge). The terms denoting these concepts are classified in a similar way: among them, there are basic, derivative and complex, basic and involved.

If we abstract from formal features, scientific terms can be combined into two

If we abstract from formal features, scientific terms can be combined into two broader classes: the class of theoretical (categorical) terms and the class of empirical (non-categorical) terms.

The formation of the main lists of terms should be carried out separately for each political economy terminological system. When compiling the main lists, it must be taken into account that the conceptual and formal classification of terms do not always coincide. According to formal features, terms are divided into simple, derivative and compound words, as well as phrases. Most of the main terms are simple words, but many terms - simple words also denote peripheral concepts of the term system. Derived terms can be both derived words and compound words and phrases.

At the same time, some terms derived from the formal classification can be included in the main list of terms because, in the course of the development of scientific knowledge, the concepts they denote become the main ones. The criterion of a terminological phrase is the integrity of its meaning. When compiling the main lists of terms, we used the methodology proposed by T.G. Sokolova in the study "Terminology of Marxist-Leninist Philosophy in English".



The main list of terms of the Marxist-Leninist political economy of capitalism in English was formed by us on the basis of 18 samples from the works of the founders of Marxism-Leninism, written by the authors in English, and translations of their works into English, while a continuous painting of the report of K. Marx was carried out "Wages, Price and Profit", as well as original works of the Marxists of Great Britain and the USA.

The main list of terms of bourgeois political economy was compiled on the basis of the materials of the continuous painting of the book by J. Keynes "The End of Laisser-Faire", selections from the works of Anglo-American economists, representing the main directions of modern bourgeois political economy. Lexicographic publications were widely used.

The specificity of the method of studying economic terminology is manifested primarily in the leading role of comparative analysis of the two term systems of political economy in the English language, both in terms of the formation and functioning of their constituent units. Another important feature of the method is the definitional-conceptual analysis, which is a refraction of the terminological material of the system analysis of vocabulary. On its basis, the system of economic terms is brought into line with the system of concepts of political economy, i.e. the definition of the meanings of terms is achieved, which is the main aspect of terminological work.

Definitional-conceptual analysis presupposes obligatory reference to extralinguistic facts and criteria, requires the use of the correlation of linguistic and social phenomena, consideration of linguistic phenomena in a broad linguo-social context.

The international nature of economic terminology predetermined the use of a comparative analysis of those languages that, due to certain historical reasons, were the main linguistic carriers of economic information.

Conclusion. The study of economic terminology cannot be effective outside the application of the entire system of basic principles and laws of dialectical and historical materialism, taking into account the specifics of a given object of knowledge.

Based on a critical revision of the views that take place in modern linguistic science on the problem of the term as a linguistic unit, we propose to interpret the scientific term as a product of the historical development of the word, associated with the theoretical level of knowledge.

It is necessary to approach the analysis of economic terminology in the unity of its part (term) and the whole (terminal system). Primarily the following features characterize the specificity of English economic terminology as a special lexical layer: "ideological coherence", "interventional-style homonymy", and the originality of internationalization processes. Attributing "general comprehensibility" to the specific features of this vocabulary is unlawful.

The specificity of political economic terminology predetermines the characteristic features of its analysis - first, the inseparable unity of lexicological and sociolinguistic approaches.

References:

[1]. Lenin V.I. Imperialism as the highest stage of capitalism. - Poly. coll. cit., vol. 27, pp. 299-426.



- [2]. Lenin V.I. Philosophical notebooks. Poly. collected works, T. 29. 782 p.
- [3]. Marx K. The Elections in Enland. Tories and Whigs. Marx K., Engels P. Collected Works, v.11. M.: Progress Publishers, 1975, p.327-332.
- [4]. Engels F. Letter to Marx. June 24, 1967 Marx K., Engels F. Soch., vol. 31, pp. 262-263.
- [5]. Marx K. Zur Kritik der Politischen Okonomie: (Manuscript 1861-1863) MEGA, Abt II, Bd.3.4. - Berlin: Dietz Verlag, - 1538 p.
- [6]. Materials of the Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU, June 14-15, 1983 M.: Politizdat, 1983. 80 p.
- [7]. On the further improvement of ideological, political and educational work. Decree of the Central Committee of the CPSU of April 26, 1979 In the book: CPSU in decisions and resolutions of congresses, conferences, plenums of the Central Committee, v.13. M., 1980, pp. 353-368.
- [8]. Actual problems of linguistics in the GDR. Language, ideology, society. M.: Progress, 1979. 310 p.
- [9]. Akulenko V.V. Issues of internationalization of the vocabulary of the language. Kharkov: Publishing House of Kharkov University, 1972. 215 p.
- [10]. Akulenko V.V. scientific and technological revolution i problem in ternational terminology. In the book: Scientific and technological revolution and the functioning of the languages of the world. M., 1977, pp. 73-84.
- [11]. Akhmanova O.G. Dictionary of linguistic terms. .2nd ed. M.: Soviet Encyclopedia, 1966. 607 p.
- [12]. Bally Sh. French style. M.: Publishing house of foreign literature, 1961. 392 p.
- [13]. Baskakov A.N. Peculiarities of terminology formation in different social conditions of language formation. M.: Soviet sociological association, 1970. 13 p.
- [14]. Bakhnyan K.V. Language and ideology: sociolinguistic aspect. In the book: Language as a means of ideological influence. M., 1983, p. 34-58.

UDC: 801.8

UNIQUENESS OF THE FICTION STYLE IN THE NOVEL "OTA" ("FATHER") BY ULUGBEK HAMDAM

Sabirova Dilorom
Researcher of Urganch State University,
Teacher of Urganch Innovation University
dilorom.sabirova@mail.ru

Annotatsiya. Mazkur maqolada zamonaviy oʻzbek nasrida alohida oʻringa ega boʻlgan ijodkor Ulugʻbek Hamdam nasriy asarlari badiiyati xususida gap boradi. Xususan, adib qalamiga mansub "Ota" romanining personajlar tizimi, asarning oʻzbek va jahon adabiyotidagi bir qator mashhur romanlar badiiyati va personajlari bilan uygʻunlik jihatlari haqida fikr yuritiladi.

Kalit soʻzlar: zamonaviy adabiyot, personaj tasviri, personaj nutqi, ota obrazi, foklor motivlari, polifonik bayon tiplari.