

ЎЗБЕКИСТОН РЕСПУБЛИКАСИ
ОЛИЙ ВА ЎРТА МАХСУС ТАЪЛИМ ВАЗИРЛИГИ

ФАРҒОНА ДАВЛАТ УНИВЕРСИТЕТИ

**FarDU.
ILMIY
XABARLAR-**

1995 йилдан нашр этилади
Йилда 6 марта чиқади

1-2021

**НАУЧНЫЙ
ВЕСТНИК.
ФерГУ**

Издаётся с 1995 года
Выходит 6 раз в год

Муассис: Фарғона давлат университети.

«FarDU. ILMİY XABARLAR – НАУЧНЫЙ ВЕСТНИК. ФерГУ» журналі бир йилда олти марта чоп этилади.

Журнал филология, кимё ҳамда тарих фанлари бўйича Ўзбекистон Республикаси Олий аттестация комиссиясининг докторлик диссертациялари асосий илмий натижаларини чоп этиш тавсия этилган илмий нашрлар рўйхатига киритилган.

Журналдан мақола кўчириб босилганда, манба кўрсатилиши шарт.

Ўзбекистон Республикаси Президенти Администрацияси ҳузуридаги Ахборот ва оммавий коммуникациялар агентлиги томонидан 2020 йил 2 сентябрда 1109 рақами билан рўйхатга олинган.

Муқова дизайни ва оригинал макет ФарДУ таҳририят-нашриёт бўлимида тайёрланди.

Таҳрир ҳайъати

Бош муҳаррир
Масъул муҳаррир

МАКСУДОВ Р.Х.
ЎРИНОВ А.А.

ФАРМОҢОВ Ш. (Ўзбекистон)
БЕЗГУЛОВА О.С. (Россия)
РАШИДОВА С. (Ўзбекистон)
ВАЛИ САВАШ ЙЕЛЕК. (Туркия)
ЗАЙНОБИДДИНОВ С. (Ўзбекистон)

JEHAN SHANZADAN NAYYAR. (Япония)
LEEDONG WOOK. (ЖанубийКорея)
АЪЗАМОВ А. (Ўзбекистон)
КЛАУС ХАЙНСГЕН. (Германия)
БАХОДИРХОНОВ К. (Ўзбекистон)

ҒУЛОМОВ С.С. (Ўзбекистон)
БЕРДЫШЕВ А.С. (Қозоғистон)
КАРИМОВ Н.Ф. (Ўзбекистон)
ЧЕСТМИР ШТУКА. (Словакия)
ТОЖИБОЕВ К. (Ўзбекистон)

Таҳририят кенгаши

ҚОРАБОЕВ М. (Ўзбекистон)
ОТАЖОНОВ С. (Ўзбекистон)
ЎРИНОВ А.Қ. (Ўзбекистон)
РАСУЛОВ Р. (Ўзбекистон)
ОНАРҚУЛОВ К. (Ўзбекистон)
ГАЗИЕВ Қ. (Ўзбекистон)
ЮЛДАШЕВ Г. (Ўзбекистон)
ХОМИДОВ Ғ. (Ўзбекистон)
АСҚАРОВ И. (Ўзбекистон)
ИБРАГИМОВ А. (Ўзбекистон)
ИСАҒАЛИЕВ М. (Ўзбекистон)
ҚЎЗИЕВ Р. (Ўзбекистон)
ХИКМАТОВ Ф. (Ўзбекистон)
АХМАДАЛИЕВ Ю. (Ўзбекистон)
СОЛИЖОНОВ Й. (Ўзбекистон)
МАМАЖОНОВ А. (Ўзбекистон)

ИСОҚОВ Э. (Ўзбекистон)
ИСКАНДАРОВА Ш. (Ўзбекистон)
МЎМИНОВ С. (Ўзбекистон)
ЖЎРАЕВ Х. (Ўзбекистон)
КАСИМОВ А. (Ўзбекистон)
САБИРДИНОВ А. (Ўзбекистон)
ХОШИМОВА Н. (Ўзбекистон)
ҒОҒУРОВ А. (Ўзбекистон)
АДҲАМОВ М. (Ўзбекистон)
ХОНКЕЛДИЕВ Ш. (Ўзбекистон)
ЭГАМБЕРДИЕВА Т. (Ўзбекистон)
ИСОМИДДИНОВ М. (Ўзбекистон)
УСМОНОВ Б. (Ўзбекистон)
АШИРОВ А. (Ўзбекистон)
МАМАТОВ М. (Ўзбекистон)
ХАКИМОВ Н. (Ўзбекистон)
БАРАТОВ М. (Ўзбекистон)

Муҳаррирлар: Ташматова Т.
Жўрабоева Г.

Мусахҳиҳлар: Шералиева Ж.
Мамаджонова М.

Таҳририят манзили:

150100, Фарғона шаҳри, Мураббийлар кўчаси, 19-уй.
Тел.: (0373) 244-44-57. Мобил тел.: (+99891) 670-74-60
Сайт: www.fdu.uz

Босишга рухсат этилди:

Қоғоз бичими: - 60×84 1/8

Босма табоғи:

Офсет босма: Офсет қоғози.

Адади: 100 нусха

Буюртма №

ФарДУ нусха кўпайтириш бўлимида чоп этилди.

Манзил: 150100, Фарғона ш., Мураббийлар кўчаси, 19-уй.

Фарғона,
2021.

Қ.Йўлчиев Лирик шеърда сюжет ва топохронос	102
С.Эшонқулова Нодира лирикасининг бадиият олами асослари	108

ТИЛШУНОСЛИК

А.Мамажонов Ўзбек тилида сабаб-натижа муносабатининг ифодаланиши	113
З.Раҳимов, Ш.Искандарова Фарғона тилшунослик мактаби	116
Р.Шукуров, Г.Жўрабоева Ёзма манбаларда ўш астионими ва унинг келиб чиқишига доир	123
М.Абдупаттоев Поэтик нутқни ўрганиш масалалари	128
З.Алимова Форсча-тожикча ўзлашмаларда вокализмларнинг ўзгариши	133
Ш.Дадабоева Қиёслаш муносабати ва унинг универсал жиҳатлари	138
Н.Якубова Жумбоқли матнлар лингвистик тадқиқот объекти сифатида	142
Л.Абдуллаева Инициализмлар инглиз юридик аббревиатуралар сифатида	146

ПЕДАГОГИКА, ПСИХОЛОГИЯ

Н.Расулова Адаптив интеллектуал таълим муҳитида индивидуаллаштирилган ўқув жараёнининг моделлари	150
Г.Ҳамраева Касб таълими йўналиши талабаларининг рақамли компетенциясини ривожлантириш усуллари	157

ИЛМИЙ АХБОРОТ

М.Мирзарахимов, А.Сирождидинов, Ж.Назирқулов Реал вақт режимида тизимдан малакали кадрларни танлаб олиш алгоритмини норавшан мантиқ асосида тадқиқ этиш	163
М.Султонова Ўзбекистонда телетиббиёт тизимини ташкил этиш тизими модели ва ундаги муаммолар	167
Н.Қодирова, И.Асқаров, Б.Дўмонов, М.Акбарова Айрим совунлар ва синтетик кир ювиш воситалари таркибига кирувчи сирт фаол моддаларнинг мицелляр ҳолати ва уларни таснифлаш	171
И.Асқаров, М.Холматова Балиқ маҳсулотларининг кимёвий таркиби	175
Х.Муйдинов, Ж.Кодиров Қорамол тери ости бўкалари: Қорақалпоғистон Республикаси шароитида бўкалар ҳашаротларининг учуш муддатлари	180
Ш.Усанов Янги Ўзбекистон ёшлар сиёсати тизимида оила-маҳалла ҳамкорлиги масалалари	183
А.Эшниязова Ижодкор биографияси ва уруш фожияси	187
Т.Рузибоев Жудолик Навоий талқинида	191
Ш.Махмиджонов Руҳият қирраларининг бадиий талқинлари	195

УДК: 4+413

ҚИЁСЛАШ МУНОСАБАТИ ВА УНИНГ УНИВЕРСАЛ ЖИҲАТЛАРИ
COMPARATIVE RELATIONS AND THEIR UNIVERSAL FEATURES
СРАВНИТЕЛЬНЫЕ ОТНОШЕНИЯ И ИХ УНИВЕРСАЛЬНЫЕ ЧЕРТЫ

Dadabaeva Shirin Shuhratovna ¹

¹Dadabaeva Shirin Shuhratovna– *Ferghana State University.***Аннотация**

Қиёслаш муносабати тилшуносликда олдиндан ўрганилиб келинган тушунча бўлиб, замонавий тилшуносликда уни ўрганишнинг янги тус олиши айнан унинг воситаларини таҳлили ёрдамида амалга ошади. Хусусан, ушбу мақолада қиёслаш муносабати ўзининг янги унсурлари ва семантик турлари инглиз ва ўзбек тиллари мисолида ёритилди.

Annotation

The comparative relation is a concept that has been studied in linguistics; the new view of its study is realized through the analysis of its constructions in modern linguistics. In particular, this article describes the comparative relation in terms of its new elements and semantic types in the example of English and Uzbek languages.

Аннотация

Сравнительные отношения в лингвистике – это понятие, которое ранее изучалось в лингвистике. Однако анализ его конструкций привёл к формированию нового взгляда на его изучение в современной лингвистике. В частности, в данной статье описывается сравнительное отношение с точки зрения его новых элементов и семантических типов на примере английского и узбекского языков.

Таянч сўз ва иборалар: қиёслаш муносабати, таққослаш, таққослаш стандарти, стандарт маркерни таққослаш, даража, даража маркери.

Keywords and expressions: comparative relation, compare, standard of comparison, standard marker comparison, degree (parameter) or degree marker.

Ключевые слова и выражения: сравнительные отношения, сравнение, стандарт сравнения, сравнение стандартного маркера, степень, маркер степени.

Any subject appears as a result of direct observation of the universe and its perception by means of sensory organs, comparison with other states, identification of different and similar signs, and drawing certain conclusions. The concept of comparison plays an important role in the process of knowing the world. The reason is that the process of cognition involves two types - emotional and intellectual cognition, and it is the knowledge that comes out as a result of comparison, generalization of sensory knowledge that forms intellectual knowledge. Prof. A. Nurmonov gives the following description of comparison: "Comparison of the studying object plays a big role in knowledge of the world. Comparing a previously studied object to a newly studied object is one of the most basic ways of knowing. The general and specific features of the objects are defined by the comparison." [6, 55-56] It is known that the process of cognition consists of two stages - the empirical and theoretical stage. In the empirical (practical) stage, observation, experiment and comparison methods are used. [6, 34-37] It is

can be seen from this, comparison is one of the most important processes in human cognitive activity.

Many scholars have given their definitions of comparison; it is expedient to give the following general definition, as it has been studied not only in linguistics, but also in such fields as logic, philosophy, literature, theology:

Comparison is a multifaceted logical category, philosophically it is the first stage of cognition, a cognitive process that determines quantitative and qualitative features, based on judgments about the similarity or difference of an object, the style that is used in the literary representation of reality, it is a way of acquaintance with any theme, and in linguistics it is a linguistic phenomenon that reflects the signs, characteristics of the environment, thing or event, and their similarities and differences.

In linguistics, however, comparison is a specific category that enters the form of thought from the simplest unit to the complex unit of language, a concept aimed at determining the

ТИЛШУНОСЛИК

qualities, properties of objects, their specificity or distinctive features.[19,10]

The study of the relation of comparison in linguistics began in the XVIII century, when linguists such as FI Buslaev, A.A. Potebnya identified the peculiarities and differences in several languages, and they historically approached the phenomenon of comparison.[22,13]

The emergence of structuralism in linguistics in the nineteenth century caused a new impetus to the study of comparative relation. A new approach to the study of comparative relation began in the twentieth century with the focus on the study of such a semantic process, the analysis and identification of its constructions[22,13]. In particular, in the middle of the twentieth century, French linguists began to study comparative construction in stylistic and rhetoric works[12,14]. The comparative relation has been studied by many linguists combining stylistic and syntactic aspects.

Comparative constructions were studied in world linguistics by H.Zimer [9] and H.Jensen[12,108-130]. R.Ultan identified the superlative and equal types of comparative constructions with the example of 123 languages and created their modern typology.[8,117-162] In his research, L. Stassen identifies the particle, conjoined, adverbial types of comparatives [7]. B. Hayne also dwells on the types of comparatives, precisely, he developed L.Stassen's particle comparatives and created a pure comparative[4,109-130]. R. Dixon created a typology of comparative constructions, which identifies other species on the basis of morphosyntactic parameters. It outlines eight types of simple or compound sentence constructions, the syntactic function of the main parts of the comparative scheme, and the grammatical level of the its constructions and their place in the sentence[3, 345-353].

Many scholars have commented on the comparative relation in the Uzbek linguistics.

The Academician G.Abdurahmanov expressed his views on this with the example of comparative compound sentences and the constructions of their formation (if any, etc.)[10,24-26].

Professor A.Mamajonov in his research on the stylistics of compound sentences emphasizes that comparison is an important tool in the use of speech styles in compound sentences, especially in the literary style, and

the scientist also points out the comparative and similitive types of compound sentences[15,51-52].

Professor N.Mahmudov gives detailed information about similarity and its types, comparative constructions, he distinguished them into similitive and pure construction of comparison. The comparison based on similarity is called similitive and the view based on differentiation is called pure comparison by him[16, 65-71].

Sh.Safarov notes that the role of comparative process is great in the transition of human thinking from the cognitive to the linguistic stage, such as analysis and synthesis[21,165].

Comparison is a mental process that explores the similarities and differences of two or more things[1,1]. It is clear from this definition that in the formation of a comparative relationship, at least two objects are compared on the basis of a certain sign, and the signs and means of these comparable objects are the elements of the comparative relation. The elements of comparison are named with different terms in scientific language by linguists.

Among the world linguists, A.A. Potebnya gives his opinion on comparison, noting that it consists of three elements:

- a) a concept that requires expansion;
- b) a concept that serves to clarify;
- c) the element that connects the above concepts.[20,11]

L.A. Ivanova clarifies comparison and says that it consists of five elements:

- a) comparative activities performed by subject;
- b) the object being compared;
- c) the object to which the first object is compared;
- d) the basis of comparison - the sign to be compared;
- d) the marker of equality and similarity.[14,18]

Many linguists point out that the process of comparison consists of three main elements, because the comparison takes place between at least two objects and requires a common basis. Namely:

- a) comparable object;
- b) standard comparison;
- c) the presence of a common feature between two objects.

Then, the third element - the general sign terms in the comparison is observed in linguistics with terms such as "basis of comparison"[11,15], "comparison conclusion"[13,179], "comparison result - R =, R>, R <,"[24, 288-338]

In Uzbek linguistics, M. Mukarramov uses the term similarity. He says three main elements are involved in this process. They are:

- a) simulated object;
- b) similar object;
- c) similar sign(parameter).[17, 6, 8]

M. Mukarramov emphasizes the importance of the similar sign, without which the process of comparison will not take place. Exactly, he gives complete and incomplete types of similarity according to the sign. If the similarity consists three elements, in particular, if the similar sign is represented by lexical units, it is *complete*, if it is not represented by lexical units, it is understood from the meaning of the words represented by the similar object, it is *incomplete*. In addition, depending on the location of these elements, there will be *prepositional* and *postpositional* similarities [17, 9-10].

N.Mahmudov notes that the relation of comparison consists of four components - the subject of comparison, the standard of comparison, the formal indicator of comparison and the basis of comparison [16, 67].

D.Khudoyberganova also says that comparison consists of four elements (subject of comparison, standard of comparison, basis of comparison and comparative constructions). It gives *implicit* types of comparisons if the text contains all the elements of comparison, *explicit* (hidden) if not fully expressed [24,30].

In modern linguistics, especially in English, the following elements are present in the process of comparison, which can be explained by the following linguistic argument.

Hovliga kirishimiz bilan,bo'yi mandan tikroq...qopqora kallaxum bola chopib keldi.(O'.Hoshimov."Ikki eshik orasi")

His room was certainly much messier than the rest of the house (J.Rowling "Harry Potter")

Through these examples, we identify the elements of comparison that help in the emergence of a comparison relationship:

1. Comparee - something being compared (*bola and his room*).

2. Standard of comparison - what is being compared (*men, the rest of the house*).

3. Standard marker - a mark of the grammatical function of the comparison standard (*-dan, than*).

4. Comparison parameter - comparable character (*tik, messy*).

5. Degree (parameter) mark (degree marker) - (*-roq, -er*)[1,3].

Two of the five elements involved in this comparison process - the standard sign and the degree sign - are grammatical comparison tools. While some languages do not have a degree character, in some languages it is difficult to distinguish a degree character from a standard character, and they both come in the same function [9,3]. In particular, in Uzbek and English we can study all the elements separately, but in Uzbek it is sometimes observed that the degree marker coincides with the standard marker.

In traditional linguistics, the following character levels of comparative constructions are indicated:

- a) *positive degree*;
- b) *equalative degree*;
- c) *comparative degree*;
- g) *superlative degree*[1,3].

In modern linguistics, the relation of comparison can be divided into the following types:

1. Quantitative comparison:

a) an equal comparison. *Sizdek, as beautiful as you.*(*og'zaki nutqdan*)

b) unequal comparison - superiority (relative and absolute superiority) and inferiority (relative and absolute inferiority). *Kichikroq, cleaner, less, more*(*og'zaki nutqdan*).

2. Qualitative comparison:

a) real similarity. *Shodiyona Imona yozgandek insho yozdi. Peter is like Sarah.*(*og'zaki nutqdan*);

b) unreal simulation. *U otasiga tomdan tarasha tushgandek qarab turardi. Sam behaves as if he were a child.*(*og'zaki nutqdan*).

In conclusion, the comparative relation is a multifaceted concept, it is a universal concept studied by many scholars not only in linguistics but also in other subjects, consisting of at least three elements in all languages and having its own semantic types and it is a synthesis of categories such as quality and quantity, which determines the equivalence or inequality of the object being compared through the category of

ТИЛШУНОСЛИК

quantity, similarities and differences through the category of quality.

Literature:

1. Yvonne Treis. Comparative Constructions: An Introduction. Linguistic Discovery, Dartmouth College Library, 2018.
2. Dixon, R.M.W. 2012. Basic Linguistic Theory. Volume 3. Further Grammatical Topics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.:
3. Fuchs, Catherine 2014. La comparaison et son expression en français. Paris: Ophrys. Қаранг: Yvonne Treis. Comparative Constructions: An Introduction. Linguistic Discovery, Dartmouth College Library, 2018.
4. Heine, Bernd 1997. Cognitive Foundations of Grammar. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 109-130pp
5. Jensen, Hans 1934. Der steigende Vergleich und sein sprachlicher Ausdruck. Indogermanische Forschungen.
6. Nurmonov A. Lingvistik tadqiqot metodologiyasi va metodlari. – Toshkent: Akademnashr, 2010.
7. Stassen, Leon 2013. Comparative constructions. In: Dryer, Matthew S. & Martin Haspelmath (eds.). The World Atlas of Language Structures Online. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology
8. Ultan, Russell 1972. Some features of basic comparative constructions. Working Papers on Language Universals (Stanford) 9:
9. Ziemer, Hermann 1884. Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Comparison insbesondere der Comparationscasus der indogermanischen Sprachen und sein Ersatz. Berlin: Dümmler.
10. Абдурахмонов.Ф. Қўшма гап синтаксиси асослари.-Т.: Фан, 1958.
11. Александрова С.Я. Структурно-семантическая характеристика сравнительных конструкций: Автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук. – М., 1981.
12. Анохина, Ю.М. Способы выражения сравнений в языках с разной грамматической структурой (на материале русского и французского языков): дис. .канд. филол. наук: 10.02.19 / Анохина Юлия Михайловна. - Омск, 2004.
13. Балута Л.И. Поле компаративности в современном английском языке (Статические и динамические характеристики): Дис. ... канд. филол. наук, -Л., 1989.
14. Николаева А.В. Функционально- семантическое поле компаративности в современном английском языке : Дис. ... д-ра филол. наук. –Ростов-на- Дону, 2002.
15. Мамажонов.А. Қўшма гап стилистикаси.-Т.: Фан, 1990.
16. Маҳмудов Н. Ўзбек тилидаги содда гапларда семантик-синтактик асимметрия. – Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1984.
17. Мукаррамов М. Ўзбек тилида ўхшатиш. – Т.: Фан, 1976.
18. Николаева А.В. Функционально-семантическое поле компаративности в современном английском языке : Дис. ... д-ра филол. наук. –Ростов-на- Дону, 2002.
19. Огольцов, В.М. Устойчивые сравнения в системе русской фразеологии / В.М. Огольцов. - Л.: Просвещение, 1978.
20. Николаева А.В. Функционально- семантическое поле компаративности в современном английском языке : Дис. ... д-ра филол. наук. –Ростов-на- Дону, 2002.
21. Сафаров Ш. Прагмалингвистика. – Т.: “Ўзбекистон миллий энциклопедияси” Давлат илмий нашриёти, 2008.
22. Сидикова М.А. Функционально – семантическое поле сравнения в таджикском и английском языках: Дисс. кан. филол. наук. -Душанбе, 2018.
23. Худойберганова Д. Семантические и стилистические особенности конструкций уподобления в узбекском языке: Дисс. канд. филол. наук.
24. Черкасс И.А., Черникова Ю.Н. Реализация функционально-семантических полей в речи//Функционально-семантические и словообразовательные поля в лингвистике. – Ростов- на-Дону: Изд-во Ростовск. пед. ун-та, 1998.

(Reviewer: N.Khoshimova – doctor of philosophy in philology).