

# Expression Of The Relation Of Localization Through Word Forms

**M. Ergashova, Kokand SPI**

Ph.D., associate professor Mail: [muhayyoergashova @ gmail.com](mailto:muhayyoergashova@gmail.com)

**Abstract.** In this article, the opinions about the relationship between the Uzbek language as a whole, which is formed by the relationship of interrelated and mutually demanding elements, and the relationship between localization and localization are highlighted.

**Keywords:** linguistic field, formal-semantic, formal-functional, semantic field, invariant-variantity, locality, localization relation.

## Introduction

It is known that although the functional-semantic fields belong to different levels of the language, they are formed on the basis of general invariant semantic symbols. In such areas, the core and periphery are initially separated, and the center and edges are taken into account. They are characterized by the fact that the elements belonging to a number of levels of the language form common segments, the semantic coherence of certain language units is ensured.

"In each level and part of the language, it is necessary to distinguish nuclear, typical, basic and peripheral (secondary) elements. The core-periphery relationship is manifested in structural, semantic and functional aspects".[1]

Considerations about the partial combination of units characteristic of different paradigms are also observed in a number of studies. In the research not related to the field theory, attention is also focused on determining the dialectical relations between language phenomena. Field theory is determined by the analysis of the continuity of language phenomena and the intermediate states of categories within the framework of research.

Functional-semantic fields have special means of expressing the meaning specific to certain functional-semantic categories, and this meaning acquires its own importance within the category. Generalized units (words, phrases) with different meanings have an individual and concrete lexical meaning. Functional-semantic

categories are manifested through the expression of distinguishing semantic signs with a "bottom-up" (or vice versa) structure. Both in the core and periphery of the field, there are specific systems, as well as small systems within the system, and they form oppositions of units consisting of a series of several members specific to a certain semantic field.

The interaction of the elements forming a certain structure can reveal functional-semantic fields through the connections of different types of language units. In particular, morphemes are a semantic-morphological unit that comes after a sound in the language expression system and is the smallest meaningful part of a word.[2]

In the Uzbek language, morphemic level units form a locality microfield based on leading and auxiliary morphemes. In the next chapters of the study, we will discuss the inner divisions of the leading morphemes (lexemes) and the form-forming affixal morpheme. (-ga, -da, -dan prepositions) we will focus on the issues related to the formation of "local" sema in the speech process.

In the word-forming affixes in the Uzbek language, the sign of locality is also manifested to a certain extent. While thinking about the category of word formation, Sh. Mirzakulov recognizes it as one of the important concepts of the word formation paradigm.

Formative morphemes with a local sign in the Uzbek language are grouped by a number of

internal symbols. They can be conditionally divided into two groups:

- the paradigm of locative nouns;
- a paradigm of placemark makers.

We include Uzbek locative noun-forming morphemes in the framework of the paradigm of locative nouns: **-loq, -zor, -goh, -iston** etc. Sh.Mirzakulov dwells on these affixes and states that this formation is combined with the category of formation of locative nouns and acts as a small system unit.[3]

These affixal morphemes are added to object nouns and create a new meaning - a local sign: **paxtazor, olmazor, o`rikzor; qumloq, toshloq, o`tloq; o`yingoh, qarorgoh**. Among these **-iston** morpheme is mainly added to personal names based on the national-ethnic character and forms the proper nouns differentiated by the territorial character as: **O`zbekiston, Tojikiston, Turkmaniston**.

Place symbol is part of the maker paradigm **-dor, -gi (-ki, -qi), -lik, -loq** belong to units like In scientific sources, their "relation to the place, expression of character" [4] is indicated. **-dor** morpheme **hosildor, unumdor** while having a "local" theme in the style, in some cases "ownership" (**zotdor, jilovdor**) also represents the theme. Also **-loq** morpheme is sometimes added to object-object nouns and expresses a "local" sign specific to them, and sometimes it forms units meaning a sign. In both cases, this morpheme contains a local sign: **toshloq yer**.

In this place, the central themes of lexemes entering into syntagmatic relationship with the nouns to which this morpheme is added are taken into account. These central frames serve as boundary frames for the units (adjectives) connected to them.

It should be noted that the role of the forming morpheme is important in the change of the derived meaning. Because the meaning of the basic lexical morpheme is felt in the composition of the artificial word, and at the same time, the main meaning of the artificial word is important, even though the basic morpheme is preserved. Including, **yurtdosh, vatandosh, mahalladosh** in units like

We did not stop at the derivation of locative nouns. Because the representation of

locality at the phonetic, lexical, and morphemic levels was explained in detail by B. Kurbanova in her candidacy thesis.[5]

In world linguistics, the term communicative field has emerged as part of the concepts related to the field, in which the communicative act, the discourse of certain syntagmatic connections, is recognized as a field.[6]

Today it is clear to many that F. Saussure showed that one of the important features of the linguistic sign is its seriality. This feature refers to the relationship between a character and a character. The interaction of a certain sign with another sign is a syntagmatic relationship.

Professor A.Nurmonov emphasizes that the basis of this relationship is the speech process and language tools are at its foundation. According to him, "a concrete material sign created (pronounced) in the process of communication is considered a real means of communication, and at the same time it applies to language as a material system of signs."

Under the syntagmatic relationship, the mutual relationship of the members of the paradigm of different levels is also taken into account. This relationship is especially evident at the lexical level.

At this point, it is necessary to clarify the difference between syntagmatic relation and syntactic relation. Some authors attribute the syntagmatic relation to the syntactic level. In this study, following F. de Saussure, we distinguish between syntactic relation and syntagmatic relation. Syntagmatics refers to all levels of the language, and is the sequential connection of the units of each level in the speech process.[7]

For example, at the phonetic level **t, o** and **sh** sequential connection of sounds at the morphemic level **-tosh** and **-ga** like the sequential connection of morphemes. The syntactic relationship represents only the mutual equal or subordinate connection of syntactic units. But this also follows the general law of syntagmatics. This shows that the syntactic relationship is the manifestation of the general syntagmatic relationship at only one of the different levels of the language.

"The members of a paradigm enter into a syntagmatic relationship with a variant of another paradigm member in the course of speech based on certain rules and regulations of any language and within the meaning of a member of a paradigm. Linguistic units entering a syntagmatic relationship have the characteristic of selection, that is, not linguistic units that are identical in any value, but only variants of members of two paradigms that are meaningfully coordinated and provide meaning enter a syntagmatic relationship." [8 ]

In fact, a certain syntagmatic relationship must be based on a logical coherence. We must, among other things, connect certain actions to the proportionality of things-objects or signs that naturally correspond to it. For example, the act of seeing, of course, to any real objects; the act of eating food; the act of putting on the head; Actions related to reading correspond to objects intended for reading, such as books, newspapers, magazines. In turn, this relationship is also expressed in language: **bog`larni ko`rmoq; palov emoq; choy ichmoq; ko`ylak kiymoq; gazeta o`qimoq.**

Such proportion also applies to other microfield units entering into a syntagmatic relationship with "local" semantic units in the Uzbek language. For example, in Uzbek **sayohat, safar, darbadar** such as concept names; **chuqur, sayoz, hosildor, shinam, keng** lexemes meaning symbols in the style; **bormoq, bunyod qilmoq, jo`namoq, kelmoq, ko`chmoq, o`tirmoq** such units representing movement are logically related to place, space, and can be syntagmatically or associatively connected with the above expressions located in the core of the microfield of locality.

Based on these, we tried to separately analyze lexemes in the Uzbek language that refer to locality, complement their active or facultative valence, and express action. Since these units are located on the periphery of the localization microfield, we divided them into localized nouns, localized adjectives, and localized verbs.

Forms of agreement express the subordinate relationship of the subordinate word to the dominant word, as well as the place of exit, direction, emergence or non-emergence of the

action-state expressed from the lexical meaning of the subordinate clause. Such agreements are contrasted with subject and accusative agreements on the basis of locality. Exit, place, departure agreements are characterized by having a sign, and the other two do not have a sign. Therefore, the agreements of the first group are also called local agreements. In this respect, income agreement takes an intermediate place. Because this form of agreement is connected to transitive verbs and represents the place of descent, the point of descent of the action understood from the governing part. The difference between the local agreement and local agreement in expressing the meaning of place is that local agreement is stable, permanent, and central, while the local agreement is borderline.

The syntactic functions of local lexemes are specified for local cases. Therefore, syntactic structural units also have specialized means for expressing locality. Such syntactic units are considered a central tool in the expression of syntactic locality. In addition, at the syntactic level, there is also the concept of the place (position) of the parts of the sentence in relation to the participle, which is also inextricably linked with the meaning of locality. The sign of syntactic position is of great importance in determining the thematic-rhematic function of the communicative structure of the sentence, whether the formal structural units of the sentence are part of the sentence or part of the sentence, i.e. functional and non-functional part for the structure of the sentence. However, in expressing the local meaning of sentences, the next case is considered as a boundary sign.

Locality is a meaningful category characteristic from the phonetic level to the highest level of language structure. At any level, there are central units that represent this meaningful category and are specific for this theme, as well as border units that serve as auxiliary tools in expressing this theme.

All linguistic units related to the representation of the locality scheme can be combined into one semantic field - the locality field. All linguistic units united in the field of locality differ from linguistic units united in the paradigm of locality by the sign of heterogeneity.

Depending on this sign of heterogeneity, the linguistic units included in the field of locality can be classified into the following meaning groups:

1. Generative locality. Such locality appears in connection with the place of emergence (birth) of sounds.

2. Positional locality. Such localization occurs as a result of the syntagmatic relationship of linguistic units with other similar linguistic units within a larger linguistic unit. The location of the parts of the word in different places of the whole in relation to each other, the position of the phonetic peak of the word in relation to the accent, and the meaningful and grammatical peak of the sentence in relation to the part is called positional locality. can be defined. Therefore, positional locality is inextricably linked with syntagmatics, so it is realized only through syntagmatics.

It should be noted that both of the above localities are outside the internal structure of the linguistic unit and have the sign of relativity.

3. Nominative locality. Such a locality is considered the center (core) of the locality field and it includes nominative units used to express local signs of objective existence. Locality is the denotative meaning of such units, and local units are the nominal of such meanings.

4. Derivative locality. Such locality is inextricably linked with nominative locality, it is a structural part of it. The difference between nominative locality and derivational locality is at the level of naming. If the root lexemes have the meaning of place, the locality represented by them is considered a nominative locality. Derived lexemes formed by adding place-making suffixes to the basic part representing things and events are considered secondary names, and the locality represented by them is a derivational locality.

5. Relational locality. A locality expressed by forms representing syntactic relations is considered a relational locality.

We noted above that Uzbek language conjugations of departure, place, exit, and some auxiliaries have a locality sign, and accordingly, they are treated as local conjugations and auxiliaries with the "local" sign. In them, the "locality" scheme has a stable feature, and on this

basis, these agreements take place in the central, core part of the locality microfield.

In "Grammar of the Uzbek language" "composition with the help of a conjugation form usually occurs as a result of the words becoming "solidified" in a certain conjugation, and has the ability to express a special meaning - a sign. It is noted that the semantic shift that occurs in the word also has a morphological paralysis" [9]. This process is a phenomenon that occurred in connection with the development of the language, and it must be recognized at the language level. The process of localization works as a synchronous event related to a specific speech situation.

In some scientific sources, it is recognized that the meaning of agreements and auxiliaries depends on the word that comes with the agreement and the auxiliary and the meaning of the word that controls them, the text and the situation. In this place, it is assumed that the possibility of realization of different semantic signs of the agreement and auxiliaries in the speech process is manifested through the environment they are in. In particular, departure, place and exit agreements and some auxiliaries serve to express different meanings by means of surrounding words.

However, it should be noted that the case of head and pointer without a local sign does not express this meaning separately in different contexts. The meanings expressed by the agreement in the intermediate state are realized in the same speech. The words in the agreement of departure, place and exit show the local character. Although the verbs (or their forms) that stand in this place and govern them are considered important, at the same time, the meaning of "space" in the content of these agreements cannot be overlooked. Because "sometimes words with the element "thing" can express the meaning of place with the conjunctions "place", "departure" and "exit".[10]

"The demonstrative of locative valence is used in the sentence, mainly in locative forms. Only in some cases **-ni**, **-ga**, **-dan** it is observed that it is used with agreements. The locative valence of directional action verbs is mainly manifested in the noun expressing the meaning of

level. Local valence of directional action verbs **oldida, orqasida, o`rtasida, bo`yida, yonida** It also appears in auxiliary forms such as "[11]

Also, some auxiliaries that enter into a synonymous relationship with the agreements of departure, place and exit also serve in the process of speech to bring out different meaning relations such as these agreements.

It is known that the names related to nature are also divided into a number of internal groups. Among them, we want to analyze the names of heavenly bodies, lexemes related to the world of plants, water and related names. Including **quyosh, oy, yulduz, bulut, ufq** such as the names of celestial bodies; **daraxt, gul, shox, butoq, yaproq** the names of the plant or its parts; **suv, to`lqin, ummon** When nouns related to water come in the main agreement, they are neutral to the locative sign. Their localization is based on the form of departure, place, exit agreement or "local". **qarab, sari, tomon, qadar, nari, beri, ichra, uzra** It is manifested through helpers such as compare:

**Kezarsan mulki so`z ichra**  
**G`animu ahli do`st ichra**  
**Charaqlab baxti ko`z ichra (M.Ulug`)**  
**Or:**  
**Yalang`och qo`llarin uzatganicha**  
**Daraxtlar olisga intilib qoldi (M.Ulug`)**

Given in the opening passage **yulduz** lexeme is defined as the name of a thing-subject, which does not contain "local" semantics. And in the next example **yulduzlarga** expression –**ga** Localization is being observed by means of the dispatch agreement form.

In some cases, the general "space" is similar **atrof, taraf, tomon** lexemes can also localize lexemes that do not have a "local" meaning in the speech process:

**Junjekar yer muzdek suvlarning labida**  
**Kengliklarda shabbodalar qolar shoshib (M.Ulug`)**

In the given poetic passage **quyosh atrofida, sening tegrangda** compounds have the meaning of "space" and reflect the local character:

As already mentioned, localization is more common in the units meaning the names of plants and their parts. Compare examples:

**Yaproqlar** tebrantar she`r maqomiga,  
 Chechaklar jimgina egib turar bosh  
 (Zulfiya).

Also:

Mening tongim boshlanar tundan,  
 Kuzataman g`uncha kulishin.  
 Tog` ortida boshlanar kundun

**Yaproqlarda** shabnam so`nishin.(Zulfiya)

**Yaproqlar** the word has no local sign in the main agreement, **yaproqlarda** together with the location indicator, it has a local character.

Salqin saharlarda, **bodom gulida**

**Binafsha labida**, yerlarda bahor.(Zulfiya)

In the given verses **bodom gulida, binafsha labida** location meeting of units –**da** it is happening by means of agreement.

He participated in the talks **orasida, uzra** assistants **kurtak, maysa** adding to lexemes, paving the way for the "makon" concept, as a result, localization of lexemes is observed.

In some cases, it is used as a plant part **to`nka** lexeme can serve for the meaning of locality. For example:

Chol kattagina **to`nka** ustida mung`ayib o`tirardi.

Such a process also occurs within the framework of names of concepts related to water. Actually **suv, to`lqin, ummon, mavj, dolg`a** lexemes do not have the meaning of "makon", "joy", their having a local character, as mentioned, is related to the speech process.

It is also observed that lexemes serve for connotative meaning in poetic texts:

Tund bulutlar orqasidan  
 Yo`lga tushadi hurram  
 Shu mitti jon izlarida  
 Erir so`nggi qorlar ham (M.Ulug`)

In the given sentence **to`lqin** the word is realized with the meaning of "the door on the surface of the shaking water" [9], in this place this unit **uzra** he is getting a local character by means of his assistant and place agreement. In the text **suvdan** the word also shows the local sign through the agreement of exit.

We distinguish lexemes meaning the names of body parts as names related to the

human or animal world, but such a distinction is related to the speech process.

A. Sobirov notes that one of the important characteristics of words is the creation of separate semantic (concept) fields depending on the idea they carry, and he cites the following words that merge into the semantic field of the body as an example: "soch, peshana, quloq, qosh, kiprik, burun, yanoq, ensa words **bosh**; til, tish, milk, lakluk, tanglay words **og`iz**; ichak, buyrak, yo`g`onichak, jigar words **qorin**; tirnoq, panja, bilak, tirsak, barmoq words **qo`l** Forming paradigmatic lines related to the word, they combine with each other and merge into the semantic field of the body. At the same time, peculiarities are also observed in all the listed words". [12]

Almost all of the indicated lexemes can be localized in relation to the speech situation. In our work, unlike the above groups, we tried to analyze lexemes that can be localized as follows:

- localization of the names of human and animal body parts;
- localization of names of body parts specific to humans only;
- localization of the names of body parts of animals and birds.

Although the names of human and animal parts of the body as a lexeme gain commonality in their content, they are realized in terms of relevance in the process of speech (in the process of localization). As their common names **tana, gavda, bosh, kalla, quloq, ko`z, burun, og`iz, tish, bo`yin, oyoq** the like can be mentioned. For example, **bosh** lexeme is defined in the "Annotated Dictionary of the Uzbek Language" as follows: **Bosh** – 1. The part of the body above the neck (in humans) or in front (in animals); head [9] **Bosh** lexeme –**dagi** comes as a determinant of doppi lexeme through the affix, and at the same time, the "o`rin" seme contained in this lexeme is preserved.

Localization of the names of body parts specific to humans is very common in Uzbek language fiction. Among such lexemes **qosh, lab, yanoq, yuz, qo`l, kaft** units in the style of In this regard, A. Sobirov says that "a whole (holonym) consisting of certain parts (meronyms) can become a meronym (fragment) of another

holonym (whole name) depending on a specific need.

For example, **qo`l, oyoq, bosh** holonyms are composed of the following meronyms:

1. Hand – **tirnoq, barmoq, kaft, bilak, tirsak, elka.**
2. Foot – **tirnoq, kaft, tovon, to`piq, ilik, tizza, boldir, son.**
3. Head – **soch, qosh, qovoq, kiprik, ko`z, quloq, burun, og`iz, peshona, ensa, iyak.**

All three lexemes, in turn, serve as meronyms for body holonyms," he says. [12] There are a number of works on the features of the use of the names of human body parts in the Uzbek language, among which the works of Z. Mirahmedova and D. Bozorova can be highlighted. In particular, Z. Mirakhmedova groups the terms denoting the external and internal parts of the human body. [12] Among them **bosh, ko`z, elka, oyoq** includes the likes. Since we analyzed them in the first group - among the names of human and animal body parts, we will focus on the localization of the names of body parts specific to humans. For example:

So`ngra jilo bo`lib kirdi yotog`imga,

Hulkar va Omonning o`pdi **yuzidan** (Zulfiya).

In the given passage **yuzidan** localization of the word is being observed through the form of the exit agreement with the locality sign. It is neutral to locality **yuz** lexeme –**dan** until the exit agreement form was added, it did not have a "local" meaning.

Kumushday **sochida** jilvalanar nur,

Ko`zida yoshlikning so`nmas yolqini.(Zulfiya)

**Sochida, ko`zida** words also have a sign of locality, their localization –**da** the effect of the location agreement is noticeable.

Uning ko`zlarida jiddiy o`y, **lablarida** ma`nodor, ingichka tabassum sezilar edi.(Oybek) In the sentence **ko`zlarida, lablarida** the words take place on the periphery of the microfield due to having the "local" sign in the speech process. "Local" helpers also have a special place in poetic texts. For example, **uzra (ustida)** assistant **yanoq** it is observed that it acts as a tool in the localization of lexemes. In some cases, these

units, representing the names of human body parts, can express a figurative meaning and have a "local" meaning. Sometimes units with an abstract meaning are also directed to a certain goal:

Mening tongim **qalbimda** otar,  
O'ydan, ko'zdan haydab zulmatni  
(Zulfiya).

Among the names of body parts typical for animals and birds **shox, tuyoq, dum, tumshuq, qanot** such as can be cited. Within these units **shox, tuyoq, xartum (fil), o'rkach (tuya)** lexemes are specific to animals, **tumshuq, qanot** lexemes are divided as body parts specific to birds. All of them are localized in the speech process, just like the above lexemes.

In his treatise, A. Sobirov talks about the basic characteristics of birds of prey and the microfield that forms them:

“**Yirtqich, tumshuq, cho'qimoq, chovut solmoq, o'limtik, sho'ng'imoq, o'lja** such lexemes form the core of the microfield of birds of prey”. [12] In some cases, the above lexemes also serve to express figurative meaning. Names of inanimate objects conditionally include names of transport, household appliances, dishes and clothes.

To the composition of transport names **mashina, samolyot, tramvay, trolleybus, traktor, poezd, avtomobil, arava, izvosh** etc., and their localization is observed by means of indicators of departure, place, exit agreement or helpers with the "local" symbol. In the given sentences –**ga, -da** "local" suffixes are opening the way for the localization of units meaning transport names.

It is known that in ancient times, various animals such as horses, donkeys, and camels were used as means of transport. Therefore, in order to ensure the believability and vitality of certain events, the processes related to them are clearly shown in the works of art. We touched on the localization of animal names above, until recent years, animals such as horses, donkeys, camels were considered vehicles such as chariots and chariots. Accordingly, although the names of inanimate objects are not counted, we took into account the names of these animals as a type of transport.

In the examples given **aravada, eshakda** the words are localized through place agreement. At the same time, both lexemes mean a type of transport. However, in scientific sources, it is indicated that any units coming in the form of place, departure and departure agreements do not have the "space" meaning. In particular, the above units, which are the names of transport, are also divided according to the function of place case or vehicle filler. Note:

**mashinada kelmoq - mashinada o'tirmoq**  
**samolyotda bormoq - samolyotga chiqmoq**

In compounds **kelmoq, bormoq** entered into a syntagmatic relationship with his words **mashinada, samolyotda** the words "local" are neutral, **o'tirmoq, chiqmoq** These words, which come into contact with words expressing action, have this sign with the help of "local" sign. Localization of lexemes denoting the names of household appliances is also often observed. To them **gilam, sandiq, ko'rpa, to'shak** names of traditional equipment such as; **divan, stol, stul, kreslo, televizor, xolodilnik, shkaf** modern equipment names such as Since all these devices are intended for the placement of certain things, sitting, lying down, standing or walking, they are taken into account with the help of "place" agreements or helpers.

Darparda orqasida tokchadagi chiroq shu'lasida uy ichidagi **ko'rpada** yotgan Hanifaga tushib lipillab turardi (I.Sodiqov). In this sentence **ko'rpada** the place affix –**da** is paving the way for localization. In the word **Sandiqqa** the affix of the departure, agreement –**qa (-ga)** serves to express the meaning of place. In this place **ustiga** auxiliary and exiting affix –**dan** indicator **stol, xolodilnik** is the basis for the localization of lexemes.

Denoting the names of household items **paqir, chelak, tog'ora, lagan, kosa, piyola, choynak, o'choq, tandir, mo'ri, savat** A number of lexemes are used as the name of an object. In fact, such units are neutral to locality, and instead their localization is observed.

In general, any real objects in the Uzbek language that do not belong to the series that we have separated as the object of analysis can also

be localized using certain tools. We have selected for analysis only the most commonly used units in practical speech. Based on this, learning the names of concrete concepts in Uzbek will give the expected result.

It is necessary to have a certain content compatibility in the structure of any linguistic units that enter into a syntagmatic relationship. The same ratio applies to "local" cells and other units interacting with them. As a result of the localization of lexemes that are neutral to locality with the help of departure, place, output agreements and auxiliaries with the "local" meaning, they can take place on the periphery of the locality microfield. Nouns related to nature in Uzbek language; names of body parts; Localization of the names of inanimate objects is a phenomenon related to the speech process, and this situation occurs with the help of "local" suffixes and auxiliaries. At the same time, assistants and agreements realize their potential through a certain environment.

#### REFERENCE:

1. Eltazarov J. So‘z turkumlari paradigmasida yadro-periferiya munosabatlari // O‘zbek tili va adabiyoti. – 2006.- № 3.- 40-bet.
2. Tojiev Yo. O‘zbek tili morfemikasi. Toshkent, 1992, 5-bet.
3. Mirzaqulov Ch. O‘zbek tilida so‘z yasalishi ma'nosi va paradigmasi: Filol. fanl. nomz... dis. avtoref.. Samarqand, 1995.- 13-bet.
4. O‘zbek tili grammatikasi. II tom. Toshkent: Fan, 1975.- 235-bet.
5. Qurbonova B. Lokallik va uning o‘zbek tilida ifodalanishi. Filol. fanl. nomz...dis. avtoref. –Toshkent. 2007.
6. Nurmonov A. va boshqalar. O‘zbek tilining nazariy grammatikasi. Morfologiya. Toshkent: Yangi asr avlodi, 2001.
7. Iskandarova Sh.M. O‘zbek tili leksikasini mazmuniy maydon sifatida o‘rganish (shaxs mikromaydoni): Filol.fanl. dokt... diss.avtoref. Toshkent, 1999. – 9-bet
8. O‘zbek tili grammatikasi. II tom. Toshkent: Fan, 1975.- 536-bet.
9. Sharipova O‘. O‘zbek tilidagi yumush fe'llarining ma'no valentliklari: Filol.fanl.nomz....diss.avtoref.. Toshkent, 1996.- 16-bet.
10. Muhamedova S.X. O‘zbek tilida yo‘nalma harakat fe'llarining predikativligi valentligi: Filol.fanl.nomz....diss.avtoref.. Toshkent, 1999.- 19-bet.
11. Sharipova O‘. O‘zbek tilidagi yumush fe'llarining ma'no valentliklari: Filol.fanl.nomz....diss.avtoref.. Toshkent, 1996.- 16-bet.
12. Sobirov A. O‘zbek tilining leksik sathini sistemalar sistemasi tamoyili asosida tadqiq etish. Toshkent: Ma'naviyat, 2004.- 48-49-betlar.13.
13. Bakirova H.B. The role of terms of specialty in professionally oriented education. Journal of Hunan University (Natural sciences) Vol 48. No.11.2021. 1430p.
14. Bakirova H.B. The content of teaching foreign languages. Eurasian Journal of Learning and Academic Teaching. Vol.2 [www.geniusjournals.org](http://www.geniusjournals.org). ISSN: 2795-739X. Belgium. 10-14p.

#### Internet sites :

<http://psycholing.narod.ru/auto/bosova-auto.html> [wikipedia.org](http://www.wikipedia.org)

<http://ontol.philos.msu.ru/info/themes/psych.htm>  
1 v yazyake rechi