

2. Флакман М.А. От и.-е. *це до англ. *window*: возраст и количество звукоизобразительной лексики в английском языке. Санкт-Петербургский гос. электротехнический университет DOI:10.30842/ielcp230690152379. 2016. –С. 1067.
3. Григорьева П.И., Березуцкая Д.О. Особенности звукоподражаний в английском языке. КиберЛенинка. Электронный журнал 2017. 2. 2.
4. Соссюр Ф. де. Курс общей лингвистики. / Ф. де Соссюр – Екатеринбург: «Урал».1999. –С. 57-58.
5. Ferdinand de Saussure. Course in general linguistics. Edited by Ch. Bally and A. Sechehaye. Philosophical library. New York. CO PYR IGH, 1959. –P. 68-69.
6. Пирс Ч.С. Избранные философские произведения (перевод с английского К.Голубович, К.Чухрукидзе Т.Дмитриев) – Москва: «Логос». 2000. – С. 204-205.
7. Anderson E. A Grammar of Iconism. London: «Associated University Press». 1998.
8. Hinton L.J., Nichols and J.J. Ohala (eds.) Sound Symbolism Cambridge. «Cambridge University Press» 1994.
9. Воронин С.В. Основы фоносемантики. -Москва: «Ленанд», 2006.
10. Ашмарин Н.И. Подражание в языках Среднего Поволжья, Издательство А.Н. Азербайджанского Гос.Университета отделение общественных наук. Том 2,3,4,5. –Баку: 1925.
11. Дмитриев Н.К. Строй тюркский языков. –Москва: «Восточная литература» 1962.
12. Басаков Н.А. Каракалпакский язык. Фонетика и морфология. Часть I. –Москва: «Академии наук СССР». 1952.
13. Ембергенов У. Хэзирги каракалпак тилиндеги еликлеуиш сөзлер. –Нөкис: «Каракалпакстан» 1990.17-6.
14. Aitchison, J. The Seeds of Speech: Language Origin and Evolution [Tekst] / J. Aitchison. – Cambridge: «Cambridge University Press» 1996. –P. 98.

REZYUME. Ushbu maqolada ingliz va qoraqalpoq tillaridagi taqlid soʻzlar, ularning kelib chiqishi va hodisasi oʻrganiladi. Bu tillarning ikkalasi ham taqlid soʻzlarga ega boʻlib, ayni paytda oʻziga xos xususiyatlarga ega. Ushbu ishda ingliz va qoraqalpoq tillaridagi taqlid soʻzlarning oʻziga xos xususiyatlarini va tasnifi oʻrganilib tahlil qilingan.

РЕЗЮМЕ. В данной статье изучаются подражательные слова в английском и каракалпакском языках, их происхождение и феномен. Оба этих языка имеют сходства и в то же время имеют свои особенности. В данной работе изучаются и анализируются особенности и классификация подражательных слов в английском и каракалпакском языках.

SUMMARY. This article studies imitative words in the English and Karakalpak language, their origin and phenomenon. Both of these languages have imitative words and they have unique peculiarities at the same time. In this work, study and analysis of specific features and classification of imitation words in English and Karakalpak languages.

EXPLORING OBJECTIVITY IN MODERN RUSSIAN LANGUAGE: A FOCUS ON WORD FORMATION AND GRAMMATICAL MEANINGS

S.A.Elmuratova – candidate of Philology

Nukus state pedagogical institute named after Ajiniyaz

Tayanch soʻzlar: tilshunoslik, soʻz yasalishi, predmet, sifat, obyekt, sybekt, narsa, substansiya, vosita, maʼno, tushuncha, semantika, jihat, shakl, ot, gap boʻlaklari, grammatik maʼno, soʻz yasovchi maʼno, soʻz yasalish kategoriyasi, hol grammatikasi.

Ключевые слова: лингвистика, словообразование, предмет, признак, объект, субъект, вещь, субстанция, инструмент, значение, понятие, семантика, аспект, форма, имя существительное, части речи, грамматическое значение, словообразовательное значение, словообразовательная категория, падежная грамматика.

Key words: linguistics, word formation, material, feature, object, subject, thing, substance, instrument, meaning, concept, semantics, aspect, form, proper noun, pars of the speech, grammar meaning, word formational meaning, category of word formation, grammatical case.

The grammatical significance of objectivity becomes evident when juxtaposed with the grammatical meanings of attributes and procedurality. The positioning of a feature within the linguistic system appears more definitive, with linguistics often defining the meaning of objectivity as an unmarked member in contrast to the meaning of a feature. This distinction is inherently shaped by the intricate relationships between the sign and the subject (thing, object, substance, reality) in the realms of reality, thought, and language.

Conceptually, a thing serves as an individual entity within the landscape of material reality, possessing a relative independence and stability of existence. The certainty attributed to a thing is contingent upon its structural, functional, qualitative, and quantitative characteristics.

In the Philosophical Encyclopedia, we encounter the following definitions: "A thing is synonymous with an object; Object (Latin: objectum - subject) – that which stands in opposition to the subject, serving as the focal point for their objective-practical and cognitive activities. An object is identical to a thing, representing a distinct part or unit within an existing entity; encompassing everything that can be in relation to or possess any property. Substance (Latin: substantia - essence, that which underlies) is an objective reality examined from the perspective of its internal unity, irrespective of the myriad modifications through which it actively exists" [1:35].

In the aforementioned definitions, the linguistic concept of objectivity underscores key facets tied to certainty, the distinct separation of an object (thing), and the object's capacity to engage in specific relationships or possess particular properties.

The assignment of linguistic signs to denote objects in the tangible world is intricately linked to processes involv-

ing the "sublation" of the objective, sensory, and active elements—essentially encapsulating the idealization of the objective world. Within human language, the outcomes of this "removal" of the objective world, capturing the genuine attributes and relationships of things, find expression predominantly through nominative signs, which encompass both single-word and multi-word lexical units.

A.A.Shakhmatov and A.M.Peshkovsky have contributed profound and inventive definitions to the subject (subjectness). A.A. Shakhmatov, in his work "Syntax of the Russian Language," presents a distinctive perspective: "Significant parts of speech distinguish themselves from non-significant parts through their connection to underlying ideas. Our ideas can be dissected into concepts related to substances (objects, persons), qualities-properties, action-states, and relationships."

Continuing his exploration of syntactic distinctions among parts of speech—nouns, adjectives, verbs, and adverbs - A.A.Shakhmatov delves into semasiological differences. Specifically addressing the concept of objectivity and its representation in language, Shakhmatov draws a clear distinction between the grammatical and real meanings of a word. He articulates, "The real meaning of a word hinges on its alignment as a verbal sign with a specific phenomenon in the external world. In contrast, the grammatical meaning of a word lies in its connection primarily with other words and their meanings. While the real meaning directly associates the word with an external phenomenon, the grammatical meaning establishes its linkage predominantly with other words and their respective meanings" [2:33-34].

Academician Shakhmatov's thesis on the conditioning of formal, or grammatical, meanings by real, or material, meanings, in the context of interpreting a sentence as a dependable reflection of "communication," not accessible to

knowledge beyond this reflection, posits, on one hand, the dialectical unity of language and thought. On the other hand, it underscores the comprehension of language as a mirror reflecting objective reality.

A.M.Peshkovsky extensively delves into the concept of objectivity, concentrating specifically on the form of the word, its components, and their respective meanings. When addressing the disparity between the real and grammatical meanings of a word, Peshkovsky links the real meaning to the significance of the stem. He posits that this meaning, which he identifies as "the main thing in a word," signifies the essence denoted by the word. In essence, this primary meaning encapsulates the core reference to the entity named within the word [3:109].

A.M.Peshkovsky elucidates the meaning of objectivity through a series of words, such as *черный*, *чернила*, *черника*, *черныш*, *чернушка*, among others, to provide clarity. In examining these words with a common root *черн-* denoting a feature and sharing a two-part structure (*черн-* + a specific suffix), Peshkovsky discerns a noteworthy distinction: while the first word designates a feature, the subsequent words do not represent features but rather diverse objects (with *черн-* understood by the author as purely grammatical subjects, encompassing material nouns). Peshkovsky emphasizes that the material differences between these objects, such as the aspect of meaning that distinguishes a liquid like ink from a blueberry as a berry or a blueberry as a bird, fall outside the realm of grammar. Instead, these distinctions are considered within semasiology, highlighting the material nuances that differentiate these objects.

While A.M.Peshkovsky emphasizes the material differences between objects as falling outside the domain of grammar and within semasiology, it is indeed true that the distribution of nouns into lexico-grammatical categories is inherently connected to grammar. The categorization of nouns, as Peshkovsky identifies them, is a formal category—specifically, the category of objectivity within grammatical language, commonly referred to as nouns.

This acknowledgment highlights the nuanced relationship between the material distinctions examined in semasiology and the grammatical classification of words. Peshkovsky's recognition of the formal category of objectivity underscores the importance of grammatical considerations in understanding and categorizing linguistic elements.

A.M.Peshkovsky's exploration of the expression of the meaning of objectivity is indeed noteworthy, as he associates it not only with various suffixes and inflectional systems but also with specific meanings, such as tools or figures, within a comprehensive system of declension. Furthermore, Peshkovsky extends this idea by delving into the connection between the expression of objectivity and forms of phrases. He asserts that phrases, with their forms, are just as potent, if not more so, in conveying objectivity compared to the forms of individual words.

This holistic approach underscores the multifaceted nature of objectivity within language, encompassing both morphological elements like suffixes and inflections, as well as broader syntactic structures such as phrases. Peshkovsky's recognition of the diverse linguistic tools employed in expressing objectivity contributes to a richer understanding of language's capacity to convey nuanced meanings.

A.M.Peshkovsky illuminates the semantic intricacies of objectivity brilliantly through the example of the abstract noun "blackness." In his analysis, he unveils a fascinating aspect of duality inherent in the concept. On one hand, the logical nature of blackness necessitates our recognition that it does not exist independently; even as we speak of it, we may be aware that blackness is not a standalone entity. On the other hand, the very act of thinking and speaking compels us to consider blackness as a separate and distinct con-

cept. This paradoxical interplay between logical understanding and conceptual separation adds depth to our comprehension of the semantic dimensions of objectivity. Peshkovsky's insightful exploration sheds light on the nuanced ways in which language captures and articulates complex ideas.

A.M.Peshkovsky, defining parts of speech as "the main categories of thinking in their primitive national stage of development," underscores the crucial role of nouns in our cognitive processes. He emphasizes the profound importance of the noun category for human thought, asserting that without it, knowledge and science would be impossible. Peshkovsky provides concrete examples, illustrating that discussions about concepts such as light, heat, electricity, life, the state, or even language itself would be unattainable because none of these entities exists independently. This recognition highlights the indispensability of nouns in shaping and expressing our understanding of the world, demonstrating their fundamental role in the cognitive framework.

In modern linguistics, objectivity is commonly defined as the overarching categorical meaning of nouns. All words classified under the part of speech "noun" share the commonality of representing objectivity. These nouns serve as linguistic tools to designate substances, specific objects, or objectively presented elements such as facts, events, phenomena, properties, qualities, concepts, and actions. The semantic core of objectivity, embedded within the noun category, encompasses a broad spectrum of entities and concepts, reflecting the diverse and comprehensive nature of linguistic expression.

V.A.Redkin and G.I.Senin-Volzhsy introduce the possibility of a positive definition of the concept of an object, emphasizing the positive significance in the definition put forth by D.N.Ushakova, where objects are delineated through the negation of a sign. They draw attention to the notion that the concept of a non-feature might lack sufficient meaningfulness, similar to the concept of concreteness.

In their analysis of predicative phrases containing plural verbs and the corresponding controlled nouns, Redkin and Senin-Volzhsy identify several semantic factors contributing to the meaning of the subject. These factors also extend to the deep meanings of cases in the Russian language, encompassing prepositional-case constructions. They assert that cases and prepositional-case constructions serve as surface structures for various combinations of deep subject meanings. These, in turn, constitute a component of the semantics of the verb that governs the respective noun. This perspective underscores the intricate relationships between surface and deep linguistic structures in conveying the nuanced meanings associated with the subject in Russian [4:55-56].

The alignment of the concept of an object with the concept of substance, as posited by V.A.Redkin and G.I. Senin-Volzhsy, offers a profound perspective within deep case semantics. This viewpoint, synonymous with A.M. Peshkovsky's idea regarding the dependence of prepositional-case meanings on verb semantics, provides a nuanced and comprehensive understanding of objectivity at a deep level.

The emphasis on the inseparable connection between the semantics of the noun and the governing verb, particularly within the context of Fillmore's "case grammar," is a fruitful attempt at semantic analysis. This approach proves valuable, especially when applied to derived nouns, which not only manifest the factors embedded in their deep semantics within the text but also represent realizations of case meanings at a profound level. Derived nouns, such as *учитель* (teacher), *ученик* (student), *сеялка* (seeder), among others, exemplify this concept by embodying subject, object, or tool meanings, further enriching the understanding of objectivity within linguistic structures.

Our perspective on the significance of word formation in the differentiation and classification of cardinal parts of speech in the modern Russian language is insightful. The observation that more than 90% of cardinal vocabulary comprises derived words underscores the pivotal role of word formation. This prominence is particularly evident in the non-overlapping sets of word-formative formants for nouns, adjectives, and verbs.

The distinct sets of word-formative formants contribute to the systematic differentiation of grammatical meanings, such as objectivity, feature, and processivity. This differentiation is not only reflected in existing words but also finds expression and confirmation in newly formed derivatives. The dynamic nature of word formation serves as a crucial mechanism for evolving linguistic expressions, providing a framework for the regular manifestation of grammatical meanings within the language.

References

1. Philosophical Dictionary. – M.: «Politizdat», 1990. –P. 445.
2. Shakhmatov A.A. Syntax of the Russian language. – M.: «Uchpedgiz», 1941. –P. 340.
3. Peshkovsky A.M. Russian syntax in scientific coverage. – M.: «Uchpedgiz», 1956. –P. 77, 234.
4. Redkin V.A., Senin-Volzhsy G.I. Deep meanings of cases in nouns with the meaning of substance // Semantics and phonology. – Tashkent: TGPI, 1990. – P. 22-28.
5. Kondakov N.I. Logical dictionary - reference book. – M.: «Nauka», 1976. –P. 717.
6. Ozhegov S.I. Dictionary of the Russian language. – M.: Russian language, 1984. –P. 797.
7. Dictionary of the Russian language in 4 volumes. – M.: Russian language, 1985-1988. T. 1 –P. 699. T.P. –P. 736. T. III –P. 750. T. 1U. – P.796.
8. Russian grammar T. I. – M.: «Nauka», 1980. – P.783.

REZYUME. Tilshunoslikda obyektivlik ma'nosini ko'pincha atribut ma'nosiga qarama-qarshi belgilanmagan a'zo sifatida ta'riflanadi. Bu belgi va obyekt o'rtasidagi murakkab munosabatlar bilan oldindan belgilanadi. Ushbu maqolada ba'zi tilshunoslarning asarlarida keltirilgan obyektivlik tushunchasining ma'nosini ko'rib chiqiladi.

РЕЗЮМЕ. В лингвистике значение предметности часто определяется как немаркированный член в оппозиции к значению признаковости. Это предопределяется сложными отношениями признака и предмета. В данной статье рассматриваются значения понятия предметности, представленные в работах некоторых ученых-лингвистов.

SUMMARY. Objectiveness defines as unmarked part of the meaning in the linguistics. It predetermines complex features of the object. The given article deals with concept of the objectiveness, which is given in different linguists papers.

АНТРОПОЦЕНТРИЧЕСКИЕ ПРОВЕРБИАЛЬНЫЕ ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ С ОЦЕНКОЙ ТРУДОВОЙ ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТИ И СОЦИАЛЬНОГО СТАТУСА ЧЕЛОВЕКА

Н.М.Жалгасов – доктор философии по филологическим наукам

Нукусский государственный педагогический институт имени Ажинияза

Таянч сўзлар: инсон (одам), меҳнат фаолияти, ижтимоий ҳолат, мақол, паремиологик бирлик, миллий-маданий хусусияти, муқобил, аналог.

Ключевые слова: человек, трудовая деятельность, социальный статус, пословица, паремиологическая единица, национально-культурная специфика, эквивалент, аналог.

Key words: human, labor activity, social status, proverb, paremiological unit, national-cultural specifics, equivalent, analogue.

Значение пословиц неоспоримо, оно согласовывается с образом жизни и мыслями тысячи людей. Функции пословиц не связаны со спором или доказательством чего-либо, они либо утверждают, либо отрицают что-либо. В корне их значения лежит неоспоримая истина. Поскольку прагматическая установка пословицы состоит в воздействии на слушателя, ведущую роль приобретает её оценочная функция. Так, основная часть оценок связана с оцениванием человека, так как именно человек является центром всех жизненных ситуаций, в результате которых зарождаются те или иные провербиальные образования [2:139].

Усвоение какой-либо профессии и участие в связанной с этой профессией отрасли человеческой деятельности требует овладения определённым видом «языка для специальных целей». Профессиональное общение между людьми, в процессе которого происходит обмен информацией, представляет собой социальное упорядоченное использование языковых и неязыковых знаков [7:11].

В анализируемых языковых системах встречаются провербиальные образования с компонентом, указывающим на профессиональную занятость человека: *Every cook praises his own broth* – (букв.) Каждый повар хвалит свой бульон; *The cobbler's children usually go unshod* – Сапожник без сапог = *Этиқдўзинг этиги йиртиқ, темирчининг теиаси кемтик* = *Темириши тагага жарымайды, этикиши ишеге жарымайды*. Обычно люди, входящие в одно и то же социальное поле, пользуются одинаковым репертуаром фреймов [7:13].

Испокон веков пословицы призывают людей к труду, искусству и творению: *Art is long, life is short* – Искусство вечно, художник смертен [4:48]; *Сендан ҳаракат – мендан барокат*, т.е. человек должен стараться и добиваться успеха своим трудом, а

не ждать чуда. Каракалпакская пословица гласит: *Агаишты мийўасынан танийды, адамды қылўасынан танийды* – Дерево смотри в плодах, а человека в делах [8:3].

Пословицы исследуемых языков высоко оценивают труд и его плоды: *He who does not work neither shall he eat* – Кто не работает, тот не ест = *Ишламаган – тишламайди; He that will eat the kernel must crack the nut* – Без труда – нет плода [5:514] = *Тоққа чиқмасанг, дўлана қайда, жафо чекмасанг жанона қайда* – Без труда не вытащишь и рыбки из пруда. Подобным значением обладает каракалпакская народная пословица *Мийнет етсең емерсең* – Без труда нет плода [8:8].

Старание и усердность человека получает высокую оценку в узбекской и каракалпакской паремиологии: *Тиришган – эр, тиришмаган – қора ер* – (букв.) Тот, кто трудится – мужчина; *Файратлы ер қамал бузады* – Удалому море по колено [8; 7]; *Көш келе-келе дүзилер* – Не сразу Москва строилась. Трудолюбие также воспевается в следующих провербиальных конструкциях узбекского и каракалпакского языков: *Йигит деган эр бўлар, меҳнат кўрса, шер бўлар* – (букв.) Юноша становится мужчиной, а если будет трудиться, то станет “львом”, т.е. могучим; *Адам мийнетте тапланады* – Человек трудом красен.

Согласно паремиям, человеку не нужно откладывать на “потом” то, что он может сделать своевременно: *Never put off till tomorrow what you can do today* – (букв.) Не откладывая на завтра то, что сможешь сделать сегодня = *Бугунги ишни эртага қолдирма* = *Бугунги исти ертеңге қойма* (или *қалдырма*), *Қалган иске қар жауар; Procrastination is the thief of time* – Откладывать – значит терять время; *Delays are dangerous* – Промедление смерти подобно = *Анқов бўлган кишининг, мазаси йўқ ишининг* [3:61].