

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHII (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 8.716
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2019 Issue: 12 Volume: 80

Published: 30.12.2019 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



Navruza Kh. Yakhyayeva
Tashkent state university of law
Teacher,
Training language center

UNIVERSAL VALUES IN UZBEK CULTURE: LINGVOCULTURAL ANALYSIS

Abstract: *In the article, the author scientifically reveals the linguistic and cultural features of universal values inherent in Uzbek culture. One of the main problems facing modern linguists is the study of functional styles of speech, the identification of their linguistic characteristics, the elucidation of linguistic units in speech styles and their separation based on linguistic facts. It is well known that universal values reflect the mentality of modern society, the national mentality and the world. In other words, this is one of the main sources of obtaining and reflecting national-cultural information in the language. Because images reflecting universal values are part of the national worldview. Cognitive orientation in the framework of linguistic and cultural studies not only uses cognitive abilities, but also imposes cultural meanings on the meaning of words in the language that is formed. In the linguistic and cultural direction, human values have been the subject of several studies. With this in mind, the author presented practical examples of universal values inherent in Uzbek culture.*

Key words: universal values, sociology, culture, social relations, language culture, spirituality.

Language: English

Citation: Yakhyayeva, N. K. (2019). Universal values in Uzbek culture: lingvocultural analysis. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 12 (80), 601-606.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-12-80-114> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2019.12.80.114>

Scopus ASCC: 1203.

Introduction

The study of universal values as objects of linguoculturological analysis has a short history. Therefore, it is advisable to place the existing research paradigm in Philology in the new field of study of linguistic units with a socially constructed meaning (good, evil, family, homeland, health, labor, love, neighborhood etc.). Language units denoting values express objects, actions, phenomena that have received social certainty, which was formed as a result of their inclusion in the social relations of members of a particular society. The interest of linguists in the linguistic units denoting objects of culture has arisen for a long time, although the object of intensive efforts by scholars of linguistic culture began in the second half of the 20th century. In the 1990s, there was a predominant interest in linguoculturology. Linguoculturological direction grew out of the works on the theory of linguistic and regional studies V.G. Kostomarova and E.M. Vereshchagin and was developed in the works of Yu.G. Prokhorov, who in

his works substantiated the ethnosociocultural concept of verbal communication, highlighting and emphasizing in it the special role of national sociocultural stereotypes in language teaching [14, p. 56]

There is a widespread trust that all modern, new ethnic groups face a civilizational choice, to which they are compelled by threats associated with globalization processes. If we proceed from the idea that the development of society is determined by supbiological programs of human life, we can agree with the idea that modern civilization is in a state of transition to a post-industrial society, replacing the technogenic stage that previously replaced the traditional society. Step by step evolutionary development of culture makes possible the simultaneous existence in one society of a complex system of supbiological programs. At any given moment, the culture of society represents a system of such programs - dying (relict), stably reproducing and

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 4.971	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHHI (Russia)	= 0.126	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

ensuring the preservation of society in time, and, finally, projects of future social programs.

Humanity try to make sense of their own behavior, characteristics and others' behavior, over time, and the important way in which we do that is by collecting our own and other people's reasons and assembling these sets of reasons into an "identity" - a simplified shape of ourselves or of others. Our sense of one another's identity (and of a set of shared values) is what justifies relation. While a small number of values have names ("freedom", "equality", "honesty", "generosity") most of them don't. Furthermore, values without names can usually be referred to by phrases ("honoring the dead", "building the capacity of the team to handle problems together"). A lot of people conversation amounts to asking the question "what is important in such-and-such-a-situation?" and answering it with value-phrases of this sort. Narrative is a way to package up such value-related questions and answers. Language arose to communicate values. Language is not able to keep up with progress in values - there are popular values which are very hard to express in words - but language tries to keep up anyhow. Some values only apply in extremely particular situations, for instance, a electric blues guitarist may have the value of "crispy licks", a mother of "letting her child get bumped around a bit", an improviser of "maintaining a loose awareness of the shape of the room", etc. When people can divide out their personal values and share them, other people can't help but be interested even when they are from very different cultures, because a person's personal values are ideas about living well, and these have the potential to be useful to all of us.

Values are, firstly, a regulator of the perception of person activity, but in a different way: as a relationship, as norms, as ideals, as selection criteria and assessments of moral actions. All axiology scientists agree that value there is a peculiar form of the conscious approach of the subject to the object about the satisfaction of their interests and needs.

Discussion

Yu. A. Sherkovin clarifies that values become a fact of consciousness thanks to the experience. Since the nature of experience is social and at the same time individual, values also take on a dual character. According to Yu. A. Sherkovin, social values have a double meaning. Firstly, they are the basis for the formation and preservation of consciousness people of attitudes that help an individual to take a certain position, express a point of view, give an assessment. So they become part of consciousness. Secondly, values are transformed as motives for activity and behavior, since the orientation of a person in the world and the desire to achieve certain goals is inevitable correlates with the values included in the personality structure.

The common thread in everything people find meaningful: appreciation of nature, the advance of art or science, the reorganization of human affairs, the participation in common rites of parenthood, childhood, etc - the common thread in all of this is the recognition of personal value and the extension of wisdom. A "life of meaning" is simply one in which one's particular values are tested, extended, and expressed.

According to A. G. Zdravomyslov, the specificity of the action of value orientations is that they function not only as ways rationalization of behavior, their actions extend not only to higher structures of consciousness, but also to those that are usually designated as subconscious structures. L. M. Smirnov notes for more a deep study of values needs to go beyond phenomenology only consciousness, and turn to the unconscious layer of the psyche [5, p. 157]. Hence one of the problems of studying the system of values of the individual, because the vast majority of methods for diagnosing personal values and value orientations aimed at identifying the conscious part of the system. Therefore, the development of projective techniques for the study of personality values in general and terminal values in particular is an urgent task facing researchers.

There is reason to believe that the way of understanding all supbiological programs is set by the so-called worldview universals. [7, p.15-16].

In the understanding of N.D. Arutyunova, the essential core of the concept belongs to practical, everyday philosophy, and includes a number of factors due to national tradition, religion, folklore, ideology, a system of generally accepted values and the feelings and feelings characteristic of this community. Thus, concepts form "a kind of cultural the layer that mediates between man and the world" (3,3). Such an understanding of the concept has an ethnoculturological orientation, which translates concept from the sphere of mental, philosophical and psychological to the sphere of value-cultural.

Without delving into the problem of the correlation of concepts of concept and value in culture, we only note the fact that the phenomenon of culture combines mental and physical activity of a person, including its artifacts results. It is no accident that a tradition of distinction has long existed in ethnography the so-called "spiritual" and "material" culture, with the second following from the first.

The sphere of communication between society members with each other and with society itself is determined by these worldview universals, which are called universal values: security, faith, power, attention to people, wealth, friendship, health, family, peace, decency, etc. The categories of culture, understood as regulating the value of spiritual and practical development of the world by man, naturally, contain not only the principles of human communication, but also the characteristics of objects

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 4.971	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHHI (Russia)	= 0.126	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

of human activity: time, movement, space, property, attitude, quality and quantity, causality, etc. UVs (universal values) have two forms of existence: ideal and objective activity. The nomenclature of ideal values reflects the generic qualities of members of society and is the basis for intercultural analysis, the subject-activity form is a tool for revealing their ethnocultural specifics. UVs by the criterion of the mode of their existence, I are divided into ideal formations that exist in public consciousness in the form of “eternal” values inherent in the human race (truth, beauty, justice), and in a concrete historical form (equality, democracy). Obviously, the content of UVs is being transformed in time due to the life of a particular society, a certain historical period. For further analysis of the forms of existence of UVs in the Uzbek society, it is necessary to differentiate them according to the criterion of attitude to the social Form of consciousness or kobydnoy consciousness. In the general consciousness, values exist as an accepted ideal in the form of an abstract representation of the qualities due in all spheres of social life. In the extraneous consciousness, UVs function as value guidelines determining the goals and motives of the individual life of activity: UVs in the individual consciousness and appear as a set of goals that individuals set themselves in public practice. Obviously, values in the form of a social ideal or in individual consciousness are internal and mental formations that require symbolic (symbolic) support for their functioning: in the form of certain objects of material and spiritual culture or in the form of rituals (human ritual acts). This form of existence of UVs can be called symbolic objectification.

UVs are the restrictions developed by the society, imposed on the activity of members of society. Any joint actions of people carried out within the framework of social relations are correlated with the category of due, and therefore receive an assessment. The problems being developed in the framework of a new direction - linguoculturology - in turn, pose a task of paramount importance for researchers to establish linguoculturology as an independent discipline. Namely, the task of constructing the terminology and conceptual foundations of the emerging scientific field. In the already classic article S.A. Askoldova (Aleksieva) “The Concept and the Word” [2, p.269], the researcher considered the function of substitution as the most important function of concepts as means of cognition (we would now say: the most essential cognitive function). According to Askoldova, the concept itself “is a mental formation that replaces an indefinite number of objects in the process of thought. He may be a substitute for certain aspects of the subject or real actions, such as the concept of “justice”. Finally, she completes his thought. A concept can be a substitute for various kinds of mental functions, such as mathematical concepts [2, p.270]. D.S. Likhachev in

his article “The Conceptosphere of the Russian Language”, developing the conceptual theory of S. A. Askoldova, called the concept “an algebraic expression for each basic vocabulary meaning of a word used by native speakers in speech, spoken and written” [9, p. 281]. The question of which of the vocabulary meanings of a word is replaced by a concept, believes D.S. Likhachev, is decided on the basis of the context of usage or from the situation [9, p.281].

The problems being developed in the framework of a new direction - linguoculturology - in turn, pose a task of paramount importance for researchers to establish linguoculturology as an independent discipline. Experience in teaching Uzbek language accumulated in Uzbek tradition as a foreign one using the “language and culture” approach, was generalized and further developed in the monograph by D. Teshabayeva.

Without entering into the problem of the correlation of concepts of concept and value in culture, we only note the fact that the phenomenon of culture combines mental and physical activity of a human, including its artifacts results. It is no accident that a tradition of distinction has long existed in ethnography the so-called “spiritual” and “material” culture, with the second following from the first. Theory and Methods, which became the theoretical basis for the new linguistic discipline, the focus of which is the national linguistic personality. The concept of linguistic culture was put forward as a taxonomic unit of the synthesized description of the elements of language and culture, which was interpreted as a complex inter-level unit, which is a unity of linguistic.

As one of the most important problems of linguoculturology should be considered the problem of establishing the corps, composition, fundamental (basic, basic) national cultural concepts. This problem is interdisciplinary character, as it includes not only philosophical and linguistic aspects, but also cultural in the broad sense of the word, as well as aspects of ethnology and ethno-psychology, considering such concepts that are relevant for our time as national / ethnic self-awareness, national character and mentality, and their role in intercultural interaction. The direction of research in this area, as we noted above, is called linguistic and philological conceptualism [8,p.112]. On the other hand, the concepts of national culture make up the object of linguoculturology.

Society as a stable social community of people with a system of social interactions among members of society is correlated primarily with communication, during which people organize both the communication itself and their joint activities. In the course of communication, according to K. Marx, “people process people” as opposed to activities where “people process objects”. If in an activity

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 4.971	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHHI (Russia)	= 0.126	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

people process objects, and the accuracy of operations of an activity is controlled in culture by means of matching the characteristics of the product with the qualities of the sample, then in communication the success of "processing people by people" cannot be objectively controlled since the external form of people does not change in the process of communication, therefore, communication operations (technologies) are recorded in society in the form of vague approximate descriptions in the form of etiquette rules with varying degrees of accuracy of prescriptions, etc., because these descriptions are designed for the profane reader: the result is achieved not due to accuracy, but due to politeness, due to the repeated repetition of verbal statements on the same topic that are varied in form, but identical in content.

Results

Linguists easily discussed that intercultural cooperation research was what they had always been doing: Historically, scholars simply equated culture with language assuming that language is one and the most visible and distinguishable aspect of culture. The tradition of contrastive linguistics comparing selected linguistic aspects and their realization in different languages could thus be taken as predetermined as a method for the comparison of cultures. Situations of intercultural contact from this perspective could primarily be seen as characterized by the fact that people of at least two different native languages meet. To start an interaction, at least one of them will then need to speak a foreign language, and some authors equate this multilingualism with multiculturalism. By the way, people speaking more than one language will also need to have some knowledge on more than one culture.

A much wider choice of works on intercultural communication conceives cultures as values instead of fixed and learnable knowledge. As noted by Geert Hofstede the world's national cultures into a framework of four linear dimensions may be seen as one of the most prominent and most strategic cited authors conceiving the relevance of culture to multi-cultural communication in terms of values underlying humans movement.

Those linguistic directions to intercultural communication assuming that underlying values and shared preferences are the crucial factors enabling people to exchange ideas and to understand each other may be put into three groups: Some of them point that values underlying discussion are by and large universal but that cultures differ in the ways people put these values into words. Furthermore, other approaches claim that underlying values are completely culture-relative and that they account for the core of cultural differences. Moreover, cultures are not adopted to differ in the way they put these values into words. A third group of studies assumes that both levels are culture-specific: Cultures differ in their

values underlying interaction, and they differ in their ways to put values into words. These lines will present some examples for each case. [5, p. 26]

The first group of directions mentioned assumes that culture influences interaction by determining the way universal values are put into words. For example for this approach comes from one of intercultural pragmatics' most extensive undertakings, the so-called *Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project* [5, p.34]. According to the scientists of this project, principles of interpersonal politeness may be taken as culturally universal. One of these universals on politeness may be seen in the idea that it is mostly expressed by different modes of communicative indirectness. However, different languages provide very different conventions on how to verbally express people intention of being indirect.

Checking the literature on intercultural communication on this behalf may impact the rather disappointing impression that most of this research rather seems to be designed to integrate culture as a factor into formerly universalist approaches and by doing so to confirm these existing theories than to design new theories tailored to open the role of culture [11,p.72] Korean scholar KIM shows for speech communication research, that academic interest in the role of culture and motivation for research have undergone a long-term shift that itself shows some parallels to cross-cultural encounters: According to early scholars took the standpoint of a "preen counter' research culture: 'I'm not interested'" [12,p.280]. This today may also be termed a universalist perspective assuming that scientific results on any scientific research question will produce the same results in all cultures. KIM then illustrates an "initial encounter' research culture" of scholars assuming that "culture is a nuisance" that has to be dealt with as a cumbersome hindrance from insights [12, p.281]. Accordingly, KIM, most of the current research may be classified as carried out from the "'Captain Cook' research culture" of scholars proposing a "Let's discover and compare" mindset [12, p. 282]. To effectively take cross-cultural insights, KIM moreover pleads for a "'paradigm shift' research culture: 'beyond ethnocentric paradigms'" [12, p. 282]. Although KIM does not substantiate this idea any further, the subsequent literature review may prove this appraisal truer than it may seem at first sight.

A cultural researcher should take into account an unavoidable circumstance: he is the bearer of a certain ethnic culture, arming and at the same time organizing it with a certain system of categories. A native and other culture is accessible for understanding only through categories in the inherited criteria of perception and evaluation. A special place in the study of culture is occupied by universals, or universal representations of accumulated cultural experience, of which two main blocks can be distinguished. The first covers the categories that describe the objective world

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 4.971	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHHI (Russia)	= 0.126	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

that is transformed into activities: “space, time, thing, property, attitude, quantity, quality, causality, chance, necessity”, etc. The second block contains categories that characterize a person as a member of a society, describe him in the structure of social relations: “man, society, I, others, labor, consciousness, truth, goodness, beauty, faith, hope, duty, conscience, justice, freedom” [9, p. 17]. These universals, which serve as a categorical grid for describing any culture, contain both invariant and variable ethno-specific features. In determining and scientific position, we proceed from the concept of B.C. Stepin on the types of scientific rationality in history and theoretical knowledge.

Conclusion

Basically, research of UVs in Uzbek culture requires special methods of analysis due to the specifics of the object being studied (axiological consciousness) that exist before the researcher of linguo-didactic aims. Consequently, the results of a study of consciousness must possess the given properties. It is important to understand that the consciousness of students has different ethno-cultural specifics, and therefore the learning process should be oriented on ownership of categories and the Uzbek culture, and on this basis, the values of modern Uzbeks. The results of the study of axiological consciousness are intended for writing manuals on the Uzbek language for children living in Uzbek families abroad, for studying without returning immigrants who settled in Uzbekistan for permanent residence and familiarizing themselves with the Uzbek culture, for compatriots coming to Uzbekistan from abroad. Researcher UVs in Uzbek culture is immersed in social reality in two ways:

- 1) It is connected with society through the norms and ideals of his professional activity;
- 2) It has his own axiological orientation and is connected with society by the relations of a member of society with a certain ethical, moral and sociopolitical position in the culture of an ethnos.

Hence, the characteristics of the epistemological position of the researcher in the analysis of UVs in Uzbek culture are as follows:

1. The study of values in Uzbek culture is a problem oriented study aimed at solving a specific pragmatic problem.
2. UVs in the Uzbek culture form a complex system of ideal objects with different appearances.
3. The content of UVs is socially constructed knowledge created by socially significant individuals and (leaders) and picked up by public institutions specializing in the formation of public consciousness.

The process of constructing their content in a particular society is a dialogue between society in the

face of social institutions that form the public consciousness and the individual, as evidenced by options for understanding UV by representatives of different social strata [14, p. 448].

4. Inside, the scientific attitudes of the UVs researcher in the Uzbek culture depends on his socio-political position. Understanding of values depends not only on the object of analysis, but also on the language of description, because the researcher can hope for attention to the results obtained only if they are presented in an acceptable manner.

5. Linguoculturological analysis of UVs can be directly expanded due to psychological procedures by means of a simple “paradigmatic vaccination” by transferring research procedures from psychologists to linguoculturology.

The difficulty of analyzing the values of “*love, sevgi or muhabbat*” lies in the fact that it is truly an UVs inherent in all people communities, as a strictly obligatory prerequisite for the reproduction of an ethnic group in time and space. Human relations, called love and inherent in each ethnic group, have an ethnocultural specificity, manifested in various degrees of its humanization. The humanization of love also includes the humanization of the relationship of society to a woman, recognition of the convergence of ethical standards of behavior of men and women. Therefore, all judgments about love as an UVs should take into account its intercultural status and the specifics of the content of this value in each particular ethnic culture. However, the dual nature of UVs intercultural specific should be considered when analyzing any UVs. The analysis shows that the UVs “*love*” is directly related to the UVs “*pleasure, creativity*” and indirectly with the UVs “*comfort, family*”. The relationship between the UV “*love*” and the UV “*pleasure, comfort, family*” is expected: the hedonistic coloring of the relationship between man and woman is well articulated and clearly understood. The connection with the UV “*creativity*” is less than expected, since not all members of the Uzbek society imagine that love is creativity, or rather, co-creation about men and women; the fact that in Uzbek culture there still exists such an idea of love can be regarded as an achievement of this culture. The discursive definition of the UV “*love*” contains almost all philosophical works addressing the problems of human generic qualities.

The word “*love, muhabbat*”, according to A. Madvaliev [17, p.115] “1. *The feeling of rejected, cordial affection.* 2. *Addiction, addiction to something*” Obviously, dictionary entries from explanatory dictionaries such as A. Khozhiev’s dictionary are externalities that are between the public and the ordinary consciousness. [20, p.200-201].

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 4.971	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHHI (Russia)	= 0.126	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

References:

1. Akromby, N., Hill, S., & Turner, B.S. (2004). *Triangulation*. Sociological Dictionary. Translation from English. (p.487). Moscow: Economics.
2. Askoldova, S.A (Alekseeva) (1977). "The Concept and the Word", p. 269.
3. Arutyunova, N.D. (1998). *Language and the world of man*. - Moscow.
4. Barabanshikov, V.A. (2006). *Psychology of perception: Organization and development of the perceptual process*. - (p.85). Moscow: Kogito-Center; Higher School of Psychology.
5. Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). Investigating cross-cultural pragmatics: An introductory overview. In Shoshana Blum-Kulka, Juliane House & Gabriele Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp.1-34). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
6. Brown, P., & Levinson, S.C. (1987). *Politeness. Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
7. Smirnov, L. M. (1996). Analysis of the experience of developing experimental methods for the study of values. *Psychological Journal*, T. 17, No. 1, pp. 157-168.
8. Styopin, V.S. (2006). *Philosophy of science. Common problems*. - Moscow.
9. Stepin, V.S., & Tolstykh, V.I. (2007). *Search for new values and development strategy*. Russia in a globalizing world: worldview and sociocultural aspects / Otv. ed. V.S. Stepin (Eds.). (pp.15-16). Moscow: Nauka.
10. Kaptsov, A.V. (2011). *Psychological axiometry of an individual and a group: method. allowance*. (p.112). Samara: SamLuxPrint.
11. Koole, A.J. & ten Thije, J.D. (1994). *The construction of intercultural discourse. Team discussions of educational advisers*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
12. Kim, Min-Sun (2007). The four cultures of cultural research. *Communication Monographs*, 74(2), 279-285.
13. Likhachev, D.S. (1997). "The Conceptosphere of the Russian Language", p. 281.
14. Lektorskiy, V.A. (2012). *Transformation of epistemology: A new life of old problems*. Epistemology: development prospects / Ed. V.A. Lektorskiy. (p.6). Moscow: "Canon +" ROOI "Rehabilitation".
15. Mamardashvili, M.K. (1964). *Transformed form*. Philosophical Encyclopedia. - Moscow, 1964 - 1970.
16. (2003). *Myths* / Ed. Ryabova A.V., Kurbangaliev E.Sh. (Eds.). (p.448). Moscow: House of Intellectual Books.
17. Madvaliev, A. (2006). *Uzbek tiling izuoli lugati*: Tashkent.
18. Neroznak, V.P. (1997). *From concept to word. To the problem of philological conceptualism*. Questions of philology and methods of teaching foreign languages. - Omsk.
19. Prokhorov, B.B. (1996). *Health // Population of Russia 1995 (Third Annual Demographic Report)*. (p.56). Moscow: Center for Demography and Human Ecology.
20. Khodjiev, A. (1974). *Uzbek tili synonymlning izoxoli lugati*: Ukituvchi.
21. Neisser, U. (1982). *Memory observed: Remembering in natural contexts*. san-framncisco: freeman.
22. (2010). *The life of language in culture and society. Conference proceedings*. Moscow, April 14-15, 2010 / Ed. Collegium: E.F. Tarasov (editor-in-chief) and others. (p.310). Moscow: Eidos Publishing House.
23. (2011). *The life of language in culture and society-2. Conference proceedings*. Moscow, April 27-28, 2010 / Ed. collegium: E.F. Tarasov (editor-in-chief) and others. (p.280). M.- Kaluga: Eidos Publishing House.