

**ЎЗБЕКИСТОН РЕСПУБЛИКАСИ
ОЛИЙ ВА ЎРТА МАХСУС ТАЪЛИМ ВАЗИРЛИГИ
ЖИЗЗАХ ДАВЛАТ ПЕДАГОГИКА ИНСТИТУТИ**



**ИНГЛИЗ ТИЛИНИ ЎРГАНИШДА
ИННОВАЦИЯЛАР ВА ЎҚИТИШ АМАЛИЁТИ
Халқаро илмий-амалий конференция
2019 йил 15 март**

**International scientific-practical conference
INNOVATIONS AND TEACHING PRACTICES IN
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNING
March 15, 2019**

**Международная научно-практическая конференция
ИННОВАЦИИ И ПРАКТИКА ОБУЧЕНИЯ В
ИЗУЧЕНИИ АНГЛИЙСКОГО ЯЗЫКА
15 марта, 2019 г**

ЖИЗЗАХ - 2019

ҚЎШОҚОВА Б. , Ўзбек тили ижтимоий функциялари кенгайиши: социолингвистик таҳлил	165
IBRAGIMOVA L. , Ona tili darslarida mustaqil so'z turkumlarini o'qitishda axborot texnologiyalardan foydalanish	166
IBRAGIMOVA L., ATAJOVA SH. , Ona tili darslarida axborot texnologiyalardan foydalanish	168
ИБРАГИМОВА С. , Инглиз адабиётида бадий асар ғоясининг герменевтик таҳлили	170
ЛУТФИЛЛАЕВ М., ТУХТАСИНОВ И., ЛУТФИЛЛОЕВА Ф. , Повышение эффективности перевода на основе компьютерных имитационных моделей в учебном процессе	172
МАМИРОВА Г. , Переводы шекспира в составе памятников мировой литературы	173
САЙДАҲМЕДОВА Н. , Ўзбек тили сўзлашув нуткидаги фонетик жараёнларда комбинатор ва позицион ўзгаришларнинг ўзига хос хусусиятлари	176
ТОШМАМАТОВА С. , Сўз ва лексема тушунчалари ҳамда уларнинг тил луғат составидаги тутган ўрни	178
ШАРИҲОВА Д. , Differences meaning of antonyms	179
МИНИҚУЛОВ И. , Жаҳон тилшунослигида шарт муносабатлари ўрганилишига семантик-прагматик ёндашув	180
MIRZAAKBAROV S. , The comparative analysis of hyponymic english and uzbek phrases in graduonymic manner	182
ШАКУРОВА Н.Н. , Suffixation as a type of word-formation in Uzbek language	184
МИРЗОЕВ Х. , Сайфий Бухорийнинг “аруз” рисоласида арузшуносликка доир айрим арабча терминларнинг форс-тожик тилидаги шарҳи масалалари	186
МУНАРОВА Р., ОЧИЛОВ О., ДЎСТНАЗАРОВА Н. , Авестода ахлокий идеал ва унинг ижтимоий-психологик кўринишлари	187
МУСАЕВ А.С. , Презентация вида глагольных фразеологизмов в словарях русского языка	188
МУСАЕВ А., РАЖАБОВА Д. , Сўзлашув нутки услубида отларда эгалик категориялари	189
МУСТОҒАҚУЛОВА М. , Синонимик қаторларда коннотатив семантикани таржима қилиш Амалиёти	192
НОРБЕКОВ Ф. Н., А.К. Дойиллимий фантастик асарларининг бадий тўқима эпизодлар таҳлили	194
ОМОНОВА М.К., HOSHIMOVA M. , Word formation in English	196
ОРИПЖОНОВА Ф.О. , Понятие мифопоэтики в изучении женской поэзии	197
АТАМУРОВОВА Ф. , Charlz Dikens – personajlar yaratuvchisi	198
BERDIYEV SH., USANOV F. , Archaisms in the uzbek language	199
ТАДЖИБАЕВ, ЭГАМБЕРДИЕВА Б. , Роман жанри намуналарида аёл образларининг психологик тақдироти	200
ТАДЖИБАЕВ М., КОМИЛОВА С. И. , Англия замонавий адабиётида образлар поэтикасининг миллий қирралари	202
ЮНУСОВ Н. , Тилшунослик нуқтаи назаридан инглиз ва ўзбек фразеологиясининг лингвомаданий хусусиятлари	204
ABDUVALIYEV A., ABDUVALIYEV Z. Ta'limda mumtoz asarlar tilini o'rganish. (Alisher Navoiy asarlari misolida)	205
JUMAYEVA Z., ESHONQULOVA N. , Zoonim komponentli frazemalarning ishlatilishi	206
RASHIDOV S. , O'zbek tiliga ingliz tilidan o'zlashgan va o'zlashayotgan neologizmlarning lingvomadaniy xususiyati	207
РАҲИМОВ М. , Фейлларнинг ўтимлилик ва ўтимсизлик категориясининг мазмун моҳияти хусусида	208
САҒАРОВА У. , Контаминированные слова и их лексико-грамматическая структура	210
SODIKOVA S. , The peculiarities of narrative manner “stream of consciousness” of Faulkner's novel "the sound and the fury"	211
SOYIBNAZAROV N. , Definition of a proverb as a linguistic phenomenon	213
ШАРИҲОВА Д. , Word meaning and it's types	214
ОЧИЛДИЕВА Д.Ш., САПАРОВА З.И. , Сложносочиненные предложения с разделительными союзами	216
ТУРДИЕВА Р.У. , Способы выражения объекта в синонимичных глагольных словосочетаниях	217
SUVANOVA H. , Nobel mukofoti sovrindori toni morissonning ijtimoiy romanlarida ayol obrazining o'ziga xos tasviri	218
SUVANOVA H. , Afrika-amerikaliklar adabiyotida sheryatning zamonaviy tasviri	219
АЛМАМАТОВ Т. , Абдулла Қахҳор ҳикояларида парранда ва ҳашоратлар эталонли ўхшатишлар	220
TUROPOVA L., HAQBERDIYEV H. , So'roq gaplarning xususiyati	222
TUROPOVA L., NURMATOVA G. , Modal so'zlarining ishlatilishi	223
USMONOV A. , Bog'lovchilarning funksional-stilistik xususiyatlari	224

Differences meaning of antonyms

Chariyeva Dilnoza, KarSU

Annotation: The article discusses the various definition of antonymy. It is emphasised that, Egan's definition of antonymy may be fitter or easier to be employed.

Key words: antonymy, concentrate, definition, semantic feature, range of application, semantically opposed wordsю.

The word "antonymy" was coined by C. J. Smith as an opposite of "synonymy". Since 1867, lots of efforts have been taken to define "antonymy", but the problem is that the definition of antonymy tends to illustration rather than description.

For example, if we would like to tell others what antonymy is, to give some examples like old/young, tall/short, open/close, bad/good, etc. will be more effective than to give a definition. However, finding a definition which could account for every example of antonymy is difficult, even problematic.

Lyons (1977) defines "antonym" as the words which are opposite in meaning and "antonymy" as the oppositeness between words. For example, "buy" and "sell" is a pair of antonyms and the relation between these two words is termed as antonymy. Leech (1981) puts forward the definition of antonym and antonymy in Semantics that the opposite meaning relation between the words is antonymy and word of opposite meaning is antonym. And a famous Chinese linguist Hu Zhuanglin (2001, p.164) simply says "antonymy is the name for oppositeness relation".

Traditional definitions of antonymy only concentrate on the oppositeness of meaning. Some traditional definitions are as follows:

word of opposite meaning; (Leech, 1981)

word of opposite sense; (Pyles & Algeo, 1970)

words that are opposite. (Watson, 1976)

These definitions are only rough ideas and over ambiguous. First, they don't explain the ways of oppositeness very concretely. The antonym pairs like hot/cold, dead/alive and lend/borrow differ from each other in the way of oppositeness.

The pair hot/cold belongs to the gradable antonyms; the pair dead/alive belongs to the complementary antonyms; and the pair lend/borrow belongs to the relational antonyms. Second, these definitions focus more on the discrepancy of the antonyms but they ignore the similarity of the grammar and usage of each of the antonym pairs. Just look at another three pairs, heat/cold, single/married, and beauty/ugly. Although either of them is opposite in meaning, they could not be regarded as antonyms in that they are not the same in grammatical units. Furthermore, people use the antonyms most of the time just for the effect of contrast. For instance, the juxtaposition of spring and winter can constantly be found in the English literature, as is presented in Ode to the West Wind, "If winter comes, can spring be far behind?"

Taking the above factors into consideration, Lyons classifies opposition into three categories: antonymy, complementarity and converseness in Semantics (1977) and Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics (1968). Lyons only regards words that are gradable and opposite in meaning as antonyms. Cruse (1986) thinks the same way in his Lexical Semantics. So the term "antonym" only refers to the set of gradable opposites, which are mostly adjectives, for gradable antonyms reflect one distinguishing semantic feature: polar oppositeness. However, in our daily life, words like male/female, dead/alive, husband/wife are also considered as antonym pairs, for these words are also opposite in meaning. Therefore, the other two categories, complementarity and converseness, are included in the field of antonymy only in a very broad sense.

In general, there are two criteria in defining antonymy: semantic and lexical. We explain elaborately the antonymy being semantic above, and yet not all semantically opposed words are antonyms. Cruse (1986) exemplifies this with the words tubby and emaciated. Almost all established antonyms have synonyms which could not constitute the antonym pairs, for example, the antonym pair of heavy and light is better than

weighty and insubstantial; antonym pair of fast and slow is better opposites rather than speedy and sluggish; antonym pair of happy and sad is more reasonable than ecstatic and miserable.

Although both of the antonymy and synonymy link words together in the lexicon, Gross et al. (1988) argue that antonymy and synonymy are different. They say while synonymy is “a relation between lexical concepts”, antonymy is “a relation between words, not concepts”. Justeson and Katz (1991) also refer to antonymy as a lexical relation, “specific to words rather than concepts”. As a matter of fact, the definition of antonymy must be lexical as well as semantic. Antonyms need to have “oppositeness of meaning”, but they also need to have a strong, well-established lexical relationship with one another. (Jackson, 1988) Lexicographer Egan (1968) makes a rather satisfying definition of “antonymy” based on her understanding of the nature of the antonymy: “An antonym is a word so opposed in meaning to another word; it’s equal in breadth or range of

application, that is, negates or nullifies every single one of its implications”. This definition shows clearly what makes two words be antonyms. The antonym pairs are equal in breadth or range of application but opposed in meaning. And the words which contrast in meaning may not be antonyms because they may be different in their breadth or range of application. Therefore, we can draw a conclusion that Egan’s definition of antonymy may be fitter or easier to be employed into the actual cases than the theories and definitions of antonymy that have been referred to above.

К ПРОБЛЕМЕ СТАТУСА МЕСТОИМЕНИЙ

Турдиева Раъно Ускановна, Преподаватель ДжГПИ

Аннотация. В данной статье сделана попытка затронуть вопрос о статусе местоимений как части речи, сущности местоименного значения и о различных точках зрения на данный вопрос.

Ключевые слова: статус, части речи, лексико-семантический признак, разряды местоимений, ситуативное значение, собственно лексическое значение.

Annotation. This article views the status of pronoun as parts of speech and different approaches to this issue. And also there are many views of scientists that is expressed the theory of lexicon in the pronoun.

Key words: Status, parts of speech, lexical-semantic character, functional-semantic commonality, deictic words, formal meaning.

Вопрос о статусе местоимений как части речи до сих пор в русском языкознании остается нерешенным. Такое положение сложилось потому, что нет единства грамматической природы местоимений, а есть некоторая общность лексико-семантических признаков. Это и порождает два противоположных отношения к местоимению как части речи. Но в каждой из частей речи есть, хотя бы малое, количество слов, которые не до конца выдержаны в грамматической природе данной части речи. Например, не все имена существительные обладают морфологическим единственным или множественным числом, часть из них имеет синтаксическую форму числа: пальто, какаду, такси и др. Есть же среди существительных и такие слова, которые не выражают понятия числа ни морфологически, ни синтаксически: (одни) ножницы – (пять-десять) ножницы:

Эти ножницы тупые. – все ножницы тупые.

Но никому не приходит в голову слова типа «пальто», «ножницы» на этом основании вывести из имен существительных. Поэтому, на наш взгляд, неправомерно отказывать местоимениям в статусе части речи на основании отсутствия у них единства грамматической природы.

Части речи – это определенный класс слов, объединенных одной грамматической природой и близких по лексико-семантическим признакам. Местоимения не имеют