HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

FOUNDATIONS OF COMPOUND NOMINATION

Abror Akhmadovich Rakhimov
PhD, Associate Professor,
Head of the Department of Foreign Philology, Zarmed University
Samarkand, Uzbekistan.
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0594-5535
E-mail: stipendiat.abror@gmail.com

Abstract. The theoretical foundations of compound nomination and its function within the secondary nomination system are examined in this article. It describes the processes that lead to the creation of compound nominative units in Uzbek and English. A comparison is made between the cognitive-discursive aspects of endocentric and exocentric models. The study emphasises how compound nomination interacts with lexicalisation, conversion, metonymy, and metaphor. A particular focus is on how nominative patterns reflect the national viewpoint. The results advance translation research, cognitive linguistics, and comparative linguistics.

Keywords: Compound nomination, compound word, secondary nomination, endocentric model, exocentric model, cognitive-discursive approach, metaphor, metonymy, English, Uzbek.

Introduction. One of the secondary nominative means that is actively discussed in word formation and onomasiological research is composite nominative. The composite basis characteristic of this means (lat. composition - composition, combination) is manifested in the formation of nominatives with the status of compound words as a result of the derivational combination of two or more independent words (or morphemes).

In the sources, the composite integrity of these words is determined by their belonging to the paradigm of compound words, their having a single lexical meaning, and their use in speech as a single part of speech. In particular, in sources related to the English language, compound words are interpreted as “a linguistic unit that is distinguished by the fact that it is formed from a combination of two or more words and is used as an independent lexical unit in speech” [Jespersen. 2013: 134; Arnold 2012: 150]. In the literature on the Uzbek language, compound words are also defined as “made-up words formed from the combination of two or more words and expressing a single concept – meaning” [Tursunov. 1992: 203].

Also, in both languages, the compositional status of compound words is determined by their specific phonetic, orthoepic and orthographic criteria, their place in the word-formation system as “word formation”, word addition, compositional method, and their integrity to the point where no element can be inserted between their components [Ivanova. 1967; Rakhmatullaev, Hojiev. 1961].

Literature review and methodology. Although there is unanimity in the issues mentioned in the interpretation of compound words, two different views are evident on the reasons and principles of the formation of the compositional integrity inherent in these constructions. In particular, G. Marchand defines compound words as “constructions formed as a result of the union of two or more words based on a defining-defining relationship” [Marchand. 1969: 11], while A. Hojiev interprets them as structures formed due to "the transformation of a certain type of word combination from a syntactic unit into a lexical unit as a result of its acquisition of a single lexical meaning in the process of language development" [Hojiev 1989. 30], which indicates the genetic connection of compositional models specific to compound words with word combinations.

Proponents of describing compound words on the basis of the principles of direct word formation recognize that they take their place in the morphological and lexical-semantic system of the

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

language through word formation. In particular, N. Guterman notes that compound words are formed not directly with the participation of words, but with the participation of morphemes with weakened syntactic connections [Guterman. 1955: 113-116]. V.M. Pavlov interprets them as "composites, the parts of which consist of free morphemes" [Pavlov. 1985: 35].

In the analysis of the example given in the Longman Dictionary, recognizing the specificity of syntactic connections to words, it is possible to understand that the relationship between compound parts should be avoided as a syntactic connection and that the relationship between compound parts is based on morphemic relations. For example: the parts space and craft in the compound word spacecraft cannot be considered a defining-defining relation, since the first of them is a word-forming stem, and the second is a word-forming part [Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English. 1978: 1136].

B. Madaliev noted that "the words in a compound word have the same rights as the word-forming suffix in a constructed word. In other words, the words in a compound word are independent and perform a similar function" [Madaliev. 1965: 63-64].

As noted earlier, the formation mechanisms inherent in nominative units in the status of constructed words in the language are based on formative nomination, which is relatively transparent in its formal structure. This analogous concept is applied to the interpretation of compound word parts. The intended purpose of interpreting these word components directly as free morphemes is to interpret them within the framework of a subordinative hierarchy, like formative constructions.

As V.M. Nikitich noted, although the nominative derivational means "occur on the basis of the vertical intersection of all levels" cause a change in their inherent derivational essence [Nikitevich. 1976: 12-16], it does not allow interpreting compound parts on the basis of the morpheme relationship manifested directly through the base+formant connection. After all, such an interpretation denies that compound words enter the paradigm of coined words through transpositive interactions such as free combinations, metonymy, metaphor, conversion, compression, lexicalization. Therefore, E. Benveniste, recognizing that it is unacceptable to "study compound words on a par with coined words," emphasizes "the need for a new theory in their interpretation." According to him, such a theory is related to a separate chapter, which can be called "metamorphism", and in this chapter it is necessary to discuss the emergence of compound words on the basis of the transfer from one specific class to another [Benvenist. 2002: 448].

Yu.S. Stepanov, noting that the term metamorphism is used by generative grammarians as "transformation", by French linguists as "translation", and in English linguistics as "conversion", notes that "metaphor, which has a wide-ranging effect, is actually one of the special manifestations of metamorphism" [Stepanov. 1975: 253]. V.N. Teliya notes the participation of regular grammatical metaphor as a means of eliminating the free attitude inherent in word compounds [Teliya. 1980: 279].

G.G. Sokolova summarizes the metamorphic means leading to the linguistic stabilization of word combinations and explains them in connection with the process of transposition. She notes that this process is multi-stage, and the initial stage, when compound words are formed as a result of the formal-semantic stabilization of free combinations, and the final stage of this process is formed by stable combinations formed as a result of their acquisition of figurative expression, phraseological meaning [Sokolova. 1987: 8-10, 58-64].

Indeed, the realization of composite nomination based on the vertical intersection of levels is based on much more complex interactions than formative nomination. Such an intersection is manifested, first of all, by the creation of composite alternatives based on the whole-part relationship, which are processed in conjunction with such metamorphic means as metonymy, metaphor, conversion, ellipsis, compression, disemantization, grammaticalization, lexicalization. The similarity

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

of composite nominatives to free compounds in terms of their structure and to the relationship of their components to the relationship of their bases and formants reflects the result of this complex metamorphic interaction.

It is not for nothing that in the sources compound words are described as products formed on the basis of the transition “from syntagm to lexeme” [Uzbek language grammar. 1. 1979:269]. Taking into account such a complex metamorphic connection between speech and linguistic nominatives, O.D. Meshkov emphasizes that “although there is a certain commonality in the formation of compound and simple artificial words, there are aspects in the mechanism of their occurrence that are completely incompatible with each other and recommends interpreting simple artificial words as a derivational object, and compound words as a compositional object [Meshkov. 1986: 14-16]

This complex metamorphic basis for compound words is also evident in their classification into such types as “morphological and semantic” [Arnold. 1973: 28], structurally motivated and unmotivated [Meshkov. 1985: 89], endocentric and exocentric [Blumfield. 1968: 255]. These types have been widely discussed in subsequent research on this topic. In particular, in the work of K.D. Tukhtaeva, due to the participation of the semantic-nominative structure inherent in compound words in the structure of phraseological combinations [Tukhtaeva. 2006: 19]; R.S. Gamanko, K.N. Mochalina and A.G. Yuldashev's dissertations discuss idiomatic compound words as an object of research, and I.M. Tokhtasinov's work focuses on the study of gender selection and linguocultural characteristics of compound words denoting human appearance and character in literary texts in English and Uzbek. [Gamanko. 2008; Mochalina. 2009: 23; Yuldashev. 2017 47; Tukhtasinov. 2011: 25].

Discussion and results. In Uzbek linguistics, the monographs published by N. Mamatov and E. Begmatov can be recognized for discussing the place of compound words in the word formation system, their interpretation within the framework of lexical-syntactic and semantic-syntactic types, classification of composite models according to syntactic and morphological indicators, and development of orthographic criteria [Mamatov. 1982; Begmatov 1985]. While the place of this tool in the word formation system is determined in most sources based on the principles of word formation, A. Hojiev emphasizes that, taking into account the lack of systematic "structure, type organization consisting of the basis of word formation and word-forming formants" in compound words, they cannot be objects of Uzbek word formation in the true sense [Abdiev. 2015: 184; Sayfullaeva. 2009: 225; Hojiev. 2007: 8-12].

As A.G. Yuldashev noted regarding the relationship of compound words to semantically based indirect naming, no separate scientific research has been conducted to determine the “linguistic indicators arising from the idiomatic sign of compound words in Uzbek linguistics”, their means and linguocognitive foundations [Yuldashev. 2017: 18]. M.M. The manual published by Mirtojiev states that phraseology consists of: 1) compound terms “the meaning of which arises from the synthesis of the meanings of the words in the content” (such as democratic authority, senior advisor, scientific worker), 2) paraphrases “having a certain part or parts in a portable meaning, which are formed from the synthesis of meanings” (such as people of the pen, owner of the brush, red seekers, captain of the blue ship), 3) phraseological expressions in the form of a word combination or predicative compound expressing a single meaning (such as a sheep does not take a stick from its mouth, a yellow chakaga does not take a bite) [Mirtojiev. 2004: 183].

This classification is based on the opinion of N.F. Alefirenko that “at the core of phraseological meaning is not a concept, but a general idea of \u200b\u200ba specific denotative situation, a conceptual generalization” [Alefirenko. 2005: 61], -the need for interpretation of compound terms and paraphrases as phraseological expressions becomes clear. After all, the degree of phraseologism of

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

these nominees, which are similar in compositional structure, cannot be said to be the same. Therefore, compound nominees such as “democratic authority, senior advisor, scientific worker” cannot be put on the same level with paraphrases such as “people of the pen, owner of the brush, red explorers, captain of the blue ship” and phraseological expressions such as “sheep did not take a stick from their mouth, mother's milk did not leave their mouth”.

In English linguistics, the division of compound words into endocentric and exocentric types is noteworthy in that it allows us to distinguish composite nominatives according to their direct and indirect naming properties. Another advantage of this classification, which allows us to interpret the occurrence of composite nominatives using linear models of the “A+B=AB” type and nonlinear models based on “A moving to B”, is that endocentric and exocentric means are associated with the structural motivation and unmotivation indicators of compound words. Therefore, we found it necessary to interpret composite nominatives belonging to the “man/person” concept sphere in English and Uzbek using endocentric models of the “A+B=AB” type and exocentric models based on “A moving to B”.

As noted in the previous parts of the work, the means of nominative activity have their origin through the discursive-synergetic mechanism, which is a feature of the self-organization of empirical and rational means inherent in human cognitive abilities. The implementation of this mechanism is manifested in the creation of a cognitively-discursively based figurative concept or proposition based on the nominative goal, which is determined by the creation of figurative concepts such as emotional image, imagination as a result of direct or indirect influence from the external environment.

The endocentric models of composite nomination of the type “A + B = AB” and the exocentric models based on “A moving to B”, like other means of secondary nomination, are linguocognitive prototypes of this invariant cognitive-discursive structure. D.A. Shepeleva [Shepeleva. 2008], N.A. Shtoklar [Shtok. 2008] discuss the cognitive-discursive analysis of compound words from the perspective of the integration of concepts as source and target. Although they provide valuable insights into the analysis of the participation of the integrative scheme consisting of the continuity of “source and target slots” in the formation of compound words in connection with transpositive mechanisms such as grammatical conversion, conceptual metaphor, and metonymy, the synergistic coherence associated with the participation of the nominative target as a conceptual center in the emergence and initial application of this cognitive-discursive structure is not taken into account.

The task of this cognitive-discursive tool, which ensures the planned implementation of the creation of a new one on the basis of previously mastered knowledge, is not to present a derivational scheme of the nominative situation. After all, this tool is activated together with the empirical concepts that are figurative alternatives of the object, as a result of the nominative purpose arising from the connection with the source, as well as the integrative scheme of concepts belonging to two mental fields and the cognitive-discursive integration of the concepts in this scheme through the atomic predicate.

The goal of forming this cognitive-discursive structure is not to create a word, but to realize the new knowledge, innovative idea, arising as a result of emotional-perceptual connection with a specific object, based on the naming. The proposition “X is related to Y” underlying composite nominatives requires prototypes that implement this typical cognitive-discursive structure in connection with a specific concept sphere, in accordance with the requirements of the nominative situation. Such prototypes typical of composite nomination are: a) linear endocentric models of the type "A+B=AB", based on the symmetric and asymmetric implication of concepts belonging to two mental fields, b) nonlinear exocentric models, which are characterized by the "migration of A to B", characterized by

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

the compressive-integration of the concept as a nominative target in the basic structure, based on its metonymic, metaphorical, conversional and their configurative cooperation.

The variation of the mentioned invariant cognitive-discursive structure according to the requirements of the nominative situation is evident through the proposition “person related to X”, which lies at the heart of the endocentric and exocentric nominatives belonging to the conceptosphere “I/man” in English and Uzbek. In turn, these tools also indicate that the proposition “person related to X”, which arises on the basis of the implication of sources that are associatively related to the concept of “person”, which is the conceptual center of the nominative observation, serves as the basis for the formation of endocentric and exocentric variants as an invariant structure of this conceptosphere.

This synergistic consistency, based on the invariant and variant relationship between cognitive-discursive structures inherent in the cognitive and conceptual phases of nominative activity, also makes it possible to recognize composite nomination as a tool that embodies the experiences gained on the basis of communicative experiences, on the one hand, and semantic and formative means of secondary nomination, on the other. In particular, through the endocentric variant of the proposition “person related to X” of the type “A + B = AB”, the person who represents the nominative target is named on the basis of classification-differentiation, and in the exocentric implementation based on “A’s transfer to B”, the concept of person is named on the basis of compressive-integration in the basic structure.

In particular, the formation of endocentric nominatives of the type of nouns such as hairstylist (hair stylist), guard, based on the implication of a thing symmetrically related to the concept of person; the formation of endocentric nominatives of the type of sign+person, such as oldwoman (old woman), astronaut-pilot, based on the implication of signs asymmetrically related to the concept of person; exocentric nominatives such as home-bird, pickpocket, kallakesar, mohir köl, formed as a result of the ellipsis of the concept of person in the proposition “person related to X” and the compressive combination of means such as metaphor, metonymy and conversion in the conjugated basic structure, indicate this configurative cooperation.

The linguistic and cultural differences related to the cognitive-discursive structures underlying the composite nominatives specific to the languages being compared are: 1) the naming of the school principal as “headmaster, headmistress” with gender distinction and the nominative target being determined by the conceptual indicator “master/-ess -ustoz male/female”, and the fact that he is “leader, boss” is determined by the metonymic source “head/bosh”, in Uzbek the nominative target is determined by the “director” tool, the word “school” as a source indicating that he works in the field of education; 2) the naming of a physical education teacher in Uzbek is based on the conceptual unity “physical + education + person”, while in English the nominatives “games-master, gam-mistress” are determined by the conceptual unity “games/o‘yin + master / ustoz”; 3) In Uzbek, the teacher is referred to as "a person engaged in teaching" / "teaching + teacher", and in English, in addition to "schoolteacher", the conceptual integration of "schoolmaster, schoolmistress / school + teacher + man / woman" can also be noted.

Also, the fact that composite nominatives in English reflect the gender-specific nature of the nouns, the differences inherent in the cognitive-discursive structures used to name professionals involved in the education system, in particular, the fact that the classificatory nominatives noted in the examples of day-boy, day-girl, schoolboy, school girl, schoolchildren cannot be expressed in Uzbek by the nominatives “o‘khū, talaba” and the need for an explanatory sentence are also evidence of these linguistic and cultural differences.

Although the nominatives “bachelor-girl, boyqiz” in English and Uzbek are endocentric parallels in both languages, the fact that the cognitive-discursive devices underlying them, such as “a girl who

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

has never married, single girl, bachelor girl" (turmushga chiximgan kiz) / "balogatga (bo'yiga) etgen kiz" use the "never married" indicator in the nominative "bachelor-girl" and the "balogatga etgen" indicator in the nominative "boyqiz" as a source in classifying the concept of a person with the status of a nominative target, also reflects such a conflict of national worldviews.

Cognitive-discursive structures serve as a basis for overcoming the differences associated with the national worldview inherent in composite nominatives: a) based on the realization of a specific nominative meaning through word combinations and complete sentences, b) through additional explanations of gaps that do not have a direct unity of expression, and c) through understanding the conceptual differences associated with the national worldview manifested through composite parallels.

It is necessary to pay special attention to the participation of the concept of the nominative purpose as the main organizer in the emergence and linguistic realization of such large-scale cognitive-discursive structures. Consequently, the emergence of this cognitive-discursive tool based on the nominative purpose and its connection with the source, the realization of the composite nomination within the formal-semantic structure: bankclerk, bus-conductor, eyedoctor, childwife, chorus-girl; endocentric such as astronaut-pilot, assistant-teacher, practitioner-nurse, photojournalist, and outside it in exocentric such as first-born, five-year-old, home-bird, road-hog; bald-headed, quarter-cutter, trader, businessman, eye-blind, big-mouthed, page-runner, etc., also relies on the concept of the nominative purpose.

The leadership of the concept in the status of nominative goal is also evident in the example of the origin of the atomic predicate from the nominative goal, which participates in organizing the cognitive-discursive integration of two mental fields. For example, in the English compound word "head-hunter", "hunter/ovchi" is the component that requires the nominative goal, and "head/bosh, kalla" is the source, and the cognitive-discursive integration of the concepts belonging to these two mental fields is carried out through the atomic predicate "ovlamoq" that comes from the component in the status of "hunter/ovchi". The lexicographic explanation of the head-hunter nominative in the form "A member of a tribe that keeps the heads of the enemies that it has killed / Dushmanlarini o'ldirgach, ularning kallalarini saqlab yuradigan qabila a'zosi" relies on this cognitive-discursive structure [CALD]. In this explanation, the discursive structure "a hunter who hunts the head of an enemy in exchange for a certain incentive" with an essentially complex metaphorical basis is relatively simplified by replacing the metaphorical meaning inherent in the component "hunter/ovchi", which represents the nominative purpose in the compound word "head-hunter", with the concept of "person", and the predicate "ovlamoq", which is similar to this purpose, with the verb "kersiby birmoq".

N.F. As Alefirenko noted, the stereotypical structures approved by the language community, when applied in the expression of various situations, serve as a unique comparative field for the subject who moves the linguistic process [Alefirenko. 2002: 72-79]. It is based on this metaphorical analogy that the aforementioned "head-hunter" nominee has a derived meaning in the form of "a person whose job is to find people with the necessary skills to work for a particular company and to persuade them to join this company / a person who lures people away from the workplace by promising a low salary" [CALD]. This nominative composite was created by comparing the act of "drawing workers for a low salary" to the process of "hunting" by expressing the nominative target "person" by means of the metaphorical alternative "hunter / ovchi", and the workers who are the object of the process of "drawing / hunting" by means of the metonymic derivative "head".

Conclusion. The above considerations indicate that the use of one or both of the concepts belonging to two mental fields in the representation of the proposition "person related to X" by means of an endocentric model of the type "A+B=AB" in a figurative sense can lead to a blurring of the motivational balance inherent in the formal-semantic structure and the acquisition of idiomatic

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

meaning. In particular, although the head-hunter nominatives are formally-semantically based on the linear connection of concepts in the status of the target and source, like compound words such as schoolboy, schoolgirl, schoolchildren, photojournalist, photo amateur, assistant teacher, they differ according to the idiomatic indicators of the nominative meaning.

Such semantic complexity inherent in composite nominatives is even more pronounced when the structure based on the integration of concepts in the status of the target and source is implemented on an exocentric basis. This compositional device, based on the realization of the concept of a person that requires a nominative purpose in the basic structure with compressive harmonization, differs from the endocentric device in that it occurs directly in conjunction with idiomatization. For example, in the nominatives such as redskin, master-hand in English, and kallakesar, cho‘rtkesar in Uzbek, the concept of “person” representing the nominative purpose is indirectly expressed, which differs from the metaphorical endocentric nominative head-hunter.

These aspects indicate the expediency of distinguishing composite nominatives according to their direct and indirect naming properties, assessing their realization through linear models of the type “A+B=AB” and nonlinear models based on “A moving to B”, and relying on endocentric and exocentric tools when considering structural indicators of motivation and non-motivation. Therefore, in the next part of the work, we found it necessary to separately analyze composite nominatives belonging to the “I/man” concept sphere in English and Uzbek, based on these two types.

REFERENCES:

1. Jespersen O. A Modern English Grammar - On Historical Principles - Part VI – Morphology. Yutang Press (August 21, 2013), 586 p.
2. Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English. - Pearson Education 1978 – 2224 p.
3. Marchand H. The Categories and Types of Present-day English Word-formation. - Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1969. – 379 p.
4. Алефиренко Н.Ф. Протовербальное порождение культурных концептов и их фразеологическая репрезентация/ // Филологические науки. 2002. - №5. –С.72-79
5. Арнольд И. В.. Лексикология современного английского языка. Учебное пособие / – 2-е изд., перераб. – М. : ФЛИНТА : Наука, 2012. – 376 с.
6. Бегматов Э. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тилининг лексик қатламлари. Т.: Фан, 1985. - 199 б.
7. Бенвенист Э. Общая лингвистика. – М.: УРСС, 2002. –448 с.
8. Блумфилд Л. Язык. Перевод с английского Е.С.Кубряковой и В.П.Мурат. - М.: Прогресс, 1968. - 607 с.
9. Гутерман Н.Г. Сложные существительные в современном английском языке: Дисс. ... канд. филол. наук. - Л., 1955.-С. 113-116
10. Иванова И.П. О характеристике сложного слова в английском языке//«Вопросы структуры английского языка в синхронии и диахронии», вып. - Л., 1967. -95 с.
11. Мадалиев Б. Ҳозирги ўзбек тилида қўшма сўзлар. - Тошкент: Фан нашриёти, 1966. - 175 б.
12. Маматов Н. Ўзбек тилида қўшма сўзлар. – Т.: Фан, 1982. – 233 б.
13. Мешков О. Д. Словообразование современного английского языка. – М.:Наука, 1976. – 248 с.
14. Миртожиев М.М. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили. 1 қисм. — Тошкент: Университет. 2004. – 358 б.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

15. Никитевич В.М. О глубинной структуре деривационного ряда // Актуальные проблемы русского словообразования. Ташкент: Таш. І Ш им. Низами, 1976. - С. 12-16.
16. Павлов В. М. Понятие лексемы и проблема отношений синтаксиса и словообразования. - М.: Наука,1985. - 278 с.
17. Раҳматуллаев Ш., Ҳожиев А. Қўшма сўзларнинг имло қоидалари ва луғати. - Т.: Ўрта ва олий мактаб, 1961. – 196 б.
18. Соколова Г.Г. Фразообразование во французском языке. – М.: Высшая школа, 1987. — 142 с.
19. Степанов Ю.С. Основы общего языкознания. – М.: Просвещение, 1975. — 271 с.
20. Телия В.Н. Семантика связанных значений слов и их сочетаемости // Аспекты семантических исследований: сб. ст. М.: Наука,1980. – С. 250 – 379.
21. Турсунов У., Мухторов Ж., Раҳматуллаев Ш. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили. – Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1992. – 400 б.
22. Ҳожиев А. Ўзбек тили сўз ясалиши. –. Тошкент, 1989. -111 б.
23. Юлдашев А. Г.. Идиоматик қўшма сўзларнинг лингвокогнитив аспекти (инглиз ва ўзбек тиллари мисолида) Фил. фан. ном. ... дис. автореф. - Т.:ЎзДЖТУ, 2017. - 47 б.