

3-5-2021

GENERAL INTERPRETATION OF THE PREDICITY EVENT

Rakhima Abdullaevna Kurbonova

trainee teacher, department of languages medicine and education faculty, Samarkand State Medical Institute, r.a.kurbonova@samdti.uz

Follow this and additional works at: <https://uzjournals.edu.uz/buxdu>



Part of the [Linguistics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kurbonova, Rakhima Abdullaevna (2021) "GENERAL INTERPRETATION OF THE PREDICITY EVENT," *Scientific reports of Bukhara State University*. Vol. 5 : Iss. 1 , Article 10.

DOI: 10.52297/2181-1466/2021/5/1/10

Available at: <https://uzjournals.edu.uz/buxdu/vol5/iss1/10>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by 2030 Uzbekistan Research Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in Scientific reports of Bukhara State University by an authorized editor of 2030 Uzbekistan Research Online. For more information, please contact sh.erkinov@edu.uz.

GENERAL INTERPRETATION OF THE PREDICITY EVENT

Kurbonova Rakhima Abdullaevna

*trainee teacher, department of languages medicine and
education faculty, Samarkand State Medical Institute*

r.a.kurbonova@samdti.uz

Abstract:

Background. *The introductory part of the article provides general information, such as the fact that the predicative event is a syntactic category that forms a sentence, giving the content of the sentence the ability to report an event of an objective being.*

Methods. *Methods, on the other hand, explain that predicative, sign (action, quality, and feature) represent the relationship of an object to time and inclination, and thus transform a sentence into a unit that forms and communicates a particular idea. This section also analyzes the level of study of the predicative phenomenon.*

Results. *This part of the article provides information on whether the presence or absence of predicative in the “secondary expression of proposition in multi-predicate devices is a hotly debated issue among linguists. Such data are analyzed with vivid evidence. it is also argued that there is diversity in the approach to predicative.*

Discussion. *The discussion section of the article analyzes the presence of complete predicativeness in the main expression of proposition in multi-predicate devices. The relationship between the subject and the predicate has a grammatical meaning and is expressed in the verb, and in the secondary expression the subject and the predicate the absence of an independent form of the predicate, even if the relation is present, is expressed by the analyzes.*

Conclusion. *In the conclusion section based on the research in the article, monopredicative sentences change the system with speech-grammatical means indicating the purpose of expression, creating a speech paradigmatic field, the linguistic aspect of the monopredicative sentence, i.e. the pattern (stable aspect) does not change, only its communicative purpose only the speech image associated with (variable aspect) change, the expression is monopredicative according to the purpose, in the sentences, it is concluded that at the higher stage of generalization, contradictory variations can be distinguished, such as the verbal form of the message, the verbal form of the interrogative.*

LINGUISTICS

Keywords: *monopredicative sentences, predicative event, syntactic category, forms of sentences, predicative phenomenon, multi-predicate devices, grammatical meaning, communicative purpose.*

Introduction. Predicative (Latin *praedicativus* - affirmative, definite) - 1) in modern logic - one of the basic concepts that reflects the objectively existing relationships between signs and objects; 2) in linguistics - a syntactic category that forms a sentence, which gives the content of the sentence the ability to inform about an event of an objective being. Predicateness refers to the interrelationship of an object with a sign (action, quality, and feature) in time and inclination, thus transforming a sentence into a unit that forms and communicates a particular idea (e.g., "The apple blossomed", "May there always be peace!"). Since the relation of the content of a sentence to existence requires that it be placed at a certain temporal and modal (real or unreal) level, predicative also consists of the unity of two syntactic categories, time and inclination. In two-part sentences, the participle is the main part of the predicate.

Methods. In the "secondary expression" of proposition in multi-predicate devices (Verb rotations, object devices) the presence or absence of predicative the issue is causing heated debate among linguists. The debate on this issue is also between linguists and logicians the diversity of approaches to predicative is the basis. Predicateness has two logics (subject and predicate) and, respectively, proponents of looking at the grammatical (possessive and interjection) element as a relationship in terms of the basic expression of proposition in multi-predicate devices there is complete predicative. The relationship between subject and predicate is grammatical and finds expression in the verb. In the secondary expression, the subject and predicates even if the relation exists, but the predicate does not have an independent form. Therefore, it is said that such devices have a semi or secondary predication. Hence, the predicate is also divided into two full (or basic) and half (or secondary) predicates. The secondary of the proposition Linguists who believe that expressions also have a predicate use this prediction with different terms in order to distinguish it from the main predicate in this simple sentence are called: "polypredicative", "more prediction", "secondary predication", "subject predication", etc. O.I. Borodovich two elements the syntactic relationship between the following is calculated by the secondary predicative structure show four characteristic features:

- 1) the subject between the elements in the content plan predicate attitude;
- 2) from the first element to the second element of communication at the same time and, conversely, the interdependence of the second element from the first element;
- 3) structure the connection of the parts together with the base word;

LINGUISTICS

4) the impersonation of the second part represented by verbs or non-verbs.

N.M. Mahmudov of the proposition secondary representatives basic, predicative even after naming devices that have been named in addition to the opinions of scholars who believe that they are nomenclature retains its functions, albeit in the background, and so on. The predicative connection in them becomes secondary, he says. Half predicative concept directly second degree verb is a logical continuation of the concept. Initially from the term secondary verb A.A. Potebnaya uses in relation to the pronoun, in the works of A.A. Shakhmatov detailed information about its types is given. According to A.A. Shakhmatov, it is the part that belongs directly to the owner of the content and is grammatically related to it. The two-way grammatical connection of such passages is shown: on the one hand, on the other hand, if it is attached to it as a subordinate part of the main section, will have a certain relationship with the owner. With a basic verb of these pieces in terms of approach they can be considered as a secondary piece in the case of a separate syntactic phenomenon in terms of its relationship with the "secondary verb" can be calculated. Owner with a secondary verb consider the relation to be semi-predicative. Later, separate passages and even introductions, inserts, and stimuli (Rudnev, Abdurahmanov) began to be included in the list of semi-predicative devices. As a result, the range of semi-predicative devices has expanded slightly. Because the grammatical connection of the separated parts is slightly different from the grammatical connection of the verb tenses. In this case, too, the two-way grammatical connection is preserved, but this two-way connection has a structural basis and does not have to be based on the verb. The semi-predicative in introductions and stimuli is solved on a completely different basis. Turkish for the first time the problem of semi-predicative in simple sentences in languages studied by D.A. Yuldashev.

Results. Syntactic of the consonant in Turkic languages as far as the function is concerned, it is simple, not just in conjunctions even in speech, he says, it undoubtedly serves as a verb. He has his own opinion proves on the basis of the existence of a relationship with the owner. From the main section in contrast, these verbs, he says, are also secondary verbs. The traditional case all the fragments are represented by A.A. Yuldashev is a secondary verb by. Verb conjugations (adverbial, adjective, noun, conditional verb conjugations), turnovers of substantive and adjective character, half in the separated parts, the question of the existence of predicative is also recognized by Uzbek linguists". But, above type of the proposition secondary expressions the presence of a predicate (of a secondary, or semi-predicative nature although) of the two elements (subjective and predicate) in these constructions and possessive and verb). This, it seems, the traditional concept of predicate, predicative under the influence of attributive logic is a reflection of his theory. Full and half of predicative in this context the prediction opposition has a

LINGUISTICS

definite basis. According to the logic of the relationship based on the unity of the predicate and its arguments the sentence consists of two members, while the predicative also consists of two members does not have to be. The predicate is important for predicativeness. Predicate and it's a system of forms representing the relation of arguments to an objective being (affirmative, tense, modal forms) is predicative. In other words, predicative certain elements that interact (affirmation, tense, person, modality). From the point of view of system theory, these elements the absence of any one undermines the system, takes it out of the predicative.

So, accordingly, no secondary predicative, half there can be no such thing as predicative. Predicative as a whole the main character of the sentence. It is a sign that speaks. In the formation of the same sentence of predicates in simple sentences with many predicates. The service is not the same. One takes predicative forms and shapes a sentence into a sentence, the rest decrease in degree. But the proposition is the same corresponds to the amount of predicates. Hence, such statements are only simple in terms of syntactic structure and complex in semantics.

Additional predicates. It had the property of adding other predicates to itself the most characteristic of predicates are process and observation predicates. Process predicates (PP) represent different processes (beginning, continuation, and end) of an action: started, continued, ended, stopped, and so on. Process predicates argue the predicate denoting the main action. The predicate denoting the main action in the argument position is in the form of a definite agreement with the predicate requirement denoting the grammatical meaning of the process. For example, the predicate of the beginning, denoting the beginning of the action, requires the predicate, which comes in the argument position, to come in the infinitive: N Q N ni - 1- began. The compound predicate, i.e. the predicate in the argument position, is in the name of the action represented by for example, Iron began to burn books. Predicate and its arguments, the relationship can be shown in the following diagram: Morphologically causative verbs can also occur in the position of the adjunct predicate: stopped, finished, continued, and so on. Such multi-predicate devices represent a causative state. For example: Karim stopped reading (finished, continued). Agents, the subject of the causative case - Karim, patients, the predicate of the causative state is self-causative with zero' condition is a means of stopping the arrow, representing a causal relationship is a morpheme. This is a time when grammar has a complex meaning represents both the agent and the patient of the causative condition.

Lexical causative verbs may be involved in the position of the connecting predicate. For example: forced, aroused, handed over, ordered, offered, and so on. This at which time the causative agent and the patient are represented separately. For example: Karim forced to read a book. In this type of devices come in the position of

LINGUISTICS

subject the noun agent in the general agreement, the predicate of the causative case antecedent, the noun patient, represented by the infinitive in the filler position, the subject of the antithesis, expressed in the name of the action in the direction of the direction component causative state, while causative verbs are concise and represents the causative relationship between the antithesis.

Predictivity and modality. Predicativeness and modality are closely interrelated phenomena. Therefore for is also devoted to the interrelationship of these two phenomena in the history of linguistics there are many works. Again, these are the points of contact of the two phenomena what it consists of and what features it differs from each other still has not found a clear answer. Sometimes equating predicative with modal cases also occurs. It is noted that both express the attitude of the content of the sentence to the objective reality (V.V. Vinogradov). To the question of what is the most basic character that speaks, some also answer modality. When it comes to modality and predicative, sometimes modality that it is a very broad concept in relation to predicative and sometimes modal is emphasized to be an integral part of predicative. V.V. Vinogradov in one place equating modality with predicative, "... the correctness of the predicative category, its constant and direct expression is a modality of speech," he says, in the second place considers modality as a component of predicative. N.Y. Petrov modality and the logic of predicative to define a certain limit of predicative, the presence of a language level as a syntactic category, while modality is communicative-syntactic as a category should be viewed as a unit of speech level, he says.

But with that their difference is not clearly revealed. Because one type of modality also applies to the language level. In the semantic plan, the unifying character function for the modality category with the category of executive subjectivity (speaker's point of view) predicative can act as a distinctive character between modality categories. Firstly, modality is indeed a broad concept in relation to predicative. Because while predicative is characteristic only for speech levels, modality is also characteristic for non-speech devices (e.g., word combinations). That is why V.G. Admoni considers modality to be twofold - a modality inherent in speech, inherent in word combinations divided into modality; secondly, the modality considered at the speech level is a component of predicative element. Predicativeness is the objective reality of information expressed through speech modality is the speaker's point of view of the content of the sentence in terms of the attitude to the objective being or the content of the speaker's speech indicates the relationship. In both types of modality the sign of subjectivity has a special place.

Predicate types and predicative. A syntactic device consisting of the relation of a predicate and its act ants is a predicative expression. The amount of predicates in a predicative expression, there are single-predicate and multi-predicate types: only

LINGUISTICS

one predicate and its devices consisting of the relation of arguments are more than one predicate device with a predicate are considered to be multi-predicate. Single-predicate devices are also referred to as monopredicative sentences. A. Sobirov expresses his opinion about monopredicative sentences are integral in speech, in certain cases, the system occurs in paradigmatic changes.

There are two types of such changes:

1. Shape changes within the main structure.
2. Changes in shape that are not part of the basic structure.

When we say changes in the form of the main structure, we mean the main and secondary parts of monopredicative sentences, which carry the objective content, formed in the presence of, as well as in this article as the "basis speech" a paradigmatic form of speech that occurs within the framework of the structure changes are understood. A paradigmatic form within the basic structure changes are usually of the same kind that occur in the basic structure of the sentence serves to express the meaning of speech. The main thing in the structure of objective modality, person-number, affirmation-denial, expression-purpose, completeness. Speech that differs in incompleteness, emotionality, and so on, meanings emerge. Accordingly, speech within the basic structure the paradigmatic form is a form that reflects the objective modality of change changes, changes in the form of personality, expression of purpose form changes, incompleteness changes, such as changes in the form of emotional response appearances differ.

This form of change is, in essence, a structural area status. In fact, it is expedient to distinguish them into two types. After all, some of them speak monopredication (monopredicative sentences) occur as the basic mechanisms of formation, and some does not directly participate in the speech formation of monopredication. Above the given paradigmatic form is from the areas of change, in particular, the objective modality number of persons affirmation-denial fields monopredication speech emerge as formative base mechanisms. They are predicates serves to occur at the speech-grammatical level. These areas each form a separate information object. In other forms areas of speech paradigmatic change, in particular, the purpose of expression, full- incompleteness, and attitude to emotion (emotionality) areas of paradigmatic deformation monopredication speech-not related to grammatical formation. Below is the same the paradigmatic form focuses on the areas of change. Changes in the paradigmatic form of speech, indicating the purpose of expression.

Discussion. Monopredicative sentences are speech-grammatical means of expressing the purpose of expression the system changes and creates a paradigmatic field of speech. In this, the linguistic aspect of the monopredicative sentence, i.e. the pattern (stable aspect), does not change, only his verbal appearance, which is related to the communicative purpose (variable aspect) changes. The expression is

LINGUISTICS

monopredicative, depending on the purpose a form of speech that expresses a message at the highest stage of generalization in sentences, there are contrasting variations, such as the interrogative form of speech. For example, the language template "Subject-object-verb" is "Did he go to university?" such as can be addressed by creating variable forms of speech. In this case, the purpose of expression abstract in general status based on the sum of indicative speech forms shape appears as an option.

The speech form of monopredicative speech that expresses a message is usually a message, the desire, the command intonation, as well as the usual of the constituent elements (normative) order. The speech form of monopredicative speech expressing the message as invariant may have its own system of internal variable forms. In this variative distinctive constructions verbs formal to differentiate based on. The interrogative form of monopredicative sentences is mainly -mi, - Question loads such as chi, -a, -ya: who? what? where which one where is when? occurs through constructions formed using interrogative pronouns such as For example: Are you going to the army? (Sh. Botayev); Who needed it? (Sh. Botayev); where is your ticket? (Sh. Botayev). Interrogative tone instead of monopredicative interrogative speech form can also be used. In this case, the structure of the construction is speech-grammatical tools (question loads, interrogative pronouns) are not required. In this depending on the speech situation, any message can become a question. For example: Anvarjon came. Are you Anvarjon? The interrogative form of monopredicative sentences is invariant and, in turn, a system of structurally variable forms can form. In this case, the grammatical means of expressing the question of variability type also occurs on the basis of intonational variation.

Multi-predicate devices. The role of predicates in speech is not the same. If each predicate in the predicate expression has a predicative sign, a compound sentence is a simple sentence if only one of the predicates represents the predicative is considered. In simple sentences with polypredicates, one predicate is the argument of another predicate comes in position. As a result, there is a hierarchy of specific predicates.

The predicate compound in the position of the argument in the hierarchy of predicates, a predicate with an argument consisting of a compound predicate is a predicate. Thus, in polypredicate devices, the compound and the predicates to be added are mutually exclusive and require one another reaches the presence of a compound predicate in a predicate expression is its semantic complicates the structure. Devices called turnover, quality, and movement in the position of the argument of the main predicate as a whole - a compound predicate function. Coming in the position of an argument in simple sentences with many predicates that do not have a predicative sign have a certain proposition but cannot be formed as a speech.

LINGUISTICS

According to T.M. Shmelyova, such materialization of the proposition is the basis of its secondary expression, which the expression in all other cases is a secondary expression emphasizes. The secondary expression of the proposition is the content and grammatically complex. For example, cursing the sorrows of the Ages, I sang a song of joy and happiness. There are two propositions here, the second proposition (I sang a song of joy and happiness) is the basis of proposition expression. It therefore forms the basis of the structure of the sentence. First proposition (cursing the sorrow of centuries) is expressed in a secondary way. Therefore, it does not have an independent speech form. As N. Mahmudov rightly noted, it is expressed in a secondary way the proposition is always combined with the proposition expressed in the primary way, the semantic structure of a simple sentence, which is the expression of this basic proposition complicates.

Some linguists consider such predicative expressions (proposition) to be secondary expressions) as maximum syntactic units. That is why, first of all, it is necessary to dwell on the maximum syntactic units. In syntactic theories, syntactic units are minimum and maximum syntactic divided into units. But even to the minimum syntactic units, the maximum syntactic the division into units is not the same. Pieces of speech in traditional and tender grammar (in French linguistics) considered as minimal syntactic units, word form in subordinate grammar (a series of letters), while in the grammar of the direct participants the morpheme is syntactic units. Also in the case of maximum syntactic units there are different opinions. According to I.B. Dolinina, a verb with a complete syntactic structure is justified a complex grammatical object is the maximum syntactic unit. From this it appears to be based on verb-based theory. In general, all syntactic theory representatives are a whole of any statements without being recognized as maximum syntactic units. But there are many predicates whether sentences should be viewed as a maximum syntactic unit or more as the maximum syntactic unit containing the maximum syntactic units. There is no consensus on whether to look. Traditional and modern grammars take a broader view of the subject looks. By recognizing the sentence as a maximum syntactic unit as a whole together with certain parts of its structure (if they exist in a whole sentence) is recognized as maximum syntactic units. In particular, the joint the sentence forms it along with the calculation of the maximum syntactic unit as a whole the maximum syntactic units within the whole of the reached parts they count.

For example, when he took bouquet, he often walked to school ... [13; 8].

This in our speech three maximum syntactic unity (V.G. Admoni in terms of terminology), they are:

- 1) a compound sentence with a follow-up sentence as a whole;
- 2) the main sentence;

LINGUISTICS

3) follow-up.

O. Espersen, L. Ten'er, and L.L. Ioffik are the main types of headlines of the above type is not considered a complete syntactic structure.

So maximize them do not add to syntactic units. In their opinion, any follow-up statements mainly of different syntactic positions (possessive, participle, determiner, complement, case position) are a method of different grammatical expressions. Most linguists have verb conjugations and predicative forms in general other non-predicates, i.e. secondary expressions of proposition are in favor of calculating the maximum syntactic unit. Indeed, such syntactic devices are a whole in relation to a whole sentence is used. They are of a certain type, united in a predicate creates a syntactic structure - a block. According to I.B. Dolinina, such syntactic structures are a separate maximum syntactic analysis of minimum syntactic units separated as syntactic units puts an end to the shortcomings of the process: on the one hand, they are within themselves has the property of syntactic division, on the other hand, as a whole participates as a part of speech. This is the predicate above the internal syntactic relations of expressions are nonfunctional with respect to the whole sentence, that their function is unique to this predicative expression itself shows.

Predicates that have the property of adding other predicates the most characteristic are process and causative predicates. Process predicates different processes of action (beginning, continuation and end). For example: started, continued, finished, stopped. Process predicates argue the predicate denoting the main action. Argument the predicate process denoting the main action in the position is grammatical is in the form of a definite agreement with the requirement of a predicate meaning:

Aziz coughed a couple of times and continued talking[13; 40].

Morphological causative verbs in the position of the added predicate possible: suspended, terminated, continued, and so on. There are so many predicates devices represent a causative state. For example, Karim stopped reading (finished, continued). Causative condition subject Karim, *pasiens*, the predicate of the causative state is self-causative with zero exponent stop reading, a means of expressing a causal relationship is a morpheme. At this time the grammatical has a complex meaning and one at the same time represents the agent and patient of the causative state.

The presence of lexical causative verbs in the position of the connecting predicate possible. For example, forced, aroused, handed over, ordered, offered and others. At this time, the causative agent and the patient are represented separately. For example, Rasul Olloyorovich forced Aziz to speak[13; 106]. In this type of device, the noun in the main agreement that comes in the position of having agent, predicate of causative condition antisentent, in the complementary position horse *pasiens*, antisentent subject, direction, expressed from the accusative case the state of

LINGUISTICS

causation of the component, expressed in the name of the action in the future, causative verbs are the causative relationship between the conjunctive and the antisense represents.

The word predicative is derived from the Latin word *praedicativus*, means "affirmative", "firm". Predicativeness in speech is a formative syntactic category, which is an objective being in the context of speech or report this event.

Conclusion. It should be noted that the above-mentioned ideas and comments are predicative only one aspect of the controversial issues within the scientific interpretation of the phenomenon requires, they have another aspect - we see in the verb. It is known that to date, the predicative phenomenon has a cut-off relationship with the possessor, it is emphasized that it is closely related. Even in existing grammar studies such sentences as one-syllable, that is, sentences consisting only of possessive explains: "A nominative case is like a possessive in a two-part sentence, its normal state, the structure is a composition. That's the cut does not require ". In our view, sentences consisting only of possessives, usually called *atov* (nominative) It is difficult to agree with the name, as the zero cut is not present, more precisely, Since in such sentences there is no syntactic place for the cut, they also have cannot exist. If there is an owner, verb (from the sentence) even if it is lowered). That is why the usual adverbs are also called sentences note that it is explanatory. In our opinion, such statements are nominative units. It is advisable to include in the sentence. But when it comes to predicativeness, it does not require an explanation that they are predicative nominative units. In the meantime predicative is expressed through tone. If we call such nominative units a sentence, then the sentence to abandon the notion of head pieces, both of the owner and verb to conclude that the syntactic function is performed by the intonation alone corresponds to. Naturally, such conclusions are inappropriate. Hence the nominative units the tone in which the sentence can be equated with the semantic and syntactic weight due to the predicative expressed by the medium. In this case, the reality to call a nominative unit a sentence for expression, and to possess it it is not absolutely necessary to look for a relationship.

In conclusion: monopredicative sentences change the system using speech-grammatical means that express the purpose of expression, create a paradigmatic field of speech, the linguistic side of the monopredicative sentence, i.e. the pattern (stable side) does not change, only its communicative purpose only (o 'the changing side) will change the image of the speech, the expression will be purposefully monopredicative, in sentences, it was concluded that opposite changes can be distinguished at the higher stage of generalization.

REFERENCES

1. *Sizov I.A. What is syntax? - M., 1966. - p. 29.*

LINGUISTICS

2. Kholodovich A.A. *On the question of the dominant of a sentence // Problems of grammatical theory.* - L., 1979. -P. 298.
3. Lomtev T.P. *Sentence structure in modern Russian language,* - M., 1979. - p. 56.
4. Vinogradov S.N., Kuzmin A.F. *Logics.* - Toshkent, 1994. - p. 59.
5. G'ulomov A. *Sodda gap.* - Toshkent, 1995. - p. 49.
6. Akhmedov A.A. *Kesim. // Uzbek language grammar.* - Toshkent, 1976. - p. 134.
7. Petrov N.E. *On the content and volume of the language modality.* Novosibirsk, 1982. - P. 51
8. Shakhmatov A.A. *Syntax of the Russian language.* - L., 1941. - P. 29.
9. Nurmanov A. *Problems of the systemic study of the syntax of the Uzbek language.* - Tashkent, 1982;
10. Nigmatov Kh.G. et al. *Sentence structure and topical issues of the syntax of Turkic languages // ST, Baku, 1984, № 5.*
11. Steblin-Kamensky M.I. *On predicativity // Controversial in linguistics.* - L., 1974. - P. 44.
12. Steblin-Kamensky M.I. *On predicativity //Controversial in linguistics. Publishing house of Leningrad State University, 1974. - P. 44. 14.*
13. Fayzulloev, O. M. (2018). *The peculiarities of the interpretation of the Uzbek fairy tales.* ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science, 12 (68), 212-215.
14. Fayzulloev, Otabek Mukhammedovich and Durdiyeva, Dilnoza Durdimurodovna (2021) "TECHNOLOGY FOR THE SELECTION OF ADEQUATE OPTIONS IN THE TRANSLATION OF CHILDREN'S GAMES," *Scientific reports of Bukhara State University: Vol. 4: Iss. 6, Article 9.* <https://uzjournals.edu.uz/buxdu/vol4/iss6/9>
15. Sobirova, Zarnigor Intern-researcher (2020) "LEXICOGRAPHIC INTERPRETATION OF THE TOURISM TERMS IN THE ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES," *Philology Matters: Vol. 2020: Iss. 4, Article 6. DOI: 10.36078/987654466* <https://uzjournals.edu.uz/philolm/vol2020/iss4/6>
16. Sobirova, Zarnigor (2020) "ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF TOURISM LEXEMES INTO UZBEK," *Scientific reports of Bukhara State University: Vol. 4: Iss. 5.* <https://uzjournals.edu.uz/buxdu/vol4/iss5/7>
17. Usmanov Utkir. *Girdob.* - Tashkent, 1995.