

Manifestation Of The Generality-Specificity Dialectic In The Vowel System Of The Uzbek Language

D. Nabieva¹, D. Nurmanova²

¹Professor of ASU, Ph.D

²Associate professor of ASU, Ph.D.

ABSTRACT

Their semantically distinctive and supplementary characteristics play a significant role in the characterization of phonological oppositions. Based on this, phonological oppositions are separated into those that are phonologically relevant and those that are not. The material creation of words and morphemes, coupled with phonologically significant oppositions, have a purpose. Phonetic oppositions between sounds that are pronounced on top of phonologically significant oppositions are known as phonologically insignificant oppositions.

Phonologically significant elements cause phonemes to be in opposition to one another. Of course, each phoneme belongs to a specific opponent. Each sound that is really uttered gains phonologically irrelevant characteristics. This implies that the characterization of their phonologically significant and inconsequential properties is of enormous relevance in identifying the invariant-variant relations in the phonemic system of a language.

Keywords. Phonological tier, phoneme, common-singular, invariant-variant, function, phonologically significant feature, additional feature, opposition, neutralization of oppositions.

Introduction

Distinctiveness is a crucial component of a phoneme's functionality.¹ The idea of contradiction is necessary for the idea of difference. According to N.S. Trubetsky, two objects only exhibit a mutual difference when they are in opposition to one another. Similar to this, the differentiating (distinctive) function of sounds only becomes apparent when their sign differs from the sign of other similar sounds. Because of this, linguistic disputes are crucial to the differentiation of language units.

The indication of meaning difference and lack of meaning difference is significant in the characterization of phonological contrasts. This indicator categorises phonological conflicts into meaning- and non-meaning-differentiating conflicts. The work of separating the meanings of morphemes and words is carried out by the first contrast, which is also a phonologically significant contrast.² The second contrast, which is phonetic in nature and connected to sound pronunciation, is placed over phonologically relevant contrasts.

Only their phonologically significant characteristics set phonemes apart. Every phoneme must belong to a certain contrast.

Additionally, every true, pronounced sound will have elements that are not crucial for phonology. Therefore, it is crucial to distinguish between their phonologically significant and insignificant indications in order to define the invariant-variant relationship in the system of phonemes.

Consonant phoneme classification uses different symbols than vowel phoneme classification. We can observe that academics use several vowel symbols even while classifying vowel phonemes.

There is a classification of vowels based on more than three indications in Uzbek linguistics literature:

1) according to the place of occurrence (front row - back row);

2) according to the degree of mouth opening and tongue elevation (wide - medium wide - narrow);

3) according to the lip participation (labialized - non-labialized).

Today, there are two distinct methods for categorising vowels based on where they appear. The first method identifies the location of vowels or, more precisely, the horizontal movement of the tongue. The classification of vowels based on this sign is deemed illogical by

the second approach since it rejects the sign of vowel occurrence.³

It should be mentioned that the line sign and the sign of lip participation are regarded as differentiating indications for the classification of vowels in all research devoted to the vocalism of Turkic languages, and in particular, the Uzbek language. However, it is feasible to demonstrate that this assumption is false by looking at the language's phonological system through the lens of the generality-specificity dialectic. Prof. E. Umarov objected to such a basis of classification: "At the beginning of our century, scientists who want to publish Turkish monuments have a problem of how to represent vowel sounds. A group of scientists headed by V.V. Radlov advocated the opinion that Turkic languages are characterized by hardness and softness, therefore vowels in these languages should be distinguished into front and back sounds, and they followed this rule in their work... Well, Is this proposal suitable for Turkish, including Uzbek? the question arises. In our opinion, the answer to this should be "no"⁴, without hesitation," he writes, and in his second article he shows that it is appropriate to classify vowels according to the degree of opening of the mouth and the participation of the lips.⁵

It should be observed that no one disputes the uniqueness of palatal and labial synharmonism in Turkic languages, or the tuning of vowels in accordance with the row in palatal harmony. Despite the fact that synharmonism does not apply to the Uzbek literary language as it is currently used, practically all dialectologists agree that it is still present in Uzbek dialects. The presence of correlations by the series in one location and the difference in meaning allow us to recognise the series as a distinguishing mark for vowels in the Uzbek dialects, which maintain the contradiction according to the series. For example, in Andijan dialect **ўт** (organism) - **от** (grass, fire), **ўп** (to weed the grass)-**оп** (braid hair), **ўз** (pronoun)-**ўз** (to pass), **ўн** (voice)- **ун** (grain). But for the vowel phonemes of the modern Uzbek literary language, in fact, the hyphen has lost its phonological value. Therefore, this sign cannot be the basis of classification for the vowel phonemes of the modern Uzbek literary language.

Therefore, it is appropriate to classify the vowel phonemes of the current Uzbek literary language on the basis of two characters:

1) оғизнинг очилиш даражасига кўра: кенг, ўрта кенг (ўрта тор), тор;

2) лабнинг иштирокига кўра: лабланган, лабланмаган.

But in Uzbek dialects, the third sign - the line sign is also a distinguishing sign.

Width-narrow characteristics. One of the most important distinguishing features of vowels in Turkic languages is width-narrowness, i.e. the degree of opening of the mouth.⁶ According to this sign, vowels form a two-stage opposition in a number of Turkic languages, in particular, in Yakut, Altaic, Karagas, Tuva, Kyrgyz, and Bulgarian languages: **а, (а), о, о** - wide (compact), **и, и, у, у** - narrow (diffuse).

The number of vowel phonemes is counted as eight in the above languages, not counting the contradiction according to their quantitative sign.

In Turkic languages such as Azerbaijani, Bashkir, Kazakh, Karakalpak, Tatar, Khakas, vowels form a three- and four-step opposition according to the above sign. For example:

in Azerbaijani:

wide	а	а	о	о
semi wide		э		
top	и	и	у	у

in Bashkir, Tatar, Chuvash languages:

wide	а	а(э)		
semi wide	и	и	о	о
top	и	и	у	у

in Kazakh:

wide	а	а	о	о
semi wide		э		
semi narrow	и	и	у	у
naeeow	и	и	у	у

Studies on the phonetics of the Uzbek language show the existence of a three-stage contradiction:

wide	а	о
semi wide	э	ў
narrow	и	у

Although the three-level conflict of vowel phonemes is recognized by almost all Uzbek linguists, there is no uniformity among linguists regarding the number of vowel phonemes that make up this three-level conflict.

The majority of linguists agreed that E.D. Polivanov identified six phonemes.⁷ Only

Professor M. Mirtojiev makes the following claims, rejecting the functional aspect of the phoneme that has been prominent since the development of the phoneme theory and acknowledging that there are more than six vowels in the Uzbek literary language: "Human voice has two bases: 1) acoustic base; 2) biological base. Some literature also talks about the linguistic basis. This refers to the role of sound in speech. However, sound does not perform a function in speech, but is a form of phoneme, which is the smallest part of speech content."⁸

It is clear that the linguist bases the phoneme identification on the acoustic-articulatory element. The phoneme choices are defined by the articulatory-acoustic concept, it should be mentioned. Once the acoustic-articulatory characteristics of the variants have been established, these characteristics are used to group the variants into specific generalisations. The basic organising concept of unification is the task side of articulatory-acoustic units.

Regarding the three-level vowel system seen in Turkic languages, A.M. Shcherbak demonstrates that it actually evolved from a two-level system.⁹

The semi-wide vowel *e* conflicts with broad vowels on the one hand and with narrow vowels on the other in the aforementioned Azerbaijan, Kazakh, and Uzbek languages. Numerous Turkologists have focused on the topic of this vowel's occurrence in Turkic languages and the development of a three-level vowel system. When Orhun-Enasoy monuments were outlawed, V. Thomsen first brought this matter to light.¹⁰

K. Foy, having studied living Turkic languages as well as ancient written monuments, presents his views on the phoneme and the variants of its speech realization. He tries to prove on the basis of examples from *i-e* parallelism in ancient Turkic languages: *бip-бэp*, *ишit-эшит*, *ит – эт*, *дi-дэ* and etc. Of these he recognizes the narrow vowel form as the primary form.¹¹

According to the degree of mouth opening, A.M. Shcherbak provided thorough information on the views of Turkologists regarding the origin of three-level vowels. A. M. Shcherbak himself advances the theory that the

long-short contrast from the wide vowel led to the semi-wide vowel's later appearance.

Therefore, three-level vowels can be found in a variety of Turkic languages depending on the extent of mouth opening. The difference in sign between these vowels does, however, lessen during speech and can sometimes be perceived as a single vowel. Such a feature is found not only between Turkic languages, but also as dialectal variants of one Turkic language. For example, in Uzbek **дедим-дидим, икки-эки, қилган эдим-қи:ганьдъм, ачаси - эчьсь** and etc.

Because the intermediate stage, i.e. semi-wide vowels appeared later in the history of Turkic languages, narrow vowels and wide vowels are concretely opposed to each other (binary). But this conflict can be moderated in the speech process. For example, **дадасi - дэдиcи**. Such **a - i** variant occurs mostly in Namangan dialect based on the phenomenon of umlaut in the second syllable of the word.

Thus, even if vowel phonemes are distinguished on the language level based on the distinguishing signs of width, middle width, and narrowness, according to the degree of opening of the mouth, but during the speech process, these signs are moderated (neutralized), middle wide vowel, wide vowel, and narrow vowel; narrow vowel middle wide vowel, middle wide vowel narrow vowel; can be used instead of a narrow vowel with a wide vowel, a narrow vowel with a wide vowel, and as a positional or dialectal variant of the same phoneme.

Regardless of the fact that vowels are pronounced in different ways from the articulatory-acoustic point of view, at the language level, depending on the degree of opening of the mouth, three differentiating signs have a phonological value and take a place in the vowel system according to their value.

Another distinguishing feature for the vowels of the Uzbek literary language is labialization. This distinguishing sign is also typical for the vowels of all Turkic languages. Vowels have a binary conflict according to the sign of labialization: **a, ä, i, i̇** – non-labialized vowels, **o, ö, y, ẏ** – labialized vowels. It seems that every labialized vowel has an non-labialized vowel.

Binary compatibility can be broken in many cases due to labializing - non- labializing sign. This discrepancy is observed in the labialization of non-labialized vowels during the speech process and the loss of labialization of the labialized vowel. In particular, the pronunciation of "a" is observed in Uzbek,

Bashkir, and Tatar languages. In Bashkir and Tatar languages, having a labial sign of "a" in the process of speech creates a combinatory variant of this vowel phoneme, although it originally existed as a variant in the Uzbek language, but it has a phonological value in the modern Uzbek literary language.¹²

In the studies devoted to the phonetics of the Uzbek language, the articulatory-acoustic sign of the phoneme «o» is interpreted differently. Some authors¹³ say that it is a labial vowel, while other researchers deny the sign of labialization.

In particular, prof. M. Mirtojiev writes the following about these two vowels: «The dialects of Bukhara and Samarkand share the vowel «o» with Uzbek as well. These have the tongue's front and back in the same place. However, they are also regarded as tongue-back vowels because of the location of their attempted passage on the back of the tongue. The vowels **u, u, e, and o** are all labialized in Uzbek. Additionally, compared to other labialized vowels, the labialization of the «o» in the Bukhara-Samarkand dialects is quite low. In some literary works, the vowel "o" is also described as labial. There is a rationale for this. Because when combined with labial sounds, it will undoubtedly have a labialized pronunciation. Other times, though, it is not labialized. This suggests that it is assimilable».¹⁴ In essence, this music should go without a label. The vowel phoneme in the paradigmatic relation is intermingled with its numerous changes (modifications) in syntagmatics, as can be observed from the remarks.

Major Turkologists who are engaged in the history of the phonetics (phonology) of the Uzbek language express two different opinions about the origin of the phoneme «o». Many people argue that the phoneme «o» in the Uzbek language is a universal back row, broad, non-labialized vowel, pronounced in a labialized variant in a certain phonetic environment, and with the passage of time, this variant has phonological value and has become an independent phoneme.

E.D. Polivanov attributed the disappearance of the regularity of synharmonism in the Uzbek language, the moderation of the binary contrast of vowels according to the series, the emergence of a wide, labialized vowel

phoneme («o») with an external factor, the influence of Iranian languages.¹⁵

As F.A. Abdullaev rightly stated, explaining such a big phenomenon as the loss of synharmonism, without taking into account the internal development of the language, only on the basis of external influence, rightly caused various objections among Turkologists.¹⁶

Nor can the origin of **o** be attributed to divergence alone. Because a number of materials of Uzbek dialects show that synharmonism can appear in the first syllable even if preserved. For this reason, A.K. Borovkov justifies the formation of **o** by connecting it with convergence and positional condition.

The following opinion of A. Abduazizov about the appearance of the phoneme **O** and its degree of lipization is noteworthy: «As a result of both influences (internal and external - D.N.), the phoneme a diverged, that is, it was divided into two phonemes. According to E.D. Polivanov's formula **a : b - c**, that is, element c is divided into elements a and b. As a result, in the vocalism of the Uzbek language, all front vowels **i, e, a** are non-labialized, and all back vowels **u, o', o** are labialized, and have two equal symmetrical groups. In fact, the fact that the phoneme **a** does not have its own pair leaves an empty cell in this system:

i	u
e	o'
a	-

The filling of the "empty cell", that is, the appearance of the **o** phoneme, was a result of the above divergence event, which brought the Uzbek vocal system to a symmetrical state. According to N.S. Trubetskoi, based on the classification of E.D. Polivanov, this system is now considered a two-class (front and back row), three-level (lower, middle, upper), quadrangular, logically equivalent (i.e., two different signs are combined: the main distinguishing mark between labialized and non-labialized and tongue-back-tongued auxiliary, non-differentiating) vocalization system that is rarely found in world languages».¹⁷

The above points about the origin of the vowel «o», the degree of labialization, and its place in the vowel system are stated based on evidence that does not require comment.

So, the second most important distinguishing feature of vowels in the Uzbek language is the sign of labialization or non-labialization.

Additional characters. In Turkic languages, the number of vowels is also considered as one of the important distinguishing marks. According to this symbol, vowels are divided into two contrasting rows - front row and back row (low tonality - high tonality) vowels. In many Turkic languages, each phoneme in the back line corresponds to a phoneme in the front line: back row vowels **a, o, y, i** conflict with front row vowels **ä, ö, ý, ĩ** and this contrast has a phonological value.

The above line's vowel contrast, which is typical of most Turkic languages, is not representative of the literary Uzbek of today. This demonstrates how the Uzbek language is unique within the Turkic language family.

The difference between the vowels in the front row and the vowels in the back row according to the row sign is mitigated, and eight vowels become four vowels in the Uzbek language, which is a remarkable trait. E.D. Polivanov, A.K. Borovkov, A.M. Shcherbak, V.V. Reshetov, N.A. Baskakov, F.A. Abdullaev, Sh.Sh. Shoabdurahmanov expressed different opinions about the reasons for this process in the Uzbek language. A.M. Shcherbak, F.A. Abdullaev, A.A. Abduazizov gave a decent assessment of these opinions. However, it is worth noting that the neutralization of the contrast of vowels according to the series sign is characteristic only for the Tashkent dialect of the modern Uzbek language. According to these two signs in the Tashkent dialect, the contrast of vowels is the basis of the literary language. All other dialects have a three-character conflict, that is, the string character also serves as a basis for conflict. For example, in Andijan, Margilan, Kokand, Namangan, Osh dialects distinctions such as **ўр - өр, ўн - өн, ўт - өт, бўз - бөз, ўз - өз, ун - үн** have phonological value. In a phonetic situation, back and front vowels alternate and serve to differentiate the meaning. Back and front vowels alternate in a phonetic situation to distinguish the meaning. We agree with E. Umarov's assertion that the six phonemes of the Uzbek literary language do not conflict with one another. In actuality, the line sign solely functions as a quality marker of variants in the present literary Uzbek language and has no phonological significance.

In Turkic languages, according to the sign of nasality, the contrast between pure and nasal vowels is not stable. At the same time, it

has no phonological value.¹⁸ That is, this symbol does not perform the function of meaning differentiation. The phenomenon of nasalization is common in the Namangan dialect of Tuva, Khakas, Azerbaijani, Uyghur and Uzbek languages.¹⁹

Nasality is Latin for "relating to the nose". In vowels with this sign, the sound has a nasal timbre as a result of the lowering of the palatal membrane and the simultaneous passage of air through the mouth and nasal cavity. As a result, the oral vowel becomes a nasal vowel.

In some modern Uzbek dialects, nasalization of the vowels before this consonant is observed as a result of the dropping of the consonants **n** and **ng** in the word structure. Because even if the pronunciation of falling nasal consonants is not heard, the trace of its articulation remains to a certain extent. Therefore, the vowel that comes before such consonants has a nasality sign. For example, in the Namangan dialect **бола-чақа:ни** (your children), **чушу:нь** (your dream), **га:сә** (you got), **га:мә:** (I got);²⁰ In Shahrisabz dialect **хә:рәде** (he screamed), **тә:лик** (tension), **д : қотма** (don't sleep);²¹ in Oguz dialects **ма:лай** (forehead), **та:лай** (palate), **но:** (bread)²² and etc.

Despite being widespread in many Uzbek dialects, the nasal sign cannot be used to identify vowel phonemes. Only a different vowel is formed as an additional letter.

It is recognised that the Uzbek paradigmatic connection of vowels does not include the nasality indicator. It only appears in syntagmatics as an additional indicator when nearby nasal consonants are present.

In Turkic languages, vowels are opposed according to their quantitative sign. According to this symbol, vowels are divided into long vowels and short vowels. In some literature, it is shown that there are three levels of length according to their quantitative sign and, accordingly, vowels are divided into three groups: long vowels, short (normal) vowels, and very short vowels.²³

Short vowels appear like typical (typical) monophthongs. Both diphthongs and monophthongs are possible with long vowels.

According to A.M. Shcherbak, the phonological system of the Altaic, Gagauz,

Kyrgyz, Tofalar, Tuva, Turkmen, Khakass, and Yakut languages heavily relies on the contrast of vowels according to the sign of longness and shortness. In most literature, vowel length is classified into main length and secondary length. Primary desire has existed in Turkic languages since the Bobotil period, although secondary longing just recently emerged in each Turkic language as a result of distinct phonetic modifications.

In particular, the lengthening of the vowel due to the drop of the consonant after the vowel is a common phenomenon in Turkic languages. For example, in the Altaic language **ту:** «mountain», **су:** «water», **му:с** «horns»; in Gagauz language **ча:р** «sharp», **си:р** «cow», **бу:н** «nose», **до:ру** «right»; in the Tuva language **о:л** «son» and etc.

The hyphen is not regarded as a distinctive symbol for the literary Uzbek language. However, there is a primary lengthening in some Uzbek dialects, particularly in the Ogiz dialects, in which case it has phonological significance. In the same phonetic circumstance, a long vowel and a short vowel might be switched out to differentiate between various meanings.

For example, **и:-и** contradiction: **и:ч** (horse)-**ич** (drink), **ди:з** (the knee) - **дъз** (to knee), **ки:р** (washed or washable fabric)- **кър** (dirty), **и:н** (nest)-**ин** (drop off);

ы:-ы contradiction: **қы:р** (hill) - **қыр** (to lose), **кы:з** (girl) - **кыз** (to heat up), **сы:х** (spit) - **сых** (to clamp);

и:-и contradiction: **бу:з** (ice) - **буз** (to break), **у:ч** (tip) - **уч** (fly), **ду:з** (salt) - **дуз** (plain);

е:-е contradiction: **гэ:ч** (late) - **гэч** (night), **эр** (man) - **э:р** (early), **эш** (twist) - **э:ш** (friend);

о:-о contradiction: **о:т** (organism, gallbladder)-**от** (pass), **о:р-** (stubborn) **ор** (mow), **го:р** (grave)-**гор** (see);

о:-о contradiction: **о:т** (fire) - **от** (grass), **ко:й** (sheep), - **кой** (leave), **о:й** (dig) - **ой** (thought) and etc.

а:-а contradiction: **а:д**, **а:т** (name) - **ат** (animal), **а:ш** (food) - **аш** (to gain, to pass), **да:ш** (stone)-**даш** (rash), **йа:т-** (a stranger)-**йат** (lie down), **йа:н** (side)-**йан** (burn), **са:ч** -(hair)-**сач** (to scatter) and etc.²⁴

It can be seen that the contrast between long and short vowels in Ogiz dialect of Uzbek language serves to differentiate meaning and has phonological value. In dialects of the Uzbek language, secondary tense (also called facultative tense) is common. Such lengthening

is common in both Ogiz and Kipchak dialects. Such secondary lengthening (facultative lengthening) in Ogiz and Kipchak dialects, and sometimes also in Korlug dialects, is the result of the dropping of consonants such as **y**, **g**, **g'**, **ng**, **h** and the lengthening of the vowel before the resulting consonant or, if the falling consonant is in an intervocalic position, as a result of the addition of a vowel on both sides appears. Vowels on both sides of a consonant can be of the same type or of different types. For example, in Kipchak dialects: **й:л** (o'g'il- son), **о:р** (og'ir -heavy), **ба:р** (bag'ir- heart) and etc.

At the same time, in some Uzbek dialects there is also an extreme length that does not fulfill a phonological function - emphatic length. Such lengthening is observed more in the Namangan dialect. In particular, the present-future tense is systematically pronounced with emphatic length, which distinguishes the Namangan dialect from other dialects. For example, **мэм бълмэ:мэ:** (men bilmayman – I don't know), **сэм бълмэ:сэ:** (sen bilmaysan – you don't know), **у бълмэ:дъ** (u bilmaydi – he doesn't know).

Thus, although the vowel length-shortness sign is not a relevant sign for the Uzbek literary language, it is found in Uzbek dialects. Primary longness is characteristic of the Ikon-Karabulok²⁵ dialects of the Uzbek language, and in these dialects long-shortness performs a phonological function. Secondary lengthening occurs in almost all dialects and is formed in the syntagmatic aspect, although it changes the quality of the vowel, but it does not have phonological value.

So, for the vowels of the Uzbek literary language, the degree of opening of the mouth (wide, medium wide, narrow) and according to the presence of the lips (labialized and non-labialized) are considered distinguishing signs. Other signs of vowels (nasality, length, line mark) are considered additional signs that are important in describing vowel variants. Main signs are characteristic of vowel paradigmatics, additional (optional) signs are typical of vowel syntagmatics.

References

1. Trubetsky N.S. Fundamentals of phonology. Moscow: Foreign Literature, 1960. –p.38
2. Yudakhin K.K. Nekotorye osobennosti Karabulakskogo govora. - Materials from Uzbek

- dialectology. T.1.-Tashkent: Uzb SSR FA publishing house, 1957. -p.32.
3. Otamirzaeva S. About nasalization in the Namangan dialect.//Issues of the Uzbek language and literature. - Tashkent, №3, 1962. – p.20-23; Katanov N.F. Experience in the study of the Uriankhai language of the folk Turkic dialects Nuhi. Baku, EAM, 1926. -p. 119.
 4. Otamirzaeva S. The sound composition of the Namangan dialect of the Uzbek language. Abstract of the thesis of Candidate of Philology. 1963. -p.4
 5. Jumanazarov Yu. Morphological features of the Khorezm dialect. Abstract of the thesis of Candidate of Philology. -Tashkent, 1963.
 6. Abdullaev F.A. Phonetics of Khorezm dialects. -Tashkent: Fan, 1967. -p. 56.
 7. Mahmudov A. Vowels. Materials from general phonetics. -Tashkent: Science, 1992; Polivanov E.D. Uzbek dialectology and Uzbek literary language. -Tashkent: Gosizdat, 1933; Abduazizov A.A. Phonology and morphonology of the Uzbek language. -Tashkent: Teacher, 1992. -p.52.
 8. Abduazizov A.A. Phonology and morphonology of the Uzbek language. -p.50-51.; Reshetov V.V. Uzbek language. I. Phonetics. Tashkent: Uchpedgiz, 1959. -p.357;
 9. Mirtojiev M.M. Phonetics of the Uzbek language. Tashkent: Science, 1991. -p.20.
 10. Shcherbak A.M. Comparative phonetics of Turkic languages. L.: Science, 1970. –C. 30.
 11. Mikhojiddinovna, J. D. (2019). THE HISTORY OF THE STUDY OF TERMINOLOGY IN UZBEK LINGUISTICS. ANGLISTICUM. Journal of the Association-Institute for English Language and American Studies, 8(8), 50-56.
 12. Jamoliddinova, D. (2009). Semantic-grammatical and linguopoetic features of parenthetical units in literary speech: Abstract for candidate of philology thesis.
 13. [10.05.2022 19:39] Dilnoza, D. (2018). Comments on Studying Linguopoetic Properties of Terms in a Textual Aspect. ANGLISTICUM. Journal of the Association-Institute for English Language and American Studies, 7(5), 37-44.
 14. [10.05.2022 19:42] Jamoliddinova, D. M. (2020). TERMINOLOGY AND PROFESSIONAL VOCABULARY. Scientific Bulletin of Namangan State University, 2(10), 294-298.