



ТЮРКСКИЕ НАРОДЫ СРЕДНЕЙ АЗИИ

Yaminkhon Askarxodjayev

Tashkent State Technical University Almalyk Branch

"Social – humanities and languages" teacher of the department

Abstract.

The proposed article will aim to acquaint readers, as far as the time at our disposal will allow, with the results achieved in the scientific history of the Turkic peoples. Readers will see that these results are not very significant yet and many questions remain insufficiently clarified. This is partly explained by the fact that the study of the history of the Turks from primary sources requires such knowledge that is rarely combined in one person.

Key words: Turks, tribes, peoples, Turkologist, Iranist, Orkhon inscriptions, Oghuz Turks, beliefs, historical inscriptions, bibliography.

Introduction.

Of course, to understand the history of a people and its cultural life one must know its language, but the written sources on the history of the Turks are for the most part not written in Turkish, and in this respect a specialist in the history of the Turks is in a completely different position than, for example, a specialist in Chinese history or in the history of one of the Western European peoples. The history of the nomadic Turkish tribes is known to us, of course, mainly from the stories of their cultural neighbors, but even where the Turks in the cultural countries they conquered became sedentary and where cultural states arose under the rule of Turkish dynasties, the influence of the culture of the vanquished was so strong that their language, and not Turkish, became the language of literature, especially prose. The history of the Turks who lived in East Asia, especially in Mongolia, from where they were driven out, probably in the 10th century A.D., is known to us almost exclusively from Chinese sources; We obtain information about the Turks who migrated to the western part of Central Asia and submitted to the influence of Muslim culture from Arabic and, above all, Persian sources. Moreover, in Turkestan in the Middle Ages there were no works of its own historical literature, or at least none that have reached us; for example, the history of the Mongol khans of Central Asia, the history of Timur and his descendants are known to us almost exclusively from works written within Iran.



More significant historical literature appeared in Turkestan only in the 15th century, under the Uzbeks.

Methods.

Of the three khanates founded by the Uzbeks, the language of office work and historical literature in the Bukhara Khanate, with a few exceptions, was Persian until the end, in the Khiva Khanate it was Central Asian Turkish; in the Kokand Khanate they sometimes wrote in Turkish [1]. Of all the Turkish states, only the history of the former Ottoman Empire can be studied primarily from Turkish historical works, but the language of the Ottoman historians contains many more Arabic and Persian words than Turkish, is almost incomprehensible to the majority of the Turkish people and is of little interest to a Turkologist. There are almost no historical works written in any pure Turkish language, as a result of which a Turkologist, like an Iranologist (it is known that the history of Iran in the pre-Mongol period also has to be studied from sources written not in Iranian languages, but in Greek and Arabic), rarely becomes a historian. In any case, to study the history of the Turkish peoples it is not enough to be a Turkologist; It is also necessary, depending on what era you are interested in, to be a Sinologist, an Arabist, or an Iranologist.

Among the few monuments that are of equal interest to a Turkologist-linguist and a historian is the oldest dated monument of the Turkish language - the historical Orkhon inscriptions of the 8th century, discovered and analyzed in the second half of the 19th century. These inscriptions belong to the first people in time to call themselves Turks, who came out in the 6th century and immediately subjugated all the steppes from the borders of China to the borders of Persia and Byzantium. We therefore have more diverse sources about these Turks than about the previous nomadic states, which only the Chinese knew about. The Turkish origin of the conquerors of the 6th century was considered fully established even before the analysis of the inscriptions they left behind [1]. The empire of the 6th century differed from most of the nomadic states in that from the very beginning it was under the rule of only one dynasty, but not one person. The khans who ruled the western half of the empire were completely independent from the very beginning, even receiving foreign ambassadors and concluding treaties with them, without sending them to the east, as the first khans of the Golden Horde did later, during the era of the Mongol Empire. European scholars, even sinologists, were primarily interested in the state of the western Turks, which had more diverse cultural ties and to some extent served as an intermediary between the culture of the Far East and the culture of the Near East countries, although not to the same extent as the Mongol Empire



later did. The western Turks are the subject of an extensive work by the French sinologist Chavain, published at the beginning of the 20th century in the publications of the Russian Academy of Sciences; in this work, Chinese information about the western Turkish state of the 6th-8th centuries is compared with information from Byzantine, Armenian and Muslim sources [2]. The western Turks did not leave any stories about themselves; Of these, as far as is known to this day, only small tombstone inscriptions have remained. The Orkhon inscriptions speak almost exclusively of the half-century-long subjugation of the Eastern Turks to the Chinese government, from the 630s to the 680s, and of the restoration of independence under the rule of new khans, who for a short time succeeded in subjugating even their western compatriots. Despite the fact that more than thirty years have passed since the Danish scholar Thomsen discovered the key to reading the inscriptions, the analysis of the inscriptions has not yet been completed and the interpretation of some places still remains controversial; when using existing translations, without knowledge of the original language, it is necessary to exercise great caution in order to draw any historical conclusions. The translations of Radlov and Thomsen himself have contributed most to the explanation of the inscriptions; after the publication of his first translation, Thomsen announced that he did not expect to return to the inscriptions, but fortunately he did not remain faithful to this intention and devoted several more works to the inscriptions [3]. Not being a Turkologist-linguist, I do not dare to make statements about the controversial interpretation of individual words and controversial translation methods. Despite the controversy of individual places, the inscriptions as a whole give a clear picture of the life of a nomadic people and a nomadic state. Under normal conditions, a nomadic people does not strive for political unification; an individual finds complete satisfaction for himself in the conditions of clan life and in the ties that are created by life and custom between individual clans, without any formal agreements and without the creation of a specific apparatus of power. At this stage of the development of the people, society has such power that its will is carried out without needing support from the authorities, which would have certain legal powers and a certain external force of coercion. Representatives of state power, khans, who, under favorable conditions, manage to subjugate the entire people or even several peoples, appear only in extraordinary circumstances, and even in these cases the khans take power themselves, are not appointed or elected by anyone; the people or peoples only reconcile themselves to the existing fact, often only after a difficult struggle, and the unification of the khan's own people under his rule is often associated with more



prolonged bloodshed than the subsequent campaigns of the nomads, with the khan at the head, on the cultural lands; these campaigns and the military booty associated with them are the only way to reconcile the people to the establishment of the khan's power [4].

The same picture is presented by the inscriptions. The khans come from the Oghuz or Tokuz-Oghuz Turks and at the same time wage long wars with the Oghuz and other Turkish peoples, about which the inscriptions speak in much more detail than about the wars with the Chinese and other cultural neighbors; the khan himself and, of course, his subjects look at these latter wars only as a means of giving food to the hungry people, giving clothing to the naked people. The inscriptions introduced only one new feature into the history of the formation of nomadic states, which Radlov did not pay attention to: one of the extraordinary circumstances under the influence of which the state was created could be the aggravation of the class struggle between the rich and the poor, between the beks and the common people [5]. In a nomadic society, property and class differences already reach such limits that such an aggravation is entirely possible. It is evident from the inscriptions that during the Chinese rule, the aristocracy, as was the case in civilized countries, in order to preserve their class privileges, more easily reconciled itself to the foreign yoke and more easily changed its national customs than the common people; the same thing happened, for example, in the Western Russian regions during the era of Polish rule. The adoption of Chinese customs by the beks increased the hatred of the masses towards them, and representatives of the khan dynasty took advantage of this to raise the people against Chinese rule and restore the Turkish state. The history of the nomadic peoples of Central Asia presents another example of the political unification of peoples after class struggle - the formation of the Mongol Empire of Genghis Khan. Only in this case the formation of the state was a consequence of the victory of the aristocracy, and Genghis Khan spoke not about his work for the benefit of the masses, like the Turkish Khan of the 8th century, but about his services to his aristocratic followers, to whom he provided a secure position in their homeland and rich booty during campaigns. And in this case, the news of the class struggle was preserved only in the epic tale of the Mongols themselves, not one of the numerous Chinese, Muslim, Armenian and European sources that speak of the formation of the Mongol Empire mentions this, just as neither the Chinese nor other sources speak of the class struggle among the Turks. If more stories of nomads about themselves had reached us, then, probably, there would have been more cases when the class struggle played a role in the history of the formation of the nomadic state. The inscriptions



provide quite a lot of information about the structure of the Turkish state, the names of positions, etc. Perhaps not all of these names have been read correctly, but it is already clear that many of them are not of Turkish origin. The title of shad, as the members of the khan dynasty who headed individual Turkish tribes were called, is most likely Iranian, of the same origin as the Persian shah; some other titles attract attention by the Mongolian ending of the plural in -t. Professor Pelliot, in a lecture given in the fall of 1925 in Leningrad, expressed the opinion that these titles were borrowed by the Turks from their predecessors, the Avars, the Juan of Chinese sources, whom he considers to be the Mongols. According to Pelliot, the Turks owed their entire state structure to the Avars. This question is connected with the more general question of the attitude of the Turks, on the one hand, to the cultured peoples of the West, and on the other, to the nomadic peoples of Central Asia who came before them [6].

Until recently, there was an opinion that the world of Far Eastern culture was almost not subject to Western influence, that Mongolia and the peoples living in it were subject only to the influence of Chinese culture. Even E. Bloche in his introduction to the history of the Mongols of Rashid ad-Din, published in 1910, found it possible to assert that in the Orkhon inscriptions everything not purely Turkish is explained by Chinese influence and that even the Mongols first became acquainted with Muslim culture during their campaigns against Muslim countries, while Chinese culture was known to them from the very beginning. The most compelling argument against this opinion is the existence of alphabets of Near Eastern origin among both the Turks in the 8th century and the Mongols in the 13th century. The Orkhon inscriptions are written in the same alphabet as the inscriptions on the upper Yenisei, known as early as the 18th century, and even then attention was drawn to the similarity of some letters with European alphabets. In general, the Yenisei inscriptions, based on the form of the letters, must be recognized as somewhat earlier than the Orkhon ones, and can be dated to the 7th century; it is impossible to establish their date more precisely. It is remarkable that not one of these inscriptions is dated even by the twelve-year animal cycle used by the Orkhon Turks; meanwhile, according to Chinese and Muslim reports, the Kirghiz lived on the upper Yenisei at that time, to whom the Yenisei inscriptions must therefore be attributed, although the Chinese say that it was the Kirghiz who used the animal cycle, so that some scholars even believed that this cycle was invented by the Kirghiz [7]. The most detailed study of the origin of the Yeniseian and Orkhon scripts belongs to the Finnish scholar Donner, who found the greatest similarities between



these scripts and the script of the Arsacid coins (the Arsacid dynasty, as is known, ruled in Iran from the 3rd century BC to the 3rd century AD). Since then, expeditions working in Chinese Turkestan and in the border areas of China proper have found documents in the Eastern Iranian language, which is usually called Sogdian (Sogd is the name of the area along the Zeravshan River, where the cities of Samarkand and Bukhara are located); these documents date back to the 1st century AD. The late Iranologist Gotyō, who was most concerned with the monuments of the Sogdian language, considered it possible to derive the Yeniseian-Orkhon alphabet from the Sogdian, but he argued that the Yeniseian-Orkhon letters must go back to a more ancient form of the Sogdian alphabet than that preserved in the most ancient Sogdian documents, i.e., in the documents of the 1st century; meanwhile, the Turkish inscriptions discovered so far date back to the epoch no earlier than the 7th century. It is therefore unlikely that it will be possible to scientifically establish the origin of the most ancient Turkish alphabet and the process of its gradual modification until some Turkish inscriptions are found that would stand closer in time to their Sogdian model.

The Turks, apparently, not only borrowed the ready-made alphabet, but added to it some new signs, for example, the sign for the sound ok or yk, representing the image of an arrow (in Turkish ok). Moreover, the alphabet was adapted by the Turks to the phonetic peculiarities of their language, especially to the law of sound harmony; as a result, the oldest of the Turkish alphabets must at the same time be recognized as the most perfect of the alphabets ever used by the Turks. It can be assumed that this alphabet was used for writing much besides inscriptions; in the inscriptions composed in the name of the khan by one of the members of the khan's family, the orthography of the old is maintained more strictly than in the inscription belonging to the Turkish statesman Tonyukuk, an associate and minister of three khans. The style and three expressions of the inscriptions force us to believe that the state of culture of the people was not as low as might be expected from the circumstances of nomadic life. The Khan even invites the entire people to read the inscriptions he left behind, in order to remember both his successes and the failures caused by his crimes against his khans; one can hardly think that literacy was so widespread, but still these words testify to a broader understanding of the tasks of the ruler than one might think from the words of Chavannes, that the Khan expressed in the inscriptions only his “dream of brutal glory”. It is said how in the days of misfortune the blood of the Turkish people flowed like a river, but nothing is said about the shedding of foreign blood in the days of victory, there is no mention of the



number of those killed, nor of any brutal cruelties, as, for example, in the inscriptions of the Assyrian kings [8]. To understand the psychology of the people, it would be important to know their religious beliefs. The inscriptions say almost nothing about this. They speak of the cult of heaven and earth, and sometimes the expressions “Turkish heaven” and “Turkish earth and water” are used. The same word tanri means heaven in the material sense and heaven as a deity. From those places where earth and water (japsub) are spoken of, it can also be concluded that earth and water are meant as a single deity, and not as a collection of earth spirits. Of the individual deities, only Umai, the patron spirit of infants, is mentioned, with whom the khan compares his mother. The veneration of Umai has been preserved in modern times by the last Turkish shamanists in the Altai [9]. It is certain that the Turks were shamanists, although the Turkish word for shaman, kam, is nowhere to be found. In the Yeniseian inscriptions, the word bai occurs next to the word tanri, apparently in the sense of a spirit revered by shamanists; this word is not found in the Orkhon inscriptions. There is no trace of the spread of cultural religions about which we have some information in Chinese sources; According to the Chinese, the khan even wanted to build a Buddhist temple, but his adviser Tonyukuk dissuaded him and said that the teachings of Buddha could have a detrimental effect on the military qualities of the Turks. We know even less about religious propaganda from the West. The spread of the Iranian alphabet, like the spread of the Phoenician alphabet in ancient times, was initially caused only by trade relations and was not connected with religious propaganda. The national religion of Iran, Zoroastrianism, was not connected with international missionary work. After the campaign of Alexander the Great, the eastern Iranian regions were cut off from the West for a long time and submitted to the influence of Sogdian culture and Buddhism. Buddhist missionaries sometimes used Indian alphabets among the Iranians and Turks; Thanks to European archaeological expeditions to Turkestan, we have Turkish Buddhist texts written in Indian letters, but the Sogdian national alphabet was soon adopted by the Buddhists, which later found use, as we shall see, among the Turks. Representatives of two Western religions, Manichaeism and Christianity, which spread to Central Asia beginning, probably, in the 3rd century A.D., also brought their alphabets with them. Manichaeism arose after Christianity and represents an attempt to combine Zoroastrian ideas with Christian and Buddhist ones, but the propaganda of Manichaeism in Central Asia began, apparently, earlier than the propaganda of Christianity. At this time, a connection was already beginning to be established between religion and alphabet; the Manichaeans had their own alphabet, the



Christians had their own, known as the "Syrian", and subsequently each of the Eastern Christian confessions had its own variety of the common Syrian alphabet. The Iranians and Turks who converted to Manichaeism and Christianity used Manichaean and Syriac letters for a long time, but at the same time there are Manichaean and Christian texts written in the national Sogdian alphabet; sometimes we have the text of the same Manichaean Turkish work in two copies, one of which is written in Manichaean letters, the other in national Sogdian letters [10].

Shortly after the disappearance of the Oghuz Turk state, Manichaeism, as we shall see in the next lecture, became widespread among the Turks; but for the period of the Khans' rule in the 6th-8th centuries, we still have no information on the extent to which the successes of Sogdian trade in the steppes were accompanied by the successes of religious propaganda. Naturally, the main field of activity of Sogdian merchants and missionaries was the trade route to China; along this route, right up to Lob-Nor, Sogdian colonies arose; thanks to Pelliot, we know that a Sogdian colony was founded on Lob-Nor in the 7th century and enjoyed a certain autonomy a hundred years later. But at the same time, merchants could profitably sell their goods in the Turkish steppes, especially in the Khan's Horde, where Sogdian settlements also arose. Thanks to the story of the Buddhist pilgrim Xuan Zang, who passed through Central Asia around 630, we know that such cities already existed at that time in the land of the Western Turks up to the banks of the Chu. Xuan Zai does not yet say anything about the cities along the southern shore of Issyk-Kul, where he also passed, but these cities are already mentioned in the history of the Chinese Tang Dynasty. Information about Central Asia in this history is interrupted in the first years of the 9th century [10].

Results.

Shamanistic beliefs were especially evident in the funeral rites of the Turks. We knew from Chinese sources that the Turks erected statues of the enemies they had killed near the graves of their warriors; the Orkhon inscriptions fully confirmed this information and gave us the term for such statues, balbals; this word is believed to be of Chinese origin. The inscriptions do not say whether the erection of the balbals was connected with the performance of any rites; but we know from Byzantine sources that captured enemy leaders were sometimes killed near the graves of Turkish khans. This custom is undoubtedly based on a belief that we also encounter among other shamanists: that the slain will serve in the next world those by whom or for whose sake they were killed. This belief most clearly expresses the difference between primitive paganism and cultural religions. Religion at the stage of



development to which shamanism corresponds is not yet connected with an ethical idea; belief in the future life does not imply belief in the afterlife and afterlife responsibility; not only does a person not fear afterlife punishment for destroying someone else's life, but he believes that the more people he kills, the better his lot in the future life [11]. The inscriptions and monuments discovered with them also confirmed the written reports in some other respects and refuted the objections raised against them. It turned out that the balbals of the 8th century Turks fully correspond in appearance to those statues that were found over a large area, starting from the southern Russian steppes, and which the Russian people call "stone women". In addition to the Chinese report about the erection of statues by the Turks, the story of the Catholic missionary of the mid-13th century Rubruck was also known, that such statues, facing east, were also erected in his time by the Turkish inhabitants of the southern Russian steppes, the Comans (the Polovtsians of the Russian chronicles). Despite such a coincidence of Chinese information with independent European information, Radlov expressed the opinion that both the Chinese and Rubruck were mistaken and that the statues were actually erected, for example, in Russia many centuries before the Turkish invasion. The possibility of such an opinion is explained by the fact that the key to reading the Yeniseian inscriptions had not yet been discovered; on many Yeniseian balbals, as well as on some Orkhon ones, inscriptions have been preserved which, after the discovery of the key to them, can now be read in Turkish, and there can no longer be any doubt about the Turkish origin of the so-called "stone women" [11].

Discussion.

Radlov also raised objections to some other Chinese reports about the Turks. In Radlov's opinion, the report that the Turks were blacksmiths in the mountains before their rise could not correspond to reality; it seemed to him that nomadic life and metal production were incompatible facts. In this regard, the Orkhon inscriptions say nothing either for or against the Chinese report, but, as is well known, Turkish and Mongolian legends speak in favor of the connection of nomadic life with the manufacture of iron weapons. Radlov also sees a contradiction between written reports and material monuments in the fact that the Chinese speak of the existence of the custom of cremation among the Turks, meanwhile, no traces of such a custom were found in the graves excavated by Radlov. From the inscriptions it is only clear that, according to Turkish folk beliefs, the soul turned into a bird or an insect; the dead are said to fly away (uchdu); It is known that in the West, long after the adoption of Islam, the Turks used the expression "became a falcon" (shunkar boldy) in the



sense of “died”. Apparently, no importance was attached to the preservation of the body. There is information that when, during the wars between the Turks and the Arabs, the corpse of a Turkish leader was left in the hands of the Arabs, this was considered an even greater disaster than the death of the leader himself; but perhaps what was important here was not religious ideas, but a feeling of shame, just as the capture of women by enemies was considered shameful [11]. More information about the burial of the dead among the Orkhon Turks than inscriptions could be provided by excavations near the places of the khan’s burial; such excavations were carried out both by Radlov and his co-workers and after them, most recently in 1925 by Professor Vladimirtsov, but to date the excavations have not led to the discovery of graves; It is very likely that, as with many other peoples, several pits were dug during burial and efforts were made to conceal which pit contained the khan’s body or ashes, so that enemies could not desecrate the grave. The most interesting result of Professor Vladimirtsov’s excavations was the discovery in the ground of a statue of a Turkish warrior, perfectly preserved and representing all the features of the Turkish racial type. Statues had been found on the surface of the earth before, but always without heads; the heads were deliberately broken off by the Mongols, who believed that otherwise these images of people of the past could cause harm to people living now; this example shows that the heads of ancient statues are destroyed even where there was no Muslim religious fanaticism, which is usually used to explain such facts. Further excavations will probably reveal new material; Until then there is hardly any reason to reject the Chinese report of the cremation of corpses, especially since after Radlov there were cases of graves being found in the steppe with traces of cremation. The Chinese had the opportunity many times to see Turkish burials at close range; some khans who fled from their enemies to China and died there were buried there in front of the population according to the customs of their people, so that the possibility of error is almost excluded [11].

Conclusions.

In this article I have tried to present the main results of the study of inscriptions and other monuments left by the first people in time who called themselves Turks. It remains to consider how much these results can contribute to clarifying the question of which of the peoples who lived earlier were in close or more distant kinship with these Turks and how much the facts of the life of the Turkish state in the 6th-8th centuries can contribute to clarifying the future fate of the Turkish people. The following articles will be devoted to these questions.

**References:**

1. Ахмедов Б. Ўзбекистон халқлари тарихи манбаалари. Тошкент. “Ўқитувчи” 1991й.
2. **Иванов П.П.** Архив Хивинских ханов, XIX века (Исследование и описание документов с историческим введением). Новые источники по истории Средней Азии, «Записки института Востоковедения АН СССР», т. VII. М.,-Л., 1940, с. 5-26;
3. **М.Ю. Юлдашев и А.К. Боровков** (ими в ЛОИВАН СССР был обнаружен 9 дафтаров этого архива),
4. **Ю.Э. Брегел.** Документы архива Хивинских ханов по истории и этнографии каракалпаков (Подбор документов, введение, перевод, примечания и указатели), М., 1967; М.
5. **Й. Йулдошев.** Хива Давлат хужжатлари, I II жилдлар. Т.: 1960;
6. **А. Шайхова.** Юридические документы, как источник по истории социально-экономических отношений в Хивинском ханстве в XIX - нач. XX веках, АКД, Ташкент
7. Троицкая Л. А. Каталог архива Кокандских ханов XIX века. Москва, 1968.
8. Набиев Р. Н. Из истории Кокандского ханства (Феодальное хозяйство Худаярхана). Ташкент, 1973.
9. Розен В. Р. О мешхедской рукописи, Иран 1924, 237-248
10. Farmer H. G. A History of arabian Musik to the XIII-th centure. London, 1929
11. Стори Ч. А. Персидская литература. **1-кисм**, 99-бет
12. Askarhodjayev Yaminkhon DIFFERENCES OF IDEAS UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF SOCIO-POLITICAL PROCESSES IN SOCIETY. *Web of Teachers: Inderscience Research*, Volume 2, Issue 11, 2 (11), 197–202. 2024
13. АСКАРХОДЖАЕВ Я. М. РАЗЛИЧИЯ ИДЕЙ ПОД ВЛИЯНИЕМ СОЦИАЛЬНО-ПОЛИТИЧЕСКИХ ПРОЦЕССОВ В ОБЩЕСТВЕ. *Web of Teachers: Inderscience Research*, 2 (11), 197–202. 2024
14. МУХАММЕДОВ Я. М. ЭТНОКОНФЕССИОНАЛЬНЫЙ ВЗГЛЯД НА СОВРЕМЕННЫЙ МИР. *GOLDEN BRAIN*. 1(29), 93–100, 2023
15. МУХАММЕДОВ Я. М. ОБ ИДЕЙНО-ТЕОРЕТИЧЕСКОЙ ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТИ ДЖАДИДОВ. *Educational Research in Universal Sciences* 3 (2), 150-164, 2024
16. МУХАММЕДОВ Я. М. ВОСПОМИНАНИЯ ПОСЛОВ В ИСТОРИЧЕСКИХ ИСТОЧНИКАХ. *International Journal of Education, Social Science & Humanities*. Volume-12| Issue-2, 26-34, 2024



17. JO'RAYEV B. N. Peculiarities of civil society in modern life: role, components, function. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Education, Technology and Management*. Vol.2, Issue 5, 647-651, **2023**
18. JO'RAYEV B. N. RAQAMLASHGAN JAMIYATNING IJOBIY VA SALBIY JIHLATLARINING IJTIMOIIY MUNOSABATLARGA TA'SIRI. *INNOVATIONS IN TECHNOLOGY AND SCIENCE EDUCATION*. VOLUME 3 ISSUE 22, 424-428, 2024
19. Xamroxonova Sokinaxon J. XALQARO MUNOSABATLARNI BILDIRUVCHI TERMINLARNING STRUKTURAVIIY VA SEMANTIK TAHLILI. *Евразийский журнал академических исследований*, 2(3), 355–358. 2022
20. Xamroxonova S. J. "O'zbek tilidagi iboralar tizimini o'rganishning nazariy muammolari." *Science and Education* 3.10: 659-663. (2022)
21. Xamroxonova Sokinaxon. INGLIZ, O'ZBEK VA RUS TILLARIDA "MEHMONDO'STLIK" TUSHUNCHASINI IFODALOVCHI MAQOLLARNING LINGVOMADANIY XUSUSIYATLARI. *Yosh Tadqiqotchi Jurnali*, 2(5), 42–45. 2023
22. Kasimowa M.N. Die Frage der Konjunktion "mit" in der usbekischen Linguistik. *Pedagog respublika ilmiy jurnali*. 5-Dekabr, 2023
23. Mirzakarimova Z. D., Qosimova M. N. O 'ZGA TILLI GURUHLARDA TALABALAR OG 'ZAKI VA YOZMA NUTQINI O 'STIRISH METODIKASI" GA DOIR ZAMONAVIIY YONDASHUVLAR VA INTERFAOL TA'LIM METODLARI // *Gospodarka i Innowacje*. – 2023. – T. 35. – С. 11-16.
24. Z.D. Mirzakarimova, & N.I. Abriyeva. (2022). KESIM-GAPNING UYUSHTIRUVCHI, TARKIB TOPTIRUVCHI BO'LAGI. *FAN, TA'LIM, MADANIYAT VA INNOVATSIYA JURNALI | JOURNAL OF SCIENCE, EDUCATION, CULTURE AND INNOVATION*, 1(2), 49–50.
25. Z.D. Mirzakarimova. (2022). O'ZBEK TILINI MATN TAHLILI ASOSIDA O'QITISH. *FAN, TA'LIM, MADANIYAT VA INNOVATSIYA JURNALI | JOURNAL OF SCIENCE, EDUCATION, CULTURE AND INNOVATION*, 1(3), 32–36.