THE EVOLUTION OF LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT AND CHANGE IN LIVING LANGUAGES

Fayzullaeva Nigina Sur'at qizi

Asia International University, English chair.

Abstract. Language is not static but continuously evolving. This article examines the evolution of language as a characteristic process of all living languages, integrating theoretical and empirical perspectives. We begin with key linguistic theories – Noam Chomsky's generative grammar, Ferdinand de Saussure's structuralism, and William Labov's sociolinguistics – outlining how each framework accounts for language structure and change. We then compare the historical evolution of English and Uzbek, providing insights from Old English through Modern English, and from Chagatai Turkic to contemporary Uzbek. Special attention is given to the evolution of spoken language in contrast to written language, highlighting how pronunciation and usage shift more rapidly in speech while written forms often preserve older conventions. We incorporate corpus-based evidence of phonological, grammatical, and lexical changes over time in both English and Uzbek, illustrating these changes with concrete examples (such as sound shifts, morphological simplification, and vocabulary expansion). The analysis underscores that all living languages undergo constant change, shaped by social, cognitive, and historical forces. By understanding these processes – through theory, historical comparison, and corpus data – we gain insight into why languages today are both connected to and different from their past forms.

Keywords: language change; historical linguistics; generative grammar; structuralism; sociolinguistics; English language history; Uzbek language history; spoken vs written language; corpus linguistics.

Introduction. All living languages undergo change – a fundamental fact of linguistics. As the noted linguist David Crystal observes, *"All living languages change. They have to. Languages have no existence apart from the people who use them. And because people are changing all the time, their language changes too, to keep up with them. The only languages that don't change are dead ones."[1]*. Indeed, the development and transformation of language is a continuous process inherent to linguistic life. New words emerge to name inventions or social trends, old grammatical forms fade, pronunciations shift, and meanings drift over generations. This dynamic evolution is observable in every natural language, whether global lingua francas like English or regional languages like Uzbek. In this article, we explore the mechanisms and patterns of language evolution from multiple angles.

First, we outline a theoretical framework through three influential linguistic perspectives. Generative grammar, pioneered by Noam Chomsky, emphasizes the innate, rule-governed structures underlying all human languages. Structuralism, introduced by Ferdinand de Saussure, focuses on language as a system of interrelated elements at a given time, distinguishing between synchronic (current structure) and diachronic (historical) analysis. Sociolinguistics, largely shaped by William Labov, examines language variation and change in social contexts, showing how usage evolves within communities. Each of these theories offers tools for understanding why and how languages change.

---

[1] Crystal, David (2011). *A Little Book of Language.* Excerpt in Visual Thesaurus: *David Crystal on Language Change.*

Next, we compare historical linguistic changes in English and Uzbek. English, a Germanic language, has undergone dramatic transformations from Old English (Anglo-Saxon, c. 5th–11th centuries) through Middle English and into Modern English. We illustrate these changes with examples from Old English texts and discuss major shifts such as the loss of inflectional endings and the Great Vowel Shift. Uzbek, a Turkic language, likewise has a rich history: it evolved from earlier Turkic tongues (with Chagatai Turkic in the 15th century as a prominent literary predecessor) to the modern Uzbek spoken today[2]. We highlight how Uzbek's development was influenced by contact with Persian, Arabic, and Russian, and by deliberate language policies (for example, script reforms in the 20th century).

We then delve into the evolution of spoken vs. written language, analyzing how spoken language often changes more rapidly and unconsciously, while written language can be conservative or subject to standardization. Spoken vernaculars undergo sound changes and grammatical simplifications that may take years or decades to be reflected (if ever) in writing.

Conversely, writing systems and orthographic conventions can preserve archaic features (such as silent letters in English) or be subject to reform for political and cultural reasons (as seen in Uzbek's script changes).

Throughout the discussion, we incorporate corpus-based evidence to ground our analysis in real linguistic data. By examining historical corpora – large collections of texts spanning different time periods – linguists can quantitatively trace phonological shifts, grammatical developments, and lexical trends. For instance, a recent diachronic corpus study (Satibaldieva 2025) compared 19th- and 20th-century English and Uzbek literary prose, revealing parallel trends like technological vocabulary expansion and the decline of archaic words, as well as differences due to each language's unique historical context[3].

In sum, the evolution of language is a multifaceted process. In the sections that follow, we integrate theory, historical comparison, and empirical data to paint a comprehensive picture of how and why languages change over time. Understanding this process in English and Uzbek will illustrate the broader principle that linguistic change is inherent to all living languages.

Theoretical Framework. Generative Grammar (Noam Chomsky)

Noam Chomsky's theory of generative grammar revolutionized linguistics in the mid-20th century by treating language as a rule-governed, innate system[4]. In this view, each human language is underpinned by a set of implicit grammatical rules and principles that allow speakers to generate an infinite number of sentences. Chomsky defined a generative grammar as "a system of rules that in some explicit and well-defined way assigns structural descriptions to sentences". Crucially, generative grammar assumes an inborn Universal Grammar – a genetic endowment common to all humans – which provides a template for language development in children. Under this framework, the astonishing speed and uniformity with which children acquire language is explained by an innate cognitive blueprint for language structure.

How does generative theory account for language evolution and change? Unlike historical linguistics, Chomsky's focus was on the synchronic competence of speakers (the

---

[2] Western European Journal of Linguistics and Education (2023). "Historical Development of the Uzbek Language". (Uzbek language phases, Navoi's role).

[3] Satibaldieva, N. (2025). "A Corpus Driven Comparison of English and Uzbek Literary Prose (19th–20th c.)." *Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy* 1(1). (Lexical change patterns from corpus analysis).

[4] Pressbooks Open Text – *Generative Grammar* overview. (Explains Chomsky's contributions to rule-governed grammar and Universal Grammar).

internalized grammar) rather than diachronic change. In fact, early generative linguists often bracketed off historical change to concentrate on the universal properties of language. However, one can interpret language change within a generative paradigm as changes in the underlying parameters or rules across generations. As children acquire language, they may interpret the input slightly differently than their parents did, especially if the input is variable or changing. Small shifts in parameter settings or rule applications can accumulate over time, leading to grammatical change. For example, a generativist might frame the loss of verb-second word order from Old to Modern English or the shift in a morphological rule as a re-setting of grammatical parameters by new generations of speakers. Generative grammar's emphasis on the creativity of language ("generating" new sentences) also implies that language is open to innovation – new structures or word forms can be generated and, if they spread in a speech community, can become part of the grammar.

In summary, Chomsky's contribution lies in viewing language as a structured, innate capacity. While generative grammar itself does not primarily study historical change, it provides insight into the cognitive constraints and possibilities that underlie any linguistic evolution. All languages are seen as variations on a universal theme, and change is the result of the same generative capacity operating on new inputs. This perspective complements historical approaches by explaining the deep commonalities across languages even as their superficial forms change over time.

Structuralism (Ferdinand de Saussure). Ferdinand de Saussure, often called the "father of modern linguistics," introduced a structuralist approach that fundamentally shaped how linguists understand language change. Saussure emphasized that language is a structured system of signs, wherein each element (word, sound) has value only in relation to others. One of his key insights was the distinction between synchronic and diachronic linguistics. A *synchronic* study examines a language at a given moment in time, treating it as a complete system (la *langue* as Saussure termed it) with interdependent parts. A *diachronic* study, on the other hand, looks at how language evolves through history, i.e., the changes in sounds, forms, and meanings over time[5].

Saussure acknowledged that any living language must change over time, but he argued for the analytical separation of describing a language's structure at one point versus describing its historical transformations. According to Saussure, *"language… as a social product… is acquired by heritage. Therefore, correlations to the past are stronger than innovation. Nevertheless, this does not impede new displacements."*. In other words, each generation inherits a linguistic system that largely persists from the past, yet incremental innovations continually occur. Because language exists in the minds of a community of speakers, it has a kind of inertia – a stability due to convention and social transmission – even while it is never truly static. Changes (or "displacements") enter the system gradually: a sound may be pronounced slightly differently by some speakers, a grammatical construction may be used in a novel way, or a new word may be coined or borrowed. Over time, these changes can generalize and become part of the language's synchronic state.

Structuralism also introduced the idea that linguistic signs are **arbitrary** and defined by relationships. This means when changes happen, they often occur in *sets* or *patterns* because altering one element can have ripple effects on the structural oppositions in the language.

---

[5]Saussure, Ferdinand de (1916). *Course in General Linguistics*. (Synchronic vs. diachronic perspective summarized in).

For example, if a language has a set of verb endings that mark tenses, and one ending erodes or disappears over time, the whole tense marking system may reorganize (perhaps another element takes over the function, or aspect markers gain importance, etc.). Saussure's focus was not on enumerating specific sound changes or etymologies (as 19th-century historical linguists did), but on understanding the *systemic consequences* of change. He famously used the analogy of language as a game of chess: the configuration of pieces (the structure) matters more than the individual history of each piece, yet the current configuration is reached through a series of moves (changes).

In sum, Saussure's structuralism contributes two major ideas to language evolution: (1) Language change is a constant but gradual process affecting a system that is socially transmitted; (2) To fully understand a change, one must see how it reconfigures the structural system of contrasts at a given time. This structural perspective laid groundwork for later linguists to investigate patterns of change (such as shifts in phonological systems or reanalysis of grammatical structures) in a systematic way. It reminds us that every historical change integrates into an existing linguistic structure and that studying those structures synchronically is crucial to explaining why certain changes unfold as they do.

Sociolinguistic Perspectives (William Labov). While generative grammar and structuralism focus on internal structures of language, **sociolinguistics** brings the spotlight to language *use* in social context and how variation across speakers drives change. William Labov, a pioneering figure in variationist sociolinguistics, argued that to understand language change, one must observe language in its social milieu[6]. Labov's famous studies in the 1960s (such as on Martha's Vineyard and in New York City) demonstrated that linguistic change is often rooted in social identity, group differentiation, and contact between dialects.

One of Labov's key contributions is the idea that language variation at any given time can signal ongoing change. By examining how people of different ages, social classes, or communities speak, we can often catch a language change in progress. For example, Labov's MA thesis research on Martha's Vineyard (an island off the coast of Massachusetts) revealed that a subtle shift in vowel pronunciation was underway in the mid-20th century. He noticed that certain Vineyarders, especially young adults in up-island fishing communities, were beginning to pronounce the diphthong in words like *"sound"* and *"bout"* with a more centralized vowel (sounding like *"seund"* or *"beut"*) – a pronunciation reminiscent of an older, perhaps more conservative accent. Paradoxically, this change went against the broader historical trend (it was a reversal to an older sound). Why was this happening? Labov discovered that those leading the change were people with strong local identity: they were often fishermen or others tied to traditional island life, and they positively valued their community's distinctiveness. By adopting an "archaic" vowel sound more heavily than their parents' generation, these speakers were symbolically resisting the influx of mainland tourists and asserting a unique island identity. This case illustrates how social factors (identity, attitude, in-group vs out-group dynamics) can cause certain linguistic features to persist or even intensify in a community, thus driving language evolution in a particular direction.

Labov's work in New York City English further showed how socioeconomic stratification correlates with language variation and change. In his study *The Social Stratification of English in New York City* (1966), Labov examined the pronunciation of the post-vocalic /r/ (as in *"car"*,

---

[6] Labov, William (1963). "The Social Motivation of a Sound Change." *Word* 19(3). (Martha's Vineyard study referenced in MVTimes article).

"fourth floor") across different social classes and stylistic contexts. He found a clear pattern: higher socioeconomic status and more formal speech styles favored pronouncing /r/ (a prestige form), whereas working-class and casual speech often dropped /r/ (a historically older NYC dialect feature). Moreover, younger speakers were adopting the prestige /r/-pronouncing habit more than older working-class speakers, indicating that change was in progress towards the r-ful pronunciation in New York City English. This change was influenced by social prestige and attitudes (rhotic pronunciation was associated with standard American English and upward mobility). Such findings underscored Labov's principle that *language change is socially conditioned* – it does not happen in a vacuum, but through the choices speakers make (often subconsciously) in response to social pressures and values.

Another important insight from sociolinguistics is about attitudes towards change. Labov formulated the "Golden Age Principle," noting that people often perceive their language as having been at a peak of perfection in the past, and thus they view contemporary changes negatively. As he put it, *"No one has ever been heard to say, 'It's wonderful the way young people talk today. It's so much better than the way we talked when I was a kid.' ... The most general and deeply held belief about language is that at some time in the past, language was in a state of perfection… and every change represents a falling away from that golden age."*. This observation explains why language evolution often encounters resistance or stigma – for instance, older generations might criticize new slang or pronunciation of younger people, even though those very changes are natural. Despite such social resistance, changes can and do spread if the social conditions favor them (e.g., the younger generation eventually becoming the majority or the new form indexing a desirable identity).

In sum, Labov's sociolinguistic perspective provides a mechanism for language change: variation within a speech community, often correlating with social groups and identities, is the seedbed of change. It complements the structural view by showing *why* a particular change might occur (social motivation) and the generative view by emphasizing that actual usage (performance) can feed back into the linguistic system. Sociolinguistics teaches us that to truly understand language evolution, we must pay attention to who is using what language forms, in what contexts, and with what social meaning – for those are the channels through which innovation becomes the new linguistic norm.

Historical Linguistic Changes in English and Uzbek. Historical Changes in English. The English language has experienced profound changes over the past 1,500 years, evolving through distinct historical stages. Old English (c. 5th–11th centuries CE), also known as Anglo-Saxon, was the language of Beowulf and King Alfred – a Germanic tongue brought to Britain by Anglo-Saxon settlers. Old English differs drastically from Modern English in grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation. It was a highly inflected language: nouns had four cases (nominative, genitive, dative, accusative) and two numbers, and they were also classified by grammatical gender (masculine, feminine, neuter)[7]. For example, the word for "stone" in Old English was *stān* (masculine noun); it would appear as *stān* (nom. singular), *stānes* (genitive, "of the stone"), *stāne* (dative, "to/for the stone"), *stān* (accusative), and had a plural *stānas*. Adjectives and demonstratives (like "the/that") were inflected to agree with these case and gender distinctions. Verbs were conjugated for person, number, tense, and mood, with many irregular (strong) verbs forming past tenses by vowel changes (e.g., *singan* "to sing" – *sang* (past) – *sungen* (past

---

[7] Payne, Julia (2011). "50 years of language study began on Martha's Vineyard." *Martha's Vineyard Times*. (Summary of Labov's Martha's Vineyard findings).

participle)). A line from an Old English text illustrates how foreign it looks to modern eyes: for instance, the opening of *Beowulf* – *"Hwæt! wē Gār-Dena in geār-dagum…"* – is almost unrecognizable as English, requiring translation (*"Lo! We spear-Danes in days of yore…"*).

By the Middle English period (c. 12th–15th centuries), following the Norman Conquest of 1066, English underwent dramatic grammatical simplification and heavy lexical borrowing. Many Old English inflectional endings weakened or disappeared, especially as unstressed vowels in final syllables all merged into a neutral *-e* (schwa) sound. This phonological erosion led to the weakening of inflections and consequently the loss of grammatical gender and case marking on nouns. By late Middle English, nouns no longer had distinct case endings (except a genitive *-'s* and some remnants in pronouns), and grammatical gender was gone – *the* replaced Old English gendered articles (*sē, sēo, þæt*) for all nouns. Word order became more rigid (since case no longer signaled subject vs object clearly). Middle English speakers also borrowed thousands of French words (due to Norman French nobility ruling England) – words related to law, art, religion, and everyday life (e.g., *court, justice, painting, prayer, beef, pork*) enriched the vocabulary. A Middle English example, from Chaucer (14th century), shows considerable change but some familiarity: *"Whan that Aprille with his shoures soote / The droghte of March hath perced to the roote…"* – while largely comprehensible with effort, it still contains archaic forms (*whan* for "when", *soote* "sweet", etc.) and a French-influenced lexicon.

In conclusion, corpus evidence corroborates that phonological, grammatical, and lexical changes in English and Uzbek are not just anecdotal but measurable. The data reveal parallel trends (all languages modernize their lexicon and simplify some structures over time) and unique paths (each language's specific history leaves a signature on its evolution, whether it's English's historical layering of vocabulary or Uzbek's mix of Turkic structure with Persian and Russian overlays). By examining corpora, linguists can observe the living process of language change in action, reinforcing the notion that evolution is an inherent property of all living languages, continuously unfolding in usage.

Conclusion. Language evolution is a universal phenomenon – any language that is used actively by a community will undergo change. We have seen through theoretical, historical, and empirical lenses how this process unfolds. Theoretical frameworks provide insight into different facets of change: Chomsky's generative grammar highlights the cognitive capacity for language that sets the stage for how children may internalize slightly different grammars than their parents, Saussure's structuralism reminds us that changes affect and are constrained by the existing linguistic system, and Labov's sociolinguistics demonstrates that social dynamics and variation are the immediate fuel of changes in progress. Together, these perspectives show that language change is at once a mental, structural, and social process.

The historical comparison of English and Uzbek put these abstract ideas into concrete context. English illustrated a dramatic trajectory from a highly inflected early medieval language to a largely analytic global language today, accumulating layers of external influence (Norse, French, Latin, etc.) and undergoing internal simplifications and sound shifts. Uzbek's journey, while less familiar to many, is equally rich – from ancient Turkic roots through a Persianate literary zenith in the Chagatai era, to adaptations under Russian/Soviet rule, and into a modern national language asserting its identity. Both languages exemplify the axiom that *"the only languages that don't change are dead ones"*[8].

---

[8] Crystal, David (2011). *A Little Book of Language.* Excerpt in Visual Thesaurus: *David Crystal on Language Change*

Changes in English and Uzbek were driven by a mix of internal linguistic pressures (e.g., ease of articulation leading to sound changes, analogy leveling irregular forms) and external influences (conquests, trade, migration, cultural prestige, political decisions). Even as the specifics differ – English never had to change its script, for instance, whereas Uzbek did multiple times – the underlying principle is the same: living languages respond to the needs, contacts, and creativity of their speakers.

Our exploration of spoken vs. written language evolution highlighted an important caveat: when we talk about "language change," we often implicitly mean the spoken vernacular, as that is where change originates. Written language can both reflect and obscure these changes. English's conservative orthography and Uzbek's shifting alphabets show that the written form may freeze or divert the course of linguistic evolution in interesting ways, but ultimately, if spoken usage changes enough, the written standard either adjusts (slowly, as in spelling reforms or new accepted grammar rules) or risks growing distant from actual speech. The tension between the inertia of writing and the flux of speech is itself a catalyst for conscious language reforms and standardization efforts.

Finally, corpus-based evidence anchored our discussion in observable data. It confirms that language change is not just a theoretical claim but an empirically measurable reality – frequencies shift, new words enter, old forms fade, and sentence structures transform over time. By analyzing corpora, linguists can trace, for example, how an Old English paradigm gave way to a new construction, or how Uzbek vocabulary changed under Soviet influence and then again after independence. Such evidence complements traditional historical linguistics (which might rely on comparing old texts and modern forms) with quantitative rigor and the ability to detect subtler trends.

In conclusion, the evolution of language – be it English, Uzbek, or any other – should be understood as a natural, continuous, and inexorable process. Languages change because they are in the hands of people, and societies and cultures themselves are never static. This is not to say change is random; it is patterned and constrained by grammatical structure, shaped by cognitive tendencies, and directed by social factors. The development and change of language is often likened to biological evolution: there is inheritance (tradition, teaching of the young), variation (different usage, new inventions), and selection (some innovations catch on because they are useful or prestigious). Over generations, these incremental changes accumulate, so that what was once *stan* in Old English is now *stone* in Modern English, or what was once a Chagatai phrase in Arabic script is now a Uzbek sentence in Latin script – intelligibly related and yet distinctly evolved.

Understanding language evolution has practical implications as well: it fosters appreciation for linguistic diversity and the historical depth of modern languages, it dispels the notion of language "decay" (realizing that change is neither good nor bad, just inevitable), and it aids efforts in language education and preservation (for instance, knowing how a language changed can help in teaching its grammar or revitalizing an endangered tongue). It also allows us to better handle contemporary language change (such as new internet-born vocabulary or grammatical constructions) with a rational perspective, recognizing these as the latest chapter in an age-old story of linguistic transformation.

Ultimately, the study of language change underscores a profound truth: language lives as long as its speakers do, and in that life lies growth and change.

By examining theories, comparing histories like that of English and Uzbek, and analyzing real language data, we see this truth in action. Every word we speak today carries echoes of the past and hints of the future – a continuum of human expression, ever-changing and ever vital.

References

1. Crystal, David (2011). *A Little Book of Language*. Excerpt in Visual Thesaurus: *David Crystal on Language Change*.
2. Saussure, Ferdinand de (1916). *Course in General Linguistics*. (Synchronic vs. diachronic perspective summarized in).
3. Chomsky, Noam (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. (Definition of generative grammar in Ch.1).
4. Pressbooks Open Text – *Generative Grammar* overview. (Explains Chomsky's contributions to rule-governed grammar and Universal Grammar).
5. Labov, William (1963). "The Social Motivation of a Sound Change." *Word* 19(3). (Martha's Vineyard study referenced in MVTimes article).
6. Payne, Julia (2011). "50 years of language study began on Martha's Vineyard." *Martha's Vineyard Times*. (Summary of Labov's Martha's Vineyard findings).
7. Britannica – *English language: Historical background*. (Old English inflection and loss of gender).
8. Wikipedia – *Uzbek language*. (Influence of Persian on Uzbek phonology, loss of vowel harmony).
9. Satibaldieva, N. (2025). "A Corpus Driven Comparison of English and Uzbek Literary Prose (19th–20th c.)." *Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy* 1(1). (Lexical change patterns from corpus analysis).
10. Western European Journal of Linguistics and Education (2023). "Historical Development of the Uzbek Language". (Uzbek language phases, Navoi's role).
11. Langdale Primary School (n.d.). "Unstressed consonants (silent letters)". (Note on spoken language changing faster than written, with examples of silent letters).
12. Labov, William (2001). *Principles of Linguistic Change, Vol. 2: Social Factors*. (Contains the "Golden Age Principle" quote on attitudes to language change).
13. Fayzullaeva, N. (2025). GRAMMATICAL ECONOMY AS EXPRESSING ECONOMY IN THE SYNTACTIC AND MORPHOLOGICAL STRUCTURE OF A LANGUAGE. Modern Science and Research, 4(2), 567–572. Retrieved from https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/science-research/article/view/65917
14. Fayzullayeva, N., & Kamolova, M. (2025). PHONETICS AS THE STUDY OF THE ACTUAL SPEECH SOUNDS THAT CREATE WORDS IN A LANGUAGE. Modern Science and Research, 4(2), 46–52. Retrieved from https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/science-research/article/view/65428
15. Fayzullayeva , N. (2024). Using animation discourse on the cartoon Kung Fu Panda. Medicine, Pedagogy and Technology: Theory and Practice, 2(9), 18–25. Retrieved from https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/mpttp/article/view/59340
16. Surat, F. N. . (2024). DIALOGUE IN THE ANIMATED SERIES "KUNG FU PANDA. JOURNAL OF EDUCATION, ETHICS AND VALUE, 3(4), 202–205. Retrieved from https://jeev.innovascience.uz/index.php/jeev/article/view/624

17. Fayzullayeva, N. (2024). FEEL THE FREEDOM IN THE WORKS OF WALT WHITMAN. MODERN SCIENCE AND RESEARCH, 3(3), 330–335. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10814469

18. Fayzullayeva, N. (2024). WALT WHITMAN WORD ABOUT "A CELEBRATION OF THE HUMAN SPIRIT IN POETRY". MODERN SCIENCE AND RESEARCH, 3(3), 336–341. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10814566

19. Fayzullayeva, N. (2024). WALT WHITMAN AND HIS POEM ABOUT AMERICA. Modern Science and Research, 3(1), 35–39. Retrieved from https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/science-research/article/view/28918

20. Fayzullayeva, N. (2024). "AMERICAN DREAM" IN WALT WITHMAN'S POEMS. Modern Science and Research, 3(1), 220–224. Retrieved from https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/science-research/article/view/27940

21. Fayzullayeva, N. S. qizi . (2023). Theoretical Views on the Use of the Term "Concept" in Cognitive Linguistics. EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF INNOVATION IN NONFORMAL EDUCATION, 3(5), 27–31. Retrieved from https://www.inovatus.es/index.php/ejine/article/view/1685

22. Sur'at qizi Fayzullayeva, N., & Kilicheva, M. R. (2022). UOLT UILTMAN NASRIDA "AMERIKA ORZUSI" KONSEPTI. INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON LEARNING AND TEACHING, 1(8), 574-576.

23. Fayzullayeva, N. (2023). THE IMPROVING OF LISTENING SKILL. Modern Science and Research, 2(10), 272–276. Retrieved from https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/science-research/article/view/25086

24. Fayzullayeva, N. (2023). THE CONCEPT OF THE AMERICAN DREAM AND WALT WHITMAN. Solution of social problems in management and economy, 2(11), 137-142.

25. Fayzullayeva, N. (2023). THE ROLE OF THE AMERICAN DREAM IN UOLT WILTMAN'S POEMS. Modern Science and Research, 2(10), 714–718. Retrieved from https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/science-research/article/view/24676

26. Fayzullayeva, N. (2023). USAGE OF THE FLORA IN THE EARLY MODERN ENGLISH POETRY. Modern Science and Research, 2(9), 36–39. Retrieved from https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/science-research/article/view/24078

27. Fayzullayeva, N. (2023). IMPORTANCE OF ENGLISH MODERN CIVILIZATION. Modern Science and Research, 2(12), 284–287. Retrieved from https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/science-research/article/view/26698

28. Qobilova Nargisa Sulaymonovna, & Fayzullayeva Nigina Sur'at qizi. (2025). Tilshunoslikda Qisqaruvni Vujudga Keltiruvchi Shart-Sharoitlar Va Ularning Linguistik Xususiyati. Miasto Przyszłości, 57, 113–115. Retrieved from https://miastoprzyszlosci.com.pl/index.php/mp/article/view/6069

29. Fayzullayeva, N. . (2025). LINGUISTIC FOUNDATIONS OF THE PRINCIPLE OF ECONOMY THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES AND APPROACHES. Modern Science and Research, 4(4), 657–667. Retrieved from https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/science-research/article/view/79289

30. Fayzullayeva, N. (2025). FUNKSIONAL LINGVISTIKA DOIRASIDA TEJAMKORLIK TAMOYILI. Modern Science and Research, 4(3), 621–626. Retrieved from https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/science-research/article/view/72798

31. Saidova , S., & Fayzullayeva, N. . (2025). THE JOURNEY, ART, AND WISDOM OF SADRIDDIN SALIM BUKHARI. *Modern Science and Research*, *4*(5), 876–882. Retrieved from https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/science-research/article/view/98096

32. Saidova, S., & Fayzullayeva , N. . (2025). THE MESSAGE BEHIND GEORGE ORWELL'S ANIMAL FARM. *Modern Science and Research*, *4*(5), 871–875. Retrieved from https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/science-research/article/view/98095

33. Fayzullayeva, N. (2025). O'ZBEK TILSHUNOSLIGINING ASOSIY YO'NALISHLARI VA SHAKLLANISH BOSQICHLARI. *Modern Science and Research*, *4*(5), 541–544. Retrieved from https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/science-research/article/view/87984

34. Саидова, О. (2025). ГЛАВНЫЕ ЧЛЕНЫ ПРЕДЛОЖЕНИЯ И СПОСОБЫ ИХ ВЫРАЖЕНИЯ КОТОРЫЕ СОСТАВЛЯЮТ ОСНОВУ ЛЮБОГО ПРЕДЛОЖЕНИЯ. *Modern Science and Research*, *4*(2), 553–558. Retrieved from https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/science-research/article/view/65915

35. Саидова Олима, . (2024). КОНЦЕПТ "ЛЮБВИ" В ЛИРИКЕ АЛЕКСАНДР СЕРГЕЕВИЧА ПУШКИНА. *Medicine, Pedagogy and Technology: Theory and Practice*, *2*(9), 59–66. Retrieved from https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/mpttp/article/view/59346

36. Ботировна , С. О. . (2024). Склонение Имён Существительных. *Miasto Przyszłości*, *46*, 531–535. Retrieved from https://miastoprzyszlosci.com.pl/index.php/mp/article/view/2895

37. Саидова Олима Ботировна. (2024). Александр Александрович Блок -Один ИзСамых Известных Поэтов-Лириков "Серебряного Века".*Miasto Przyszłości*,*55*, 696–700. Retrieved from https://miastoprzyszlosci.com.pl/index.php/mp/article/view/5708

38. Саидова Олима Ботировна. (2024). ЗНАЧЕНИЕ ОТЧИЗНА В ТВОРЧЕСТВЕ МИХАИЛ ЮРЬЕВИЧ ЛЕРМОНТОВА.*Miasto Przyszłości*,*49*, 472–475. Retrieved from https://miastoprzyszlosci.com.pl/index.php/mp/article/view/3919

39. Саидова, О. (2025). ГЛАВНЫЕ ЧЛЕНЫ ПРЕДЛОЖЕНИЯ И СПОСОБЫ ИХ ВЫРАЖЕНИЯ КОТОРЫЕ СОСТАВЛЯЮТ ОСНОВУ ЛЮБОГО ПРЕДЛОЖЕНИЯ.*Modern Science and Research*,*4*(2), 553–558. Retrieved from https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/science-research/article/view/65915

40. СаидоваОлима,(2024). КОНЦЕПТ"ЛЮБВИ" ВЛИРИКЕАЛЕКСАНДРСЕРГЕЕВИЧАПУШКИНА.*Medicine, Pedagogy and Technology: Theory and Practice*,*2*(9), 59–66. Retrieved from https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/mpttp/article/view/59346

41. БотировнаС. О.(2024). Склонение Имён Существительных.*Miasto Przyszłości*,*46*, 531–535. Retrieved from https://miastoprzyszlosci.com.pl/index.php/mp/article/view/2895