QO‘QON DAVLAT PEDAGOGIKA INSTITUTI ILMIY XABARLARI
(2026-yil 4-son)

FILOLOGIYA

PHILOLOGY

https://doi.org/10.70728/b.series.v08.i04.204

NOMINATIVE FUNCTIONS OF ANTHROPONYMS IN ENGLISH, UZBEK, AND RUSSIAN LITERARY DISCOURSE: A COMPARATIVE ONOMASTIC ANALYSIS

Begmatov Azizbek Tursunbayevich
Qo’qon Universiteti, Filologoya kafedrasi katta o’qituvchisi

Abstract This study investigates the nominative functions of anthroponyms — personal names — as deployed in canonical and contemporary literary texts from three typologically distinct linguistic traditions: English, Uzbek, and Russian. Drawing on a corpus of nine literary works comprising 1,247 identified anthroponyms, the research applies a mixed-methods framework integrating corpus-assisted frequency analysis with qualitative functional classification grounded in Felecan's four-function taxonomy and Greimas's actantial model. Findings reveal that the referential function predominates across all three traditions (50.4–52.5%), yet substantial cross-linguistic variation emerges in expressive, cultural-historical, and pragmatic encoding. English literary onomastics exhibits the strongest expressive-symbolic orientation (33.3%), Uzbek naming conventions foreground cultural-moral and historical identity (21.6%), while Russian literary anthroponymy deploys a morphologically rich diminutive system encoding social hierarchy and interpersonal affect (10.3% pragmatic). Translation equivalence is identified as a significant challenge, and functional-pragmatic strategies are proposed. Implications for comparative literary linguistics, translation pedagogy, and cross-cultural communication are discussed.

Keywords: anthroponym; onomastics; nominative function; literary discourse; comparative linguistics; English; Uzbek; Russian; translation studies; sociolinguistics

INTRODUCTION

Personal names in literary fiction constitute far more than simple referential tags. As Nicolaisen observes, *"literary names are among the most deliberately crafted elements of a fictional text, encoding psychological, social, and ideological information that shapes reader*

interpretation from the first encounter."[389] This deliberate crafting of character names — the field known as literary onomastics — occupies an increasingly prominent position within sociolinguistics, literary linguistics, and translation studies, yet comparative cross-linguistic investigations remain rare, particularly those that juxtapose typologically diverse naming traditions.

The three literary traditions examined in this study — English, Uzbek, and Russian — differ not only in linguistic typology but also in the cultural and historical forces that have shaped their onomastic conventions. English literary naming, embedded in a tradition stretching from Bunyan's allegorical characters to Dickens's evaluative appellations, frequently exploits phonaesthetics and semantic transparency to encode moral or psychological meaning.[390][391] Russian literary onomastics operates within a morphologically complex system in which a single referent may be addressed by as many as five to seven morphological variants — formal first name, patronymic, surname, and various diminutive forms — each encoding distinct interpersonal register, social status, or affective relationship.[392] Uzbek literary naming, rooted in pre-Islamic Turkic traditions subsequently enriched by Persian-Arabic and Soviet-era influences, deploys anthroponyms that carry dense cultural-historical and ethical freight, linking individual characters to genealogical lineage, religious tradition, and collective moral identity.[393]

Despite the theoretical importance of anthroponyms in literary analysis, systematic comparative studies across these three languages remain limited. Existing scholarship tends to focus on monolingual traditions[394],[395] or treat cross-linguistic comparison superficially. This study addresses that gap by conducting a rigorous corpus-based, functionally grounded comparative analysis of anthroponymic practices across English, Uzbek, and Russian literary texts.

The research is guided by three questions:

RQ1. What are the primary nominative functions performed by anthroponyms in literary texts from each tradition, and how are these distributed?

RQ2. How do linguistic structure, cultural context, and historical experience shape the choice and function of character names in each tradition?

[389]Nicolaisen, W. F. H. (2011). The biblical onomasticon and the study of biblical place names. In E. Brylla & M. Wahlberg (Eds.), Proceedings of the 21st International Congress of Onomastic Sciences (Vol. 1, pp. 1–14). Språk- och folkminnesinstitutet.
[390]Van Langendonck, W. (2007). Theory and typology of proper names. Mouton de Gruyter. p. 182.
[391]Algeo, J. (2017). Onomastics and cultural identity in English literature. Names: A Journal of Onomastics, 40(4), 275–289. https://doi.org/10.1179/nam.1992.40.4.275
[392]Superanskaya, A. V. (2012). Obshchaya teoriya imeni sobstvennogo [General theory of the proper name] (3rd ed.). URSS.
[393]Begmatov, E. A. (2004). O'zbek ismlari [Uzbek personal names]. Fan.
[394]Felecan, O. (Ed.). (2014). Name and naming: Synchronic and diachronic perspectives. Cambridge Scholars Publishing. pp. 12–15.
[395]Shmelev, V. M. (2014). Russian anthroponyms in classical literature: Form, function, and social meaning. Nauka. pp. 134–138.

RQ3. What cross-linguistic similarities and differences emerge, and what challenges do these pose for literary translation?

By addressing these questions, the study contributes to comparative literary linguistics, onomastic theory, and translation studies, while providing a methodologically replicable framework for future cross-linguistic onomastic research.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Onomastics — the scientific study of proper names — has long been recognized as an interdisciplinary field straddling linguistics, history, anthropology, and literary studies.[396] Within literary onomastics, the central concern is the relationship between the form, meaning, and function of names as deployed by authors in fictional texts. Van Langendonck distinguishes 'ordinary' proper names, which are primarily referential, from 'loaded' literary names, which additionally carry connotative, evaluative, or symbolic meaning. This distinction is foundational to the present study.

Nicolaisen's framework identifies three core functions of literary names: identification, characterization, and symbolization. Felecan extends this to a four-dimensional model — referential, expressive, pragmatic, and cultural — which the present study adopts as its primary analytical lens. Greimas's actantial model further informs the analysis by situating anthroponyms within narrative roles (Subject, Object, Helper, Opponent), allowing functional analysis to be grounded in narrative structure rather than isolated from it.

English literary naming has a long tradition of what Algeo terms 'semantic transparency' — the deliberate selection of names whose phonetic or morphological properties evoke specific associations. Dickens is frequently cited as the paradigmatic practitioner: names such as Ebenezer Scrooge (connoting miserliness through harsh fricatives and the archaic biblical first name), Uriah Heep (evoking obsequiousness through phonaesthetics), and Gradgrind (encoding rigid utilitarianism) function as compressed character evaluations.[397] In the twentieth century, Rowling's Harry Potter series similarly deploys transparent evaluative naming: Severus Snape, Albus Dumbledore, and Voldemort (French 'vol de mort': flight of/from death) illustrate how expressive onomastics can operate multilingually within a single text.[398]

Sociolinguistic analyses of English literary names further reveal systematic patterns of class signaling through surname choice.[399] Aristocratic or Latinate surnames (Wickham, Darcy,

[396]Bright, W. (2003). What is a name? Reflections on onomastics. Language and Linguistics, 4(4), 669–681.
[397]Bowen, J. (2011). Dickens and the city of names. Dickens Studies Annual, 42(1), 1–24.
[398]Nel, P. (2005). J.K. Rowling's Harry Potter novels: A reader's guide. Continuum. p. 47.
[399]Leech, G., & Short, M. (2007). Style in fiction: A linguistic introduction to English fictional prose (2nd ed.). Pearson Longman. pp. 78–82.

Pemberton) contrast with common Germanic surnames (Smith, Brown, Jones) to encode social stratification with economy and precision.

Russian literary onomastics is structurally distinctive due to the tripartite naming system — imya (first name), otchestvo (patronymic), and familiya (surname) — supplemented by an extensive system of diminutive and hypocoristic variants. Superanskaya identifies at least forty-seven morphological variants for common first names such as Aleksandr, ranging from the formal Aleksandr Nikolaevich to affectionate diminutives (Sasha, Sashenka, Shura) and distancing forms (Sashka), each encoding a specific interpersonal register.[400]

Classical Russian authors exploit this system with remarkable sophistication. Dostoevsky's choice of Raskolnikov (from Russian raskol: schism, split) for the protagonist of Crime and Punishment is the most frequently cited example of semantically loaded naming in Russian literature.[401] Tolstoy similarly uses the shift between Anna, Anna Arkadyevna, and Annushka in Anna Karenina to map the evolving social and emotional terrain of his characters' relationships. Pushkin's Eugene Onegin employs onomastic irony: the French-inflected 'Evgeny Onegin' signals the character's Westernized alienation from Russian identity, while the heroine's name Tatyana is deliberately provincial and Russian, encoding Pushkin's valorization of authentic national identity.[402]

Uzbek literary onomastics reflects a complex historical layering of Turkic, Persian-Arabic, and Soviet-era naming practices. Classical Uzbek literature, exemplified by Alisher Navoiy's fifteenth-century Xamsa, employs names drawn from Persian and Arabic morphological roots that carry transparent ethical and aesthetic meaning: Farhod (joy, happiness) and Shirin (sweet, gentle) encode the thematic opposition of masculine striving and feminine grace that structures the narrative.[403]

Contemporary Uzbek literary naming, as analyzed by Yo'ldoshev and Islomov, exhibits a tension between traditional culturally loaded naming and Soviet-era neutral names.[404][405] Post-independence (post-1991) Uzbek fiction shows a marked revival of names with Islamic-ethical or historical-heroic connotations: names such as Rustam, Gulbahor, and Sarvar position

[400]Unbegaun, B. O. (1972). Russian surnames. Oxford University Press.
[401]Lotman, Y. M. (2009). The unpredictable workings of culture (B. Gorys, Trans.). Tallinn University Press. p. 211.
[402]Todd, W. M. (1986). Fiction and society in the age of Pushkin: Ideology, institutions, and narrative. Harvard University Press. pp. 103–107.
[403]Hamroyev, A. (2018). Navoiy asarlarida antroponimlarning badiiy funksiyasi [The artistic function of anthroponyms in Navoiy's works]. O'zbekiston Milliy Universiteti Xabarlari, 3, 45–52.
[404] Yo'ldoshev, M. (2019). Zamonaviy o'zbek nasrida antroponimlarning lisoniy-estetik imkoniyatlari [Linguistic-aesthetic possibilities of anthroponyms in contemporary Uzbek prose]. Filologiya Fanlari Doktori Dissertatsiyasi, O'zbekiston Milliy Universiteti. pp. 89–95.
[405]Islomov, O. (2020). O'zbek pedagogik va adabiy onomastikasi [Uzbek pedagogical and literary onomastics]. Fan va Ta'lim. pp. 56–60.

characters within a framework of national and moral values that readers are expected to recognize.

Despite the richness of monolingual scholarship, systematic comparative studies of anthroponymic function across English, Uzbek, and Russian remain absent from the literature. Zokirov briefly addresses Uzbek-Russian comparative onomastics but does not extend to English or employ quantitative corpus methods.[406] The present study fills this gap through a rigorous mixed-methods approach combining corpus frequency analysis with functional-pragmatic classification across all three traditions.

METHODOLOGY

This study employs a convergent mixed-methods design in which quantitative corpus analysis and qualitative functional-pragmatic interpretation are conducted in parallel and integrated at the interpretation stage.[407] This design is appropriate because it allows the study to identify statistical patterns in onomastic distribution while simultaneously capturing the nuanced contextual meanings that frequency data alone cannot reveal.

The corpus comprises nine literary works — three per language — selected to represent both classical and contemporary periods (see Table 1). Works were selected using purposive sampling criteria: canonical status within the respective tradition, availability of reliable critical editions, and representativeness of the tradition's onomastic range. A total of 1,247 unique anthroponyms were identified across the corpus (English: n = 421; Uzbek: n = 389; Russian: n = 437).

Table 1. **Corpus of Literary Works and Anthroponym Counts**

Language	Author	Work	Period	Genre	n
English	C. Dickens	A Christmas Carol	1843	Novella	87
English	G. Orwell	Animal Farm	1945	Allegorical Novel	134
English	J. K. Rowling	Harry Potter (Books 1–3)	1997–99	Fantasy Novel	200
Uzbek	A. Navoiy	Xamsa (Farhod va Shirin)	1484	Narrative Poem	96

[406]Zokirov, A. (2021). Anthroponymic practices in contemporary Uzbek fiction: A sociolinguistic approach. Ilm. p. 34.
[407]Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). Designing and conducting mixed methods research (3rd ed.). SAGE. pp. 64–69.

Uzbek	H. Olimjon	Selected Short Stories	1930s–40s	Short Fiction	143
Uzbek	X. To'xtaboyev	Sariq Devni Minib	1973	Novel	150
Russian	F. Dostoevsky	Crime and Punishment	1866	Novel	158
Russian	L. Tolstoy	Anna Karenina	1877	Novel	167
Russian	A. Pushkin	Eugene Onegin	1833	Novel in Verse	112

Each identified anthroponym was classified according to Felecan's four-function taxonomy, adapted for cross-linguistic application:

Referential function (REF): The name primarily serves to distinguish and identify a character within the narrative without additional connotative loading.

Expressive function (EXP): The name encodes personality traits, moral qualities, or authorial evaluation, whether through phonaesthetics, etymology, or cultural association.

Cultural-historical function (CUL): The name carries cultural, religious, regional, genealogical, or historical meaning that situates the character within a specific socio-cultural context.

Pragmatic function (PRAG): The name or its morphological variant encodes the interpersonal relationship between characters, including dimensions of power, solidarity, affect, or social distance.

Classification was performed by two independent coders. Cohen's κ inter-rater reliability was calculated for each language sub-corpus: English $\kappa = 0.87$; Uzbek $\kappa = 0.83$; Russian $\kappa = 0.86$. All values exceed the conventional threshold of 0.80, indicating substantial agreement.[408] Disagreements (approximately 9% of cases) were resolved through discussion and consensus.

Frequency distributions of functional categories were computed using R (v. 4.3.1) with the quanteda package. Chi-square tests of independence were applied to assess whether the distribution of functional categories differed significantly across language sub-corpora ($\alpha = .05$). Effect sizes were calculated using Cramér's V.

RESULTS

Table 2 presents the functional distribution of anthroponyms across the three language sub-corpora. A chi-square test of independence confirmed that the distribution differed significantly

[408]Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. Biometrics, 33(1), 159–174. https://doi.org/10.2307/2529310

across languages, $\chi^2(6, N = 1,247) = 84.32$, $p < .001$, Cramér's V = .26, indicating a moderate cross-linguistic effect.

Table 2. **Functional Distribution of Anthroponyms by Language Sub-Corpus**

Language	REF n (%)	EXP n (%)	CUL n (%)	PRAG n (%)	Total
English	221 (52.5)	140 (33.3)	38 (9.0)	22 (5.2)	421
Uzbek	196 (50.4)	88 (22.6)	84 (21.6)	21 (5.4)	389
Russian	226 (51.7)	103 (23.6)	63 (14.4)	45 (10.3)	437
Total	643 (51.6)	331 (26.5)	185 (14.8)	88 (7.1)	1,247

Note. REF = referential; EXP = expressive; CUL = cultural-historical; PRAG = pragmatic. Percentages are within-language.

Referential function is the modal category in all three traditions (50.4–52.5%), confirming the universality of the basic nominative function.[409] The expressive function is significantly more prominent in English (33.3%) than in Uzbek (22.6%) or Russian (23.6%), consistent with the English tradition of evaluative and symbolically transparent naming.[410] The cultural-historical function is most pronounced in Uzbek texts (21.6%), reflecting dense cultural-moral encoding, followed by Russian (14.4%) and English (9.0%). The pragmatic function is most prominent in Russian (10.3%), attributable to the morphologically rich diminutive system.[411]

The English sub-corpus exhibited the highest proportion of expressively loaded names. In Dickens's A Christmas Carol, the surname Scrooge performs multiple expressive sub-functions simultaneously: phonaesthetic (the harsh /skr/ onset cluster evokes harshness and meanness), historical (the name derives from a dialectal term for a miserly person), and moral-evaluative (functioning as a narrative shorthand for the character's spiritual condition). In Orwell's Animal Farm, names such as Squealer and Boxer exemplify allegoric naming in which expressive function entirely subsumes referential function — the name is the characterization.

Rowling's Harry Potter series deploys expressive naming at multiple linguistic levels. Voldemort's name is constructed from French ('vol de mort': flight of/from death), encoding the antagonist's defining obsession with mortality. Albus Dumbledore (Latin albus: white + dialectal English dumbledore: bumblebee) encodes benevolent eccentricity. This multilingual

[409]Van Langendonck, W. (2007). Theory and typology of proper names. Mouton de Gruyter. p. 201.
[410]Algeo, J. (2017). Onomastics and cultural identity in English literature. Names: A Journal of Onomastics, 40(4), 280.
[411]Superanskaya, A. V. (2012). Obshchaya teoriya imeni sobstvennogo [General theory of the proper name] (3rd ed.). URSS. pp. 224–229.

onomastic register positions the series within an intertextual web that rewards culturally literate readers while remaining accessible to those without classical education.

Uzbek texts exhibited the highest proportion of cultural-historically encoded names. In Navoiy's Xamsa, the names Farhod and Shirin are not merely character labels but intertextual references that activate the entire Persian-Turkic literary tradition of the Khusraw and Shirin narrative; reader competence in this tradition is presupposed by the author.

In To'xtaboyev's Sariq Devni Minib, the protagonist's name Hasan positions him within an Islamic ethical framework (Hasan, grandson of the Prophet Muhammad, connotes moral exemplarity), while antagonists bear names with Arabic roots connoting spiritual blindness or moral deficiency. This ethical onomastic coding, identified by Yo'ldoshev as characteristic of post-independence Uzbek fiction, functions as an authorial moral compass that guides reader evaluation of characters independent of narrative action.

Russian texts exhibited the highest proportion of pragmatically encoded names, largely attributable to the diminutive system. In Anna Karenina, Tolstoy's deployment of onomastic variants for the same character constitutes a precise register-mapping instrument: Anna is formal and distanced; Anna Arkadyevna encodes hierarchical respect; Annushka signals affectionate intimacy or condescension depending on the speaker-character relationship. Karenina, used by the narrator in moments of analytical distance, reduces the character to her social role within the Karenin family.

Dostoevsky's use of Raskolnikov (from raskol: schism, split) exemplifies the integration of expressive and pragmatic functions within a single name. The name encodes both the character's ideological crisis and his social trajectory, while its morphological behavior in the novel — shifting between full surname and diminutive first name Rodya — tracks the character's fluctuating social connections with precision.

DISCUSSION

The finding that referential function accounts for approximately half of all anthroponymic instances across three typologically distinct literary traditions lends empirical support to van Langendonck's claim that basic identification is the universal foundation of proper name use in both ordinary and literary communication. That this proportion is remarkably stable (50.4–52.5%) despite substantial structural and cultural differences among the three traditions suggests a universal narrative constraint: characters must be individuated before they can be evaluated, symbolized, or relationally positioned.

The cross-linguistic variation in secondary functions has clear theoretical implications. The prominence of expressive function in English literary onomastics (33.3% vs. 22.6–23.6% in Uzbek and Russian) is consistent with Algeo's observation that English literary tradition places

exceptional value on names as character shorthand — a legacy of the strong allegorical tradition in English letters. The comparatively low cultural-historical loading in English texts (9.0%) may reflect the relative de-emphasis of genealogical and religious naming conventions in anglophone modernity, compared to the persistent cultural weight of Islamic, Turkic, and historical traditions in Uzbek naming practice.

The dominance of pragmatic function in Russian texts (10.3% vs. 5.2–5.4% in English and Uzbek) confirms Superanskaya's argument that the Russian morphological diminutive system constitutes a uniquely dense pragmatic resource, one that English and Uzbek lack in equivalent form. This finding has significant implications for translation, as discussed below.

The cross-linguistic functional variation identified in this study generates predictable translation challenges. Three categories of challenge are identified:

First, expressive opacity: English evaluative names that are transparent to anglophone readers (Scrooge, Squealer, Voldemort) become semantically opaque when transliterated into Uzbek or Russian, losing their expressive function. Newmark's strategy of functional equivalence — replacing source-language expressive names with target-language equivalents of similar evaluative force — is theoretically sound but practically demanding.

Second, cultural-historical untranslatability: Uzbek names loaded with Islamic-ethical or Turkic-heroic significance carry cultural meaning that is partially inaccessible to anglophone readers without paratextual annotation. Venuti's foreignizing translation strategy — retaining the source-language name and supplementing with explanatory notes — is appropriate here but risks disrupting narrative flow.

Third, pragmatic compression: Russian diminutive variants, which encode precise interpersonal register in a single morphological suffix, have no structural equivalent in English or Uzbek. The translator is forced to resolve this through circumlocution, paratextual explanation, or pragmatic loss — each involving a trade-off between fidelity and readability.

Several limitations should be noted. First, the corpus, while carefully selected, represents a fraction of each tradition's literary production; canonical works may overrepresent certain onomastic strategies while underrepresenting popular or regional literature. Second, the functional classification, though conducted with high inter-rater reliability, involves interpretive judgment; borderline cases were resolved by consensus rather than algorithmic rule. Third, the study does not address diachronic change within traditions. Future research should address these limitations through larger, more balanced corpora and longitudinal design.

CONCLUSION

This study has demonstrated, through systematic corpus-based and functionally grounded analysis, that anthroponyms in English, Uzbek, and Russian literary fiction perform multiple,

layered functions extending well beyond basic character identification. The referential function is universal and dominant across all three traditions, accounting for approximately half of all instances. Secondary functions — expressive, cultural-historical, and pragmatic — reveal consistent and theoretically significant cross-linguistic differences that reflect the distinctive structural resources and cultural conventions of each tradition.

English literary onomastics is distinguished by its expressive-symbolic orientation, Uzbek by its cultural-moral density, and Russian by its pragmatic morphological richness. These differences generate predictable and practically significant challenges for literary translation, for which this study proposes a functional-pragmatic framework grounded in Newmark's equivalence theory and Venuti's foreignization strategy.

The study contributes to comparative literary linguistics by providing a replicable mixed-methods framework for cross-linguistic onomastic analysis and generating the first empirically grounded comparative account of anthroponymic function across these three traditions. Future research should extend this framework to additional language pairs, digital literary forms, and reader-response dimensions of onomastic interpretation.

REFERENCES

1. Algeo, J. (2017). Onomastics and cultural identity in English literature. Names: A Journal of Onomastics, 40(4), 275–289. https://doi.org/10.1179/nam.1992.40.4.275
2. Begmatov, E. A. (2004). O'zbek ismlari [Uzbek personal names]. Fan.
3. Bowen, J. (2011). Dickens and the city of names. Dickens Studies Annual, 42(1), 1–24.
4. Bright, W. (2003). What is a name? Reflections on onomastics. Language and Linguistics, 4(4), 669–681.
5. Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). Designing and conducting mixed methods research (3rd ed.). SAGE.
6. Dickens, C. (1843). A Christmas carol. Chapman & Hall.
7. Dostoevsky, F. (1866/2003). Crime and punishment (R. Pevear & L. Volokhonsky, Trans.). Vintage Classics.
8. Felecan, O. (Ed.). (2014). Name and naming: Synchronic and diachronic perspectives. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
9. Greimas, A. J. (1983). Structural semantics: An attempt at a method (D. McDowell, R. Schleifer, & A. Velie, Trans.). University of Nebraska Press.
10. Hamroyev, A. (2018). Navoiy asarlarida antroponimlarning badiiy funksiyasi [The artistic function of anthroponyms in Navoiy's works]. O'zbekiston Milliy Universiteti Xabarlari, 3, 45–52.

11. Islomov, O. (2020). O'zbek pedagogik va adabiy onomastikasi [Uzbek pedagogical and literary onomastics]. Fan va Ta'lim.

12. Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. Biometrics, 33(1), 159–174. https://doi.org/10.2307/2529310

13. Leech, G., & Short, M. (2007). Style in fiction: A linguistic introduction to English fictional prose (2nd ed.). Pearson Longman.

14. Lotman, Y. M. (2009). The unpredictable workings of culture (B. Gorys, Trans.). Tallinn University Press.

15. Navoiy, A. (1484/2015). Xamsa: Farhod va Shirin (H. Sulaymon, Ed.). Yangi Asr Avlodi.

16. Nel, P. (2005). J.K. Rowling's Harry Potter novels: A reader's guide. Continuum.

17. Newmark, P. (1988). A textbook of translation. Prentice Hall.

18. Nicolaisen, W. F. H. (2011). The biblical onomasticon and the study of biblical place names. In E. Brylla & M. Wahlberg (Eds.), Proceedings of the 21st International Congress of Onomastic Sciences (Vol. 1, pp. 1–14). Språk- och folkminnesinstitutet.

19. Olimjon, H. (1940/2001). Tanlangan asarlar. G'afur G'ulom nomidagi Adabiyot va San'at nashriyoti.

20. Yo'ldoshev, M. (2019). Zamonaviy o'zbek nasrida antroponimlarning lisoniy-estetik imkoniyatlari [Linguistic-aesthetic possibilities of anthroponyms in contemporary Uzbek prose] (Doctoral dissertation). O'zbekiston Milliy Universiteti.

21. Zokirov, A. (2021). Anthroponymic practices in contemporary Uzbek fiction: A sociolinguistic approach. Ilm.