

FUNCTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF ONOMASTICONS IN
ENGLISH AND UZBEK LITERARY PROSE: A CONTEXTUAL
COMPARATIVE STUDY

Baxtiyorova Maftuna Baxtiyorovna

Iqtisodiyot va Pedagogika Universiteti

Xorijiy tillar kafedrası PhD, dotsenti

Gmail: maftunabakhtiyorovna.phd@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0009-0005-8551-6683>

Tel.: +998919535222

Abstract. The article examines literary onomasticons as interconnected systems of reference, characterization, social address and spatial meaning. It compares John Bunyan's *The Pilgrim's Progress* and Charles Dickens's *Hard Times* with Abdulla Qodiriy's *O'tkan kunlar* and Mehrobdan chayon. Rather than treating twenty-eight illustrative correspondences as lexical equivalents, the study follows the development of selected names across character relationships, recurrent scenes and ideological conflicts. Close reading indicates that Bunyan's overtly interpretable allegorical designations often anticipate a moral position, whereas Qodiriy's conventional anthroponyms typically become evaluative through social interaction, titles and plot. Dickens occupies an intermediate position: suggestive surnames acquire force through satire, repeated speech and institutional control over forms of address. Personal and geographical names work together to direct readers toward the ethical stakes of each narrative. The study distinguishes name form from contextual function and identifies the limits of a direct English–Uzbek semantic transfer. Its findings are qualitative and confined to four purposefully selected literary works.

Keywords: literary onomastics; functional onomasticon; English–Uzbek comparison; proper names; characterization; address forms; spatial semantics; literary discourse.

ANNOTATSIYA: Maqolada ingliz va o‘zbek badiiy nasridagi onomastikonlar alohida ismlar yig‘indisi emas, balki qahramon xarakteri, ijtimoiy munosabat, badiiy makon va asar g‘oyasini yuzaga chiqaruvchi o‘zaro bog‘liq birliklar tizimi sifatida o‘rganiladi. Jon Banyanning «The Pilgrim’s Progress», Charlz Dikkensning «Hard Times» hamda Abdulla Qodiriyning «O‘tkan kunlar» va «Mehrobdan chayon» asarlari qiyosiy tahlil qilindi. Tahlil nomlarning yuzaki lug‘aviy o‘xshashligiga emas, ularning syujet va nutqiy vaziyatlarda bajaradigan vazifasiga tayandi. Ingliz allegoriyasida nomning ochiq ma’nosi qahramonning axloqiy mavqeyini oldindan ko‘rsatishi, o‘zbek tarixiy romanlarida esa ismning baholovchi kuchi murojaat shakllari, unvon, qarindoshlik munosabati va voqealar rivojida ochilishi aniqlandi. Xulosalar to‘rt asardan maqsadli tanlangan material bilan cheklanadi.

Kalit so‘zlar: badiiy onomastika, onomastikon, atoqli ot, funksional tahlil, antroponim, toponim, murojaat shakllari, qiyosiy adabiyotshunoslik.

АННОТАЦИЯ: Статья рассматривает английские и узбекские литературные ономастиконы как взаимосвязанные системы номинации, характеристики персонажей, социальных отношений и художественного пространства. Сопоставляются произведения Джона Беньяна The Pilgrim’s Progress и Чарльза Диккенса Hard Times с романами Абдуллы Кадыри «Уткан кунлар» и «Мехробдан чаён». Анализ основан не на предполагаемой лексической эквивалентности имён, а на их функции в конкретных эпизодах и сюжетных отношениях. Показано, что в английской аллегории оценка нередко выражается самой формой имени, тогда как в узбекской исторической прозе она формируется в сочетании

имени, титула, обращения и поступков персонажа. Выводы имеют качественный характер и ограничены избранными произведениями.

Ключевые слова: литературная ономастика, ономастикон, имя собственное, функциональный анализ, антропоним, топоним, формы обращения, сопоставительный анализ.

1. INTRODUCTION: A character's name is encountered before the reader knows everything about the person who bears it. This temporal order can matter. In Bunyan's religious allegory a figure called Obstinate already sounds resistant; in Qodiriy's historical fiction the name Homid does not announce a villain in the same way. It is the later configuration of jealousy, interpersonal schemes and consequences that makes Homid a negative presence. The contrast does not imply that one language possesses meaningful names and the other does not. It suggests that the meaning relevant to fiction is produced at different points in the reading process: sometimes in the lexical surface of the name, sometimes in an evolving network of scenes and social relationships. This distinction offers a way of moving beyond inventories of anthroponyms and toponyms. A literary onomasticon should be understood as a system whose members identify fictional referents while also connecting those referents to moral expectations, status distinctions, familial allegiance and geographical experience. The same name can participate in more than one relation. Yusufbek hoji, for example, identifies a specific figure and, through hoji, signals a socially recognized distinction; its narrative effect also depends on how that figure acts as a father and moral interlocutor. Conversely, Gradgrind is not merely a surname inviting an association with grind: its force accumulates as the schoolroom, the household and the children's damaged emotional lives reveal the limits of the character's programme. The central problem of this article is therefore functional rather than exclusively etymological. How do names direct interpretation when their descriptive content is transparent, suggestive or

linguistically conventional? How do English and Uzbek literary traditions distribute interpretive work between names, titles, speech, setting and action? And what can be compared without turning characters from distinct cultural and generic worlds into artificial equivalents? These questions are examined through four works chosen for their contrasting narrative conventions. The comparison seeks not a catalogue of matching names but an explanation of the mechanisms by which naming becomes consequential to the development of a literary text.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS: The English material consists of John Bunyan's *The Pilgrim's Progress* (Part I, 1678) and Charles Dickens's *Hard Times* (1854); the Uzbek material comprises Abdulla Qodiriy's *O'tkan kunlar* and Mehrobdan chayon. The texts represent allegorical, industrial-satirical and historical-social modes of narration. Such differences are essential to the comparison because a descriptive allegorical label and a conventional historical personal name cannot reasonably be expected to carry information in the same way. The unit of analysis was the named expression in its narrative environment, not a detached entry in a dictionary. For each focal example, attention was paid to its identifying role, possible lexical cues, titles or honorifics, the character's behaviour, its co-occurrence with other names and the type of scene in which its significance becomes visible. The selected pool comprises more than twenty-five distinct personal and spatial expressions, including Christian, Faithful, Hopeful, Obstinate, Pliable, Talkative, Evangelist, Giant Despair, Vanity Fair, Celestial City, Doubting Castle, Gradgrind, Bounderby, Sissy/Cecilia Jupe, Louisa, Rachael, Mrs Sparsit, Stephen Blackpool, Coketown, Otabek, Kumush, Zaynab, Hasanali, Homid, Yusufbek hoji, O'zbek oyim, Mirzakarim qutidor, Anvar, Ra'no, Solih maxdum, Abdurahmon domla, Toshkent, Marg'ilon and Qo'qon. Their coverage is purposive, not statistically representative. The procedure follows a repeated movement from a naming form to a verifiable textual role and then to a cross-linguistic comparison of function. When a short English quotation is supplied,

its Uzbek equivalent is an analytical translation prepared for this paper. When the Uzbek plot is discussed in English, the rendering is an explanatory paraphrase rather than a falsely attributed original English line. This distinction avoids presenting invented dialogue as a quotation from Qodiriy. Name associations are not presented as proven historical derivations unless their structure warrants that conclusion. No frequency test, reader-response survey or inferential statistical procedure was performed.

3. RESULTS: A proper name first differentiates one referent from another, but narrative expectation begins to form as soon as that referent is introduced. Bunyan makes this interaction particularly legible. Christian is both a participant in a journey and a figure whose appellation identifies the religious framework within which the journey must be understood. The figures who meet him do not merely increase the cast: Obstinate and Pliable put two forms of moral inadequacy into immediate contrast. Obstinate refuses the path outright, whereas Pliable agrees to accompany the pilgrim but abandons the endeavour when hardship replaces promise. The narrative turns the apparently positive capacity to be persuaded into an unstable disposition. Thus, the functional content of Pliable is not exhausted by its dictionary sense, just as Obstinate becomes more than the adjective ‘stubborn’ when refusal becomes an action in the plot. The same relation of anticipation and fulfilment is developed more slowly through Faithful and Hopeful. Their lexical bases suggest ‘faith’ and ‘hope’, yet the narrative does not assign them interchangeable positive qualities. Faithful’s fidelity is tested through persecution at Vanity Fair, while Hopeful enters Christian’s path after the loss of his earlier companion. The first name therefore becomes associated with constancy under pressure, the second with the persistence of spiritual movement after apparent defeat. Here the sequence of names creates meaning: an ethical quality survives in another form even as a named individual disappears. Their functional relationship can be expressed in a bilingual analytical gloss—Faithful: ‘e’tiqodiga sodiq’; Hopeful: ‘umidini

yo‘qotmagan’—but these glosses are explanations, not replacements for the fictional persons. The point of naming is felt through the transition between episodes. Qodiriy’s Otabek and Kumush demonstrate why this mechanism must not simply be imported into Uzbek prose. Otabek includes a historically resonant element *bek*, while Kumush is recognizable as the ordinary word for silver. Yet neither ‘*bek*’ nor ‘*silver*’ provides an adequate summary of the figures’ narrative identity. Otabek’s moral and social profile emerges through commercial outlook, family obligations, personal affection and conflict with inherited expectations. Kumush’s association with something precious may contribute to an initial image, but affection, vulnerability and the later tragedy make that association specific. In an English analytical formulation, Kumush may be glossed as ‘*silver*’; in Uzbek, the English allegorical Hopeful may be glossed as ‘*Umidvor*’. Their functions are comparable only in the restricted sense that both become emotional centres within a developing narrative, not because silver and hope form a lexical pair. The contrast becomes clearer in the representation of negative figures. Bunyan’s Giant Despair explicitly embodies a destructive inner condition, and the spatial expression Doubting Castle places that condition inside an imagined architecture of confinement. Homid in O‘tkan kunlar, by contrast, becomes threatening through antagonistic decisions and manipulation rather than through an openly descriptive name. A useful English paraphrase is ‘Homid’s plotting endangers the lovers’, whereas the name Giant Despair can be given an interpretive Uzbek equivalent ‘*Umidsizlik devi*’. The former statement identifies a function demonstrated by conduct; the latter translates a role already marked by the fictional designation. Comparing these cases shows that a proper name can either predict an ethical category or acquire ethical force retrospectively. Both procedures characterize, but they distribute information differently between nomination and narrated action. This distribution helps explain a second pattern: the functional meaning of a name is often relational. In *The Pilgrim’s Progress*, Talkative sounds as though speech

itself were the defining virtue, but the pilgrim's assessment exposes the insufficiency of pious language unsupported by practice. An informative Uzbek interpretive gloss, 'Sergap', conveys the visible lexical cue but not the moral argument established through the conversation. The evaluative mechanism resembles, without equalling, the satirical presentation of Solih maxdum in Mehrobdan chayon. The designation maxdum signals a religious-educational position, while episodes involving calculation, domestic conduct and money complicate the respect implied by such a title. Qodiriy produces irony through tension between social designation and portrayed behaviour; Bunyan produces it by making an apparently neutral verbal trait reveal spiritual hollowness. In each case, a name is drawn into an evaluative contrast, although one text exposes the irony on the surface of the appellation and the other needs the reader to interpret a social role against repeated actions. Dickens often intensifies precisely this distance between public label and conduct. Mr Gradgrind has the grammar of an ordinary Victorian surname, but its audible resemblance to grind becomes persuasive in a world of regimented instruction. Its significance cannot be proved solely by breaking the spelling into fragments; it is strengthened by descriptions of rigid physical form, the rejection of imagination in the classroom and the consequences suffered by Louisa and Tom. In *Hard Times*, Dickens describes Gradgrind with the recurring image 'square coat, square legs, square shoulders' (Book I, Chapter I). Uzbek analytical translation: 'to'rtburchaksimon kamzul, to'rtburchaksimon oyoqlar, to'rtburchaksimon yelkalar'. The patterned repetition prepares the reader to interpret the surname as part of a wider texture of mechanical constraint. Meaning arises from the cooperation of sound, bodily imagery and educational ideology. A comparable relation between naming and public status can be observed around Yusufbek hoji in *O'tkan kunlar*, but the difference is equally instructive. The honorific hoji does not describe a restrictive worldview; it marks religious and social recognition. The portrait is completed through his relations with Otabek and other members of the

household. Put differently, the English case uses recurrent satirical description to heighten a possible phonetic association, whereas the Uzbek case uses a culturally intelligible honorific whose narrative evaluation depends upon the bearer. To gloss Yusufbek hoji simply as ‘Mr Yusufbek’ would remove a layer of social information, while to translate Gradgrind semantically as ‘Maydalovchi’ would falsely treat one interpretive association as a certified etymology. Both losses show why the relevant comparison concerns functional effect rather than literal lexical replacement. Bounderby and Mirzakarim qutidor further clarify the issue. Dickens’s Josiah Bounderby repeatedly foregrounds his personal account of self-making and identifies himself through Coketown, converting a formula of self-introduction into an assertion of wealth and authority. Qutidor, in Qodiriy’s setting, is not an interchangeable equivalent of an English industrialist: it is a historically situated designation of standing whose significance lies in the economic and social arrangements of the story. The formal extensions ‘of Coketown’ and ‘qutidor’ both help position their bearers within institutions beyond the household, yet they point to different social orders. A functional reading must retain this asymmetry: identification through a locality associated with industrial production is not the same as identification through a historically specific title. A third possibility is that a name directs satire by becoming excessive. M’Choakumchild uses comic orthography and sound to suggest a teacher who figuratively stifles children. Its effect is amplified by Dickens’s criticism of education measured by accumulated facts. Abdurahmon domla in Mehrobdan chayon belongs to another naming system: domla immediately places the bearer within an educational or religious social world, but an evaluation of that individual requires context rather than an assumed negative meaning in the title. In both works schools and claims to authority are brought under scrutiny. The English nickname-like construction compresses critique into the signifier itself; the Uzbek title makes authority socially legible before the narrative investigates

how it is exercised. This is a difference in functional distribution, not a hierarchy of literary sophistication. If titles specify publicly recognized positions, familiar and formal variants show how the right to name someone can become a struggle over identity. Dickens makes the point directly in Gradgrind's classroom when the student Sissy Jupe is required to adopt Cecilia. His correction, 'Sissy is not a name' (Hard Times, Book I, Chapter II), may be rendered in Uzbek as 'Sissi ism emas'. The statement is more than a linguistic judgment: it substitutes the institution's preferred form for a familiar one and tries to bring the pupil's social self into the rigid pattern of the school. The affectionate version does not disappear from the novel's moral imagination, however. Sissy becomes associated with practical compassion and forms of human understanding that the factual curriculum cannot explain. The competition between Sissy and Cecilia thus dramatizes a tension between relational identity and administrative regularity. Qodiriy's forms of address encode power without repeating that English classroom scene. In *O'tkan kunlar*, *O'zbek oyim* and *Oftob oyim* are not merely female names followed by an expendable suffix. The respectful *oyim* places the named women within relations of household seniority and recognizable etiquette. Similarly, *Yusufbek hoji* and *Mirzakarim qutidor* are not equivalent to the English sequence Mr + surname, although they can share the broader function of indexing rank or deference. English Mrs Gradgrind and Mrs Sparsit indicate status through a marital or socially conventional form; their behaviour must then be interpreted in relation to class expectations and domestic hierarchies. Uzbek *oyim* marks a different set of cultural relations that cannot be recovered by uniformly rendering it Mrs. An apparently small translational adjustment would flatten the narrative network of age, kinship and respect. Such networks matter to the construction of women's identities in both traditions. Louisa Gradgrind receives a family name tied to the pedagogical system that constrains her, but the personal name Louisa itself does not reveal her unhappiness. Similarly, Zaynab's role in *O'tkan kunlar* cannot be deduced from

her given name. Her predicament develops from competing marriage expectations, emotional exclusion and an increasingly damaging response to family conflict. The comparison is consequently grounded in the way identity is shaped by social relations, rather than in any alleged semantic resemblance between Louisa and Zaynab. Kumush's position within the same family arrangement makes the point still more sharply: two women with distinct personal names are drawn into a relational conflict that changes how both names are experienced by readers. Ra'no and Anvar in Mehrobdan chayon develop a related but distinct configuration. The association of Ra'no with beauty is available within naming culture; Anvar also carries a conventional positive association with light. Yet their significance in the narrative cannot be reduced to 'beautiful woman' and 'radiant man'. Their mutual attachment and resistance to coercive power turn the names into markers of a contested human future. Faithful and Hopeful belong to another genre, but the pairing is illuminating because the names' significance similarly depends on a relation sustained through danger. Bunyan places the ideal visibly in the names, while Qodiriy locates the practical meaning of love and resistance in dramatic decisions. An English explanation may identify Ra'no as a culturally meaningful name, and an Uzbek gloss may render Hopeful as 'Umidvor'; neither explanation reproduces the other work's relational architecture. The functions already observed in personal names become more expansive when the objects named are places. Bunyan's City of Destruction is the condition from which pilgrimage must begin. The Celestial City projects an endpoint toward which decisions and trials receive orientation. Between these poles, Vanity Fair converts exchange into a moral test. The narrator explicitly explains the name through the vanities offered for sale. The phrase 'Vanity Fair' can be analytically glossed as 'Behudalik yarmarkasi' or, more interpretively, 'Dunyoviy havaslar bozori'. These Uzbek formulations highlight that the name is not a neutral geographical label: its commercial form is made to evaluate the practices of the society

encountered there. The named route itself becomes an argument about the direction of human life. In Dickens's Coketown, a different relation unites naming and material environment. Coke, a substance associated with industrial fuel, makes the compound legible, and the narrative fills it with smoke, machinery, uniform labour and contaminated waterways. Dickens's short description 'a town of machinery and tall chimneys' (Book I, Chapter V) may be translated as 'mashinalar va baland mo'rilar shahri'. The expression is not only a visual inventory: it connects the place-name to the system that disciplines the daily rhythm of its inhabitants. Gradgrind and Bounderby become more intelligible because Coketown supplies the institutional landscape in which their attitudes carry power. Thus, the urban toponym, the satirical surname and the classroom register reinforce one another rather than producing three unrelated stylistic effects. Toshkent and Marg'ilon in O'tkan kunlar cannot be handled as if they were allegorical inventions. Their referential significance arises from the historical and cultural geography of the narrative: movement between cities also means movement between trading relationships, parental authority, marriage negotiations and competing loyalties. Marg'ilon becomes inseparable from Otabek's connection with Kumush, while Toshkent anchors another network of household and social responsibilities. This does not make Marg'ilon an Uzbek equivalent of Vanity Fair, even though commercial life is relevant to both. In Bunyan, the fair's name supplies a moral judgment; in Qodiriy, the actual city's meaning emerges from the characters and events situated in it. The two modes demonstrate how named space can structure ethical conflict either by being overtly evaluative or by gathering historically situated actions. The political setting of Qo'qon in Mehrobdan chayon adds a further dimension to this spatial system. Its courtly institutions and unequal authority make Anvar's and Ra'no's choices intelligible within a particular order of power. A generic designation such as xon saroyi ('the khan's palace') derives its force from the practices of those controlling it; it need not carry an internally transparent negative adjective.

By contrast, Doubting Castle announces uncertainty as an imprisoning environment, and Giant Despair gives that environment an embodied agent. Both texts spatialize forms of domination, but one does so through the personification of inner struggle and the other through a recognizable political structure. Reading the spatial names together therefore reveals not the sameness of place, but the different pathways by which geography becomes an explanatory element of narrative conflict. Qodiriy's two novels similarly build interpretation through intersecting networks, yet the resources differ. Otabek's links to Yusufbek hoji, O'zbek oyim, Kumush, Zaynab, Hasanali and Homid expose how family authority, affection, loyalty and destructive rivalry affect one another. Hasanali's significance is particularly revealing: his conventional name does not overtly mean Faithful, but repeated acts of care and allegiance allow a comparison with the function of loyalty in Bunyan. The distinction is crucial. 'Faithful — e'tiqodiga sodiq' explains a lexicalized allegorical value; 'Hasanali — Otabekka sadoqat bilan munosabatda bo'lgan qahramon' explains a textual relation. One is a gloss on a name's signification, the other a proposition supported by the story. Both are legitimate scholarly statements provided that their different evidential status is preserved.

In Mehrobdan chayon, Anvar, Ra'no, Solih maxdum, Abdurahmon domla and the courtly space of Qo'qon make a different relational field. Positive implications that a reader may associate with some personal names are tested against conduct and social power; titles place others within institutions whose authority the narrative makes open to judgment. The novel thereby shows that linguistic and social meaning may pull in opposing directions. A respectful appellation does not guarantee moral excellence, and a favorable given-name association does not exempt a figure from danger. This interaction between expectation and narrative verification is the thread connecting the Uzbek cases with the English examples without dissolving their cultural specificity.

The bilingual evidence consequently suggests a graded approach to translation and analysis. Christian, Faithful, Hopeful, Obstinate and Giant Despair are sufficiently transparent to permit explanatory Uzbek glosses such as ‘Nasroniy’, ‘Sodiq’, ‘Umidvor’, ‘O‘jar’ and ‘Umidsizlik devi’, though whether to translate the names within a complete literary edition is a separate artistic decision. Coketown and Vanity Fair require both lexical analysis and an account of their environments. Gradgrind and Bounderby are safer when preserved as names and interpreted contextually, rather than assigned speculative derivations. Conversely, Otabek, Kumush, Zaynab, Yusufbek hoji, O‘zbek oyim, Mirzakarim qutidor, Solih maxdum and Ra’no cannot be replaced by English common nouns without losing their social and historical positioning. For instance, Kumush — ‘silver’ explains an available association, whereas Kumush — ‘a character whose fate gives the name its emotional weight’ describes the function. This difference between linguistic gloss and literary explanation is not a minor editorial precaution; it is the methodological condition for an accurate English–Uzbek comparison.

4. DISCUSSION: The comparison supports a distinction between the semantic availability of a name and its achieved narrative function. A transparent appellation creates an early expectation, but a literary text may confirm, intensify or ironize that expectation. Overt allegory places unusual weight on the semantic availability of words such as Faithful and Despair; realist and historical narratives distribute weight across names, dialogue, institutions, events and the contrast between public reputation and private conduct. These are differences of textual organization rather than a rigid English–Uzbek binary. Dickens’s satirical practice shows how an English conventional-looking surname may become powerfully evaluative through repeated context, while Qodiriy’s Kumush and Ra’no show that Uzbek personal names may carry discernible positive lexical or cultural associations without serving as full character descriptions. A function-based method also imposes constraints on

interpretation. It would be unfounded to claim that Homid is the etymological equivalent of Obstinate, that Marg‘ilon is the literal counterpart of Vanity Fair, or that qutidor and ‘of Coketown’ have the same institutional history. Such pairings can support a carefully specified comparison—antagonistic effect, commercial setting or socially positioned identity—but not lexical equivalence. Likewise, the paper does not infer authorial intention from every modern resemblance between a surname and a common English word. The most robust evidence is found where naming, narration and character behaviour converge. The study remains limited by its purposive selection, differences of genre and period, and the absence of a full machine-readable inventory of names. Its interpretations have not been validated by independent annotators or reception studies. A later investigation might document each naming occurrence across complete editions and compare published translations to determine how readers actually recover moral and honorific meanings. For the present argument, the close-reading method establishes the more modest but necessary conclusion that literary onomastic functions must be demonstrated through relations in the text, not simply asserted in a list.

5. CONCLUSION: The four works demonstrate that an onomasticon functions through the interaction of naming and unfolding narrative evidence. In Bunyan, semantically transparent anthroponyms and allegorical toponyms organize a journey as a succession of moral conditions. In Dickens, suggestive surnames, institutional naming practices and the industrial setting reinforce a critique of factual rigidity and social self-presentation. In Qodiriy’s O‘tkan kunlar and Mehrobdan chayon, conventional personal names, honorifics and historically situated places build networks of household authority, affection, conflict and political pressure. Across the languages, identity is only the starting function: a name becomes characterizing or symbolic when its position in the story gives it force. The comparative result is not a catalogue of interchangeable English and Uzbek names. It is an account of distinct means leading to partially

comparable literary effects. Lexical transparency, social address and contextual accumulation each contribute differently, while chronology and genre determine how much interpretive work a name performs before or after the action. The strongest scholarly treatment therefore reads a name with the people, spaces and episodes to which it belongs. Only then can the functional properties of the literary onomasticon be described without confusing dictionary meaning, cultural association and narrative evaluation.

REFERENCES

1. Bunyan, J. (1678). The Pilgrim's Progress (Part I). Project Gutenberg. <https://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/131/pg131-images.html>
2. Dickens, C. (1854). Hard Times. Project Gutenberg. <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/786/786-h/786-h>
3. Qodiriy, A. O'tkan kunlar. Primary literary text; edition and page citations to be confirmed against the copy used for submission.
4. Qodiriy, A. Mehrobdan chayon. Primary literary text; edition and page citations to be confirmed against the copy used for submission.
5. Smith, G. W. (2016). Theoretical foundations of literary onomastics. In C. Hough (Ed.), The Oxford Handbook of Names and Naming. Oxford University Press.
6. Van Langendonck, W. (2007). Theory and Typology of Proper Names. De Gruyter Mouton.
7. van Dalen-Oskam, K. (2016). Corpus-based approaches to names in literature. In C. Hough (Ed.), The Oxford Handbook of Names and Naming. Oxford University Press.