# Proper Name as A Language Category

Koziyeva Iqbol Komiljonovna

Lecturer of the Department of Russian language and literature at the Faculty of Philology of Bukhara State University, Uzbekistan

**Abstract**: This article provides information about the linguistic field of onomastics and the anthroponyms included in it. The article describes in detail the gradual study of proper names by scientists and their work on anthroponyms. The article describes the research of not only Russian, but also world linguists in this field. Proper use of the form of one's own name, knowledge of a foreign language and familiarity with foreign cultural models of personal names are among the most important conditions for the success of the intercultural communication process. Many issues related to the functioning of personal names have been addressed by various disciplines. Anthroponyms are of great importance in people's lives. They reflect the culture and worldview of the society.

**Keywords:** Proper names, anthroponyms, onomastics, vocabulary, dialectal anthroponyms, accepted anthroponyms.

**Introduction:** Proper names have already attracted the attention of ancient Egyptian, ancient Greek and ancient Roman scientists. They were identified as a special class of words by the Stoics (in particular, by Chrysippus), but even later — in the Renaissance, in modern times (T. Hobbes, J. Locke, G. Leibniz), throughout the 19th century (J. St. Mill, H. Joseph, etc.), the discussion about them continued, in the course of which many unambiguous (accepted by many scientists) and completely opposite judgments were expressed.

**Literature review**

The most difficult task turned out to be to determine the peculiarity of the meaning of a proper name. In the last century, this problem was perceived not so much as a linguistic one, but as a logical one, so its researchers were mainly logicians and philosophers. The great

English logician John Stuart Mill (1806-1873) devoted much effort to its resolution. He came to the conclusion that proper names have no meaning, they are peculiar labels, or marks (like a cross) that help to recognize objects and distinguish them from each other. The characteristic of the named thing is not associated with the name-label, they do not "connote" (do not designate, do not describe it), but only "denote" or name it. "Proper names do not connote anything and, strictly speaking, have no meaning"?. Logically developing his idea of tag words and words capable of characterizing (connoting), Mill suggested that "connoting names appeared after proper names"

Another English logician X. Joseph, disagreeing with Mill, who rejected proper names in semantics, expressed the opposite opinion: he not only allowed the proper name to have a meaning, but found that "a proper name has even more meaning than a common name," for example, in the phrase Chalicurus overboard (companion of Aeneas) compared to the expression "The man is overboard!" In the 20th century, the logical concept of proper names was developed by the famous English logician and philosopher Bertrand Russell (1872-1970). In his opinion, everything that is designated in space-time by proper names can well be designated using a coordinate system, and it is designated more precisely, more scientifically. But for everyday, to a certain extent "primitive" communication, proper names are more convenient, and this justifies their existence in the language. B. Russell noticed a certain similarity of his own name with the demonstrative pronouns this, that, this.

Danish linguist Paul Kristoffersen saw the difference between common and proper names in the fact that the former are abstract, the latter are concrete. A proper name is a direct name of an individual, a common name is an indirect name. The common noun first names the class that the individual belongs to, and only then — the individual. The concreteness of a proper name should not be put in direct connection with the uniqueness of the subject. Uniqueness entitles an object to its own name. However, the same name may well serve as a designation for several objects. It is only important that they are all thought of as individual. So, the names Sergey and Tatiana are currently called by hundreds of thousands of men and women, remaining individual designations for each of them. An important milestone in the study of proper names was the work of the English linguist Alan G Ardiner "Theory of proper names" (1954).

Accepting Mill's main thesis about the absence of proper names, A. Gardiner clarifies and develops his interpretation. "A proper name is a word or group of words whose specific purpose is recognized as identification and which fulfill, or tend to fulfill, this purpose solely by means of a distinctive sound (the sound appearance of the word.— In . B.), regardless of any meaning inherent in this sound from the very beginning or acquired by it as a result of association with an object or objects identified through this sound"

Gardiner's idea of "embodied" and "once-embodied" proper names is interesting. Embodied, or "corporeal", are names attached to certain persons, places, etc. (such as William Shakespeare, the River Thames), Disembodied, or "disembodied", are the same name words, but considered outside of connection with specific persons or topographical objects (William as a personal name in general for example, in the dictionary of English anthroponyms). Historically, "embodied" names are primary. Their "disincarnation" occurred later. According to the Soviet linguist M. I. Steblin-Kamensky, who approached the analysis of the history of onomastic vocabulary from the perspective of "more or less "incarnation" of proper names in the language of a particular epoch" (based on the material of Icelandic literature), "the existence of "disembodied" proper names is a relatively new phenomenon characteristic of modern European languages. In Old Norse, there seemed to be no "disembodied" proper names at all. Every proper name has always implied a certain denotation."

The question of the "embodiment" ("corporeality") and "disembodied" ("disembodied") of names (dating back to the teachings of T. Hobbes on the names of individual objects and names common to many things, as well as G. Leibniz — on the relationship of concrete and abstract in thinking and language) is extremely important for the development of the problem under discussion both in general theoretical and historical terms. It deserves close consideration in connection with the analysis of the essence and functions of a proper name in language (in the system of sign units of communication) and in speech (in the communicative application of these units) 8 *, as well as in connection with the need to characterize proper names, their categories and properties not from abstract logical, but from concrete- historical positions.

J. Mill's thesis that "a proper name has absolutely no meaning," supported by linguists V. Brendal, E. Boyseens, L. Elmslev and a number of other scientists, led the modern Danish linguist Knud Togebuto the conclusion that proper names (as well as pronouns), being devoid of semantic content (they are with the "zero root"), they are synonyms. This circumstance, in his opinion, is the reason that one individual can have several different names, and several individuals can have the same name (namesakes, namesakes).

The opposite view of a proper name as words with a greater meaning than common ones, expressed by the ancient Greek Stoic philosophers and supported in the 19th century by H. Joseph, a contemporary of J. St. Mill, was defended in the 20th century by O. Jespersen, M. Breal, and others. So, O. Jespersen wrote: "... proper names have a large number of features, not common names. Using Mill's terminology, but completely at odds with his point of view, I dare say that proper names (as they are actually used) "connote" the largest number of signs." 8 The remark about "real usage" is not accidental here. Jespersen means the speech meaning, not the (linguistic!) meaning that J. S. Mill and his numerous followers analyzed. "Mill and his followers paid too much attention to what could be called the dictionary meaning of a name, and very little attention to its contextual meaning in the particular situation in which it is pronounced or written." 10. We will not describe the opinions of other scientists who have written about proper names, but in order to summarize, we will give the final formulation of the famous Soviet linguist who studies various problems of onomastics, A.V. Suranskaya, who specifically dealt with the history of the study of proper names (mainly in foreign science). "The lack of a single, generally accepted concept of a proper name is largely due to the difference in the initial positions and methods of their creators, as well as the fact that searches were sometimes conducted in diametrically opposite directions. Hence the pairwise opposite theories based on the connection of a proper name with a concept and a named object."

The fact that the problem under discussion is of interest to linguists and especially onomatologists all over the world is evidenced by its nomination as the main topic of the XIII International Onomastic Congress — "Common names and Proper names", held in Krakow in 1978. In 1973, the work of Yevg. G Rodzinsky, a specialist in the philosophy of language, "An Essay on the general theory of proper Names" was published, in which the author set out to "show the true place of proper names in the language, determine their specific properties and relation to other categories of expressions, and also try to establish the ways that led to the emergence of proper names as a special language category". The main issues of the theory of proper names are solved by the author traditionally, however, a number of his observations, clarifications, interpretations, and terms deserve attention.

Among proper names, E. Grodzinsky distinguishes: 1) monodesignate (a designation is an object designated by a word, the same as a denotation, signified), or ideal, proper names, 2) mnogodesignate (with a large number of carriers) and 3) empty — having no designations (for example, the names of mythological characters that never really existed).

The author argues with the point of view of J. S. Mill and his supporters, who deny proper names both meaning and connotation. The meaning of a word (both common and proper) is considered to be the thought experienced by the speaker when using a word meaning an object. E. Grod-Zinsky notes that with a common word, the thought of an object encompasses "only such properties of this object that any other cognate of this common name also possesses (and it can be all general properties or only a part of them); the meaning of a proper name is a thought about the object designated by this name, which encompasses all the most important properties of this object known to the speaker." If a common word does not cover "strictly individual properties," then the meaning of a proper name (including a multi-signified one) includes them. "When we talk about a Yang that we know, the meaning that we attach to our own name "Yang" also covers the individual properties of this Yang, and not just the properties possessed by all persons bearing the name Yang." In this reasoning, it is not difficult to see the concept of the "greater significance" of O. Jespersen, M. Breal and other linguists.

E. Grodzinsky's considerations on the difference between proper names and individual descriptions (descriptions, designations) are interesting. "The proper name of any object can be replaced — without changing the designation — by any other proper name. For example, the proper name Persia was replaced by the name Iran, the proper name Siam by the name Thailand, and the famous French writer Aurora Dudevant replaced her feminine name with the masculine name Georges Sandu, and all these substitutions were approved by the linguistic community at various times."

Individual descriptions (descriptions, designations) do not replace one another, as they designate different objects in view of their uniqueness. From this thesis, it is concluded that names like "The United States of North America and the Baltic Sea are not proper names, but individual descriptions (since they cannot be replaced without losing their designations, for example, by the names of the United States of South America, the Baltic Coast)*. The author objects to the widespread interpretation of "any single name that serves to permanently designate a given object as the proper name of that object." At the same time, it allows for the transformation of individual descriptions of the subject into proper names. The general concept of the origin of proper names from common nouns, as well as specific examples of the formation of proper names, is quite consistent with this... "The name Leo became a proper name only when it lost all connection with the idea of a

lion. Originally, the name of Warsaw Warshowa was an abbreviated description of "the village of Warshowa", i.e. "the village belonging to Warsaw". This name became a proper name when Warsaw ceased to belong to Warsaw."

In the seventies, several theoretical works by Soviet onomatologists appeared. First of all, these are the books by A. A. Beletsky "Lexicology and Theory of Linguistics (Onomastics)" (Kiev, 1972), A.V. Superanskaya "General Theory of proper names" (Moscow, 1973), V. A. N. I. konov "Name and Society" (Moscow, 1974). At the specified time, articles and works by Yu.A. Karpenko "Theoretical foundations of the differentiation of proper and common names" (Movoznavstvo, 1975, No. 4), "On proper and common names" (1976), I. I. Karpenko were published. K o v a l I k a "On proper and common names in the Ukrainian language" (1977), the collection "Common and Proper Names" (1978) was published, and studies devoted to theoretical issues of anthroponymy, toponymy, cosmonymy, and cinematonymy appeared. Let's consider the main provisions of some of these works.

A. A. Beletsky sees the main difference between proper and common names not in their structural and linguistic terms, but in their function. "The difference between proper and common names," he writes, "lies not in morphology or semantics, but in the use, usage, and function of both lexical classes... With regard to their functions, proper names could be called individualizers, and common names could be called classifiers." Proper names differ from non-proper ones in their "correlation" with concepts... and with discrete objects of reality."

A. V. Superanskaya, concluding in her book the consideration of her own name and the teachings about it, names three distinctive features that, in her opinion, make it possible to distinguish between proper names and common names: "The main distinguishing features of a proper name are that: 1) it is given to an individual object, and not to a class of objects having a feature characteristic of all individuals belonging to this class; 2) an object referred to by its proper name is always clearly defined, delimited, and outlined.; 3) the name is not directly related to the concept and does not have a clear and unambiguous connotation at the language level." In a later article "Appellative — onoma", A.V. Superanskaya concretizes the differences between proper names and different types of improper names, considering the specifics of their basic properties. For words of general vocabulary, the main properties are — according to the author of the article — the connection with the concept, the relationship with the class of objects, the absence of a direct connection with a specific object. For nomen words (from Latin. On the contrary, they are characterized by: a weakened connection with the concept, the designation of a class of objects, a close connection with the named object, which constitutes the infima species of logical division. "The main property of proper names is the lack of connection with a concept, a close connection with a single specific object."

B. A. Nikonov considers it important to pay attention to the patterns of proper names development: "A name is a word and, like all words, obeys the laws of language, i.e. it is subject to linguistics... But proper names form a special subsystem in the language, in which general linguistic laws are specifically refracted, and their own patterns arise that do not exist in a language outside of it." V. A. Nikonov especially insistently emphasizes the sociality of proper names, their historical conditionality. "Personal names," the researcher writes, "exist only in society and for society, and it inexorably dictates their choice, no matter how individual it may seem. Personal names are always social.". The social nature of the name is associated with such a property as the "introduction to the series." "The current notion that a name serves as entertainment needs at least a serious correction: it not only divides, but also introduces a number. The name connects the bearer with other bearers of the same name and with the group of society in which it is accepted",— notes V. A. Nikonov.

The Ukrainian onomatologist Y. A. Karpenko focused on the essential and functional difference between proper and common names, as well as on their linguistic features. To him, only a functional approach to the problem does not seem sufficient and reliable, in particular, the unconditional recognition of the functions of generalization (classification, generalization) for common names, and the functions of individualization for proper names (not only proper words can be individualized, but also common words). In addition, a function is not an entity, but only its manifestation. The researcher believes that the functional differences between proper names and common names are undeniable, but they do not follow the line of generalization-individualization, but rather the line of separation-unification: "proper names separate homogeneous objects, and common names unite them." .Y. A. Karpenko suggests calling the function of proper names differential, and common names classification. (Most often, especially in toponyms and anthroponyms, the differential function appears in the form of addressability. In general, the author stands in terms of the semi-functionality of proper names (as well as common names), finding identifying, aesthetic and a number of other functions in them. The differentiation of essence and function

actually boils down to the differentiation of the position of a proper name in language and speech. The linguistic essence of a word is embodied in its speech function. The main criterion for separating proper and non—proper names is as follows: the name of one object is a proper name, the name of a number of homogeneous objects is a common name. In thinking, a common word corresponds to a concept (although its meaning is not equal to a concept), a proper name corresponds to a representation (usually a single one). In general, Y. A. Karpenko comes to the formulation (and terminology) proposed by the famous Soviet linguist A. A. Reformatsky: proper names primarily perform the nominative function (from Latin. nominativus — "nominal") function — certain objects are called, common names — semasiological (from the Greek semasi a — "designation" and 1ogos — "word", "teaching") — they not only name, but also express the concept of the subject

## METHODOLOGY

In studying the various aspects of a proper name, researchers are unanimous in the following statements:

1. Proper names.They are units of language, most often words, and therefore should be considered as a completely legitimate object of linguistics; the analysis of proper names from philosophical, logical, psychological and other positions does not replace their linguistic characteristics, which are better able to express their linguistic essence than others.

2. Proper names belong to nominative rather than communicative units of language and are included in the class of specific nouns (or substantives) in most languages of the world.

3. The specificity of a proper name is noticeable both at the language level — when considering them "in general", outside of specific usage, and at the speech level — in specific contexts and situations (constitutions).

4. The specificity of a proper name concerns both its structural and linguistic side and its functional one. 5. Structurally and linguistically, the specificity of a proper name usually makes itself felt in the field of semantics (therefore, many scientists consider a proper name to be a lexical rather than a lexico-grammatical, and even more so not a grammatical category) and to a lesser extent in the field of morphology (including word formation) and syntax.

6. Attention to the functional side of proper names made it possible to identify the following essential functions peculiar to them (only to them or both to them and to common names): nominative, identifying, differentiating. The following functions (classified as "additional", "cultural", "derivatives" of the main ones or as "passive", etc.) are called: social, emotional, accumulative, deictic (indicative), the function of "introduction to the series", targeted, expressive, aesthetic, stylistic.

7. The researchers tried to find one leading feature, according to which, as it seemed to them, there is a separation of common and proper names. Is there such a feature? The answer to this question can only be given by a comprehensive study of proper names, in particular, an analysis of the features that combine them with common nouns, as well as with other parts of speech, i.e. with all common nouns (especially pronominal, interjective, and other words), and especially those features that distinguish and differentiate them from common nouns.

## RESULTS

The concepts outlined above do not exhaust, of course, the entire range of issues related to clarifying the specifics of a proper name. Researchers have noticed many other features that characterize a proper name to a greater or lesser extent. Leaving aside the minor features, as well as those that are characteristic of proper names of individual languages (for example, only Russian or related Slavic and other Indo—European languages, as opposed to non-systemic languages - Turkic, Finno-Ugric, Iberian-Caucasian, etc. In addition to those discussed above, we should mention such, in our opinion, important features of proper names as:

a) their genetic secondary nature in comparison with common nouns (most proper names are derived from common nouns); b) their functional secondary nature (a proper name is always the second, usually more specific name of an object that has already been named "before" by a common word); c) their structural and linguistic (lexico-semantic, as well as grammatical) and functional specialization; d) the somewhat peculiar position of onomastic units (words and other linguistic signs functionally similar to onyms) in the language: they cannot be attributed to the same lexical tier of the language* since their originality is also manifested in grammar and phonetics (although weaker than in semantics); e) a slightly different embodiment Proper names include such linguistic phenomena as ambiguity, homonymy, synonymy, antonymy, variation, and some others.; f) their statistical (quantitative and frequency) pattern of use is different from the appellatives (common names), as well as, apparently, a different distribution by functional styles (there are quite numerous types of texts that do not use proper names at all, i.e. constructed from the same appellative units, and there are few types of texts composed of the same

proper names).

The most difficult and controversial issues turned out to be the presence or absence of a proper lexical meaning for a name (already concepts, more broadly information), its nature (whether it is meaningful or purely formal), its "volume" in comparison with the semantics of common words, its nature (linguistic, speech, logical, psychological, etc.) onomastic meaning, the degree of opposition of proper names to common names (in terms of meaning and other indicators). Correctly noting the specifics of the proper name in its meaning, researchers differ in its interpretation. Some see the specifics in the weakening, or "reduction", of meaning, or even in its complete absence (hence the qualification of onyms as empty signs, labels, labels and comparing them with balls (differing only in their external coloring with the similarity of their "voids"), with numerical and symbolic signs). Others find the specificity of proper names in the "hypertrophied nominativeness" and in their special concreteness due to it. Such a discrepancy of views indicates, on the one hand, the real complexity and "diversity" of proper names, on the other hand, that the meaning (semantics) of a proper name means different things, moreover, seen from different points of view.

Most often, the "semantics" of a proper name is taken to be its structural and linguistic content. Comparing it with the abstract-structural (actually linguistic), conceptual content of the appellatives, it is found that the semantics of the proper name is poorer due to the unequal representation of the conceptual principle in it (cf. the river - 1 is a constant water stream of considerable size' and the Don — 'one of the rivers in the European part of the SSR7, a man — 'a living being with the gift of thinking and speech, capable of creating tools and using them' and John — 'one of the people, one of the men, etc.'). In other cases, the semantics of a proper name is judged by its specific verbal use, in which there is an extremely "bodily" perception of the so-called objects of reality. For example, Elbrus (Russian folk Shat-mountain) is not an abstract mountain, but first of all one of the specific mountains of the Caucasus, having a certain height (5630 m above sea level), configuration (two peaks). Cf.: "And I mean the jagged chains of endless Siliceous mountains, And the Shat rises beyond them With two snow heads" (M. Y. Lermontov).

In a certain connection with the approach and qualification of the semantics of a proper name, only from the standpoint of language or speech, there is an emphasis on the conceptuality of common nouns and the non-conceptuality of proper names. Common words are classifiers ("unifiers", "generalizers"), proper words are differentiators ("disconnectors", individuators). Common nouns denote an object "through a concept," proper nouns denote it through the direct correlation of the name with the object. In recent theoretical works (Y. A. Karpenko, V. Blanara, A.V. Superanskaya, etc.), there is a desire to more clearly distinguish the definitions of onomastics, taking into account the opposition of "language" and "speech". Undoubtedly, a more rigorous and consistent description of linguistic entities and their functional-speech implementations is advisable. However, the dismemberment of onomastic, as well as other linguistic, categories in order to describe them separately and terminologically without further combining and characterizing them as integral phenomena of linguistic reality cannot be the ultimate task of research. It seems that in the future (and, if possible, even now) definitions of onomastic units and their aggregates should include the total results of their study in language, speech and all other aspects.

The opposite concepts of a proper name arose due to the one-sidedness of the approach to its characterization. For some, proper names turned out to be only identifying labels ("crosses", "scratches"), and this happened due to complete inattention to their real (speech) life, for others, words with overloaded semantics (including all encyclopedic information or all "my" information about their speakers) - according to This is due to a complete lack of attention to their linguistic status, i.e. to their place and meaning in language as a communicative and sign system. The concept of antisemanticism (complete misunderstanding) of a proper name ignores the fact that the named and especially named object is always, albeit with varying degrees of distinctness, correlated with other objects of this type, as well as with other types of similar and dissimilar objects. This is one of the manifestations of the cognitive classification activity of a thinking person and the real embodiment of the accumulative function (in the sense of storing knowledge, human experience) of language. Leningrad... It's a city. It stands in the same classification row with other cities — Moscow, Kiev, Minsk, Odessa, etc. Mikhailovskoye... It is located in another, "rural" row — Trigorskoye, Boldino, Karabakha, Ternovka, Lipovka.

In the concept of the maximum significance of onyms, the actual linguistic meaning is replaced by an encyclopedic meaning, or information about the named subject. Meanwhile, these are two different types of word meanings, which was written about in the last century by the remarkable Russian philologist A. A. Potebnya, who proposed the term "the closest meaning of the word" for the linguistic meaning, and "the further

meaning of the word" for the encyclopedic meaning. "What is the meaning of a word? Obviously, linguistics, without shying away from achieving its goals, considers the meaning of words only up to a certain limit. Since it is said about all kinds of things, without the aforementioned limitation, linguistics would contain, in addition to its indisputable content, which no other science judges, the content of all other sciences... But the fact is that the meaning of a word generally means two different words, of which one, which is subject to linguistics, is called the closest, the other, which is the subject of other sciences, is the meaning of words. Only one immediate meaning makes up the actual content of thought during the utterance of the word " *•", of course, lexicology as the science of words and onomastics as the study of anthroponyms, toponyms, cosmonyms, etc. they cannot deal with the designated subjects and all the encyclopedic (complete, comprehensive) information about them. Our contemporary, the Soviet Slavist N. I. Tolstoy, also points out the inadmissibility of mixing information and meaning: "A proper name carries some information ("content") that is not the same for everyone, which should not be confused with meaning (semantics)."

Despite the apparent contrast between the concepts of the minimum and maximum importance of a proper name, it is easy to see a common feature in them — the denial of the generalizing role of proper names. In the first case, they are denied the existence of a concept directly (and generalization, as is well known, is based on the concept), in the other — indirectly, through excessive "burdening" of their meaning with a specific image of the object. Meanwhile, the meaning of proper names as units of language (most often words) is as complex and dialectical as the meaning of common words. And V. I. Lenin's famous remark that "every word (speech) already generalizes" applies to proper names In modern word theory, it is recognized that the meaning of a word is its content, which is approximately equally understood by both the speaker and the listener and includes three types of relationships.: 1) denotative (the relation of the meaning of a word to a subject: from Latin. denotatare — "to distinguish, to designate"), 2) significant (relation to the concept, Latin. significare — "to discover, to give, to know"), 3) structural (the relation of the meaning of a word, as well as the whole word to other words of a given language).

A proper name, being a unit of language — a word or a functionally similar phrase, has all these types of relations — denotative, significant and structurally linguistic, however, their quality in a proper name is somewhat peculiar compared to the corresponding components of the meaning of common words, which provides proper names with linguistic and speech specificity and unites them into a special a subsystem within the general lexical and semantic system of the language. We find a remark about the nominative, significant, and structural-linguistic specifics of proper names in the works of L. A. Bulakhovsky: "Those words that we call proper names, of course, are less capable of being a means of generalization than common words; their task is to focus attention on the individual, extract it from the plural, and contrast it with the plural.. But proper names are also generalized as words in the sense that they indicate by their nature a certain part of speech, etc., that the concept belongs to one rather than another sphere of perception."

## CONCLUSION

Summing up the consideration of a proper name as a linguistic and speech category, we can state the following. Proper names are units of language—speech (words and substantive phrases) that serve to emphasize the specific naming of individual objects of reality and, as a result of such specialization, have developed certain features in meaning, grammatical design and functioning. The purpose of a common noun is to express the concept of a certain class of objects and to name one or more specific objects of this class. The purpose of a proper name is to name a specific subject, correlating with a class of similar or related subjects. In the foreground of a common word is the expression of a concept, in the second is the designation of an object, in the foreground of a proper name is the highlighting of an object, in the second is the correlation of an object with its like. For a common name, the designation of a concept is mandatory and the naming of a specific object is optional; for a proper name, the naming of a specific object is mandatory and its (subject's) conceptual correlation is optional.

## REFERENCE

Begmatov E. A. O'zbekiston nomlari ma'lumotiismlari ma'nosi (izoxlilug'at). 14 600 ismlar izoxi.2-nashri. — Toshkent: O'zbekiston milliy ensiklopediyasi (lug'at), 2007. — 608 r.

Nafasov T. Markayev O'tish: Saytda Harakatlanish, Qidiruv O'zbek etnoantroponimlari // Onomastika O'zbekiston onomastikasi. Sat. tez.II rep. ilmiy-amaliy.conf. - Qarshi, 1989. — P. 136-140.

Superenskaya A.V. Atoqli otlar struktrasi fonologiya va morfonologiya.-M.: Nauka, 1969.

Petrovskiy N.A. Rus shaxsiy ismlar lug'ati.-M.: Izdatelstvo Sovetskaya ensiklopediya,1966.

Yermolovich D.I. atoqli otlr tillar va madaniyatlar o'rtasida.-M.: R.Valent, 2001.

Козиева И. К. ЛЕКСИКО-СЕМАНТИЧЕСКИЕ СВОЙСТВА АНТРОПОНИМОВ В ХУДОЖЕСТВЕННОЙ ЛИТЕРАТУРЕ //TADQIQOTLAR. UZ. – 2024. – Т. 33. – №. 1. – С. 167-171.

Ikbol K. Aesthetic onomastics and its functions in artistic and intertext //International Journal on Integrated Education. – 2021. – Т. 4. – №. 4. – С. 132-136.

Komiljonovna K. I. ANTHROPONYMY AS A BRANCH OF ONOMASTICS //Open Access Repository. – 2023. – Т. 9. – №. 9. – С. 84-87.

Koziyeva I. ISSUES OF ANTHROPONYMY IN UZBEK AND RUSSIAN LINGUISTICS //Science and innovation. – 2023. – Т. 2. – №. B1. – С. 121-123.

Kozieva I. ANTHROPONYMY STUDIES //Science and innovation. – 2023. – Т. 2. – №. C10. – С. 63-65.