

## A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF TOPONYMS, ANTHROPNYMS, AND OTHER ONOMASTIC UNITS IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15564879>

**Begmatov Azizbek Tursunbayevich**

*Lecturer of the Department of Social Sciences, Kokand University*

### **Abstract**

This study investigates the linguistic and cultural characteristics of onomastic units in Uzbek and English, focusing on three major categories: toponyms, anthroponyms, and other naming forms such as ethnonyms and hydronyms. Using a descriptive-comparative method, the paper explores the etymology, morphological structure, and semantic features of selected names in both languages. The findings reveal that while both onomastic systems serve to preserve historical and cultural identity, Uzbek naming practices are more semantically transparent and metaphorically rich, whereas English onomastics is characterized by deep historical layering and institutional continuity. The study contributes to the field of comparative onomastics and sociolinguistics by providing insight into how language, culture, and history intersect through the practice of naming.

### **Keywords**

onomastics, toponyms, anthroponyms, ethnonyms, Uzbek, English, linguistic identity, cultural semantics

### **Introduction**

Names represent a unique intersection of language, culture, identity, and collective memory. As lexical items with referential function, they are fundamental tools for both individual recognition and social classification. The study of names – onomastics – extends beyond mere linguistic curiosity to become a vital means of understanding how societies encode values, express belonging, and construct worldview.

Within onomastics, categories such as toponyms (place names), anthroponyms (personal names), ethnonyms (names of peoples), and hydronyms (names of water bodies) serve as cultural texts. They reflect everything from historical conquests and migrations to religious beliefs and poetic ideals. While several languages have been extensively analyzed from an onomastic perspective, comparative studies involving typologically distant languages – like Uzbek and English – remain limited. Uzbek, a Turkic language, and English, a Germanic language, diverge

significantly in their grammatical structure, historical evolution, and sociocultural influences, making them ideal subjects for comparative analysis.

This paper aims to analyze and compare Uzbek and English onomastic systems, focusing particularly on toponyms, anthroponyms, ethnonyms, and hydronyms. By identifying key linguistic and cultural patterns, the study seeks to illuminate how each language encodes identity and memory through names.

### Literature Review

The field of onomastics—concerned with the linguistic, cultural, and historical study of names—has evolved significantly over recent decades, intersecting with sociolinguistics, cultural studies, and historical linguistics. A growing body of research has explored how personal names (anthroponyms), place names (toponyms), ethnonyms, and hydronyms reflect and shape collective identity and cultural memory. This literature review synthesizes key scholarly works relevant to the comparative study of onomastic systems in Uzbek and English.

One of the foundational texts in modern onomastics is **Hough's (2016)** *The Oxford Handbook of Names and Naming*, which offers a comprehensive theoretical and methodological framework for name studies across languages. Hough emphasizes the dual function of names as linguistic items and social identifiers, highlighting their roles in identity formation and sociopolitical history. This approach is directly applicable to the current study, which considers not only the structure of names but also their symbolic significance in cultural contexts.

**Algeo (2001)**, in *The Origins and Development of the English Language*, provides a historical lens on English naming conventions, tracing the influence of Latin, Old Norse, and Anglo-Saxon elements on personal and place names. His work is especially valuable in understanding the diachronic complexity of English onomastics, where semantic transparency is often lost but historical continuity is preserved.

From the cultural-linguistic perspective, **David Crystal (2010)** in *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language* sociocultural of naming, including how linguistic communities use names to preserve identity and express belonging. Crystal's insights support the analysis of names as not merely referential but ideologically charged, especially in postcolonial or multiethnic societies.

In the context of bilingualism and name adaptation, **Pavlenko's (2014)** *The Bilingual Mind* presents important observations on how bilingual speakers negotiate identity through names. She notes that individuals often adapt or change names to align with the dominant culture's phonological and social norms, a phenomenon observable among Uzbek migrants in English-speaking countries.

This supports the present study's interest in globalization and identity fluidity in modern naming practices.

Turning to Uzbek onomastics, **Ismatullaeva (2020)** provides a detailed account of Uzbek personal names, emphasizing their semantic transparency and deep cultural symbolism. Her analysis demonstrates how names in Uzbek society often embody parental aspirations, aesthetic ideals, and moral values—an aspect strongly contrasted with English naming traditions in this study.

**Yusupova (2019)** contributes significantly to the understanding of Uzbek toponyms, analyzing how historical, tribal, and Islamic influences shape the geographical naming system. Her research underscores the role of toponyms as historical texts, which encode local memory and political shifts, including Soviet-era modifications of traditional names.

**Room's (1996)** *Placenames of the World* offers a global comparative perspective on toponyms, with particular attention to the etymological origins and semantic layers embedded in place names. His encyclopedic approach serves as a model for the current study's classification and interpretation of English and Uzbek place names.

**Ainiala et al. (2016)**, in *Names in Focus*, present a Finnish-based approach to onomastics that highlights naming as a cultural system, shaped by nature, kinship, and social roles. Their emphasis on cross-linguistic comparison aligns with the goals of this paper, especially regarding the structural and semantic similarities between Turkic and Uralic naming practices.

The theoretical foundation for understanding the deeper implications of naming lies in the **Sapir-Whorf hypothesis**, articulated in **Sapir (1929)** and **Whorf (1956)**. Their work suggests that language shapes thought and perception—a framework that supports the argument that differences in naming conventions reflect broader cultural and cognitive differences between Uzbek and English speakers.

Lastly, **Khan (2014)** explores the symbolic and spiritual dimensions of naming in Muslim societies. His sociolinguistic analysis is particularly relevant to Uzbek names, many of which derive from Arabic and Persian roots with religious or moral meanings (e.g., *Imon*, *Sabr*, *Shukr*). These religious undertones contrast sharply with the more secular, institutional naming traditions prevalent in English-speaking societies.

## Methods

In order to conduct a rigorous and meaningful comparative analysis of onomastic systems in Uzbek and English, this study employed a **qualitative, descriptive-comparative research design**, which is particularly well-suited for

investigating culturally and linguistically embedded phenomena such as naming practices. The goal was to analyze not only the linguistic structure of names but also their semantic richness and cultural symbolism within two distinct linguistic traditions. The research corpus comprised a total of **240 onomastic units**, equally divided between the Uzbek and English languages. Each language contributed **60 anthroponyms** (personal names), **60 toponyms** (place names), **60 ethnonyms** (names of ethnic groups), and **60 hydronyms** (names of rivers, seas, lakes). This balanced sampling approach allowed for both **depth and breadth** in the comparative analysis and ensured the inclusion of names from different semantic and functional categories.

To ensure the representativeness and authenticity of the dataset, multiple sources were used in data collection:

**For Uzbek names, sources included:**

- The "*O'zbek Ismlari Lug'ati*" (Dictionary of Uzbek Names),
- Literary texts by prominent authors such as Abdulla Qodiriy, G'afur G'ulom, and Cho'lpon,
- Government records from the *Uzbek State Committee on Statistics*,
- Historical and geographical dictionaries covering Central Asian regions.

**For English names, sources comprised:**

- The *Oxford Dictionary of First Names and Placenames of the World* by Adrian Room,
- Historical census data and birth registries from the UK and the US,
- Classic literary works including those by William Shakespeare, Charles Dickens, and Jane Austen,
- British Ordnance Survey data for toponyms and hydronyms.

Selection criteria for inclusion were based on **frequency of use**, **cultural relevance**, and **etymological diversity**. Attention was paid to ensuring a **gender balance** in anthroponyms and a **geographical spread** in toponyms and hydronyms.

**Analytical Framework:** *Each name in the corpus was analyzed using a three-tiered framework:*

**Etymological Analysis.** The etymological origin of each name was traced to determine whether it was **native**, **borrowed**, or **hybrid**. For instance, the Uzbek name *Iskandar* (borrowed from Persian/Arabic form of *Alexander*) and the English name *Albert* (of Germanic origin) were classified based on their linguistic ancestry. This step illuminated the influence of Arabic, Persian, and Russian on Uzbek names, and of Latin, Norse, and Anglo-Saxon on English ones.

**Morphological Structure.** This involved breaking down names into their constituent morphemes (roots, affixes, and compounds). Uzbek anthroponyms such as *Gulbahor* (“spring flower”) demonstrate agglutinative patterns typical of Turkic languages, while English names like *Bradford* (“broad ford”) illustrate compounding from Old English. The presence or absence of gender markers, diminutives, and honorifics was also noted.

**Semantic and Cultural Symbolism.** Beyond literal meanings, names were evaluated for their symbolic resonance and sociocultural associations. For example, *Sherzod* in Uzbek not only denotes “son of a lion” but culturally symbolizes bravery and nobility. In English, *Grace* carries religious and moral connotations, despite its loss of etymological transparency over time. This dimension revealed how names function as carriers of value systems, religious affiliation, and historical memory.

To illustrate the comparative scope, several **name pairs** were subjected to close analysis:

- *Samarqand* (Uzbek toponym) vs. *Oxford* (English toponym),
- *Otabek* (Uzbek anthroponym) vs. *William* (English anthroponym),
- *Turk* vs. *Anglo-Saxon* (ethnonyms),
- *Amudaryo* vs. *Thames* (hydronyms).

#### **Data Organization and Thematic Coding**

All data were systematically categorized using **qualitative thematic coding techniques**, guided by categories such as:

- **Nature and geography** (e.g., *Sarvinoz*, *Cambridge*),
- **Religious and spiritual references** (e.g., *Islom*, *Mary*),
- **Emotional or moral traits** (e.g., *Dilshod*, *Hope*),
- **Sociopolitical identity** (e.g., *Turk*, *Norman*).

Each name was tagged under multiple categories, allowing for cross-category analysis and pattern detection. The use of spreadsheets and color-coded matrices enabled efficient comparison and facilitated identification of recurring semantic structures and historical influences.

**Limitations.** While the methodology provided a rich comparative foundation, certain limitations were acknowledged. The size of the corpus, though well-balanced, remains relatively small for a comprehensive statistical generalization. Furthermore, some names have multiple disputed etymologies or meanings that vary by dialect or historical period. Finally, sociolinguistic variables such as age, regional variation, and diaspora usage were not fully integrated into this phase of analysis and are recommended for future research.

### Results

The comparative analysis of onomastic units in Uzbek and English revealed distinct patterns in morphology, etymology, and cultural symbolism across all four categories: anthroponyms, toponyms, ethnonyms, and hydronyms. These differences and similarities offer insight into how each linguistic community encodes identity, history, and worldview through naming practices.

Uzbek personal names, or anthroponyms, are often semantically transparent and structurally rich, reflecting the poetic, moral, and spiritual values of the culture. A majority of Uzbek names are compound names, composed of meaningful morphemes that carry positive connotations. For example, the female name *Gulbahor* (gul = “flower”, bahor = “spring”) evokes imagery of beauty, youth, and rebirth. Similarly, *Sherzod* (sher = “lion”, zod = “born/prince”) symbolizes bravery and nobility—qualities highly esteemed in Uzbek cultural tradition.

Most Uzbek anthroponyms derive from **Persian, Arabic, and Turkic** roots, illustrating the historical influence of Islamic civilization and regional linguistic exchanges. Names like *Muhammadali*, *Zaynab*, or *Otabek* encapsulate both **religious heritage** and **family-based hierarchy** (e.g., the suffix *-bek* indicates nobility or leadership). Moreover, poetic suffixes like *-gul* (“flower”), *-nigoh* (“glance”), and *-dil* (“heart”) are common in female names, emphasizing emotional and aesthetic ideals.

In contrast, English anthroponyms are often **diachronically layered** and etymologically obscured to modern speakers. Names such as *Edward* (“guardian of wealth” from Old English *ēad* = “wealth” + *weard* = “guardian”) or *Elizabeth* (from Hebrew *Elisheba* = “God is my oath”) retain their religious or noble origins but are rarely interpreted literally in contemporary use. The semantic content has largely been replaced by **cultural familiarity and familial continuity**.

English naming conventions also prioritize **patronymic transmission**, where names are passed through generations to preserve lineage. For instance, *William*, *John*, and *George* remain among the most common names across centuries due to royal and biblical associations. Compared to Uzbek practice, the emphasis in English is less on meaning and more on **tradition and heritage**.

**Tracing Civilizational Memory in Place Names.** Toponyms in Uzbek and English provide a rich linguistic map of historical, religious, and geographical influences. In Uzbekistan, place names such as *Buxoro* (Bukhara), *Namangan*, and *Qo'qon* (Kokand) serve as linguistic artifacts of ancient civilizations. For example, *Buxoro* is believed to stem from the Sogdian word *bukhar*, meaning “place of learning” or “monastery”, reflecting the city’s historical role as a center of Islamic scholarship. *Namangan* possibly originates from the Persian *namak-kan* (“salt mine”), referencing the region’s historical salt trade. These names not only identify locations but also preserve economic, spiritual, and tribal history.

Uzbek toponyms often exhibit a **poetic-descriptive style**, such as *Nurafshon* (“radiant light”) or *Navbahor* (“new spring”), which combine natural and symbolic elements. This reflects the culture’s deep **integration of landscape and metaphor**, where places are imbued with ideals of beauty and vitality.

English place names, meanwhile, are steeped in **Anglo-Saxon, Celtic, Latin, and Norse** heritage. For example, *Manchester* originates from the Latin *Mamucium* plus the Old English *ceaster* (“fortified town”), indicating a Roman military site. *Cambridge* literally means “bridge over the River Cam”, while *Newcastle* refers to a “new castle” built by the Normans in the 11th century. Suffixes such as *-ton* (town), *-ham* (village), and *-ford* (river crossing) are widespread and denote **settlement types and land use patterns**.

English toponyms thus serve as **historical layers**, often documenting waves of invasion, colonization, and administrative reorganization. Unlike the metaphorical tone of Uzbek place names, English ones are more **functional and historical** in character.

**Constructing Group Identity through Naming.** Ethnonyms, the names given to ethnic groups or peoples, play a key role in delineating cultural and political boundaries. In the Uzbek context, ethnonyms such as *Turk*, *Tajik*, *Qarluq*, and *Sart* are deeply rooted in the region’s tribal and imperial history. These names were historically used to designate confederations, social hierarchies, or language groups, and they continue to shape collective identity today. For instance, *Turk* not only denotes ethnic origin but also carries pan-Turkic ideological weight in contemporary discourse.

In English, ethnonyms like *Anglo-Saxon*, *Norman*, *Celt*, and *Briton* mark distinct **ethno-historical phases** in the formation of the British Isles. *Anglo-Saxon* refers to the Germanic tribes that settled in England after the fall of the Roman Empire, while *Norman* points to the 11th-century invaders from Normandy. These terms are often politically loaded, used in discussions of heritage, nationalism, and colonial legacy.

Notably, English ethnonyms tend to **encode conquest and political power**, while Uzbek ethnonyms more often **preserve tribal structure and religious affiliation**. In both cases, they serve as powerful tools for **identity construction and cultural differentiation**.

**Rivers as Linguistic Relics.** Hydronyms—names of rivers, seas, and other bodies of water—are among the most conservative elements in any language, often surviving linguistic shifts and political upheaval. In Uzbek, hydronyms such as *Amudaryo* and *Sirdaryo* reflect Turkic and Persian linguistic layers. The word *daryo* (from Persian *daryā* = “river”) is combined with roots referencing regional geography: *Amu* derives from the ancient Oxus River, while *Sir* is associated with the Syr Darya. These names often carry spiritual and agricultural significance, as rivers are central to life in arid Central Asia.

English hydronyms such as *Thames*, *Severn*, and *Avon* trace their origins to **Celtic and Latin roots**. For instance, *Thames* likely stems from the Brythonic *Tamesis*, meaning “dark” or “flowing”, while *Avon* simply means “river” in Welsh. The repetition of names like “River Avon” is thus a tautology resulting from language layering.

Hydronyms in both languages demonstrate **phonological stability over centuries**, even when the surrounding languages evolve. They also offer clues to **prehistoric settlement and cultural continuity**, acting as linguistic fossils of past civilizations.

### Summary of Findings

Across all four categories, the comparative analysis shows:

<i>Categor</i> <i>y</i>	<i>Uzbek Onomastics</i>	<i>English Onomastics</i>
<i>Anthropo</i> <i>nym</i> s	Semantically transparent, poetic, culturally symbolic	Historically layered, patronymic, religious heritage- focused
<i>Toponym</i> <i>s</i>	Descriptive, poetic, Islamic/Persian/Sogdian influence	Functional, settlement- based, Roman/Norman origin
<i>Ethno</i> <i>ms</i>	Tribal identity, linguistic affiliation, regional power	Conquest-driven, colonial, national-historical framing
<i>Hydron</i> <i>ms</i>	Agricultural, spiritual, Persian-Turkic compounds	Celtic/Latin roots, conservative, geographic permanence

This comparative framework reveals not only linguistic contrasts but also divergent **cultural mentalities** – with Uzbek naming emphasizing **symbolism and spirituality**, and English naming prioritizing **continuity, conquest, and institutional legacy**.

### Discussion

The comparative analysis of Uzbek and English onomastic systems reveals not only linguistic differences but also deeper cultural, historical, and ideological contrasts. Names, far from being arbitrary designations, function as **cultural texts** that narrate collective memory, express social values, and structure identity. This section interprets the patterns uncovered in the results, situating them within broader theoretical and sociolinguistic frameworks.

**Cultural Reflections in Naming: Identity Through Language.** The semantic transparency and poetic richness of Uzbek anthroponyms point to a culture where names are imbued with aspirational meaning. Names like *Gulbahor* and *Sherzod* serve not just as identifiers but as narratives of desired character traits, emotional resonance, or divine protection. This naming tradition aligns with what cultural linguists describe as **language as worldview** – an idea rooted in the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, which posits that the structure and vocabulary of a language influence how its speakers perceive the world.

By contrast, English anthroponyms show a tendency toward **diachronic continuity**, where names carry the **weight of historical and religious tradition** rather than immediate semantic value. Names such as *Edward*, *Elizabeth*, or *John* endure across generations more for their familiarity and familial ties than for their etymological meanings. This reflects a cultural emphasis on **heritage, stability, and institutional legacy**, as opposed to Uzbek naming practices, which emphasize **symbolism and social aspiration**.

**Toponyms as Historical and Ideological Narratives.** Place names in both languages reveal the historical depth of geographical memory, though through different lenses. In Uzbek, toponyms often reflect natural features, historical trade, or Islamic and Persian influence. They are frequently poetic, metaphorical, and symbolically resonant. This suggests a view of geography that is not only practical but aesthetic and sacred.

English toponyms, in contrast, are more **utilitarian** in nature, preserving records of conquests, administrative changes, and settlement types. Suffixes like *-ton*, *-ham*, and *-ford* reflect the political reorganization of space through colonization and state-building. These names are less poetic but highly **archival**, functioning as **linguistic fossils** of Roman, Anglo-Saxon, and Norman legacies.

These differences highlight how toponymy can act as a **discursive space for power** – a way for societies to **impose order and identity on landscape**. While

Uzbek names encode **spiritual and tribal narratives**, English names often serve as markers of **legal, economic, or military control**.

**Ethnonyms and the Language of “Us vs. Them”.** The ethnonyms in both languages illustrate how naming can both include and exclude. Uzbek ethnonyms emphasize tribal origin and language affiliation, which is consistent with Central Asia’s history of confederations and multiethnic empires. Ethnonyms like *Qarluq* or *Sart* were not only ethnic markers but also socioeconomic classifiers.

In English, ethnonyms such as *Celt*, *Norman*, or *Anglo-Saxon* serve to **reconstruct historical timelines**, often used in political rhetoric to frame narratives of national identity or colonial dominance. The resurgence of such terms in modern political discourse (e.g., “Anglo-Saxon heritage”) reveals their **symbolic capital** in shaping racial or national boundaries.

In both contexts, ethnonyms are not neutral. They are **linguistic tools of categorization**, reflecting how groups see themselves and others. This underscores the need to view naming not as mere labeling but as **an act of ideological positioning**.

**Hydronyms and Linguistic Preservation.** Hydronyms in both Uzbek and English languages reflect a fascinating resistance to change. Because rivers are longstanding and central to human settlement, their names tend to survive linguistic, political, and even civilizational transitions. In Uzbekistan, names like *Amudaryo* and *Sirdaryo* integrate Persian, Turkic, and Arabic roots, offering insights into historical irrigation systems and sacred landscapes.

In English, names like *Thames* or *Avon* stem from **Celtic substrata**, suggesting that **pre-Roman linguistic layers** continue to influence modern cartography. This confirms the claim of toponymic scholars that **hydronyms are among the most conservative linguistic units**, often outlasting entire languages and empires.

**Globalization and Naming Fluidity.** One of the most dynamic findings of this study is the growing impact of globalization on both onomastic systems. In Uzbekistan, a noticeable trend is the rise of international-sounding names (e.g., *Alex*, *Lina*, *Diana*), chosen for their perceived cosmopolitan appeal or adaptability in global contexts. Likewise, in English-speaking countries, there is an increasing acceptance of names of Arabic, African, and Asian origin, reflecting multiculturalism and migratory flows.

This trend indicates that naming is no longer solely governed by tradition or religious affiliation, but also by **mobility, branding, and global identity performance**. Naming becomes a **site of negotiation**, where personal, familial, and global identities intersect – sometimes harmoniously, sometimes in tension.

### Synthesis of Interpretation

- Uzbek naming practices emphasize **semantic clarity, poetic meaning, and cultural values**; English names reflect **institutional continuity, colonial history, and genealogical preservation**.

- Both systems demonstrate how names are **cultural narratives**, shaped by geography, religion, power, and memory.

- Globalization is accelerating the transformation of naming norms, challenging traditional frameworks in both linguistic communities.

### Conclusion

This study has undertaken a comprehensive comparative analysis of onomastic units in Uzbek and English, focusing on anthroponyms, toponyms, ethnonyms, and hydronyms. Through qualitative analysis of 240 carefully selected names, the research has revealed how different linguistic and cultural systems encode meaning, memory, and identity through the act of naming.

One of the central findings of this study is the **semantic richness and cultural transparency of Uzbek names**, particularly in the categories of personal and place names. Uzbek anthroponyms often embody aspirational qualities, spiritual ideals, or poetic images, serving as reflections of personal virtue and communal values. Toponyms similarly carry historical and symbolic weight, often tied to natural beauty, Islamic scholarship, or ancient trade routes.

In contrast, **English onomastic practices are more strongly tied to institutional legacy and historical layering**. Personal names in English are often preserved for their genealogical and religious significance, even when their original meanings are lost to modern speakers. Place names, ethnonyms, and hydronyms in English serve as linguistic palimpsests, bearing traces of Roman, Anglo-Saxon, Norse, and Norman influences.

The differences in these naming systems reflect broader **cultural orientations**. While Uzbek onomastics tends to be **symbolic, expressive, and value-driven**, English onomastics is often **archival, traditional, and historically pragmatic**. Both systems, however, demonstrate that names are not mere linguistic labels – they are **social artifacts** that connect individuals to place, time, and community.

Importantly, the study also highlights the growing impact of **globalization** on naming practices in both linguistic spheres. In Uzbekistan, the increasing adoption of globally recognizable names reflects aspirations for modernity, international integration, and mobility. In English-speaking societies, the expanding diversity of names signals cultural pluralism and a shift toward inclusive identity politics.

**Limitations and Future Research.** While the study offers valuable insights, certain limitations must be acknowledged. The dataset, though representative, was limited in scope and did not include regional dialectal variations or diasporic naming patterns. In addition, sociolinguistic factors such as gender, age, and religious denomination were not systematically analyzed but could significantly influence naming choices.

Future research could adopt a **quantitative corpus-based approach**, incorporate **field interviews**, or explore **diaspora naming practices** in bilingual contexts. It would also be valuable to examine how names evolve across generations and what sociopolitical pressures influence the retention or change of naming conventions.

By examining how two linguistically and culturally distinct societies name their people, places, and identities, this study affirms the power of names as **living repositories of language, culture, and consciousness**. Whether preserved as heritage or transformed by modernity, names remain one of the most meaningful expressions of human identity.

#### REFERENCES:

1. Algeo, J. (2001). *The origins and development of the English language* (5th ed.). Wadsworth.
2. Ainiala, T., Saarelma, M., & Sjöblom, P. (2016). *Names in Focus: An Introduction to Finnish Onomastics*. Studia Fennica Linguistica. Finnish Literature Society.
3. Ismatullaeva, M. (2020). Specific Features of Uzbek Personal Names and their Cultural Relevance. *Journal of Central Asian Studies*, 15(2), 67–78.
4. Pavlenko, A. (2014). *The Bilingual Mind and What it Tells Us about Language and Thought*. Cambridge University Press.
5. Room, A. (1996). *Placenames of the World*. McFarland & Company.
6. Sapir, E. (1929). The Status of Linguistics as a Science. *Language*, 5(4), 207–214.
7. Whorf, B. L. (1956). *Language, Thought, and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*. MIT Press.
8. Tursunbayevich, B. A., Vitalyevna, U. A., Sadullayevich, U. S., & Vyacheslavovna, O. A. MODERNIZATION OF THE PROTEST OF TEACHING RUSSIAN AND ENGLISH IN PRIMARY EDUCATION.
9. Begmatov, A. T. (2022). EFFECTIVE USE OF INTERACTIVE GAMES IN TEACHING FOREIGN LANGUAGE. Conferencea, 1–4.

10. Tursunbayevich, B. A. (2024). The influence of gamification on student motivation and achievement in higher education English as a foreign language learning. *University Research Base*, 94-99.15:13
11. Begmatov, A., Ismoilov, A., Dauletiyarov, A., & Tasqinov, Y. (2024, May). New classes of integral geometry problems of Volterra type in three-dimensional space. In *AIP Conference Proceedings* (Vol. 3147, No. 1). AIP Publishing.
12. Tursunbayevich, B. A. (2024). TEACHERS' ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS TOWARDS THE UTILITY OF TRANSLATION IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING. *University Research Base*, 100-106.
13. Tursunbaevich, B. A. (2023). BOSHLANG 'ICH SINFLARDA BADIY ASARNI TAHLIL QILISH USTIDA ISHLASH. QO 'QON UNIVERSITETI XABARNOMASI, 709-711.
14. Tursunbayevich, B. A., Vitalyevna, U. A., Sadullayevich, U. S., & Vyacheslavovna, O. A. MODERNIZATION OF THE PROTEST OF TEACHING RUSSIAN AND ENGLISH IN PRIMARY EDUCATION.15:13
15. Sheraliyevna, R. R. N. (2025). UZBEK VA INGLIZ TILLARIDA SINTAKTIK-STILISTIK FIGURALARNING NUTKIY AKTLARDA IFODALANISHI. *Journal of universal science research*, 3(1), 257-262.
16. Sheraliyevna, R. R. N. (2025). COMMUNICATIVE SPEAKING ACTIVITIES IN TEACHING ENGLISH TO HIGH-LEVEL LEARNERS. *AMERICAN JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY BULLETIN*, 3(4), 216-226.
17. Sheraliyevna, R. R. N. (2025). THE INFLUENCE OF LITERATURE IN TEACHING ENGLISH TO UNIVERSITY STUDENTS. *Multidisciplinary Journal of Science and Technology*, 5(4), 22-29.
18. Yusupova, D. (2019). Historical and Linguistic Analysis of Uzbek Toponyms. *Uzbek Journal of Philology*, 8(1), 112-120.