

Ways of Forming Proper Names in Russian and Uzbek: Affixal Derivation and Secondary Nomination

RANO IBADOVNA SAYDULLAYEVA
Karshi State University, Karshi, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

This article presents a comparative study of the mechanisms involved in the formation of proper names (onyms) in two typologically different languages Russian, an inflectional Indo-European language, and Uzbek, an agglutinative Turkic language. The analysis focuses on two principal derivational processes: affixal (morphological) derivation and secondary (semantic) nomination, the latter being understood as the transfer of a common noun or an already existing proper name into another onymic category without any formal modification of its lexical shape. The study is based primarily on anthroponyms and toponyms, with occasional reference to zoonyms in both languages. It identifies structural and typological distinctions resulting from the fundamentally different grammatical organization of Russian and Uzbek, while also revealing functional and semantic regularities that characterize onomastic derivation across languages. The findings demonstrate that, in Russian, affixation is represented by an extensive system of derivational suffixes expressing subjective evaluation, patronymic relations, and place-name formation. In Uzbek, by contrast, the derivation of proper names is mainly achieved through the agglutinative attachment of formally stable and functionally transparent affixes, alongside a considerable number of derivational elements of Arabic and Persian origin that have become fully integrated into the national naming tradition. Secondary nomination in both languages reflects comparable cognitive mechanisms based on metaphorical and metonymic transfer.

Nevertheless, the motivational patterns underlying these processes differ considerably due to the distinct cultural, historical, and linguistic backgrounds of the Russian and Uzbek naming systems. The comparative analysis highlights both language-specific features and universal tendencies in the development of proper names, thereby contributing to a deeper understanding of onomastic word formation in genetically unrelated languages. The findings of the study may be applied in comparative linguistics, onomastic research, lexicography, translation studies, and in the methodology of teaching Russian to Uzbek-speaking learners.

Keywords: Onyms, onomastics, affixal derivation, secondary nomination, anthroponymy, toponymy, word formation, comparative linguistics, Russian language, Uzbek language, agglutination, onomastic formant, appellative, onym motivation.

INTRODUCTION

Proper names (onyms) occupy a distinctive place within the lexical system of a language, combining the function of identifying unique entities with that of preserving the cultural and historical memory of a nation. They reflect a community's worldview, traditions, beliefs, social organization, and patterns of everyday life. The study of the formation of proper names including anthroponyms, toponyms, zoonyms, ergonyms, and other onymic categories has long been regarded as one of the central concerns of onomastic research. Today, onomastics has developed into an independent linguistic discipline situated at the intersection of lexicology, word formation, historical linguistics, and ethnolinguistics.

Comparative research on the formation of proper names in languages belonging to different typological groups has become increasingly significant, as onymic material clearly demonstrates both universal principles of nomination shared across languages and language-specific features determined by the grammatical structure of individual linguistic systems. Russian and Uzbek constitute a particularly illustrative pair for such a comparison. Russian belongs to the Slavic branch of the Indo-European

language family and is characterized by an inflectional morphological system, whereas Uzbek is a member of the Karluk branch of the Turkic languages and exhibits an agglutinative structure. These fundamental differences in morphological organization namely, the polyfunctional and syncretic nature of inflection in Russian versus the sequential accumulation of functionally distinct affixes in Uzbek are naturally reflected in the processes through which proper names are formed.

Among the numerous mechanisms of onym formation, this study focuses on two processes that appear to be especially productive and theoretically significant for comparative analysis: affixal derivation and secondary nomination. Affixal derivation involves the creation of new proper names through the attachment of derivational affixes, primarily suffixes and, less frequently, prefixes, to a lexical base. These affixes perform various naming functions, including the expression of diminutive or augmentative meanings, emotional and evaluative nuances, as well as patronymic and toponymic identification. Secondary nomination, in contrast, does not involve any formal alteration of the lexical form. Instead, it transfers an existing lexical item either an appellative or a proper name into another onymic category on the basis of associative, metaphorical, or metonymic relationships. Typical examples include the Russian toponym *Oryol*, historically associated with the zoonym *oryol* ("eagle") through symbolic motivation; *Zarechye*, derived from a prepositional case form of an appellative meaning "beyond the river"; and the Uzbek toponym *Toshkent*, formed from *tosh* ("stone") and *kent* or *kand* ("city"), representing a metonymically motivated compound.

The relevance of the present study is further supported by a number of practical considerations. The teaching of Russian as a foreign language to Uzbek-speaking learners and the teaching of Uzbek in Russian-speaking environments frequently involve difficulties related to the adaptation, transliteration, grammatical integration, and interpretation of proper names. Addressing these challenges requires a clear understanding of the derivational models employed in both languages. Furthermore, the issues discussed in this study are of considerable importance for

translation studies, cartography, official documentation, and the ongoing efforts in Uzbekistan to standardize personal names and geographical nomenclature.

The aim of this article is to conduct a comparative analysis of affixal derivation and secondary nomination as the two principal mechanisms of proper-name formation in Russian and Uzbek, identifying both their common structural and semantic characteristics and the differences arising from the typological features of the two languages. To achieve this objective, the study pursues the following tasks: (1) to establish the theoretical and methodological foundations for the investigation of onym formation in Russian and Uzbek onomastic scholarship; (2) to describe the system of onomastic affixes in Russian and compare it with the derivational affix system of Uzbek; (3) to examine the mechanisms of secondary nomination in the anthroponymy and toponymy of both languages; and (4) to identify the typologically and culturally determined differences affecting the productivity and semantic characteristics of onym-forming patterns.

METHODS

The theoretical and methodological framework of this research draws upon the principal approaches developed within Russian and Uzbek onomastic scholarship. The conceptual apparatus of the study including the notions of onym, onymization, transonymization, onomastic formant, and the internal form of a proper name is based on the glossary compiled by N. V. Podolskaya [11], which is widely recognized as the standard terminological reference in Russian-language onomastics. The general theoretical foundations of onomastics, encompassing the semantics, functions, and systemic organization of proper names, are grounded in the seminal works of A. V. Superanskaya [13; 14], who proposed a comprehensive classification of proper names and introduced the concept of the onomastic space of language.

The analysis of anthroponymic derivation in Russian relies primarily on the studies of V. D. Bondaletov [3], who examined both the historical evolution of the Russian anthroponymic

system and the productive mechanisms involved in the formation of personal names, patronymics, and surnames through suffixation. Complementing this perspective, A. V. Superanskaya and A. V. Suslova [15] investigated the development of Russian personal names and identified the regular patterns governing the formation of patronymic and family names. The principles of toponymic derivation and the naming of geographical entities in Russian are discussed in the works of E. L. Berezovich [2], whose research places particular emphasis on secondary nomination based on metaphorical and metonymic transfer. These issues are further elaborated in the studies of V. A. Nikonov [9], one of the founders of Russian toponymic research, whose work explains the linguistic regularities underlying the formation and geographical distribution of place names.

The derivational aspect of Russian onomastics, particularly the role of evaluative suffixes in the formation of personal names and nicknames, is addressed in the classical linguistic studies of V. V. Vinogradov [4]. Additional methodological support is provided by E. A. Zemskaya [6], whose theory of Russian word formation clearly distinguishes derivational processes from inflectional morphology. This distinction is essential for differentiating genuine onomastic derivation from grammatical word forms.

The Uzbek-language material is interpreted within the theoretical framework established by E. A. Begmatov, whose monograph *Anthroponymy of the Uzbek Language* [1] remains one of the most authoritative studies in the field. The work provides a detailed account of the structure of Uzbek personal names and identifies productive derivational patterns based on affixation as well as the incorporation of formants of Arabic and Persian origin, including *-khon*, *-bek*, *-boy*, and *-jon*. The grammatical system of Uzbek, particularly the inventory of nominal derivational affixes, is described in the academic grammar by A. N. Kononov [8], which continues to serve as a fundamental reference for the morphology of Modern Standard Uzbek. Historical aspects of Uzbek word formation and the development of nominal derivational affixes are further examined in the studies of A. G. Gulyamov [5]. The theoretical

basis for the analysis of Uzbek toponymy is supplemented by the collective volume *Onomastics of Central Asia* [10], which explores toponymic formants of Turkic, Arabic, and Persian origin, as well as by B. Yuldoshev's textbook on Uzbek onomastics [16].

Overall, the methodological foundation of this study combines the theoretical principles of contemporary onomastics with approaches from derivational morphology and comparative linguistics. This integrated framework makes it possible to examine derivational processes in Russian and Uzbek proper names from structural, semantic, and functional perspectives and to identify both language-specific features and shared typological patterns.

The theoretical foundations of secondary nomination as a cognitive-semantic mechanism for generating new meanings and proper names from existing linguistic units are based on the works of B. A. Serebrennikov [12], who viewed nomination as an activity-driven process mediated by the categorization of reality, and V. G. Gak [7], whose research demonstrated that metaphorical and metonymic transfer represent universal mechanisms of secondary nomination across languages.

The research employs a combination of complementary methods. A comparative-typological approach is used to identify structural similarities and differences between the onymic derivational models of two genetically and structurally distinct languages. Morphemic and derivational analyses are applied to identify, classify, and interpret affixal formants involved in the formation of proper names. Semantic analysis of the internal form of onyms is employed to investigate the mechanisms underlying secondary nomination. Elements of quantitative analysis are incorporated to evaluate the productivity of individual derivational formants on the basis of lexicographic and textual evidence. In addition, the study adopts the method of continuous sampling, whereby proper names are systematically collected from lexicographic sources, including onomastic dictionaries, toponymic reference works, and anthroponymic studies in both Russian and Uzbek.

The current state of research may be characterized as well developed with respect to each language individually, whereas comparative investigations remain relatively limited. Russian onomastic studies have produced an extensive body of research on the affixal derivation of anthroponyms and toponyms, beginning with the pioneering works of V. A. Nikonov and A. V. Superanskaya and continuing in contemporary studies devoted to regional toponymy. Likewise, Uzbek onomastic scholarship, which has developed primarily since the mid-twentieth century through the contributions of E. A. Begmatov, T. Nafasov, S. Qorayev, and other scholars, has established a substantial descriptive tradition in the study of anthroponymic and toponymic systems. Nevertheless, comparative studies specifically examining affixal derivation and secondary nomination as two systematically contrasting mechanisms of proper-name formation in both Russian and Uzbek remain relatively scarce. This gap in the existing literature constitutes the principal rationale for the present study and determines its scientific novelty.

RESULTS

Affixal derivation of proper names in Russian

Affixal derivation of proper names in Russian is realized primarily through suffixation, whereas prefixation occupies a peripheral position and plays only a limited role in onym formation. The few place names that appear to involve prefixes, such as *Zarechye* and *Podgornoye*, are more accurately interpreted as the result of the lexicalization of prepositional-case constructions rather than genuine prefixal derivation.

Within the Russian anthroponymic system, suffixation performs several important functions. First, it serves to form hypocoristic (diminutive and affectionate) variants of personal names. For example, *Ivan* gives rise to *Vanya*, *Vanechka*, and *Vanyusha*, while *Maria* develops forms such as *Masha*, *Mashenka*, and *Marusya*. The most productive suffixes in this subsystem include *-echk-*, *-ochk-*, *-enk-*, *-onk-*, *-ushk-*, *-yush-*, *-ush-*, *-ik-*, and *-k-*, together with their various combinations.

These suffixes express different degrees of emotional and stylistic evaluation, ranging from neutral diminutive meanings to strongly familiar or, conversely, respectfully affectionate forms. A comprehensive description of this derivational subsystem is provided by Bondaletov [3] and Superanskaya [13].

Second, suffixation constitutes the principal mechanism for the formation of patronymics and surnames in Russian anthroponymy. Patronymics are formed by means of the suffixes *-ovich/-evich* for masculine forms and *-ovna/-evna* for feminine forms (e.g., *Pyotr* → *Petrovich*, *Petrovna*; *Sergey* → *Sergeyevich*, *Sergeyevna*). Russian surnames are predominantly derived using the suffixes *-ov/-ev*, typically attached to the father's given name or nickname and, less frequently, to occupational names or descriptive appellations denoting physical or personal characteristics (e.g., *Ivanov*, *Kuznetsov*, *Belyayev*). Another productive pattern involves the suffixes *-in/-yn*, which are commonly attached to stems ending in *-a* or *-ya* as well as to nickname-based stems (e.g., *Ilyin*, *Nikitin*). The suffixes *-sky/-tsky* constitute another important derivational type historically associated with toponymic motivation, indicating either geographical origin or historical ownership of a particular locality (e.g., *Obolensky*, *Vyazemsky*). The historical development and structural organization of these derivational patterns are comprehensively described by Bondaletov [3] and by Superanskaya and Suslova [15].

Within the Russian toponymic system, the most productive derivational suffixes include *-sk-* (e.g., *Smolensk*, *Kursk*), *-ov/-ev* combined with toponymic endings (e.g., *Ivanovo*, *Orekhovo*), and *-in/-yn* (e.g., *Borodino*, *Golitsyno*). Adjectival suffixes such as *-ny/-naya* also occur frequently in place names, particularly in settlement names such as *Lesnoye* and *Podgornoye*. As noted by Berezovich [2: 47-52], Russian toponymic suffixation is historically rooted in possessive and relational constructions that originally denoted the ownership of land by a particular individual, family, or social group.

Affixal derivation of proper names in Uzbek

The agglutinative structure of Uzbek determines a fundamentally different pattern of affixal derivation from that found in Russian. In Uzbek, derivational formants are attached to the lexical stem in a linear manner, generally preserving both their phonological shape (subject to vowel harmony) and their specific derivational or grammatical function. Unlike the fusional morphology of Russian, Uzbek derivation is characterized by the absence of extensive allomorphy and morphological fusion.

In the Uzbek anthroponymic system, a prominent role is played by so-called name formants, which function as components of compound personal names. According to Begmatov [1: 79-112], these elements originate from Turkic, Arabic, and Persian lexical sources and are systematically combined with personal-name stems according to productive derivational patterns. Among the most frequent formants are *-khon* (derived from Persian, historically associated with nobility, e.g., *Dilkhon*, *Gulkhon*), *-bek* ("lord" or "ruler" in Turkic; e.g., *Ulugbek*, *Jaloliddinbek*), *-boy* ("wealthy" or "prosperous"; e.g., *Ergashboy*), *-jon* (from Persian *jan*, "soul" or "dear"; e.g., *Diljon*, *Malohatjon*), *-oy* ("moon"; e.g., *Ziloloy*, *Guloy*), *-gul* ("flower"; e.g., *Gulnora*, *Gulchehra*), and *-nur* ("light"; e.g., *Dilnura*, *Nurbek*).

Alongside these semi-affixal elements, Uzbek anthroponymy also employs productive agglutinative derivational affixes. Diminutive and affectionate forms may be created by attaching derivational suffixes to truncated personal-name stems in colloquial usage. Some hybrid formations influenced by contact with Russian have also been documented; however, such forms belong to the domain of language contact rather than to the indigenous Uzbek derivational system.

Within the Uzbek toponymic system, derivation is primarily achieved through lexicalized toponymic formants inherited from Turkic, Persian, and Arabic. As described in *Onomastics of Central Asia* [10] and in the studies of Kononov [8], these formants denote settlement types, geographical features, or socio-cultural characteristics. The most productive include *-kent/-kand* ('town' or 'settlement'; e.g., *Tashkent*, *Samarkand*, *Kokand*), –

obod/-abad (“inhabited” or “prosperous place”; e.g., *Khonobod*, *Yangiobod*), *-ariq* (“irrigation canal”), *-qishloq* (“village” or “rural settlement”), and *-tepa* (“hill” or “elevation”; e.g., *Oqtepa*).

Unlike Russian derivational suffixes, which often perform both lexical and grammatical functions simultaneously, Uzbek toponymic formants primarily retain lexical and classificatory meanings, identifying the type or nature of the geographical object being named. In this respect, they are structurally closer to lexical roots in compound words than to inflectional affixes in the strict morphological sense. This characteristic has been emphasized in the grammatical descriptions of Uzbek by Kononov [8: 165-180] and in Gulyamov's studies on the historical development of Uzbek nominal derivation [5].

Secondary nomination in Russian and Uzbek

Secondary nomination in both Russian and Uzbek is based on the same fundamental cognitive mechanisms, namely metaphorical and metonymic transfer. However, the cultural and historical content associated with these mechanisms differs considerably between the two linguistic traditions. Serebrennikov [12: 147] defines secondary nomination as the use of existing linguistic naming resources to designate a new referent through a meaningful conceptual relationship between the original and the newly designated object. Gak [7: 98-101] further argues that such transfers are grounded in universal cognitive operations – similarity in the case of metaphor and contiguity in the case of metonymy – while their realization remains culturally specific.

In Russian toponymy, metonymic secondary nomination is observed in settlement names derived from hydronyms, for example *Volgograd*, whose name originates from the hydronym *Volga* through the addition of the derivational element *-grad*. A similar mechanism is found in historical place names derived directly from the names of founders or landowners without additional derivational marking. Metaphorical transfer is particularly productive in Russian anthroponymy and zoonymy, where personal nicknames such as *Medved'* (“Bear”), *Oryol* (“Eagle”), and *Lisa* (“Fox”) arise through the metaphorical transfer

of animal names to humans based on perceived similarities in physical appearance or character traits. This pattern corresponds to the well-established model of zoo-anthroponymic transfer described in studies of secondary nomination.

Secondary nomination is likewise highly productive in Uzbek anthroponymy. A considerable proportion of Uzbek personal names originate from common lexical items that have entered the anthroponymic system without formal derivational marking through symbolic and metaphorical reinterpretation. Examples include *Gulnora* ("flower" + "light"), *Sherzod* ("lion-like" or "born of a lion"), symbolizing courage and strength, and *Oygul* ("moon-flower"). According to Begmatov [1: 134-141], such names reflect traditional Turkic-Muslim cultural beliefs in the auspicious symbolism of personal names, whereby desirable qualities such as beauty, strength, prosperity, and good fortune are metaphorically attributed to the bearer.

In Uzbek toponymy, metonymic transfer is commonly realized through place names derived from characteristic natural features or traditional occupations without the use of additional derivational formants. For example, *Tol* ("willow") may designate a locality characterized by willow trees, while other place names reflect the predominant occupation of local inhabitants.

A major contrast between Russian and Uzbek concerns the degree of formal marking associated with secondary nomination. In Russian, secondary nomination in toponymy is frequently accompanied by affixal derivation, as illustrated by the development of *Volga* into *Volgograd*. In Uzbek, by contrast, secondary nomination more often involves the direct transfer of a common noun into the class of proper names without overt derivational marking. This pattern reflects the general tendency of agglutinative languages to maintain a clearer distinction between lexical meaning and grammatical expression.

DISCUSSION

A comparison of affixal derivation and secondary nomination in Russian and Uzbek reveals two complementary dimensions of

analysis: a typologically determined dimension and a cultural-historical dimension.

From a typological perspective, the observed differences are primarily attributable to the fundamental contrast between fusional and agglutinative morphological systems. As demonstrated by Zemskaya [6], Russian suffixation is characterized by the existence of multiple allomorphs expressing the same derivational meaning. For instance, diminutive formation employs a range of suffixes, including *-k-*, *-ik-*, *-ok-*, *-ek-*, *-ochk-*, and *-echk-*, whose variation reflects historical phonological developments and morphophonemic alternations. Moreover, Russian derivational suffixes frequently combine lexical derivation with grammatical information, such as gender or case marking. In contrast, Uzbek affixation exhibits a high degree of functional consistency. As noted by Kononov [8], individual formants generally express a single derivational meaning and are attached to the lexical base according to regular agglutinative principles governed by vowel harmony. Consequently, the morphological structure of Uzbek proper names is more transparent and predictable than that of Russian.

From a cultural-historical perspective, the contrast is reflected in both the semantic nature of derivational formants and the cultural motivations underlying their use. Uzbek anthroponymic formants such as *-khon*, *-bek*, *-boy*, and *-jon*, which derive from Turkic, Arabic, and Persian lexical traditions associated with social status and kinship, preserve important historical and cultural information concerning systems of rank, honorific address, and family relationships in Turkic-Muslim society. Begmatov [1: 95-110] emphasizes that these elements function not merely as derivational markers but also as carriers of cultural meaning. By comparison, Russian patronymic suffixes (*-ovich/-evich*) and the surname-forming suffixes (*-ov/-ev/-in*) reflect a different historical model of personal identification based primarily on paternal lineage and family affiliation within the Slavic patronymic tradition, as described by Bondaletov [3: 56-73]. These observations suggest that affixal derivation in both languages serves not only grammatical purposes but also encodes

culturally specific concepts of identity, kinship, and social organization.

Secondary nomination, in turn, demonstrates a considerably higher degree of cross-linguistic universality at the cognitive level. Both languages rely on metaphor and metonymy as the principal mechanisms through which existing linguistic units acquire new referential functions. This finding is consistent with Gak's theory of the universal character of semantic transfer [7: 98-101]. At the same time, important differences emerge in the symbolic motivations underlying individual names. In Russian anthroponymy, zoomorphic nicknames are typically motivated by perceived similarities in character or behavior, such as the cunning associated with the fox or the strength attributed to the bear. In Uzbek anthroponymy, by contrast, symbolic names referring to flowers, the moon, or the lion primarily perform a benevolent and protective function. As observed by Begmatov [1: 138], these names reflect the traditional belief that a personal name possesses symbolic power capable of influencing the destiny, well-being, and character of its bearer.

Another important aspect concerns the productivity of the two naming mechanisms in contemporary language use. In Russian, the affixal derivation of patronymics and surnames largely represents a historically closed system, and the creation of new surnames according to traditional derivational models is now relatively uncommon. By contrast, suffixation remains highly productive in the formation of hypocoristic variants of personal names and continues to develop actively in everyday spoken communication. In Uzbek, traditional anthroponymic formants likewise remain productive in contemporary naming practices, as evidenced by the structure of newly registered personal names. At the same time, recent naming tendencies indicate a gradual increase in simple, non-derived personal names without traditional formants, reflecting the influence of ongoing social and cultural change. These developments illustrate the dynamic interaction between linguistic tradition and contemporary naming practices in both languages. Finally, it should be emphasized that further comparative research on onym formation in Russian and Uzbek has considerable methodological

and practical potential. Such studies may contribute to improving the principles governing the transliteration and adaptation of Uzbek proper names in Russian discourse and Russian proper names in Uzbek, since differences in the affixal structures of the two languages have a direct impact on the integration of borrowed proper names into the recipient linguistic system.

CONCLUSION

The comparative analysis of affixal derivation and secondary nomination as the two principal mechanisms of proper-name formation in Russian and Uzbek leads to several major conclusions.

First, affixal derivation in both languages reflects the typological characteristics of their respective morphological systems. Russian suffixation is characterized by extensive allomorphy, the integration of derivational and grammatical functions within individual suffixes, and the historical continuity of many derivational patterns, particularly those associated with surnames. Uzbek, by contrast, exhibits a highly regular agglutinative derivational system in which individual formants generally express a single derivational meaning. These formants remain closely connected with lexical concepts denoting social status, kinship, and settlement types inherited from the Turkic as well as Arabic-Persian linguistic traditions.

Second, secondary nomination in both languages is based on the universal cognitive mechanisms of metaphorical and metonymic transfer, confirming its general linguistic character. Nevertheless, although the underlying cognitive models are shared, their cultural realization differs significantly. Russian zoo-anthroponymy is primarily motivated by perceived character traits, whereas Uzbek anthroponymy based on floral and celestial symbolism predominantly serves a benevolent and symbolic function. This contrast demonstrates that onomastic systems are deeply embedded in the cultural worldview of their respective speech communities.

Third, the comparison of contemporary productivity reveals different developmental tendencies in the two languages. In

Russian, surname formation through traditional affixation has become largely historical and non-productive, while hypocoristic suffixation continues to develop actively in everyday language. In Uzbek, traditional anthroponymic formants remain productive in present-day naming practices, although recent naming trends also indicate a growing preference for structurally simple personal names without traditional derivational components.

The findings of the present study confirm the importance of comparative research on onomastic derivation for addressing both theoretical issues in general and comparative linguistics and practical problems in lexicography, translation studies, and the teaching of Russian and Uzbek. Future research may broaden the empirical basis of investigation by incorporating ergonyms, pragmatonyms, and computer-mediated proper names such as online nicknames. The application of quantitative corpus-based methods would further contribute to a more precise assessment of the productivity of individual derivational formants in contemporary language use.

REFERENCES

1. Begmatov, E. A. 1998. *Anthroponymy of the Uzbek Language*. Tashkent: Fan.
2. Berezovich, E. L. 2000. *Russian Toponymy from an Ethnolinguistic Perspective*. Yekaterinburg: Ural State University Press.
3. Bondaletov, V. D. 1983. *Russian Onomastics*. Moscow: Prosveshchenie.
4. Vinogradov, V. V. 1972. *The Russian Language: A Grammatical Theory of the Word*. Moscow: VysshayaShkola.
5. Gulyamov, A. G. 1955. *Problems of Historical Word Formation in the Uzbek Language. Part I: Affixation. Derivational Affixes of Nouns*. Tashkent: Academy of Sciences of the Uzbek SSR.
6. Zemskaya, E. A. 1973. *Modern Russian: Word Formation*. Moscow: Prosveshchenie.
7. Gak, V. G. 1998. *Linguistic Transformations*. Moscow: School "Languages of Russian Culture".
8. Kononov, A. N. 1960. *Grammar of the Modern Uzbek Literary Language*. Moscow-Leningrad: Academy of Sciences of the USSR.
9. Nikonov, V. A. 1965. *Introduction to Toponymy*. Moscow: Nauka.

10. Ibragimov, S. I. (ed.) 1978. *Onomastics of Central Asia*. Moscow: Nauka.
11. Podolskaya, N. V. 1988. *Dictionary of Russian Onomastic Terminology*. 2nd ed. Ed. A. V. Superanskaya. Moscow: Nauka.
12. Serebrennikov, B. A. 1988. *The Role of the Human Factor in Language: Language and Thought*. Moscow: Nauka.
13. Superanskaya, A. V. 1973. *General Theory of Proper Names*. Moscow: Nauka.
14. Superanskaya, A. V. 1986. *Theory and Methodology of Onomastic Research*. Moscow: Nauka.
15. Superanskaya, A. V. & Suslova, A. V. 1991. *On Russian Personal Names*. Leningrad: Lenizdat.
16. Yuldoshev, B. 2015. *Issues in Uzbek Onomastics: A Textbook*. Samarkand: Samarkand State University Press.

RANO IBADOVNA SAYDULLAYEVA

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR,
PHD IN PHILOLOGICAL SCIENCES,
DEPARTMENT OF RUSSIAN
LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE,
KARSHI STATE UNIVERSITY,
KARSHI, UZBEKISTAN.