BG Pulse Journal USA
ISSN:1947-2536 http://www.bgpulseusa.com/index.php/bg
BG PULSE JOURNAL

A COMPARATIVE-INTEGRATIVE ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH AND UZBEK LITERARY ONOMASTICONS BASED ON THEIR DERIVATIONAL, FUNCTIONAL, AND PRAGMATIC FEATURES

Baxtiyorova Maftuna Baxtiyorovna
PhD in Philology, Associate Professor
Department of Foreign Languages
Faculty of Pedagogy and Philology
University of Economics and Pedagogy
doi:https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23553213

ABSTRACT. This article presents a comparative-integrative analysis of literary onomasticons in English and Uzbek, focusing on their derivational, functional, and pragmatic features. The study considers literary onomasticon as a structured system of proper names functioning within the artistic space of a literary text. Particular attention is given to anthroponyms, toponyms, nicknames, and other contextually significant onomastic units and their role in constructing character identity, cultural meaning, textual cohesion, and authorial intention. The research employs descriptive, comparative, contextual, and linguo-stylistic approaches to identify common and culture-specific patterns in English and Uzbek literary naming practices. The analysis demonstrates that literary names are not limited to their nominative function: their morphological and derivational structure may contribute to characterization, while their contextual realization may generate expressive, symbolic, evaluative, cultural, and pragmatic meanings. The comparative perspective reveals that both English and Uzbek literary texts employ proper names as multifunctional textual resources, although their associative and pragmatic potential is shaped by different linguistic structures, naming traditions, cultural values, and literary conventions. The study argues that an integrative examination of derivational form, textual function, and pragmatic meaning provides a more comprehensive understanding of literary onomasticons and their contribution to artistic meaning-making.

Keywords: literary onomasticon, literary onomastics, proper names, anthroponyms, toponyms, derivation, word formation, stylistic function, pragmatic function, English, Uzbek, comparative linguistics.

INTRODUCTION. Literary onomastics occupies an important position at the intersection of linguistics, literary studies, stylistics, and cultural analysis. Proper names in literary discourse are not merely nominative units used to identify characters, places, or other entities; they may also participate in the construction of characterization, cultural identity, symbolic meaning, textual organization, and authorial intention. Consequently, the analysis of literary names requires an approach that considers both their linguistic structure and their functions within a particular artistic context. Iliescu (2015) emphasizes the relevance of literary onomastics by drawing attention to the semantic standing of proper names, their symbolic significance, and their potential influence on readers. The concept of a literary onomasticon is particularly productive for examining the systematic organization of proper names within a literary text. An onomasticon may include anthroponyms, toponyms, ethnonyms, zoonyms, nicknames, and other contextually meaningful naming units. Their linguistic form can reveal derivational patterns, while their textual realization may produce stylistic, semantic, pragmatic, and aesthetic effects. Andaniyazova (2015), analyzing onomastic units in literary texts, demonstrates that anthroponyms, zoonyms, and toponyms can

perform poetic functions beyond their basic nominative role. Her study consequently supports the consideration of proper names as significant elements of literary expression. From a derivational perspective, literary names are of particular interest because their morphological structure may be intentionally modified or creatively constructed by an author. Derivational elements, diminutive and augmentative forms, compounds, lexical transformations, and occasional naming patterns can contribute to the semantic and expressive potential of a literary name. Such forms may encode information about a character's social position, personal qualities, emotional evaluation, or relationship with other characters. Therefore, the derivational structure of an onomastic unit can become an important mechanism through which literary characterization is achieved. The functional dimension of literary onomastics is equally significant. A proper name may simultaneously perform identifying, characterizing, localizing, sociocultural, expressive, symbolic, and intertextual functions. Andaniyazova (2015) demonstrates that the poetic use of onomastic units is closely connected with the artistic organization of literary texts and with the author's literary purposes. Thus, the functional interpretation of a literary name should not be separated from its position within the narrative structure and from the artistic intentions underlying its selection. The pragmatic dimension provides an additional level of interpretation. In literary communication, the meaning of a proper name is frequently dependent on the relationship among the author, character, reader, and textual context. A name may communicate evaluation, irony, emotional attitude, social distance, cultural affiliation, or an implicit reference without expressing these meanings directly. Iliescu (2015) points to the probable consequences of naming for readers and highlights the cognitive and symbolic dimensions of names in literary works. This makes pragmatic analysis essential for understanding how literary names influence interpretation and reader perception. A comparative study of English and Uzbek literary onomasticons is particularly relevant because the two languages represent different linguistic systems and cultural naming traditions. At the same time, both literary traditions demonstrate the capacity of proper names to function as multifunctional artistic resources. The similarities may be observed in the use of names for identification, characterization, localization, and symbolic representation, whereas differences may emerge from derivational patterns, naming conventions, cultural associations, and pragmatic strategies.

The present study therefore aims to provide a comparative-integrative analysis of English and Uzbek literary onomasticons by examining their derivational, functional, and pragmatic features as interconnected dimensions of literary naming. The study seeks to identify common and culture-specific patterns in the formation and use of literary names and to demonstrate how their structural properties interact with their textual functions and pragmatic meanings. Such an integrated perspective makes it possible to view the literary onomasticon not as a simple collection of proper names, but as a dynamic linguistic and cultural system participating in the creation and interpretation of artistic meaning.

MAIN PART. Derivational features of English and Uzbek literary onomasticons. The literary onomasticon represents a structurally and semantically organized system of proper names functioning within an artistic text. Its derivational dimension is particularly important because the formal structure of a name may contribute to its literary interpretation. In fiction, authors can employ existing personal names, modified forms, compound names, nicknames, descriptive naming patterns, and contextually created names in order to construct particular associations and characterize fictional figures. The derivational structure of a literary name may therefore function as more than a formal linguistic phenomenon. Morphological elements, lexical components, diminutive formations, compounds, and creatively constructed forms can convey social, emotional,

evaluative, or cultural information. In this respect, literary naming becomes a productive mechanism of artistic characterization. Andaniyazova (2015) demonstrates that literary authors may create names specifically for fictional characters and employ their internal semantic structure for artistic purposes. The researcher gives examples such as Semiz Nazarov, Oriq Nazarov, and Yovqoch Ollaberganov, showing how structurally meaningful names can contribute to comic characterization (pp. 16–17). This phenomenon is also relevant to English literary naming. English literary texts frequently employ semantically transparent, modified, compound, or culturally marked names whose formal composition contributes to the reader's interpretation of a character. Thus, derivation can be regarded as an interface between the linguistic form of an onomastic unit and its functional realization in literary discourse. From a comparative perspective, English and Uzbek demonstrate both common and culture-specific tendencies. The common tendency lies in the author's ability to manipulate the formal structure of a name for artistic purposes. The culture-specific dimension is reflected in the morphological resources available in each language and in the cultural associations attached to particular naming patterns. Consequently, derivational analysis provides an important basis for identifying how linguistic structure participates in the formation of literary meaning.

Functional features of literary onomasticons. The functional potential of literary proper names represents one of the central issues of literary onomastics. A proper name may perform an identifying function while simultaneously contributing to characterization, localization, cultural representation, expressiveness, symbolism, or intertextuality. Gibka (2015), in her study of proper names in literary works, emphasizes that literary names cannot be reduced to their basic denotative role. Her functional approach distinguishes a primary identifying function from a range of secondary functions, including semantic, sociological, allusive, expressive, and localizing functions (pp. 79–90). The identifying function constitutes the fundamental level of literary naming. Through an anthroponym, the reader can distinguish one character from another, while a toponym establishes a particular geographical location. However, the literary significance of a name frequently emerges at higher functional levels. Dimitrov (2015), examining proper names in the poetry of Zbigniew Herbert, focuses particularly on anthroponyms, toponyms, and theonyms and investigates their functions within poetic texts.

[03.09.2026 23:42] Dilbar Ganiyeva: The study explicitly identifies functions connected with “location in time and space, expressive function, intertextual function” (Dimitrov, 2015, p. 421). The localizing function is particularly important in literary discourse. Toponyms can establish the spatial and temporal framework of a narrative while simultaneously activating historical and cultural associations. In English literary texts, place names such as London, Oxford, or Cambridge may function not only as geographical references but also as markers of social environment and cultural identity. Similarly, Uzbek literary texts may employ Tashkent, Samarkand, Bukhara, or other culturally significant place names to establish geographical space and activate historical or national associations. The expressive function represents another important dimension. A proper name may contribute to the emotional and evaluative characterization of a fictional figure. Andaniyazova (2015) shows that onomastic units may be selected in accordance with particular literary purposes and may acquire additional poetic meanings within the text. Her analysis of anthroponyms, zoonyms, and toponyms demonstrates that their literary value is closely connected with their contextual use. The functional interpretation of literary names therefore requires attention to the relationship between the name and the surrounding text. The same proper name may remain primarily identifying in one context but acquire expressive, symbolic, humorous, ironic, or intertextual significance in another.

Pragmatic features of literary onomasticons. The pragmatic dimension of literary onomastics concerns the meanings and effects produced by a name in a particular communicative and contextual situation. In literary communication, the interpretation of a proper name depends on the interaction between authorial intention, character relationships, textual context, and reader interpretation. Iliescu (2015) emphasizes the importance of examining "the probable consequences names have on readers" and draws attention to the "symbolic weight of names" and the cognitive features associated with their literary functions (p. 144). This perspective demonstrates that a literary name may communicate information indirectly. Its pragmatic meaning can be produced through cultural knowledge, contextual associations, irony, emotional evaluation, or the reader's recognition of an allusion. For example, an author may select a particular name because it evokes a specific social group, historical period, cultural tradition, or previously known literary figure. The reader then interprets the name not only according to its referential meaning but also according to the associations activated by the context. In this sense, the literary onomasticon becomes a pragmatic resource through which implicit meanings can be communicated. Pragmatic meaning is especially evident in cases of expressive or evaluative naming. A nickname, altered form, or semantically motivated personal name may communicate the speaker's attitude toward the person being named. Such naming may express affection, irony, criticism, admiration, social distance, or humour. Andaniyazova's (2015) examples of semantically motivated names used for comic characterization demonstrate that the relationship between naming and evaluation may be central to the artistic construction of a character.

Derivational, functional, and pragmatic integration. The main methodological value of an integrative approach lies in the fact that derivational, functional, and pragmatic properties of literary names are closely interconnected. The formal structure of a name may determine or support its stylistic function, while its textual function may generate a particular pragmatic effect. For instance, a semantically transparent or creatively constructed anthroponym may initially attract attention because of its unusual derivational form. Within the literary context, this form may then characterize the person denoted by the name. At the pragmatic level, the same name may communicate irony, humour, evaluation, or the author's attitude toward the character. Thus, the three dimensions should not be examined independently. This interrelationship is consistent with the broader understanding of literary onomastics proposed by Iliescu (2015), who emphasizes the interaction between the linguistic construction of names, their semantic status, their literary employment, and their consequences for readers. Similarly, Gibka's (2015) functional approach demonstrates that the literary name participates in different relations within the naming process, which makes its interpretation dependent on the elements involved in literary communication.

Comparative perspective: English and Uzbek literary onomasticons. The comparison of English and Uzbek literary onomasticons reveals a common functional foundation combined with significant linguistic and cultural differences. In both literary traditions, proper names may identify characters and locations, construct literary space, contribute to characterization, express evaluation, and activate cultural or intertextual associations. The differences become more apparent at the derivational and pragmatic levels. English literary naming is influenced by the morphological and lexical resources of English as well as by English-speaking cultural and literary traditions. Uzbek literary naming, in contrast, reflects the structural possibilities of Uzbek and incorporates naming traditions connected with national history, folklore, kinship, social relations, and cultural values. Andaniyazova's (2015) analysis is particularly relevant to the Uzbek side of the comparison because it demonstrates how anthroponyms, zoonyms, and toponyms acquire poetic functions in literary texts. The author stresses the importance of examining onomastic units through a linguo-

poetic approach rather than treating them as simple nominative elements. Dimitrov's (2015) analysis of literary names likewise demonstrates that proper names can organize poetic space and activate expressive and intertextual meanings. Taken together, these observations support the comparative-integrative view adopted in the present study: the literary onomasticon should be interpreted as a dynamic system in which form, function, and pragmatic meaning interact.

Literary onomasticon as a multifunctional system. The analysis ultimately indicates that literary onomasticons should be regarded as multifunctional linguistic systems rather than simple collections of proper names. Their derivational organization provides the formal basis for meaning construction; their functional properties determine their role within the literary text; and their pragmatic properties regulate the meanings and associations available to the reader. A single onomastic unit can consequently perform several functions at once. An anthroponym may identify a character, indicate social or cultural affiliation, characterize personality, produce an emotional or humorous effect, and establish an intertextual connection. A toponym may identify a geographical location while simultaneously constructing historical space and activating cultural memory. Therefore, the comparative-integrative analysis of English and Uzbek literary onomasticons demonstrates that the interpretation of proper names requires a multidimensional approach. Derivational form, functional role, and pragmatic effect are not isolated characteristics; rather, they constitute interconnected components of literary naming through which authors construct characters, organize fictional space, encode cultural information, and guide reader interpretation.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND RESULTS

Research methodology. The present study employs a comparative-integrative methodology to examine the derivational, functional, and pragmatic features of literary onomasticons in English and Uzbek. The research is based on a qualitative analysis of selected literary examples representing personal names, place names, nicknames, and other contextually significant proper names. The methodological framework combines descriptive, comparative, contextual, semantic, and linguo-stylistic approaches. The descriptive method is used to identify the structural and derivational characteristics of literary onomastic units. Particular attention is paid to morphologically marked forms, compound formations, modified names, diminutive forms, semantically transparent names, and author-created naming patterns. The comparative method establishes similarities and differences between English and Uzbek naming practices, while contextual analysis determines how the meaning of a proper name changes according to its textual environment. The functional analysis focuses on the roles performed by literary names within the artistic text, including identification, characterization, localization, cultural representation, expressiveness, symbolism, and intertextual reference. This approach is consistent with Andaniyazova's (2015) treatment of anthroponyms, zoonyms, and toponyms as linguo-poetic resources in literary texts. Her study specifically examines the poetic functions and usage characteristics of onomastic units. The pragmatic dimension is examined through the relationship between naming, authorial intention, character interaction, contextual evaluation, and reader interpretation. Iliescu (2015) identifies the consequences that names may have for readers and emphasizes their operational, symbolic, and cognitive dimensions in literary works. The integrative principle is central to the study because derivational form, textual function, and pragmatic meaning are treated as interconnected rather than isolated characteristics. A formally marked name may acquire a particular stylistic function, while that function can subsequently generate an implicit pragmatic effect for the reader.

Research results. The comparative analysis demonstrates that English and Uzbek literary onomasticons display a high degree of functional and pragmatic complexity. The results can be summarized in the following table:

No	Analytical Dimension	English Literary Onomasticon	Uzbek Literary Onomasticon	Major Result
	Derivational	Compounds, modified names, diminutives, semantically motivated forms	Affixal formations, compound names, modified forms, traditional naming patterns	Derivational structure contributes to the semantic and expressive potential of names
	Nominative	Identification of characters, places and other entities	Identification of characters, places and culturally significant entities	Nomination constitutes the basic function in both languages
	Characterizing	Names may indicate personality, social position or cultural background	Names may indicate personality, social status, family and cultural affiliation	Proper names participate directly in characterization
	Symbolic	Names may evoke literary, historical or cultural associations	Names may activate folklore, historical and national-cultural associations	Context transforms names into symbolic signs
	Localizing	Toponyms establish geographical and social settings	Toponyms establish geographical, historical and cultural space	Place names organize the fictional world
	Pragmatic	Names may communicate irony, evaluation, humour or social distance	Names may express evaluation, respect, irony, affection or social relations	Pragmatic meaning depends strongly on context and interaction
	Cultural	Names encode English-speaking historical and cultural associations	Names encode Uzbek national, historical and folkloric associations	Onomastic units function as markers of cultural identity
	Intertextual	Names may recall literary and historical figures	Names may recall national literary, epic and historical	Context transforms names into symbolic signs

			figures	
	Aesthetic	Phonetic form, rhythm and semantic associations may enhance literary expression	Sound, semantic structure and cultural associations may strengthen poetic effect	Proper names contribute to the aesthetic organization of literary discourse

The first major result concerns the derivational dimension. The analysis shows that the formal structure of a literary name can contribute directly to its interpretation. A modified or semantically transparent name attracts the reader's attention and may provide additional information about the character or situation. This is particularly evident in Uzbek literary materials analyzed by Andaniyazova (2015), where creatively constructed names can participate in comic and characterizing effects. The second major result concerns functional multifunctionality. Proper names rarely perform only one function in literary discourse. An anthroponym may simultaneously identify a character, characterize the person, establish cultural affiliation, and create an evaluative or symbolic effect. Similarly, a toponym may identify a geographical location while constructing historical and cultural space. Andaniyazova's (2015) analysis confirms the importance of anthroponyms, zoonyms, and toponyms as poetic elements of literary texts. The third major result relates to pragmatic interpretation. The pragmatic meaning of a literary name is not necessarily contained in its lexical form alone. It emerges through contextual interaction among the author, characters, textual situation, and reader. A name can therefore communicate meanings such as irony, affection, social evaluation, criticism, respect, or cultural belonging without explicitly expressing them. This corresponds to Iliescu's (2015) observation that literary names possess symbolic and cognitive significance and may influence readers' interpretation of fiction. The comparative results further demonstrate that English and Uzbek literary onomasticons share a common functional foundation but differ in their derivational resources and cultural-pragmatic associations. In both languages, literary names operate as instruments of identification, characterization, localization, symbolism, and cultural representation. However, Uzbek literary naming demonstrates particularly strong connections with folklore, national history, traditional naming practices, and culturally specific associations, whereas English literary naming reflects the structural possibilities and cultural conventions of English-language literary discourse. The most significant finding of the integrative analysis is that derivational form, functional role, and pragmatic effect form a continuous interpretive chain. The structural organization of a name may determine its stylistic salience; its stylistic function may influence characterization or textual organization; and these functions may subsequently produce specific pragmatic effects in the reader's interpretation. Thus, the literary onomasticon can be conceptualized as a dynamic system in which linguistic form, textual function, cultural association, and pragmatic interpretation interact.

CONCLUSION. The comparative-integrative analysis demonstrates that literary onomasticons in English and Uzbek function as dynamic linguistic and aesthetic systems rather than as simple collections of proper names. Their significance is determined not only by nominative meaning but also by derivational structure, functional distribution, cultural associations, and pragmatic potential. Literary names therefore contribute substantially to the semantic organization, characterization, symbolism, and communicative effectiveness of a literary text. The study has shown that the derivational properties of literary names may increase their expressive and semantic markedness. In both English and Uzbek literary discourse, authors can exploit

morphological patterns, lexical associations, and culturally recognizable naming models to create names that characterize fictional entities and reinforce particular textual meanings. At the functional level, literary names perform several interconnected roles, including identification, localization, characterization, symbolic representation, emotional expression, and intertextual reference. This multifunctionality corresponds to the broader understanding of literary names as significant aesthetic and semantic elements of artistic discourse (Andaniyazova, 2015; Gibka, 2015). The pragmatic dimension further reveals that the interpretation of a literary name depends on the interaction between authorial intention, textual context, cultural knowledge, and reader perception. As Iliescu (2015) emphasizes, names possess "the symbolic weight" and cognitive potential that can influence readers' interpretation of literary texts. Thus, a proper name may convey meanings that extend beyond its direct referential function and may activate cultural, historical, emotional, or intertextual associations. The comparison of English and Uzbek materials indicates both universal and culture-specific patterns. While the two literary traditions share the multifunctional nature of proper names, they differ in the morphological resources, naming conventions, cultural symbolism, and pragmatic associations through which these functions are realized. Consequently, the literary onomasticon can be viewed as a productive interface between language, culture, cognition, and literary aesthetics. Overall, the research confirms that an integrated derivational-functional-pragmatic model provides a more comprehensive framework for studying literary names in comparative linguistics. Such an approach can contribute to the development of comparative literary onomastics and may also be effectively applied to translation studies, intercultural communication, and the analysis of culturally marked literary texts.

REFERENCES

1. Adams, M. (2015). "The course of a particular": Names and narrative in the works of Joseph Mitchell. Names: A Journal of Onomastics, 63(1), 3–15. https://doi.org/10.1179/0027773814Z.00000000095
2. Andaniyazova, D. (2015). Edebî metinde onomastik birimlərin kullanım özellikleri [The properties of using onomastic units in literary texts]. Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 54, 15–21.
3. Budnikova, G. A. (2015). Role of literary names in Maxim Gorky's novel Life of Klim Samgin. Slavic Studies, 30(3), 125–164.
4. Dimitrov, D. (2015). The poetry of Zbigniew Herbert through the prism of literary onomastics (based on selected works). Research Papers of Paisii Hilendarski University of Plovdiv, 53(1), 421–433.
5. Gibka, M. (2015). The functions of proper names in the literary work of art. Symbolae Europaeae, 8, 79–90.
6. Gibka, M., & Rutkowski, M. (2015). Funkcja humorystyczna nazw osobowych w oryginale i przekładzie "Feet of Clay" Terry'ego Pratchetta [The humorous function of personal names in the original and translation of Feet of Clay by Terry Pratchett]. In I. Sarnowska-Giefing, M. Balowski, & M. Graf (Eds.), Funkcje nazw własnych w kulturze i komunikacji (pp. 169–182). Wydział Filologii Polskiej i Klasycznej, Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza.
7. Graf, M. (2015). Literackie nie-nazywanie. Onomastykon polskiej prozy współczesnej [Literary non-naming: An onomasticon of contemporary Polish prose]. Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.
8. Iliescu, A. (2015). Names and naming in literary works. Review of Contemporary Philosophy, 14, 144–149.

9. Kresa, M. (2015). W Koluszkach, w Mińsku, w Chile – przestrzeń poetycka wierszy i piosenek Agnieszki Osieckiej toponimami pisana [“In Koluszki, in Minsk, in Chile” – poetic space in Agnieszka Osiecka’s poems and songs written with toponyms]. In A. Gałkowski & R. Gliwa (Eds.), Mikrotoponimy i makrotoponimy w komunikacji i literaturze (pp. 371–381). Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
10. Rieger, M. A. (2015). Othering by naming: The function of unconventional names in German colonial literature. In O. Felecan (Ed.), Name and naming: Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Onomastics “Name and Naming” – Conventional/Unconventional in Onomastics (pp. 966–978). Editura Mega / Editura Argonaut.Eslatma: ushbu ro‘yxat ataylab faqat 2015-yilda nashr etilgan manbalar asosida tuzildi. Masalan, Gibka maqolasi 2015-yil Symbolae Europaeae jurnalining 8-sonida 79–90-betlarda berilgan; Iliescu maqolasi esa Review of Contemporary Philosophy jurnalining 14-sonida 144–149-betlarni egallaydi. Adams maqolasi ham Names jurnalining 63(1)-sonida 3–15-betlarda 2015-yilgi nashr sifatida qayd etilgan.