



THE EXPRESSION TOPONYMS IN THE FUNCTION OF NUCLEAR COMPONENTS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Jumatov Rashid Yangibaevich

PhD Student at Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

ABSTRACT

This article is dedicated to the comparative study of toponyms in the English and Uzbek languages, in which the place names functioning as nuclear components are analyzed based on modern linguistic methods. In particular, the syntactic relations of toponyms in the sentence are explained on the basis of junctional models, and their morphological features are revealed through component models. Also, their similarities and differences in these unrelated languages have been identified. This article may be useful for linguistic researchers and those interested in toponymy and/or functional syntax.

INTRODUCTION

As noted by N. Mahmudov, it is not appropriate to look at the language, which is a miraculous and rare gift that nature has given to mankind, as a plain system and set of living signs necessary for thinking and to approach it only as an emotionless, soulless tool [4, 88]. Therefore, today, our linguistics faces the issue of systematically studying the role of toponyms in human life, their special status in human thinking and the unique "mission" of this type of units.

The study of place names can be an object of geography, history and linguistics. Linguistics is one of these areas that deals with extensive and deep research of toponyms [1, 12].

LITERATURE REVIEW

So far, a number of works have been carried out on the study of toponyms. It should be acknowledged that S. Koraev laid the foundation stone for the wide development of this direction in our country with his work "Toponymics". In this field, some aspects of proper nouns were studied in monographic research works and scientific activities of scientists such as N. Makhmudov, E. Begmatov, Z. Dosimov, D. Khudoyberganova, D. Yuldashev.

Scholars have approached toponyms from different perspectives and classified them based on several principles. In particular, lingua-cultural, cognitive, etymological, sociolinguistic, functional and semantic aspects of toponyms have been studied more widely. For example, A.V. Urazmetova emphasizes the secondary naming of toponyms and the scientist includes "place names given on the basis of descriptive expression in the group of secondary toponyms" [8, 56].

Since the emergence of "transformational grammar" in the world of linguistics, in the course of the development of structural and functional syntax, many linguistic studies have been carried out about the external and internal structures of the sentence. N. Chomsky tried to analyze the external and internal (surface and deep structure) structure of the sentence based on different methods of transformation [10]. The passive participle indicates that the internal structure of the sentence is expressed in the definite participle. For example, "The bear was chased by the lion" (surface structure), "The lion chased the bear" (deep structure) [11, 207] explains the sentence structure by



transformation. In this regard, Ray Jackendoff "emphasizes that transformational grammar has the ability to reveal the essence of human thought."

If we pay attention to this idea, the initial appearance as a result of the formal connection of syntactic elements in the sentence device is recognized as an internal structure. The problematic aspect of the definition given by N. Chomsky is that it does not differentiate between external and internal structures of exactly one sentence structure (without transformation into another form).

P.H. Matthews expresses the following opinion about the internal structure of the sentence: "The internal structure is an expression of the sentence syntax that differs from the external device by its variable criteria" [12]. Also, in the sentence device "Children are hard to please" children - subject, "to please" is a determinant of the attribute "hard" which constitutes the external device of this sentence, according to the internal structure of the sentence, the syntactic unit "children" is the object of the word please and together they perform the function of possessive in relation to "hard", he cites the following transformation view of this sentence as an internal structure: "To please children is hard" [12]. Here, too, it is noticeable that Chomsky's opinion is relied on, that is, the existence of an internal and an external structure in the same sentence is not stated.

Surider Deol comments on this as follows: "...deep structure in the study of language is an underlying semantic content of a sentence. Surface structure of a sentence on the other hand is what we make of the sentence. If we expand this idea to cover all aspects of our life, we can say that surface structure (ideas, aspirations, actions) is the medium through which we make sense of our deep structures" [13]. With this, the scientist shows that the internal structure forms the semantic content of the sentence, and the external structure relies on individual factors from a sociological point of view.

METHODOLOGY

Having studied the opinions of linguists about the concept of the external and internal devices of the sentence, we were sure that the principles of distinguishing the external and internal structures of the sentence were not developed on the basis of specific linguistic methods. Until now, the opinions of researchers are not consistent with the fact that problems of syntactic content arise from word forms and their lexical meanings. Some linguists recognize lexical meaning as the basis of grammar (Barkhudarov), others deny it, and a third group of researchers do not recognize it as a linguistic category [9; 8-23; 13; 14].

Among such opinions of linguists, A. M. Mukhin's statement about the external and internal device attracted our attention: "the external device of a sentence is understood as the analysis of its content by dividing it into components... and the internal device is determined by the syntax analysis of this sentence" [7, 198]. So, according to the principle of A. M. Mukhin, exactly one sentence form can have both an internal and an external device. This allows young researchers like us to analyze sentences correctly. Now let's cover the definition of A.M. Mukhin in more detail. In order to determine the external device of the sentence, the mutual syntactic relations of the syntactic units involved in it are explained using junctional models, and on the basis of these models, the differential syntactic features of the syntactic units, that is, the composition of the components and their morphological characteristics, are revealed using the component models.

When analyzing the sentence structure separating into components, there is a need to identify syntactic relationships and distinguish syntactic units from each other. The syntactic relations determined between the syntactic units provide a wide opportunity to determine the differential syntactic features of the components involved in the sentence structure, and the method of contrast is used for this.

DISCUSSION

The distinctive features of the nuclear predicative relationship are that they can form a sentence that expresses an independent idea without being subject to other syntactic relationships and it connects two nuclear components



with equal rights [3, 36]. Therefore, the nuclear predicative relationship is given in the form of a sign [\longleftrightarrow], which is bidirectional and has a two-way index, in the representation of junction models, due to the fact that two mutually equal nuclear components are organically connected. Also, this syntactic connection is a feature that distinguishes it from other syntactic connections due to its existence between the components that make up the main device of the sentence. Other syntactic relations cannot form the main center of the sentence in terms of construction. Because syntactic relations other than nuclear predicative relations are non-nuclear relations.

We fulfill component analysis of the surface structure of the following sentences:

1. *The White House was smaller* [18, 126].

2. *Indian Island was news!* [15, 2]

Both of these sentences fall into the same junction and component model as they are simple compound sentences, but their morphological features are different.

1 2		J.M.	NP ₁ . NP ₂ K.M.
(1) <i>The White House was smaller.</i>			
1 2			
(2) <i>Indian Island was news!</i>			

At this point, we found it necessary to give an explanation of the symbols in the component model. The symbol NP₁ denotes the subject of the sentence (N –nuclear, P₁ – predicated – determination of the subject of the sentence through a predicate), and the symbol NP₂ denotes the predicate of the sentence (N –nuclear, P₂ – predicating, represents the meaning of the element forming the center), $\tilde{N}D$ is a non-nuclear dependent component and represents any secondary part of a sentence [6, 99]. An object, attribute and adverbial modifier, called secondary parts, are subordinate to another clause and cannot exist without a primary parts. Therefore, combining an object, attribute and adverbial modifier and naming them generally as a subordinate component ($\tilde{N}D$) makes it easier.

In the above sentences, if the goal is to determine only the subject and predicate, their component models remain the same. Therefore, it is necessary to explain aspects of their morphological expression.

The component models of the examples analyzed above can be expressed as follows:

1 2		J.M.	<u>NP₁ . NP₂</u>	K.M
(1) <i>The White House was smaller.</i>			S cA	
1 2			<u>NP₁ . NP₂</u>	
(2) <i>Indian Island was news!</i>			S cS	

The toponyms in the place of the nuclear predicated (NP₁) components in the sentences have the structure of Adjective + Noun, and are represented by (1) the color-based coloronym in the sentence and (2) the toponym based on the origin in the sentence. In both sentences, the nuclear predicating (NP₂) components are complex noun-predicate, the linking verb (c) is combined with the adjective (A) in the first sentence, and the noun (S) in the second sentence.

In the following examples, subordinate components are also involved and simple common sentences are formed:

3. *New York City had been selected as the site for the kidnap* [17, 84].

4. *Times Square presented an extraordinary sight* [17, 127].

5. *The actual village of Stocklehaven could not be seen* [15, 71].

In these sentences, the toponyms representing the names of the city (*New York City*), the square (*Times Square*) and the village (*Stocklehaven*) appear in the function of the nuclear predicated component and connected with



NP₂ – the action verb in the passive voice (*had been selected*) and the state verb in the active voice (*presented*) and the modal verb in the passive tense (*could not be seen*) on the basis of nuclear predicative relationship. The junction and component models of these sentences will look like this:

(3) <i>New York City had been selected as the site for the kidnap</i>			
	J.M. 3	$\underline{NP_1} . \underline{NP_2} . \underline{\tilde{N}D} . \underline{\tilde{N}D}$ S auxVp ₂ S prS	K.M. 3
(4) <i>Times Square presented an extraordinary sight</i>			
	J.M. 4	$\underline{NP_1} . \underline{NP_2} . \underline{\tilde{N}D} . \underline{\tilde{N}D}$ S Vf A S	K.M. 4
(5) <i>The actual village of Stocklehaven could not be seen</i>			
	J.M. 5	$\underline{\tilde{N}D} . \underline{NP_1} . \underline{NP_2}$ A SprS m.auxngVinf.	K.M. 5

In the following examples, we observe that the toponyms that are in the function of the nuclear predicated component are connected with the predicate by means of state verbs in the function of linking verbs:

6. *Edgeway station looked so isolated* [18, 19].

7. *Tanjier Island was named after Tanjier, Morocco* [18, 97].

To clarify the content of these sentences, we use the substitution and omission methods of the transformation method.

6) *Edgeway station looked so isolated.* → *Edgeway station was ... isolated* → *Edgeway station was in the state of isolation.*

7) *Tanjier Island was named after Tanjier, Morocco* → *Tanjier Island got its name from Tanjier, Morocco.*

The junction and component model of sentences is as follows:

(6) <i>Edgeway station looked so isolated</i>			
	J.M. 6	$\underline{NP_1} . \underline{\tilde{N}D} . \underline{NP_2}$ S Adv cVp ₂	K.M. 6
(7) <i>Tanjier Island was named after Tanjier</i>			
	J.M. 7	$\underline{NP_1} . \underline{NP_2} . \underline{\tilde{N}D}$ S auxVp ₂ prS	K.M. 7

The fact that these models clearly demonstrate the differences in the syntactic order, component composition and morphological expression of sentences indicates their advantage in conducting research.

Therefore, the toponyms that replace the nuclear predicated component retain their position even when transformed; they are connected to the nuclear predicating part represented by an adjective or noun using linking verbs; it is also observed that it enters into a syntactic relationship with an independent verb in the passive tense, if the verb expresses a state, it is in the form of an active voice.

In the following examples, the syntactic role of toponyms in place of the nuclear predicating component is analyzed.



8. *The President was for the Secret Service* [17, 10].

9. *At the top was the stamped address Indian Island, Sticklehaven, Devon* [15, 3].

Toponyms are observed only in the function of noun-predicate in the English sentence structure. In this case, they enter into a syntactic relationship with the subject of the sentence using the linking verb “to be”. In the sentence 8, the toponym “Secret Service”, which means the name of a place, combined with the preposition “for”, has taken the place of the nuclear predicating component and is clarifying the position of the syntactic unit the nuclear predicated component “the President”. To prove that the toponym in sentence 9 is a nuclear predicating component, we use the transformation method.

9) *At the top was the stamped address Indian Island, Sticklehaven, Devon* → *the stamped address was Indian Island...*

The surface structure of sentences can be graphically expressed as follows in junction and component models:

<i>(8) The President was for the Secret Service</i>			
	J.M. 8	$\frac{NP_1}{S} \cdot \frac{NP_2}{c.prS}$	K.M. 8
<i>(9) the stamped address was Indian Island...</i>			
	J.M. 9	$\frac{\tilde{N}D}{Vp_2} \cdot \frac{NP_1}{S} \cdot \frac{NP_2}{cS}$	K.M. 9

From the analyzed examples, it can be seen that toponyms can be found in prepositional and non-prepositional forms in the function of a nuclear predicating part and in this case they can only be complex noun-predicates since toponyms are characteristic of nouns, they cannot be simple predicates according to the structure of the sentence.

Our next examples are collected from works of art in the Uzbek language, on the basis of which we analyze the syntactic position of toponyms in Uzbek sentence structures, in particular, the occurrence of nuclear components.

1. *Samarqand zebo shaharmi?* [20, 82]

2. *Ozarbayjon – sehrli o'lka* [20, 44].

In these sentences 1, 2, the toponyms, which are the nuclear predicated parts, represent the names of cities and waterways, and are connected to the adjective + noun syntactic units, which are the nuclear predicating components, on the basis of the nuclear predicative relationship. Such statements can be indicative, interrogative and negative. Below, we reveal the component structure of these sentences, syntactic relations of syntactic units and features of morphological expression using junction and component models:

1) <i>Samarqand zebo shaharmi?</i>			
2) <i>Ozarbayjon – sehrli o'lka.</i>			
	J.M. 10	$\frac{NP_1}{S} \cdot \frac{\tilde{N}D}{A} \cdot \frac{NP_2}{S}$	K.M. 10

It is known from the models that the component structure and syntactic relations of both sentences are the same and the nuclear components are represented by nouns. Also, sentences contain subordinate components represented by adjectives, which are connected to the nuclear predicating syntactic unit on the basis of a subordinate relationship.



In the next sentence, the subordinate components that illuminate the features of the toponym, appear as homogeneous parts of the sentence.

3. *Amu go'zal, ammo sehrGAR, jodugar shahar* [16, 154].

It is possible to prove that the subordinate components in the given sentence are connected on the basis of a coordinative relationship and have equal syntactic relationship using the transformation method:

3) *Amu go'zal, ammo sehrGAR, jodugar shahar* → *Amu go'zal ... shahar* → *Amu sehrGAR shahar* → *Amu jodugar shahar*.

From the derivation of the transformation, it became clear that it is possible to connect each of the subordinate components to the dominant component without any lexical and grammatical changes, leaving out the others. The junction and component model of this sentence looks like the following:

(3) <i>Amu go'zal, ammo sehrGAR, jodugar shahar</i> .			
	J.M. 11	$\frac{NP_1 \cdot IH\tilde{N}D \cdot IIH\tilde{N}D \cdot IIIH\tilde{N}D \cdot NP_2}{S \quad A \quad cjA \quad A \quad S}$	K.M. 11

In this sentence, we saw that the toponym in the function of the subject is attached to a predicate expressed by one original adjective, two derived nouns and a predicate expressed by a countable concrete noun in the singular form.

4. *Ko'yki – vodiyning ko'rki* [16, 81].

5. *Orol O'rta Osiyoning Baykali* [16, 175].

The structure of sentences 4-5 is very similar to the structure of the above sentences; the difference is that the subordinate component is expressed not by an adjective or a noun in the common case, but by a noun in the possessive case. In other words, a possessive toponym is connected to a noun-predicate with a demonstrative determiner by means of a nuclear predicative relation. The syntactic and morphological features of sentences are as follows:

4) <i>Ko'yki – vodiyning ko'rki</i> .			
5) <i>Orol O'rta Osiyoning Baykali</i> .			
	J.M. 12	$\frac{NP_1 \cdot \tilde{N}D \cdot NP_2}{S \quad Sps \quad S}$	K.M. 12

Let's move on to the analysis of the next sentences expressed by the nuclear predicated toponym.

6. *Istanbul dengiz sathidan ancha baland* [19, 60].

7. *Istanbul dengiz yoqasida* [19, 60].

8. *Nurbuloq ham shu yo'lda* [21, 188].

In the following sentences 6, 7, 8, the possessive toponyms Istanbul (6, 7), Nurbuloq (8) are in the singular form and in the common case and are syntactically connected with nuclear predicating components as the concrete adjective “baland” (6), the accusative form of the noun “yoqasida” (7), “yo'lda” (8). This information is reflected in the following models:



6) <i>Istanbul dengiz sathidan ancha baland.</i>				
	J.M. 13	$\frac{NP_1}{S} \cdot \frac{\tilde{N}D}{S} \cdot \frac{\tilde{N}D}{S_{dan}} \cdot \frac{\tilde{N}D}{Adv} \cdot \frac{NP_2}{A}$	K.M. 13	
7) <i>Istanbul dengiz yoqasida.</i>				
	J.M. 14	$\frac{NP_1}{S} \cdot \frac{\tilde{N}D}{S_{ps}} \cdot \frac{NP_2}{S_{da}}$	K.M. 14	
8) <i>Nurbuloq ham shu yo'lda.</i>				
	J.M. 15	$\frac{NP_1}{S} \cdot \frac{\tilde{N}D}{prtc} \cdot \frac{\tilde{N}D}{P_{dm}} \cdot \frac{NP_2}{S_{da}}$	K.M. 15	

The toponyms that come in the place of the nuclear predicated component are connected not only to the noun predicate, but also to the verb predicate. We observe this in the following examples:

9. *Bo'tana Amu keng yoyilib oqardi [16, 154].*

10. *... jar tagida qaynab oqqan Shodasoy ko'rindi [16, 261].*

The toponyms in the given sentences acquire a syntactic relationship based on the nuclear predicative relation to the nuclear predicating component represented by an independent intransitive verb in the active voice "oqardi" (9) and the transitive verb in the reflexive voice "ko'rindi" (10).

In the analysis of factual examples collected from works of art, we did not observe that the toponyms appearing in the place of the nuclear predicating component are associated with the transitive verb in the exact relative form in the place of the nuclear predicating component.

The junction and component model of these examples is different from the above.

9) <i>Bo'tana Amu keng zozilib oqardi.</i>				
	J.M. 16	$\frac{\tilde{N}D}{A} \cdot \frac{NP_1}{S} \cdot \frac{\tilde{N}D}{Adv} \cdot \frac{\tilde{N}D}{Vp_1} \cdot \frac{NP_2}{Vf}$	K.M. 16	
10) <i>... jar tagida ... Shodasoz ko'rindi.</i>				
	J.M. 17	$\frac{\tilde{N}D}{S} \cdot \frac{\tilde{N}D}{Adv} \cdot \frac{NP_1}{S} \cdot \frac{NP_2}{Vf_{rf}}$	K.M. 17	

It is observed that in Uzbek sentences, words made from toponyms and compounds with toponyms also appear in the possessive function.

11. *Kogondagilar ularning kelishini bilishar ekan [16, 266].*

12. *Samarqanddan ekaningiy yuz-ko'yingiydan ma'lum [19, 15].*

The syntactic unit "Kogondagilar" in the given sentence 11 is in syntactic relation with the transitive verb in active voice, which is a predicate because it means a personal noun formed from a toponym of a syntactic unit. In the



next sentence, the combination “Samarqanddan ekaningiz” (12) is a nuclear predicated component and it has a nuclear predicative syntactic relationship with the nuclear predicating component with the adjective “ma’lum”. It was observed in our examples that in the Uzbek language, a compound consisting of several words can be used as a nuclear predicated part.

In the examples of the Uzbek language, we will consider the place of toponyms in the place of the nuclear predicating component by means of the analysis of the following examples:

13. *Italiyaning poytaxti – Rim* [19, 70].

14. *Oyog‘imiz ostidagi yer – Turkiya* [19, 166].

In these sentences, toponyms come in the form of common case and are connected with nouns in common case in the function of a subject based on the nuclear predicative relationship. Their junction and component models are as follows:

Examples	J.M. 19	K.M. 19
13) ... <i>poytaxti Rim</i> .		$\frac{NP_1 \cdot NP_2}{S \quad S}$
14) ... <i>yer Turkiya</i> .		

In the following sentences, it is observed that toponyms with in the function of a predicate are combined with the verb “emoq” and in the form of locative and ablative cases:

15. *Moskvada ham obi-havo Tataristondagi kabi edi* [20, 167].

16. *U ... Samarqand shahridan* [20, 151].

17. *Qizlarning hammasi Bokudan emas* [20, 10].

In the given sentences, the syntactic unit “Tataristondagi kabi edi” (15) is connected with an abstract noun “ob-havo”, the toponym with an apposition “Samarqand shahridan” (16) is connected with the personal pronoun “U”, the toponym “Bokudan emas” (17) is connected with the negative form of the verb “emoq”, and all are connected with the collective pronoun. The junction and component models of the examples look like this:

Examples	J.M.	K.M.
15) ... <i>ob-havo Tataristondagi kabi edi</i> .		$\frac{NP_1 \cdot NP_2}{S \quad S_{\text{даги}}}$
17) ... <i>hammasi Bokudan emas</i> .		$\frac{NP_1 \cdot NP_2}{S \quad ngS_{\text{дан}}}$
16) <i>U ... Samarqand shahridan</i> .		$\frac{NP_1 \cdot NP_2}{S \quad S_{\text{дан}}}$

Although almost all of the considered examples fall into the same junction model, there is a difference in their morphological expression. In the Uzbek language, the toponyms appearing in the place of the nuclear predicating component can appear in the forms of the nominative case, locative case, exit case. In this case, they can be connected with the noun or pronoun that replaces the nuclear predicated component based on the nuclear predicative relationship.

Of course, the work does not end with the analysis of the syntactic units represented by the toponyms that have replaced the nuclear components. If these components in the sentence are analyzed by separating them into syntaxemes, it will be possible to identify various non-categorical (additional) differential (differentiating) syntactic-semantic signs in them.



CONCLUSION

Judging from the above, we can see that the nature of toponyms, which are a reflection of national culture, and their syntactic-semantic features are not fully studied in the case of both unrelated languages. In this article, the semantic realization of toponyms at the syntactic level, the syntagmatic nature of the syntactic signs expressed in the place of nuclear components from their syntactic functions and the paradigmatics of syntaxemes expressed through them are studied by comparing and analyzing them into components and syntaxemes.

In the structure of the sentence, the nuclear components forming the basis of the sentence, expressed in traditional grammatical terms, are a subject and a predicate. The syntactic units that replace the nuclear components are connected to each other based on the nuclear predicative relationship. As A.M. Mukhin noted, "...in order to express an independent complete thought, it is necessary to have a nuclear predicative relationship between the two elements representing the main idea in the sentence, i.e. a subject and a predicate" [5, 78; 6, 48-70]. The mutual syntactic relationship between a subject and a predicate is a nuclear predicative relationship. Hence, we conclude:

1. From the analyzed examples in English language, it can be seen that toponyms can be found in prepositional and non-prepositional forms in the function of a nuclear predicating part and in this case they can only be complex noun-predicates since toponyms are characteristic of nouns, they cannot be simple predicates according to the structure of the sentence.

2. In the Uzbek language, the toponyms appearing in the place of the nuclear predicating component can appear in the forms of the nominative case, locative case, exit case. In this case, they can be connected with the noun or pronoun that replaces the nuclear predicated component based on the nuclear predicative relationship.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are very grateful to our scientific instructors and consultants, as well as, scientists in linguistic sphere for their advice and assistance in writing our research work and this article.

REFERENCES

1. Qorayev S. *Toponimika*. – Tashkent, 2006. – 318 p.
2. Asadov R.M. *Ingliz tili sodda gap qurilmalarida monovalentli va polivalentli komponentlarning sintaksem tahlili: PhD diss. abstract*. – Tashkent, 2018. – 53 p.
3. Ashurov Sh.S. *Ingliz va o'zbek tillarida kesim tipologiyasi. Diss. of can. of phil. sciences*. – Samarkand, 2007. – 154 p.
4. Makhmudov N. *Tilning mukammal tadqiqi yo'llarini izlab // O'zbek tili va adabiyoti*, 2012, #5. – P. 86-90.
5. Мухин А.М. *Модели внутренних синтаксических связей предложения // Вопросы языкознания*. – Moscow, 1970. -№4 – P. 68-80. 76
6. Мухин А.М. *Структура предложений и их моделей*. – Leningrad: Наука, 1968. – 230 p.
7. Мухин А.М. *Функциональный синтаксис. Функциональная лексикология. Функциональная морфология*. – Санкт – Петербург: 2007. –198с.
8. Уразметова А.В. *Английская топонимика как лексическая подсистема языка (на материале топонимической лексики Великобритании и США)*. 2016. – 461 p.
9. Звегинцев В.А. *Проблемы значения в современном зарубежном языкознании // Новые в лингвистике, вып. 2*. – Москва, 1968. – С. 8-23.
10. Chomsky N. *Deep structure, surface structure and Semantic interpretation // In Steinberg and Jakobits*. 1971. – P. 183-216.
11. Jackendoff Ray, *"Language, Consciousness, Culture: Essays on Mental Structure."* MIT Press, 2007.
12. Matthews P.H. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics*. Oxford University Press, 2007
13. <http://Linguistics.berkeley.edu/~syntax-circle/syntaxgroup/spr08/Anderson.Pdf/>
14. <http://www.syntagma.h1.ru/article46,htm.>



LITERAL SOURCES

1. *Agatha Christie. And then there were none.* – New York, The Berkley publishing group, 1991.
2. *Asqad Muxtor. Chinor.* – Toshkent, Ilm ziyo nashriyoti, 2020.
3. *Charles Templeton. The kidnapping of the President.* – New York, First Avon Printing, 1975.
4. *Patricia Cornwell. Isle of Dogs.* – New York, The Berkley publishing group, 2001.
5. *Azamat Qorjavov. Musofir go'dak. Book 1.* – Tashkent, Ijod press, 2019.
6. *Azamat Qorjavov. Musofir go'dak. Book 2.* – Tashkent, Ijod press, 2019.
7. *Ro'ziyev Uyg'un. Atirgul.* – Tashkent, O'zbekiston, 2021.
8. *Shuxrat. Oltin zanglamas.* – Tashkent: publishing house named "Gafur Ghulom", 2021.