

“PRAGMATIC INTERPRETATION OF WORD-SENTENCES IN UZBEK LANGUAGE”

¹MukhabbatKurbanova, ²FleraSayfullina, ³Zulnura Karimova

¹Professor of National of University Uzbekistan named after Mirza Ulugbek, Tashkent, Uzbekistan. E-mail:

qurbonova2007@mail.ru ²Professor of Kazan Federal University, Russian Federation. E-mail: fsaifulina@mail.ru ³Teacher of Languages Department, Tashkent State Agrarian University, Tashkent, Uzbekistan. E-mail: purelight16.09@mail.ru

ABSTRACT:

This article is devoted to the pragmatic features of word-sentences, separated as special parts of speech in Uzbek language. The pragmatic feature of word-sentences is higher than other units of language in speech statement. Though word-sentences don't have a content of proposition, they completely express communicative intention and content from illocutionary aspect. Studying the word-sentences in Uzbek language from pragmatic aspect discovers peculiarities of usage in speech system units.

In Uzbek linguistics word-sentences were studied as interjections, descriptives, and vocative sentences by E.Shodmonov, S.Usmonov, R.Kongurov, S.Saidov, B.Orinboyev, O.Lafasov; R.Bobokalonov studied them under the concept of semantic-functional formed word-sentences. This system is divided into 4 groups: 1) modal verbs; 2) interjections; 3) positive/negative words; 4) offer-indicational words.

In this article several methods such as descriptional, differential-semantic, discursive and component analyses are used.

Keywords:

Uzbek language, semantic-functional formed word-sentences, pragmatics, intention, speech statement.

Article Received: 18 October 2020, Revised: 3 November 2020, Accepted: 24 December 2020

INTRODUCTION

In contemporary Uzbek linguistics word-sentences, separated as special parts of speech are divided into the following types: 1) modal verbs; 2) interjections; 3) positive/negative words; 4) offer/indicational words (Bobokalonov, 2001; Sayfullayeva and Kurbanova, 2013). The reason of calling the semantic-functional formed word-sentences is that “semantic” (meanings) component in this term indicates lexical-semantic part of the phenomena; and position of it in sentence center shows the ontologic – two natural features of the lexemes. “Functional” component in this concept indicates both syntactic function of word-sentences and limitation of coming them as a sentence. It is noted that signs of word-sentences are the followings: 1. Meaning possibilities are limited. 2. They don't require grammar forms. 3. They cannot combine with other words. 4. Their

function in sentence is limited. For this reason these lexemes are more different and extraordinary than other lexemes, however they are considered special and stable language units in order to meaning and function. In contextual system of these units the special semema is always distinguished and it is considered by the means of predicative meaning (Pm). So they are important between units of lexic and grammatic levels of the language. (Bobokalonov, 2001; Kurbanova, 2001). In this article we shall go into detail on pragmatic features of word-sentences based on above-mentioned standpoint.

- **Aim and function of the research.** The following functions are paid attention in order to describe pragmatic features of word-sentences in Uzbek language:
- studying the system of word-sentences in Uzbek language and language units in system;
- indicating pragmatic features of word-

- sentences in Uzbek language;
- showing the connection with the state of appearing word-sentences in speech;
- elucidating the special features of word-sentences in Uzbek language in speech statement;
- demonstrating national features of Uzbek language on the basis of pragmatic analyses of word-sentences.

OBJECT AND MATERIALS OF THE RESEARCH.

Word-sentences in literary texts of Uzbek language and in colloquial speech are functioned as research materials.

METHODS

In this article several methods such as descriptional, differential-semantic, discursive and component analyses are used in investigating factual materials.

RESULTS

Theory of speech statement is considered one the main issues of pragmalinguistics. In speech statement several language acts such as to give question, to inform, to order, to explain any situation, to express gratitude, to please, to congratulate, to confirm, to ignore are done. Speech statement is considered as three staged activity. They are locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts. Locutionary act is language conversation, in other word it is a live conversation in a language, expressing the words with the language. So, the interjection “Oh my God!” in English translated into Uzbek as “Ey xudoyim!”, it is not locutionary act for the English. O’tkir Khoshimov described in his novel “Ikki eshik orasi” (“Between two worlds’ gates”) the similar statement and he revealed discrepant process to the locutionary act. In this extract speeches of an old Uzbek man and a German

officer emerged speech statement, which were not locutionary for both of them:

Old man trembled at first, and then opened his eyes.

- Brutals! – He moaned and scolded continuously.

- Gut! – As officer, who gave injection, gave a sign to his soldiers, they submerged again the old man, who recovered just now. (p. 462)

Phonetic act depends on sounds’ pronunciation. In this case, writer can depict character’s speech through 2 ways: expressing words directly or using sounds in word pronunciation irregularly. Surely, irregularly using sounds in word pronunciation can lead to pragmatic obstacle. Writer uses this way due to describe character’s real emotional state. Some people may have inborn pragmatic obstacle in their speech, in other word they stutter, whilst others may be in this condition because of being nervous or drunken. For instance, - Stop my son, if you have some problem, you will talk tomorrow. – Nooo! – said Mauser furiously. – No-o-o-o-w or n-neve-e-er! (O’.Khoshimov). In this extract writer clearly depicted spiritual state of personage, who got drunk because of being angry, as he knew his father’s evil deed. Especially, we can see in the negative word “Nooo!” the letter o is used inappropriately and gets pragmatic obstacle and also it means strict intonation.

While a person is talking, s/he uses manifest or hidden information. Irrespectively using any one of this information, this process is connected with speech condition and inner purpose of the speaker. When the information is told manifestly, speaker uses grammatically complete sentences and delivers the information openly. When it is used hidden information, it can be used word-sentences. For example, in this case there can be used the word-sentence “Well?” in the meaning of question:

— Put off! Now I will call policeman, he will sign you as “dipsomaniac” and give you pail. You will sweep the street. I will make him to imprison

you here. Well? – Mister, now... (Sh.Kholmirzaev)

In the word “Well?” in this extract certain purpose of the addressee is hidden. There are several meanings like “Well?- don’t you tell me again what happened? Now tell faster! Tell everything!” Similarly, we can see the word “Ok?” in colloquial speech: - “I went even to his house searching him”, - Ok? (from colloquial speech) – He wasn’t at his home. Ok? – We can understand the several meanings here such as “then what happened, did you find him from his home, continue, I am all ears”.

There are several bases that studying forms of primary meanings are the main problems of pragmatics. One of the functions of primary meaning expresses that informing of the speaker about future speech statement, coming true of speaker’s intention or not is not related to interlocutors:

— Mr.Safarkul, we are not dissatisfied with you. Live a peaceful and happy life with your children. Allah forgives all of our sins. I want to be with you happily in another world.

— If Allah lets... (T.Malik)

Types of primary meaning and allegory always appear in the relationship of subject-object, speaker-listener. Whilst addressee – addresser, speech statement are realized as components of speech act, it is noted that using these components is essential in putting into practice of primary meanings successfully. (Hakimov, 2013;97)

Sometimes word-sentences in speech, in particular exceeding of the same interjection generate pragmatic obstacle:

I put my saddle-bag in the window. I sat slowly. I looked at Rikhsiyev on the purpose of greeting.

— Aha, what is your surname? - asked Rikhsiyev.

- Bald Ziyodulla! – I said.

- Aha, hahah! No, I meant your surname? Kurbanov? Aha, good, good! How are you Mr. Kurbanov? Are you well?

- Thanks for God, dear correspondent. Not so bad, it is going on. What about you? What

about your children? Everytime I praise you and tell about your job with proud.

- Tha-a-ank you, tha-a-ank you. Listen to me, Mr.Kurbanov, I am going to write a radio-essay about you!

- Wow, what do you mean, Mr.correspondent?

- A? Hahah! Yes, Dear Kurbanov, dear Kurbanov! There is such genre! Aha, it is journalistic genre! In this genre heroes will be praised!

- Ye-e-eah, thank goodne-e-ss. I thought it was bad thing. If I tell the truth, I am not worthy for this, dear correspondent.

- Aha, we will find solution for this, don’t worry, Mr.Kurbanov. It depends on us. Here is the paper, write down, please. Is there any pen? EW, it is not good! (T.Murod)

Some people use the same word involuntarily during the conversation, especially, interjections. In above-mentioned extractwriter Togay Murod depicted skillfully such speech habit of people by the means of the correspondent. The interjection “Aha” means “Sneering at someone during the bad situation” in dictionaries (DDUL, 2006). According to us this definition is not acceptable. The interjection “Aha” is defined as an exclamation of understanding, realization, invention, or recognition. Its pronunciation depends on the situation or character’s personality: - A-ha, - Umarbekov grinned as if he knew about my secret immediately. – It is clear... (Sh.Xolmirzaev). However, like the previous extract exceeded usage of it creates pragmatic obstacle.

It is clear that author tries to depict character’s personality through pragmatic obstacle, and uses it as stylistical means. When pragmatic obstacle is used, textual information is not changed; on the contrary, its effectiveness will be increased. Stylistical illogicalness of character’s speech creates pragmatic obstacle. For example: -Where were you in the night between 7-8th November? – Y-y-yes! Are you going to put the blame on me? You’ll just waste your time, Mr. investigator!... In this extract writer depicted

stuttered state of the character during the process of answering the question by the investigator through this way.

People express their purposes directly or indirectly during the conversation. These two ways are considered types of expressing speech act. Expressing communicative purpose – intention indirectly, hidden or directly is specific feature of all nations. We can come across differently indirect conversation in all nations. For example, in France it is enough to kiss hand in order to express praise. Also for expressing the word-sentences such as “Well done”, “Bravo” through body language Uzbek people show their thumb, whilst English people show their thumb and forefinger. Uzbeks address rarely to question forms in order to express request. But they effectively use the word-sentence “please”. Indeed, request is expressed due to speech statement. Moreover, weak or strong form of request is expressed in intonation too:

1. Someone:

— No, not like this... - said. Now Ismat calmed them down:

— Listen till the end. Please, brothers... He might know something...(Sh.Xolmirzayev)

2. —You are saying again it is right, - Ekhsan grumbled and rose his chest, - comrade Eshkuvvatov, come in for a minute. Please... Hm, ok, I'll go myself! – He said. – Yes, I'll go. If there is such condition, there is no other way... Truly I'm free these days. I'll go! (Sh.Xolmirzayev).

Request is expressed directly in above-mentioned examples.

Shame is incomparable tradition of Central Asian nations, in particular Uzbek nation. This phenomenon, which is special component of Uzbek ethics and behavior, is expressed through certain language and non-verbal means in Uzbek

speech conversation. Because of the shame the Uzbeks don't openly express their feelings in most cases. They find some excuse in denying some cases in order to not hurt someone's feeling. The below given example is also negative answer for request because of the shame: - Sit down please; let's eat manti (Uzbek national meal)! – When Sayfi Sokiyeovich hold lid of casserole on bedside table, smell of the black pepper spread. Sayfi Sokiyeovich had prepared patir (Uzbek bread), minced sausage made from raw horse-flesh in round shape, laying newspaper on the bedside table. – Sit down please; - he said not looking at Sherzod. Apparently, recent sharpness a little bit passed away. – Thank you! – Sherzod expressed sincerely his gratitude. – Now we'll go for dinner. (Otkir Khoshimov, “Nur borki, soya bor” (If there is light, then shadow exists) p.12)

In this example character expressed his opinion by the word-sentence “thank you”, related to gratitude respect category, out of respect of his interlocutor in order to deny offer. Character's negative answer, expressed via “Thank you”, is not result of he can't eat pastry food, but also he doesn't have desire to eat this manti, because he has seen the preparation this meal and his appetite spoiled. We can realize it from this extract:

As soon as the woman, who was making dough by her hand with golden rings, appeared beside Sherzod, his appetite spoiled. – Thank you, - he said standing up. – I don't like pastry food. (Otkir Khoshimov, “Nur borki, soya bor” (If there is light, then shadow exists) p.13)

It can be observed widely that word-sentences are used in speech with nonverbal means. Usage of word-sentences and nonverbal means at the same time is one of the special pragmatic signs. We can look through their expressing in the following way:

Types of nonverbal means	Word-sentences	Parts of the body and actions	Examples
Indicative signs	That, this, here it is	Hand, head, eye. Indication with hand, to gesture with eye, threatens with.	- Please! – he said gesturing by hand. (O'.Kh.)
Emphasizing signs	Yes, no, ok, well, sure, never, I don't know, of course, certainly, very well	Head, hand, shoulder. Nod, shake, and shrug.	1. – Ok! – my dad nodded his head (O'.Kh.) 2. — wow!.. Why... Hmm, — he shook his head. (Sh. Kh.)
Symbolic signs	Good morning, hi, thank you, thanks a lot, hurrah, amen, good bye.	Head, hand. Putting hand on the chest, fold one's arm, hang down one's head, shake hand, rise hand making fist, hold up cupped hands	1. — Amen! — said suddenly music teacher holding up supped hands. — Good luck. May idlers find job because of you! Thank you! (Sh.Kh.) 2. Thank you! – Sherzod nodded his head gratefully. (O'.Kh.)
Descriptive signs	Well done, bravo, very well.	Finger, hand. Pointing thumb, tying hands together, clap one's hands, shake head	Gulsara shook her head as saying "Bravo". I also said rising my eyebrows: - Well done! (Sh.Kh.)
Emotional signs	Pff, oh, wow, ew, kissing	Head, eyes, lips, face, hand. Shaking heads, twist one's mouth, wave one's hand, speak swingly one's arm, goggle, and screw up one's face.	1. – Ew! – said my sister-in-law twisting her lips. (O'.Kh.) 2. - Pff! – waved his hand angrily. (O'.Kh.) – Wow! – Abduvali goggled. (O'.Kh.)

Nonverbal means can be differentiated in order to age, sex, social status, even place of the speaker. For example we can see several cases such as old and middle aged communicants grab their collars because of the astonishment using the words "Oh my God!", "My God!", "my goodness!"; mainly, women say "Oh my God!" twisting their mouth, frowning their eyebrows and

turn away their head from the interlocutor; people say the interjections "Oh", "Wow" shaking heads; interjection "Duh" expresses annoyance over something stupid or obvious; "ouch" exclamation of pain; "Eek" means girly scream, surprised, scared; "Eh" means that asking for repetition, expressing enquiry, expressing surprise, inviting agreement; "humph" means a

snort, to express dislike, disbelief or annoyance; “Muahaha” means evil villain’s triumphant laugh; “Shsh” means to make someone be quiet; “Bye” means telling farewell rising one of the hands and waving.

There are such word-sentences; they express two statements, in other word being upset and happy. They create action in order to express which statement. For example, it can be seen that when the interjections “oh”, “ahh” express enjoyment, people’s eyes close as soon as they smile; if these interjections are told in difficult situations, people punch onto their chest. We observed during our research that serious, grave people rarely use nonverbal means. Favourable people use effectively them. The aim of using word-sentences with nonverbal means in literary texts is to create character’s personality and movements lively in reader’s imagination. For example, - Hey, teacher! – spoke old man swinging his arm. – Don’t you understand? Do you need special invitation?! (O’tkir Khoshimov “Ikki eshik orasi” (“Between two worlds’ gates”) p.43) The old man in the given example is village elder. He is a straight, unevasive, direct man. Writer in his work depicted skillfully the old man’s character by the help of his actions; and writer’s method caused to appear the image clearly in reader’s imagination.

It can be seen the above-given table that we can note particularly the connotation is used in expressing the word-sentences in Uzbek language through language as well as action. Also, word-sentences, especially, positive and negative meanings are expressed without language, in other word by the help of nonverbal means: Berdiyev (jabbering): Did you hear, sister-in-law? You are also responsible! (Khanifa shook her head silently). (O’.Kh.). Personage is expressing approval through shaking head.

DISCUSSION

Pragmatics is a special branch of linguistics; it studies several issues like choosing language units

during conversation, using them and effect of used units into participants of the conversation. These rules are studied as broad-meaningly context due to the conditions of communication. (Safarov, 2008;76).

Speech act is a language conversation, appeared among people in a certain condition and clear purpose. The most important components of speech act are speaker, listener, speech object – factual material and speech condition. (Khakimov, 2011). It can be noted that another essential components of speech act should be general language knowledge and skills of the participants, if the speakers and listeners don’t have language knowledge (even gesture, body language), speech act will be unclear for the participants. (Kurbanova, 2018)

So, speech act is expressing person’s inner feelings and purposes by the help of the language, in other word delivering them to the listener by speech.

All pragmatists acknowledged that the content of the speech act consists of generalisation of language and non-language features. The most of them consider that the speech act is three-staged activity. In these stages three types of acts are done. They are locative, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts. (Safarov, 2008; 81).

The concept of locative act is the use of words in an unusual or specialized way with its pronunciation. This notion is described differently. M.Kurbanova, researcher on pragmatics of children speech, doesn’t agree to the opinion of pragmatist M.Khakimov, which is said “the concept of locution is realization of the speaker about occurrence in the world and the level of verbal and nonverbal expressing in some cases”, she has noted that “though nonverbal expression of the conversation is a component of speech act, it is not the same with locutionary act”. (M.Kurbanova. 2018).

According to our point of view, the opinion of M.Kurbanova is close to the reality for the notion of locutionary act. The following definition of Sh.Safarov is a certain proof of it: “We create

meaningful word or phrase during the conversation and we do speech activity through pronunciation, exactly the execution of the act is locution or locutionary act. If the meaningful sentence isn't made or pronounced in order to any reason (like unknowing the language or being dumb), locutionary act will not be occurred". (Safarov, 2008;75). Sh.Safarov explains that if the sentence "I brewed hot tea" remains in script, there will be no locution. G.Yule noted that "Locutionary act is producing act of basic or meaningful language expression of the speech". (G.Yule, 1996;48). J.Ostin divided locutionary act into 3 groups: phonetic, phatic, rhetic. (Ostin, 1986;84).

Structure of illocutionary act parts has logical order. This order provides independence of illocutionary act and gives chance to be done the illocutionary act without propositional act. For instance, some speech units such as "Alas! Oh my God! Goodness me!" don't have propositional content, but they have complete form due to illocutionary aspect, in other word they express communicative purpose and meaning in certain context. (Sh.Safarov, Pragmalinguistics. p.84).

So it should be noted supporting these ideas that though word-sentences don't have propositional content, they express communicative purpose and meaning due to illocutionary aspect.

It can be said that primary period of language system development begins from pragmatics. (Safarov, 2008;40). Certainly, linguist's description is true. Because language expresses inner purpose and thoughts of the people, it serves for their personal desire. In creating the conversation speaker (addresser) and listener (addressee) participate and they have own purpose-intention for emerging the process of communication. Intention of addresser is delivering the information, while intention of addressee consists of listening. Their intentions unite and appear intentional conversation. Moreover, speaker sets main goal to deliver the information as well as to be understood of him by

listener. This recognition emerges reaction of listener to the information; the listener isn't restricted only to have the information. So, there is intention under each action and there will not be conversation without it. For example, - "Guli fell down. – Oh my God! Where did she fall down?" Intention of informer is not only to give information about falling down of Guli, but also to know about reaction, influence and opinion of listener. Expectedly, the listener expresses his reaction via emotion. This word, mainly, means deep emotion, it appears in women's speech, when they hear sudden occurrence, and it expresses additional meanings to propositional content. (Safarov, 2008;236)

Linguistic pragmatics and its problems: speech act, presupposition, aspects of simple and extended content as well as types of allegory and primary meaning always appear in relations of speaker-listener, subject-object. Components of speech act are addressee and addresser, speech statement, these components' participation is important in successfully carrying out of primary meaning. (Khakimov, 2013;97).

During the conversation speaker can choose which speech act s/he uses in order to his/her intention. However, sometimes there will be some impedimental cases to the chance of speaker's choice. This impediment can be related to gender and age features, psychological condition or social status of the speaker. For instance, according to the psychological conditions men use rude expressions, women use fondling words, children mostly use speech act, which expresses question. (M.A.Kurbanova, 2018; M.M.Kurbanova-N.Qobilova, 2020)

There are unique traditions of Central Asian's nations, in particular Uzbek nation. These traditions "... are union of behavior, politeness, disciplined actions, rules and trends of human treatment. During the usage of these features in life special dimensions of morals will appear. They are goodness, duty, conscience, honor and shame, patience, sharpness, modesty, sense" (Yusubov, 2012). Above-mentioned traditions are

expressed in Uzbek speech communication via language and nonverbal means.

G.Kh.Rakhimov notes about English speech culture in his research and gives example by A.Vejbitskaya: "...in English language culture there is not "command" anywhere except army, also there are not "to please and entreat" in this culture". He doesn't agree to this opinion, and gives J.Thomas's point of view as proof: "...the most politely forms such as "Will you be kind enough to tell me what time is it? or If you'll be kind enough to speed up a little?" are heard inappropriately in the communication of close friends; in this case it is the best way to use the forms like What's the time? and Hurry up! "

Truly, it can not be agreed completely to the strong opinion of Vejbitskaya. As we mentioned above that English people are so polite speakers, who put the respect category for the first stage, they prefer to express request indirectly based on respect category like Can you...? Could you...? Would you...?

But it doesn't mean that English speakers never use imperatives and imperatives are only used in army. For example, speech ethics are not always be high in the family or among friends.

Also, using politeness in every communication can be seemed uncomfortable for people in some cases.

In pragmatic analyses there is a concept pragmatic obstacle, when we note about pragmatic features of word-sentences in Uzbek language, we can not avoid from this phenomenon. Pragmatic obstacle appears as a result of inappropriate pronunciation, inappropriate word choice, irregular uniting of grammatical form and syntactic structure, inappropriate usage of functional style; it will be apparent as negative of expression by the effect of aphasia. In any text author uses pragmatic obstacle as stylistical means in order to express own inner intention and depict character's personality. (Khakimov, 2013;p.133).

Author tries to depict completely image's character through pragmatic obstacle. It is considered one of stylistical means of the writer.

When pragmatic obstacle is used, text information will not be changed, vice versa its effectiveness will increase.

CONCLUSION

It can be seen from above-mentioned opinions that pragmatic aspect of word-sentences in Uzbek language has special peculiarities. These units, which express different modal meanings, give extra meanings to the main proposition in sentence during conversation and they appear through primary concepts of pragmalinguistics such as speech act, intention, presupposition, primary meaning. Because speech statement of language signs, clearly, relation of speaker and listener is the base of pragmatic researches. Person, who is going to make conversation, aims to deliver the information as well as to express his/her own attitude and also to give that purpose completely to the listener. This recognition emerges reaction of listener to the information; so the listener isn't restricted only to have the information.

In any language, particularly in Uzbek language pragmatic "load" of these units is heavier than other language units because of being clearly realized some meanings like modal attitude, emotions during conversation, mood, desire, positive and negative treatment of the speaker toward speech preposition in semantic-functional formed word-sentences.

REFERENCES

- [1] Bobokalonov Ramazon (2000) Semantic-functional formed word-sentences in Uzbek language. can.diss.
- [2] Sayfullayeva, Ra'no, Kurbanova, Mukhabbat (2013), Contemporary Uzbek language. Volume 2.Syntactics. Classic word, Tashkent.
- [3] Safarov Shakhriyor (2008) Pragmalinguistics. Tashkent. library www.ziyouz.com

- [4] Hakimov Mukhammad (2013) Bases of Uzbek O'zbek Pragmalinguistics. Tashkent. library www.ziyouz.com
- [5] Hakimov Mukhammad (2011) Pragmatic interpretation of text in Uzbek language: Doc.Phil.... diss. – Tashkent.
- [6] Kurbanova, Mukhabbat, 2001. Interpretation of formal-functional direction and simple sentence structure in Uzbek linguistics. Doc.phil.scien....dis.Tashkent.
- [7] Kurbanova M.M., Qobilova N.E. FOUNDATION OF PARAGRAPH IN UZBEK TEXTS. Journal of Critical Reviews ISSN-2394-5125 Vol 7, Issue 3, 2020, 255-259
- [8] Kurbanova, Munavvara, Pragmatic features of Uzbek children's speech.. Doc.phil.scien.diss. avtoreferati. 2018.
- [9] Arnol'd IrinaVladimirovna. Stilistika sovremennogo angliyskogo yazika. - M., 1990.
- [10] Ostin Djeyn. Slovo kak deystvie. H3L. Bip. XVII. - M., 1986.
- [11] George Yule, (1996) Pragmatics. Oxford University Press. P. 48
- [12] Explanatory dictionary of Uzbek language. 5 volumes. "Uzbekistan National encyclopedia ofUzbekistan" state scientific publishing house. 2006-2008yy.
- [13] Yusubov D.A., Saitkhodjayev X.B., Mavlyanov A.A.,Philosophy. - Tashkent, 2012. p. 264
- [14] Tokhir Malik, The last bullet. Library www.ziyouz.com. p. 80
- [15] Tog'ay.Murod. Horse neighed night. Library www.ziyouz.com. p. 6
- [16] Shukur.Kholmiraev, Saylanma. 4 volumes.Library www.ziyouz.com
- [17] O'tkir Khoshimov (2015) Between two worlds. "MERIYUZ" HMNK. Tashkent. p. 462
- [18] O'tkir Khoshimov, (2002) Terrible dreams. Publishing house Literature and art named G'afur G'ulam. Tashkent.p. 126