ISSN:2828-6235
Impact factor:13.77

International Journal of Literature and Language Studies(IJLLS)

FUNCTIONAL AND PRAGMATIC FEATURES OF ANAPHORIC DEVICES IN RUSSIAN AND UZBEK PROVERBS

Makhbuba Kakharovna Khamidova
Instructor at Fergana State University, Fergana, Uzbekistan
doi:https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23490140

Abstract. The article examines the functional and pragmatic properties of anaphoric devices in Russian and Uzbek proverbs from a comparative perspective. The term anaphora is used primarily in its referential and cohesive sense: an anaphoric expression is interpreted through a previously activated or structurally correlated element, while stylistic initial repetition is considered only when it contributes to referential continuity or pragmatic parallelism. The study focuses on pronominal and correlative constructions, demonstrative and locative reference, reflexive and possessive anaphora, lexical recurrence, and zero or elliptical anaphora. The analysis demonstrates that proverbial discourse makes especially productive use of compact correlation patterns such as Russian kto – tot, chto – to, gde – tam and Uzbek kim – u/o‘sha, nima – shu/shuni, qayerda – shu/o‘sha yerda. These patterns perform more than a cohesive function: they generalize the referent, convert an individual situation into a rule, intensify didactic force, organize cause–effect relations, and reduce the need for explicit nomination. Uzbek proverbs additionally exploit pro-drop and morphologically recoverable reference more freely, whereas Russian examples more often retain overt correlates for structural balance and rhythmic symmetry. The article argues that anaphoric devices constitute one of the mechanisms by which paremias achieve semantic compression, memorability, inferential economy and pragmatic universality.

Keywords: anaphora, anaphoric reference, proverb, paremiology, Russian language, Uzbek language, cohesion, pragmatics, pronoun, ellipsis, correlative construction.

Introduction

Proverbs are compact predicative units in which a culturally recognized judgment is represented as a generalized model of experience. Their semantic density is achieved not only through metaphor, parallelism and rhythmic organization, but also through grammatical mechanisms that minimize repeated nomination while preserving interpretability. Anaphoric reference is one of these mechanisms. In a proverb, a pronominal, demonstrative or zero form may reactivate a participant, property, place, action or proposition already introduced in the same construction; in correlative patterns, the first element can also establish a variable whose value is resolved by a formally related expression in the following clause.

In text linguistics, anaphora is usually associated with endophoric reference and with the interpretation of a reduced expression through an antecedent. Halliday and Hasan treated reference, substitution and ellipsis as major resources of cohesion, showing that textual unity arises when one element presupposes another for its interpretation [1]. Later approaches shifted attention from a purely textual relation to cognitive accessibility and discourse processing. Ariel’s Accessibility Theory connects the form of referring expressions with the presumed accessibility of their antecedents in the addressee’s mental representation [2]. Cornish, in turn, emphasizes that discourse anaphora cannot be reduced to mechanical coreference between forms: an anaphor provides instructions for retrieving or constructing a discourse referent in context [3]. These perspectives are particularly relevant for paremias, where overt context is minimal and the linguistic form itself must guide the addressee toward a generalized interpretation.

The term anaphora is also used in stylistics for the repetition of the same word or phrase at the beginning of successive syntactic units. This meaning is widespread in descriptions of folklore poetics. Russian and Uzbek proverbs indeed employ initial repetition, parallel constructions and

recurring lexical frames. However, the present article distinguishes rhetorical anaphora from referential anaphora. The latter is central to the analysis; rhetorical repetition is included only where it interacts with reference, parallelism or pragmatic emphasis. Such delimitation is necessary because the two phenomena may coexist in a proverb but perform different linguistic tasks.

The comparative perspective is especially productive because Russian and Uzbek belong to different structural types. Russian is a fusional Slavic language with overt case marking, gender distinctions in the pronominal system and relatively frequent expression of syntactic subjects. Uzbek is an agglutinative Turkic language in which person-number morphology and possessive markers often make the referent recoverable without an overt independent pronoun. Uzbek grammar also makes extensive use of correlating elements such as kim, nima, qayerda, shunday, shu, o‘sha and corresponding verbal morphology. Comparative descriptions of Uzbek and Russian subordinate constructions note the importance of mutually correlated pronominal elements in both languages, while Uzbek permits a wider range of omission when grammatical morphology preserves the relevant relations [7, 8].

In paremiology, such structural differences acquire a pragmatic dimension. A proverb is expected to be short, portable and applicable to many situations. It therefore tends to avoid unnecessarily specific reference. Indefinite-human pronouns, interrogative-correlative forms and zero anaphora allow a proverb to speak about anyone and everyone at once. For example, Russian Что посеешь, то и пожнёшь and Uzbek Nima eksang, shuni o‘rasan present the actor as an unexpressed generic human subject and organize the object relation through a correlative pair. The proverb does not identify a concrete sower; instead, the referential economy supports a general moral inference: consequences correspond to prior actions. Uzbek paremiological sources register Nima eksang, shuni o‘rasan as a stable folk proverb, while comparative folklore scholarship also notes its close correspondence with the Russian form [9, 10].

The relevance of the present study lies in the fact that anaphoric mechanisms in Russian and Uzbek proverbs are often mentioned only incidentally within broader discussions of syntax, stylistics or paremiology. Recent studies on Uzbek pronouns, reference and anaphoric dependency confirm the growing interest in the deictic-anaphoric potential of pronominal systems [11, 12], while work on ellipsis in Uzbek proverbs demonstrates the importance of omitted but recoverable components for proverbial compression [13]. Nevertheless, a functional-pragmatic comparison of anaphoric devices in Russian and Uzbek paremias remains insufficiently systematized.

The aim of this article is to identify the principal anaphoric devices used in Russian and Uzbek proverbs and to determine their functional and pragmatic contribution to proverbial meaning. The objectives are: (1) to delimit referential anaphora from stylistic initial repetition; (2) to describe pronominal, demonstrative, locative, reflexive, lexical and zero-anaphoric patterns; (3) to compare their realization in Russian and Uzbek; (4) to establish the pragmatic functions of generalization, compression, inferential guidance, evaluation and didactic emphasis; and (5) to show how structural typology interacts with the communicative nature of the proverb.

Materials and Methods

The material of the study is an illustrative comparative sample of Russian and Uzbek folk proverbs selected from established paremiological collections, primarily V. I. Dal’s Poslovitsy russkogo naroda and O‘zbek xalq maqollari compiled by T. Mirzayev, A. Musoqulov and B. Sarimsoqov [9, 10]. Additional Uzbek examples were checked against contemporary collections and grammatical descriptions in order to preserve current Latin-script spelling. The study does not claim corpus-wide frequency values; its goal is qualitative modelling of recurrent anaphoric configurations. For this reason, numerical percentages are deliberately avoided unless supported by an independently quantified source.

The analysis combines comparative, functional, semantic, syntactic and pragmatic procedures. The comparative method identifies formally comparable constructions across the two languages. Functional analysis determines what textual work is performed by each anaphoric device: maintenance of reference, clause linking, topic continuity, semantic compression or parallel organization. Semantic analysis establishes the relation between antecedent and anaphor, including identity, variable-binding, part-whole, locative and propositional relations. Pragmatic analysis focuses on the effect of these choices on generalized reference, normative meaning, inferential direction and the speaker's implicit didactic stance.

A distinction is made among five analytical groups: (1) correlative-pronominal anaphora; (2) demonstrative and locative anaphora; (3) reflexive and possessive anaphora; (4) lexical recurrence functioning as referential reinforcement; and (5) zero or elliptical anaphora. The categories overlap in some examples. For instance, Nima eksang, shuni o'rasan combines a correlative pair with a zero generic subject; Har kim o'zidan o'tganini o'zi biladi combines generalized human reference with reflexive anaphora; Ko'z qayerda bo'lsa, mehr ham o'sha yerda links a locative interrogative-correlative element to a demonstrative-locative anaphor.

The theoretical framework draws on the cohesion model of Halliday and Hasan [1], Accessibility Theory [2], discourse-anaphora analysis [3], pragmatics [4, 5], Uzbek text-pragmatics [6], and comparative grammar of Uzbek and Russian [7, 8]. Paremiological interpretation is informed by the view of the proverb as a generalized, structurally compressed and pragmatically reusable unit [14, 15].

Results and Discussion

1. Referential anaphora in the compressed structure of the proverb

The proverb presents a special environment for anaphora because its textual space is extremely limited. In extended discourse, an anaphor can refer back across several sentences or discourse segments. In a paremia, antecedent and anaphor are usually located within one syntactic whole, frequently in adjacent clauses. This proximity increases accessibility and permits formally reduced reference. At the same time, the meaning of a proverb is not confined to the referents explicitly mentioned in the wording. The addressee must construct a generic situation and map it onto a new communicative context. Thus, proverbial anaphora operates simultaneously on two levels: local cohesion inside the fixed expression and pragmatic projection beyond it.

The fixed expression Что посеешь, то и пожнёшь illustrates this double mechanism. The pronoun что introduces an open variable referring to whatever action, behavior or cause is metaphorically conceptualized as sowing; то resumes that variable in the result clause. The pair is syntactically compact, but pragmatically expansive. Its referent is not a specific seed or object; it is a schematic input whose consequences are evaluated through the second clause. Uzbek Nima eksang, shuni o'rasan follows the same general logic: nima establishes an open object slot, while shuni marks a specific, discourse-linked object in the following clause. Because the second form carries the accusative marker -ni, the anaphoric relation is simultaneously semantic and morphosyntactic.

These constructions cannot be adequately described as simple repetition. Their central function is variable maintenance. The first element does not name a concrete referent but creates a discourse parameter; the second signals that the parameter remains constant across the causal sequence. Such correlation is especially well suited to proverbial logic because it transforms a concrete agricultural image into an abstract principle of reciprocity and consequence.

2. Correlative-pronominal patterns and generic human reference

Russian proverbial syntax frequently employs correlative pairs in which an interrogative or relative-like pronoun in the dependent clause corresponds to a demonstrative or personal form in the main clause: кто – тот, кто – тому, что – то/того, где – там, как – так. Examples such as Кто рано встаёт, тому Бог подаёт and Что написано пером, того не вырубишь топором use a first-

clause variable and a second-clause correlate. The first construction introduces an unspecified human participant through кто; the dative тому then reactivates that participant as recipient. The second introduces a propositionally rich object through что and resumes it by the genitive-accusative того.

The pragmatic significance of кто is its genericity. It avoids reference to a concrete individual and invites any addressee to occupy the relevant participant role. The proverb therefore functions as a conditional-normative model rather than as a report about a particular person. The anaphoric correlate reinforces this universalization: the person who satisfies the first condition is precisely the person to whom the consequence applies. The relation is both referential and logical.

Uzbek uses functionally similar patterns with kim, kimki, har kim and subsequent u, o‘sha, uning or zero realization. Grammatical descriptions explicitly note constructions such as Kimda-kim mehnat qilsa, u maqsadiga yetadi and Kim mehnat qilsa, u rohat ko‘radi as examples of mutually correlated subordination [7, 8]. In authentic proverbial material, the generalized-human pattern is also frequent: Har kim o‘zidan o‘tganini o‘zi biladi; Har kim ekkanini oladi; Har kim qazgan chuquriga yiqilar [10]. In these examples, har kim establishes an unrestricted human set, while reflexive or possessive forms subsequently maintain reference to the same generic participant.

A notable difference concerns the necessity of the overt correlate. Russian tends to preserve an explicit element in many canonical correlative paremias because the pair contributes to syntactic symmetry and rhythm. Uzbek can preserve u or o‘sha, but verbal endings, possessive suffixes and reflexive forms often make the participant recoverable even without an independent pronoun. The result is a stronger interaction between anaphora and morphology.

3. Demonstrative and locative anaphora: from spatial reference to evaluative mapping

Demonstratives and locative correlates occupy an important position in both languages. Russian pairs such as где – там and куда – туда establish a spatial parameter in the first clause and reactivate it in the second. In proverbial discourse, physical location often develops into a metaphorical or evaluative domain. Где тонко, там и рвётся does not merely identify a place; it establishes the weakest point in a system as the locus where failure is expected. The locative anaphor там converts the first clause into a predictive frame for the second.

Uzbek exhibits a rich set of spatial correlates: qayerda – shu yerda/o‘sha yerda, qayerga – shu yerga/o‘sha yerga, qayerdan – o‘sha yerdan. Comparative grammar describes these as havola bo‘laklari, correlating elements that create reciprocal semantic dependence between clauses [8]. In paremiological material, Ko‘z qayerda bo‘lsa, mehr ham o‘sha yerda and Ko‘rpang qayerda bo‘lsa, ko‘ngling shu yerda provide clear examples [10]. The spatial relation is simultaneously psychological: physical orientation becomes a model for emotional attachment.

The pragmatic function of such locative anaphora is mapping. A location introduced in the first clause becomes an interpretive coordinate for the second clause. Because the locative is open rather than lexically specified, the proverb can be applied to indefinitely many situations. The construction is therefore both cohesive and schematic. It economizes expression while maximizing contextual adaptability.

Demonstrative forms also contribute evaluative distance. Uzbek shu tends to present the resumed element as immediate or textually proximal, while o‘sha can mark stronger identification with the previously established referent. Russian тот and там likewise point to a discourse-established entity or domain. In fixed proverbial structures, these deictic origins are refunctionalized: spatial or perceptual pointing becomes textual pointing, and textual pointing in turn supports generalized inference.

4. Reflexive and possessive anaphora

Reflexive anaphora is especially productive in Uzbek proverbial discourse because o‘z combines with person and possessive morphology and can compactly maintain identity between an

argument and a previously introduced generic participant. Har kim o‘zidan o‘tganini o‘zi biladi contains two reflexive forms linked to har kim. The proverb’s meaning depends on strict referential identity: the experiencer, the source of the experience and the knower are construed as the same person. This chain intensifies the idea that certain experiences remain privately accessible.

The same mechanism is visible in O‘zing yoqqan o‘tga, o‘zing isin, where the reflexive subject is repeated to emphasize responsibility for one’s own action. Here referential anaphora intersects with rhetorical repetition. The repetition of o‘zing is stylistically salient, but its pragmatic force derives from persistent coreference: the agent who creates the cause must also undergo its consequence. The proverb thus makes personal accountability linguistically unavoidable.

Russian has reflexive forms себя, свой and related constructions, but many Russian proverbs encode generic self-reference through possessive or reciprocal lexical patterns rather than a single highly productive reflexive correlate. The cross-linguistic difference is not absolute; it reflects the different distribution of grammatical resources. Uzbek o‘z can operate as a compact identity marker across several syntactic functions, which makes it especially suitable for proverbs centered on responsibility, self-knowledge and self-caused consequences.

Possessive anaphora also supports cultural and relational meanings. In both languages, possessive forms can identify the relevant participant without repeating a noun. The pragmatic effect is often one of personalization within generalization: a proverb applies universally, but the possessive structure makes the consequence feel attributable to each participant individually.

5. Zero anaphora and ellipsis as mechanisms of proverbial economy

Zero anaphora arises when a semantically necessary participant is not expressed by an independent lexical item but can be recovered from grammatical marking or from the construction. Uzbek provides particularly transparent cases because person-number suffixes on predicates can identify the subject. The proverb Nima eksang, shuni o‘rasan contains no overt second-person pronoun sen, yet the verb forms eksang and o‘rasan identify a generic second-person subject. The omitted subject is not absent from interpretation; it is an anaphorically stable participant maintained across the two clauses by verbal morphology.

This generic second person has a strong pragmatic effect. It creates direct involvement without addressing any particular individual. The hearer is invited to interpret sen as a role that anyone can occupy. In proverbial communication, such zero realization reduces verbal material while preserving both reference and didactic orientation. Research on ellipsis in Uzbek folk proverbs confirms that omission is a recurrent means of structural compression and that recoverability depends on grammatical and contextual cues [13].

Russian also permits subject omission in imperative, infinitival and contextually recoverable patterns, but in finite proverbial clauses overt subject correlates are often retained when they contribute to parallel structure. Nevertheless, Russian paremias also use zero realization in generalized-personal constructions: Посеешь ветер — пожнёшь бурю or За двумя зайцами погонишься — ни одного не поймаешь. The subject is grammatically encoded by the second-person singular verb, while the absent pronoun has generic reference. Thus, both languages exploit zero anaphora, though Uzbek morphology often makes omission more structurally ordinary.

Ellipsis can also affect predicates or complements. When parallel clauses repeat the same semantic frame, one component may be omitted because the first clause activates it sufficiently. In proverb form, this is not merely grammatical economy. Ellipsis creates rhythm, encourages inferential participation and often sharpens opposition. The addressee reconstructs the missing material almost automatically, which increases processing fluency and memorability.

6. Lexical recurrence, anaphoric reinforcement and parallelism

Not every anaphoric relation is pronominal. Repetition of a lexical item can function as a high-explicitness strategy when the speaker chooses not to reduce the second mention. Accessibility Theory predicts that highly accessible referents normally permit reduced expressions, but repetition may be selected when contrast, rhythm or didactic clarity is more important than economy [2]. Proverbs frequently exploit precisely this tension between compression and reinforcement.

Uzbek examples such as Har kim o‘zidan o‘tganini o‘zi biladi combine reduced reference with repeated reflexive morphology; Russian examples often repeat lexical material in antithetical structures. Repetition may also form a chain in which each occurrence narrows or redirects evaluation. In such cases, lexical recurrence does not simply restate content; it stabilizes the referent while placing it in a new predicative relation.

The interaction of anaphora and parallelism is important because proverbial memorability depends on patterned recurrence. A first clause establishes a syntactic and semantic template; the second repeats enough of that template to make the relationship transparent while changing the crucial element. Referential continuity therefore supports rhetorical balance. The distinction between referential and stylistic anaphora remains analytically useful, but actual paremias often exploit both simultaneously.

7. Pragmatic functions of anaphoric devices in proverbial discourse

The comparative analysis reveals several recurrent pragmatic functions. The first is generalization. Indefinite-human and interrogative-correlative forms remove individual reference and allow the proverb to function as a general rule. Кто…, тот… and Kim…, u/o‘sha… constructions are not about a named person; they construct a role and attach a predictable consequence to it.

The second function is semantic compression. Anaphoric forms prevent repeated lexical nomination. In a genre whose authority partly depends on brevity, this economy is structurally valuable. Zero anaphora intensifies the effect by allowing morphology or parallel structure to carry referential information without an independent word.

The third function is inferential guidance. Correlative pairs tell the addressee which elements must be interpreted as equivalent or dependent. Что посеешь, то и пожнёшь and Nima eksang, shuni o‘rasan do not leave the causal relation entirely implicit: the paired forms explicitly signal that the object of the result corresponds to the object of the initiating action. This reduces ambiguity and directs moral interpretation.

The fourth function is didactic personalization. Generic second-person and reflexive forms allow a maxim to sound personally relevant without becoming a direct accusation. O‘zing yoqqan o‘tga, o‘zing isin attributes responsibility to the addressee role, but because the form is proverbial, the judgment is presented as collective wisdom rather than an individual speaker’s attack. The same mechanism operates in Russian generalized second-person paremias.

The fifth function is contrastive and evaluative organization. By maintaining one referent across two clauses, anaphora makes a change in predicate, result or evaluation especially noticeable. The hearer can focus on the consequence because participant identity is already settled. This is one reason why anaphoric structures are effective in proverbs about reciprocity, responsibility, reward and punishment.

The sixth function is mnemonic organization. Correlative pairs and repeated reference create formal predictability. Once the first element is heard, the second becomes partly expected: kto anticipates tot/tomu, gde anticipates tam, nima anticipates shu/shuni, qayerda anticipates shu/o‘sha yerda. Such anticipatory structure lowers processing cost and supports oral transmission.

8. Comparative tendencies in Russian and Uzbek

The Russian and Uzbek materials show a substantial functional parallelism. Both languages use anaphoric devices to maintain reference, generalize participants, organize cause–effect

relations and produce compact symmetrical constructions. The proverb pair Что посеешь, то и пожнёшь / Nima eksang, shuni o‘rasan demonstrates near-isomorphic pragmatic organization despite morphological differences. Both establish an open variable in the first clause and resume it in the second; both employ a generic implicit subject; both turn agricultural causality into a general ethical model.

The main differences concern the distribution of overt and morphologically encoded reference. Russian correlative constructions often preserve an explicit second member — тот, тому, то, того, там — as part of the canonical architecture of the proverb. Uzbek can use similarly explicit correlates — u, shu, shuni, o‘sha, o‘sha yerda — but the language’s agglutinative morphology and pro-drop properties allow reference to be distributed across suffixes and omitted positions. Consequently, anaphoric relations in Uzbek may be less lexically visible but no less structurally active.

A second tendency concerns reflexivity. Uzbek o‘z and its inflected forms create dense networks of self-reference that are highly compatible with proverb semantics involving personal responsibility and self-knowledge. Russian has functionally comparable resources, but the exact grammatical packaging differs. A third tendency concerns locative correlation: both languages actively exploit spatial pairs, but Uzbek offers highly transparent multiword correlates with yer ‘place’, such as qayerda – shu yerda / o‘sha yerda.

These differences should not be interpreted as evidence that one language is more anaphoric than the other. Rather, they show that the same discourse-pragmatic requirements can be satisfied by different combinations of lexical, pronominal and morphological means. The universal need for referential continuity is realized through language-specific structural resources.

Table 1. Representative anaphoric patterns in Russian and Uzbek proverbs

Pattern	**Russian example**	**Uzbek example**	**Main pragmatic effect**
Object correlation	Что посеешь, то и пожнёшь.	Nima eksang, shuni o‘rasan.	Reciprocity; cause–effect identity; moral generalization
Human correlation	Кто рано встаёт, тому Бог подаёт.	Har kim ekkanini oladi.	Generic participant; predictable consequence
Locative correlation	Где тонко, там и рвётся.	Ko‘z qayerda bo‘lsa, mehr ham o‘sha yerda.	Mapping a location/domain onto a result or evaluation
Reflexive continuity	Каждый за себя отвечает (proverbial model).	Har kim o‘zidan o‘tganini o‘zi biladi.	Personal responsibility or private experience
Zero generic subject	Посеешь ветер — пожнёшь бурю.	Nima eksang, shuni o‘rasan.	Direct involvement; compression; universal addressee

The table demonstrates that formal equivalence is not required for pragmatic equivalence. A Russian overt correlate may correspond to an Uzbek demonstrative, reflexive form or morphologically supported zero element. What remains stable is the discourse operation: a referent or variable is activated, maintained and interpreted in relation to a subsequent predication.

Conclusion

The study confirms that anaphoric devices are structurally central to the economy of Russian and Uzbek proverbs. Their role extends beyond the traditional notion of textual cohesion. In paremiological discourse, anaphora organizes generalized reference, binds conditions to

consequences, stabilizes participants across parallel clauses and enables extensive semantic content to be expressed in a minimal verbal form.

The most productive patterns include pronominal correlation, demonstrative and locative resumption, reflexive identity, lexical reinforcement and zero anaphora. Russian canonical paremias frequently rely on overt correlative pairs such as кто – тот/тому, что – то/того and где – там. Uzbek employs comparable pairs kim – u/o‘sha, nima – shu/shuni and qayerda – shu/o‘sha yerda, while also making broader use of morphologically recoverable zero participants and of the reflexive element o‘z.

From a pragmatic perspective, anaphoric devices perform six interrelated functions: generalization, compression, inferential guidance, didactic personalization, contrastive-evaluative organization and mnemonic structuring. These functions explain why anaphoric patterns are especially compatible with proverb semantics. A proverb must be applicable beyond its original situation, memorable in oral transmission and sufficiently compact to be reproduced as a ready-made judgment. Anaphora supports all three requirements.

The comparative evidence also shows that structural differences between Russian and Uzbek do not prevent functional convergence. The two languages may encode referential continuity through different combinations of overt pronouns, demonstratives, reflexives and verbal morphology, but the underlying communicative tasks remain comparable. This makes anaphoric organization a productive parameter for the contrastive study of Russian and Uzbek paremiology.

Further research can expand the present qualitative model through corpus annotation of larger proverb collections. A quantified study could measure the distribution of anaphoric types, compare antecedent–anaphor distance, examine the frequency of zero realization and determine which patterns are associated with particular semantic domains such as labour, family, morality, social hierarchy and reciprocity. Such a corpus-based extension would make it possible to distinguish universal properties of proverbial reference from language-specific preferences with greater statistical precision.

References

1. Halliday, M. A. K., Hasan, R. Cohesion in English. London: Longman, 1976.
2. Ariel, M. Accessing Noun-Phrase Antecedents. London: Routledge, 1990.
3. Cornish, F. Anaphora, Discourse, and Understanding: Evidence from English and French. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
4. Levinson, S. C. Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
5. Safarov, Sh. Pragmalingvistika. Toshkent: O‘zbekiston milliy ensiklopediyasi, 2008. 318 b.
6. Hakimov, M. O‘zbek tilida matnning pragmatik talqini: filologiya fanlari doktori dissertatsiyasi. Toshkent, 2001.
7. Mahmudov, N., Nurmonov, A. O‘zbek tilining nazariy grammatikasi. Sintaksis. Toshkent: O‘qituvchi, 1995.
8. O‘zbek va rus tillarining qiyosiy tipologiyasi. O‘quv qo‘llanma. Toshkent, 2022.
9. Dal, V. I. Poslovitsy russkogo naroda [Proverbs of the Russian People]. Moscow: AST, Astrel, 2000. 752 p.
10. Mirzayev, T., Musoqulov, A., Sarimsoqov, B. O‘zbek xalq maqollari. Toshkent: Sharq, 2005. 512 b.
11. Mirzaaxmedov, M. Anaphoric Dependencies in Korean and Uzbek. ACTA NUUz. 2025. Vol. 1, No. 11. P. 255–257. DOI: 10.69617/nuuz.v1i11.9708.
12. Davlatova, R. Matn tarkibida ishora birliklari. O‘zbek tili va adabiyoti. 2015. No. 2. P. 100–104.
13. Vafoeva, M. The Ellipsis in Uzbek Folk Proverbs. Web of Scientist: International Scientific Research Journal. 2021. Vol. 2, No. 11. DOI: 10.17605/OSF.IO/CT3BF.

14. Jo‘rayeva, B. O‘zbek xalq maqollarining lingvistik asoslari. Toshkent: Akademnashr, 2019. 186 b.
15. Mieder, W. Proverbs: A Handbook. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2004.
16. Lutfullayeva, D., Davlatova, R. O‘zbek muloqot matnining deyktik birliklari. O‘zbek tili va adabiyoti. 2011. No. 6. P. 32–36.