

World Conference on Social Sciences, Law and Public Policy
Hosted Online from Toronto, Canada
Date: 26th November, 2026
Website: https://econferencia.com

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ANTHROPONYMS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Rajabova Zarnigor To'lqin qizi
Master's student at Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages
Email: zarnigorr5@gmail.com

Egamnazarov Qobil Abdunazarovich
PhD, Associate Professor Scientific Supervisor

ABSTRACT

This article presents a comparative analysis of anthroponyms in English and Uzbek. Beyond serving as basic nominative units, personal names act as cultural markers that encode history, religious heritage, social organization, and national identity. The study examines the structural models, semantic motivation, etymology, and sociolinguistic functions of personal names across both languages, with particular focus on patronymic formation, surname development, and semantic transparency. The analysis demonstrates that while English and Uzbek anthroponymic systems share universal patterns of individual identification, they diverge considerably in morphological productivity, cultural symbolism, and motivational structure. Comparing these systems offers valuable insight into linguistic diversity, cultural identity, and the broader relationship between language and society.

Keywords: anthroponym, onomastics, proper names, patronymic, semantic transparency, sociolinguistics, comparative linguistics.



World Conference on Social Sciences, Law and Public Policy
Hosted Online from Toronto, Canada
Date: 26th November, 2026
Website: https://econferencia.com

ANNOTATSIYA

Ushbu maqolada ingliz va o‘zbek tillaridagi antroponimlarning qiyosiy tahlili keltirilgan. Shaxs ismlari nafaqat asosiy nominativ birliklar, balki tarix, diniy meros, ijtimoiy tuzum va milliy o‘zlikni o‘zida mujassam etgan madaniy belgilar sifatida ham xizmat qiladi. Tadqiqotda har ikki tildagi shaxs ismlarining strukturaviy modellari, semantik motivatsiyasi, etimologiyasi va sotsiolingvistik vazifalari o‘rganilib, otasining ismini (patronim) shakllantirish, familiyalarning rivojlanishi va semantik shaffoflik masalalariga alohida e’tibor qaratilgan. Tahlil shuni ko‘rsatadiki, ingliz va o‘zbek antroponimik tizimlari shaxsni identifikatsiya qilishning universal qonuniyatlariga ega bo‘lsa-da, ular morfologik mahsuldorlik, madaniy ramziylik va motivatsion tuzilish jihatidan sezilarli darajada farqlanadi. Ushbu tizimlarni qiyosiy o‘rganish lisoniy xilma-xillik, madaniy o‘zlik hamda til va jamiyat o‘rtasidagi keng qamrovli o‘zaro bog‘liqlikni chuqurroq anglashga xizmat qiladi.

Kalit so‘zlar: antroponim, onomastika, atoqli otlar, patronim (otasining ismi), semantik shaffoflik, sotsiolingvistika, qiyosiy tilshunoslik.

INTRODUCTION

Proper names referred an essential layer of any language’s lexical system. Unlike common nouns, which categorize classes of objects or concepts, proper names single out unique entities. Among them, anthroponyms occupy a central place because they designate human beings and are tied to personal identity and daily social interaction between people.

In his foundational work, Ferdinand de Saussure defined language as “a system of signs that express ideas” (Saussure, 1916, p. 67). Viewed through this lens, anthroponyms operate as linguistic signs uniting form and meaning. However,

the meaning carried by a personal name is rarely purely lexical rather, it is deeply cultural, historical, and symbolic, often reflecting religious connection, ethnic background, historical memory, or parental aspirations. Studying anthroponyms therefore reveals how distinct societies conceptualize individuality and social belonging.

The two languages examined in this study stem from markedly different linguistic and historical backgrounds. English, a member of the Indo-European family, evolved through successive waves of Germanic, Latin, and French influence. Conversely, Uzbek belongs to the Turkic language family and has been shaped by Turkic, Persian, Arabic, and Russian linguistic traditions. These divergent historical paths have left a clear imprint on the structure and evolution of their respective naming systems. Accordingly, this study aims to provide a comparative analysis of English and Uzbek anthroponyms by examining their structural composition, semantic motivation, etymology, and sociocultural functions.

Literature Review

The systematic study of anthroponyms emerged as a distinct branch of linguistics during the 19th century. Early on, Otto Jespersen argued that linguistic phenomena cannot be divorced from social and cultural development (Jespersen, 1922)—a functional perspective that laid essential groundwork for modern onomastic inquiry. Contemporary research in this area regularly intersects with anthropology, history, and sociology, an interdisciplinary orientation clearly reflected in reference works such as The Oxford Handbook of Names and Naming (Hough, 2016).

Within English linguistics Crystal (2003) draws attention to the structural stability and grammatical adaptation of proper names. In Uzbek scholarship,

researchers have predominantly investigated anthroponyms within the framework of national onomastics, frequently noting that Uzbek names exhibit high semantic motivation grounded in ethical, religious, and aesthetic values. Despite strong scholarship within each individual tradition, systematic comparative studies examining English and Uzbek anthroponyms side by side remain scarce, underscoring the relevance of the present inquiry.

Structural Analysis of English Anthroponyms

Contemporary English anthroponyms typically follow a three-part structure:
Given Name + (Middle Name) + Surname
Here, the given name identifies the individual, while the surname denotes family origin. Middle names, though optional in everyday use, frequently remember relatives or preserve familial traditions.
Historically, English surnames took shape between the 11th and 15th centuries, developing primarily from four distinct sources:
Occupational names: *Smith, Baker, Miller*
Locative names: *Hill, Wood, Brook*
Descriptive names: *Brown, White, Armstrong*
Patronymic names: *Johnson ("son of John"), Richardson*
Over the centuries, these surnames became strictly inherited, gradually losing their literal ties to a person's trade or physical traits someone named Smith today is rarely a blacksmith by profession. Grammatically, English anthroponyms are morphologically invariable. Because English is an analytical language, personal names do not inflect for case, and relationships such as possession are marked syntactically (e.g., John's book) rather than through morphological alteration. Furthermore, centuries of colonization and modern globalization have carried

English names across the globe, resulting in widespread cross-cultural adoption alongside variations in pronunciation and spelling.

Structural Analysis of Uzbek Anthroponyms

In official and formal contexts, Uzbek anthroponyms traditionally follow a three-component pattern:

Given Name + Patronymic + Surname

The patronymic is derived from the father's given name using the suffixes -ovich (for males) and -ovna (for females), a convention rooted in Slavic administrative influence during the Soviet era (e.g., Farrux Akbarovic Aliyev). Prior to and alongside this period, Uzbek naming practices were shaped by indigenous Turkic roots, Islamic culture, and Persian literary heritage a synthesis exemplified by the historical name Alisher Navoi.

During the Soviet period, Uzbek surnames were standardized with the Russian suffixes -ov or -ev. Following Uzbekistan's independence in 1991, however, many citizens opted to drop these endings in favor of more authentic national forms (such as changing Karimov to Karim). This shift illustrates how anthroponyms actively participate in sociopolitical processes and the reclamation of national identity. Unlike their English counterparts, Uzbek anthroponyms undergo morphological adaptation in specific grammatical environments, particularly within possessive and case-marked constructions.

Semantic and Etymological Features

English personal names draw largely from Germanic, Biblical, Latin, and Norman French roots. While most of these names originally carried transparent lexical meanings, those meanings have largely faded from everyday awareness. The name William, for example, originally signified "resolute protector," yet

contemporary English speakers rarely associate the name with this etymology. Similarly, Biblical names such as John, Mary, and Elizabeth became embedded in the lexicon through Christian tradition, while the Norman Conquest introduced a substantial wave of French names that remain staples in English today.

In sharp contrast, Uzbek personal names tend to retain a high degree of semantic transparency. Many common Uzbek anthroponyms directly evoke admirable character traits, natural beauty, or spiritual devotion:

Jasur – brave, strong

Dilnoza – joy of the heart

Gulbahor – spring flower

Iymon – faith

Islamic tradition also exerts a profound influence on Uzbek naming practices. Widely used names such as Muhammad, Abdulloh, and Fotima signal religious identity and reverence for sacred figures. Consequently, Uzbek anthroponyms frequently operate as overt symbolic blessings bestowed upon a child. Ultimately, this contrast highlights a core distinction Uzbek names remain actively lexically motivated, whereas English names have become largely historically conventionalized.

Comparative Discussion

Examining both naming systems together brings several structural parallels and typological divergences into focus.

Key Similarities:

Both languages rely on a core two-component framework (given name and surname) for standard personal identification. Both systems serve as historical repositories, preserving traces of religious shifts and cultural contact. Both

traditions demonstrate the gradual stabilization of surnames into fixed, hereditary markers over time.

Key Differences:

Uzbek anthroponyms maintain far greater semantic transparency than English names, whose original meanings are mostly opaque to modern speakers.

Patronymic formation remains an active, productive component of official Uzbek naming, whereas in English it survives primarily as fossilized surnames (e.g., Johnson).

Uzbek naming foregrounds symbolic meaning and explicit parental wishes, while English naming leans more heavily on familial continuity and established convention.

These contrasts are not arbitrary, they reflect the broader typological divide between an analytical Indo-European language (English) and an agglutinative Turkic language (Uzbek), reinforced by each society's distinct historical and cultural trajectory.

Conclusion

Anthroponyms in English and Uzbek represent multifaceted linguistic and cultural phenomena. While both systems fulfill the universal pragmatic need to identify individuals within society, they diverge notably in their structural organization, semantic motivation, and sociocultural resonance. Uzbek anthroponyms are characterized by strong lexical motivation, symbolic expressiveness, and deep religious influence, whereas English anthroponyms prioritize historical continuity, morphological stability, and family lineage.

Conducting a comparative analysis of these systems enhances our understanding of linguistic diversity, cultural identity, and the ongoing interplay between

language and society. Future research in this area would benefit from quantitative studies examining contemporary name frequency and evolving naming trends across both linguistic communities.

References

1. Crystal, D. (2003). The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
2. Hough, C. (Ed.). (2016). The Oxford Handbook of Names and Naming. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
3. Jespersen, O. (1922). Language: Its Nature, Development and Origin. London: George Allen & Unwin.
4. Saussure, F. de (1916). Course in General Linguistics. New York: McGraw-Hill.