HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS OF ANTHROPONYMIC MODELS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Nazarova Nigora Djakhangirovna
Uzbekistan state world languages university

Abstract: This article investigates the structural organization of anthroponymic models in English and Uzbek from a comparative linguistic perspective. Anthroponyms are treated not only as units of personal identification but also as culturally marked linguistic signs that encode family relations, historical memory, semantic motivation and social tradition. The study focuses on the composition of personal names, surnames, patronymic components, compound forms and derivational elements in the two languages. The research applies descriptive, comparative, structural and semantic methods to identify the main similarities and differences between English and Uzbek naming formulas. The analysis shows that English anthroponymic models are mainly organized around a stable given-name and surname pattern, with middle names and historically motivated surnames functioning as additional components. Uzbek anthroponymic models demonstrate more visible morphological richness through patronymic markers, affixal elements and compound formations. The findings confirm that anthroponymic structure is influenced by language type, cultural worldview, religious tradition, family values and historical contact. The article concludes that the structural study of anthroponyms contributes to onomastics, translation studies, sociolinguistics and intercultural communication.

Keywords: anthroponymy, anthroponymic model, structural analysis, English names, Uzbek names, personal name, patronymic, derivation, onomastics, comparative linguistics.

INTRODUCTION

Anthroponymy, as a branch of onomastics, studies personal names and the principles according to which people are named in a particular language and culture. A personal name may appear to be a simple means of identification, but in linguistic analysis it becomes a complex sign that connects the individual with family, society, history and collective memory. The structural analysis of anthroponymic models examines the internal composition of names, the order of their components, the grammatical markers used in naming and the semantic sources from which names are formed. In this sense, the study of anthroponyms is closely linked with morphology, lexicology, sociolinguistics, cultural linguistics and translation studies. The relevance of the present topic is determined by the growing attention to proper names in modern linguistics. Names are widely used in official documents, literary texts, electronic databases, intercultural communication and translation practice. A correct understanding of name structure is important not only for linguistic description but also for the accurate transfer of names between languages. When English and Uzbek anthroponyms are compared, the researcher deals with two languages that belong to different typological systems. English is mainly analytic and relies on relatively fixed word order, while Uzbek is agglutinative and actively uses suffixation and morphological expansion. This difference directly influences the structure of anthroponymic models.

The English naming system is commonly represented by the formula given name plus surname, and in many formal contexts it may be expanded through a middle name. Such forms as John Smith, Mary Brown and William Henry Taylor illustrate a stable linear model. The surname often preserves information about ancestry, occupation, geographical origin or a characteristic feature. For example,

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

Smith and Baker are occupational surnames, Hill and Wood may indicate geographical association, and Johnson represents an old patronymic formation. Although the original meaning of many surnames is not always felt in everyday speech, their structure remains an important historical layer of English anthroponymy.

The Uzbek naming system is also based on personal identification, but it shows a broader range of structural and cultural markers. Along with the given name and surname, Uzbek anthroponyms may include a patronymic component formed through the father's name and elements such as o'g'li and qizi. In addition, Uzbek personal names frequently contain components of Arabic, Persian and Turkic origin, as well as affixal or semi-affixal elements such as -jon, -bek, -xon, -oy, -gul and -niso. These elements can express respect, affection, beauty, nobility, gender association or religious-cultural meaning. Therefore, Uzbek anthroponymic models are often more transparent semantically and more expressive morphologically.

The comparison of English and Uzbek anthroponymic models is important because it reveals how different linguistic systems organize the same social function. Every language needs names to identify people, but the way this identification is structured differs according to grammar, culture, religion, legal practice and social tradition. English names tend to emphasize the stable relation between individual identity and family surname, while Uzbek names frequently preserve a visible connection between the individual, the father's name and the wider family lineage. Such differences are especially relevant in translation, passport transcription, academic documentation, database design and the interpretation of literary characters. The object of this research is the system of anthroponymic models in English and Uzbek. The subject of the research is the structural composition of personal names, surnames, patronymic forms, compound names and derivational models in both languages. The aim of the study is to analyze the structural features of English and Uzbek anthroponyms and to determine their common and distinctive characteristics. The scientific value of the article lies in its comparative approach to two linguistically and culturally different naming systems. The practical value is connected with the use of the findings in translation studies, foreign language teaching, intercultural communication and the preparation of academic materials on onomastics.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND METHODOLOGY

The literature on anthroponymy shows that personal names are studied as linguistic, cultural and social phenomena. Researchers describe anthroponyms as proper names that perform nominative, identifying, cultural and pragmatic functions. Within the field of onomastics, anthroponymy is connected with the study of given names, surnames, patronymics, nicknames, pseudonyms and name variants. The American Name Society defines onomastics as the formal study of names and naming and explains patronym as a personal name originating from a father's name. This theoretical distinction is important for the present article because the structural comparison of English and Uzbek names requires clear separation between given names, family names and patronymic elements. Modern studies on English and Uzbek anthroponyms often emphasize their cultural nature. Mustafoyeva states that anthroponyms reflect the culture, history and worldview of the people who use them and discusses how English and Uzbek names can be classified according to natural, religious, mythological and social associations. Nazarova's research on structural-semantic and linguocultural features also stresses that English anthroponyms usually follow a given-name and surname pattern, whereas Uzbek anthroponyms may include a patronymic component derived from the father's name. These studies provide a useful basis for analyzing the structural contrast between the two languages, although the present article gives special attention to models and derivational patterns rather than only to cultural classification.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

Research devoted to Uzbek anthroponymy shows that Uzbek names reflect a complex combination of Turkic, Arabic, Persian and Russian influences. Djuraeva points out that an anthroponymic formula may consist of a name, an optional patronymic component and a surname, and this formula functions in different social areas from family communication to official documentation. Contemporary discussions of Uzbek names also note that patronymic forms such as o'g'li and qizi are used in identification and formal address, while Soviet-style components such as -ovich and -ovna may still appear in documents or older naming traditions. Such variation makes Uzbek anthroponymy an especially rich field for structural analysis. The structural analysis of names cannot be separated from the morphological features of the language. Uzbek is an agglutinative language, and affixes play a significant role in word formation and grammatical expression. Salaev's work on the morphological analysis of Uzbek demonstrates that roots and affixes are central to the structure of the language. This is directly relevant to Uzbek anthroponymy because many names are formed or expanded through name-forming elements. Names such as Kadirjon, Sanobarxon, Oygul and Gulbahor show that Uzbek personal naming often involves a combination of lexical roots and meaningful components. English anthroponyms, in contrast, are less dependent on productive modern affixation, although historical derivation remains visible in surnames.

The methodological basis of this article combines descriptive, comparative, structural and semantic approaches. The descriptive method is used to explain the main types of anthroponymic models in each language. The comparative method allows the analysis to identify similarities and differences between English and Uzbek naming formulas. The structural method focuses on the number and order of name components, the presence or absence of patronymic elements, and the distinction between simple, compound and derived forms. The semantic method is applied to reveal the meaning and motivation of selected names, especially where the meaning is transparent in Uzbek or historically preserved in English surnames. The material of the research consists of common English and Uzbek personal names and naming formulas used in linguistic studies, dictionaries, official practice and everyday communication. English examples include models such as John Smith, Mary Ann Brown, William Johnson, Baker, Taylor, Hill and Wood. Uzbek examples include Sanobarxon Kadirjon qizi Abduqaxxorova, Jamshid Olimboy o'g'li Shomurodov, Dilshod Karimov, Gulbahor, Oygul, Sherzod, Muhammad and Fotima. The selected examples are not treated as statistical data but as representative units for structural and semantic comparison. The article does not aim to describe every possible name type; rather, it focuses on the most productive and culturally significant models.

The analytical procedure follows a consistent framework. Each anthroponymic model is examined according to its component structure, morphological markers, semantic motivation and cultural function. The English and Uzbek materials are then compared according to the same criteria. This makes it possible to avoid a one-sided description and to show how similar nominative needs are realized differently in two language systems. The study also takes into account the influence of religion, historical contact, social hierarchy, family tradition and official documentation on naming practice. These factors are essential because anthroponyms are not isolated lexical items; they operate within a cultural and communicative environment.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis indicates that English anthroponymic models are generally based on a stable two-component structure. The most common official formula consists of a given name and a surname. The given name identifies the person as an individual, while the surname connects the person with a family line. In formal documents and academic contexts, a middle name or middle initial may also be included, but this component usually does not change the basic structural logic of the model. It

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

expands the full name without introducing a grammatical relation comparable to the Uzbek patronymic. Therefore, the English model can be described as structurally linear and comparatively fixed. English surnames preserve several important historical models. Occupational surnames such as Smith, Baker and Taylor reflect professional activity. Topographical or locative surnames such as Hill, Wood and Brook are connected with geographical features. Patronymic surnames such as Johnson and Richardson historically indicate descent from a male ancestor. Descriptive surnames such as Brown, Short or White may refer to physical appearance or a distinguishing characteristic. In present-day usage, many speakers do not interpret these surnames according to their original meaning, but the structural source remains visible to the researcher. This shows that English anthroponymy contains historical derivation more than active modern derivation.

Table 1. Comparative structural models of English and Uzbek anthroponyms

Analytical criterion	English anthroponymic model	Uzbek anthroponymic model
Dominant official formula	Given name + surname; middle name may be added	Given name + patronymic + surname or given name + surname
Morphological character	Mostly fixed and analytic; historical derivation is preserved in surnames	Agglutinative and derivational; affixal and compound elements are productive
Patronymic expression	Often fossilized in surnames such as Johnson or Richardson	Actively expressed through o'g'li and qizi or through Russian-style -ovich/-ovna
Compound forms	Limited double names such as Mary-Jane or Anne-Marie	Frequent semantic compounds such as Gulbahor, Oygul, Dilshod, Sherzod
Semantic transparency	Original meanings are often historical and less visible to modern speakers	Many meanings remain transparent and culturally expressive
Cultural source	Biblical, Germanic, French, occupational and geographical layers	Turkic, Arabic, Persian, Islamic and Russian-influenced layers
Translation issue	Surname origin may need cultural explanation in analysis	Patronymic markers and special sounds require careful transliteration

Uzbek anthroponymic models show a broader combination of components. The basic official model can also be given name plus surname, as in Dilnoza Karimova or Jamshid Karimov. However, the model may be expanded through a patronymic component, as in Sanobarxon Kadirjon qizi Abduqaxxorova or Jamshid Olimboy o'g'li Shomurodov. The patronymic element has a transparent relational meaning because it identifies the person through the father's name. This feature makes the Uzbek model structurally more explicit in expressing family lineage than the typical English model.

The Uzbek system also demonstrates strong derivational and semantic productivity. Elements such as -jon, -bek, -xon, -oy, -gul and -niso are widely used in personal names and often carry emotional, social or cultural meaning. The element -jon may express affection and respect; -bek may

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

signal nobility or masculinity; -xon can be used as a respectful or gender-associated component; -oy and -gul are often associated with beauty and femininity; -niso appears in names of Arabic-Persian origin and is connected with female naming traditions. These elements do not function exactly like ordinary grammatical suffixes in all cases, but they are structurally significant because they help form recognizable anthroponymic models.

The comparative table demonstrates that the two naming systems have both universal and language-specific features. The universal feature is the need to identify a person through a personal name and a family-related component. Both English and Uzbek can use religiously motivated names, and both systems contain historical traces of patronymic thinking. The difference lies in the visibility and productivity of these elements. In English, patronymic meaning is often fossilized in surnames, while in Uzbek it may appear as an active component of the full name. This difference is particularly important for translation and transcription because a translator must decide whether to preserve, transliterate or explain the patronymic relation. Another important result concerns compound names. English contains compound or double given names such as Mary-Jane, Anne-Marie and Billy-Joe, but these forms are relatively limited in comparison with the broader Uzbek practice of semantic combination. Uzbek names such as Gulbahor, Oygul, Dilshod and Sherzod are structurally compound and semantically motivated. Gulbahor combines the meanings of flower and spring, Oygul combines moon and flower, Dilshod expresses joy of the heart, and Sherzod contains the idea of strength and noble descent. The meaning of these names is more accessible to Uzbek speakers because the lexical components are still recognizable. The semantic motivation of names is also different in the two languages. English given names often have etymological meanings of Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Germanic or French origin, but those meanings are not always transparent in modern use. Names such as William, Elizabeth, John and Mary carry strong historical and religious associations, yet their original lexical meanings are usually known only through dictionaries or etymological explanation. Uzbek names are often more transparent because many of them are formed from words that are still active in the language or familiar through Persian-Arabic cultural layers. This transparency allows Uzbek names to express wishes, beauty, courage, faith, prosperity and respect more directly.

The role of religion is visible in both systems. English anthroponymy contains many names connected with Biblical and Christian tradition, including John, Mary, Joseph, Elizabeth and Michael. Uzbek anthroponymy contains many names connected with Islamic and Arabic tradition, such as Muhammad, Abdulloh, Fotima, Zaynab and Madina. These religious layers show that anthroponyms function as carriers of cultural memory. However, the structural manifestation of religious influence is not identical. In English, religious names usually appear as given names without additional grammatical markers. In Uzbek, religious names may combine with local, Persian or Turkic components and may be integrated into extended naming formulas with patronymics and surnames. The influence of social and official practice must also be considered. English official naming generally requires a given name and surname, while the middle name is optional in many contexts. Uzbek official naming may include the given name, father’s name and surname, and different document traditions may preserve Uzbek, Russianized or mixed forms. The coexistence of forms such as o'g'li, qizi, -ovich and -ovna reflects historical contact and administrative change. From a structural point of view, this variation creates multiple models within one naming system. The same person’s name may appear differently in Latin or Cyrillic script, in Uzbek national form or in Russian-influenced form, which can lead to challenges in translation, name matching and official record keeping.

The structural contrast between English and Uzbek anthroponyms can be explained through language typology. English is relatively analytic; it does not normally attach productive personal-name suffixes to create new official names in the way Uzbek does. Its name structure depends on component

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

order and historical surname formation. Uzbek, as an agglutinative language, allows a more visible interaction between lexical roots and name-forming elements. This does not mean that every Uzbek name is grammatically transparent, but the system as a whole shows a stronger connection between morphology and anthroponymy. Therefore, a structural model in Uzbek often includes not only the position of components but also the meaning of affixal and compound elements. The analysis of surnames reveals another important distinction. English surnames are mostly inherited family names and are not normally marked for gender. Uzbek surnames, especially those influenced by Russian models, may show gender opposition through endings such as -ov and -ova or -ev and -eva. For example, Karimov and Karimova indicate masculine and feminine surname forms in many official contexts. At the same time, contemporary Uzbek naming practices may also use forms without Russian gendered endings or may prefer national patronymic markers. This shows that Uzbek surnames are not only linguistic units but also indicators of historical and social transformation.

In translation and intercultural communication, these differences require careful treatment. English names translated into Uzbek are usually transliterated rather than semantically translated, but their surnames may sometimes need explanation in literary or cultural analysis. Uzbek names translated into English require attention to apostrophes, special sounds, patronymic markers and the order of components. The elements o'g'li and qizi should not be omitted when they are part of the official or culturally meaningful form. At the same time, they should not be confused with surnames, because they express a patronymic relation. A structural approach helps translators and researchers preserve the identity and cultural meaning of the name. The findings confirm that anthroponymic models are shaped by a combination of linguistic structure and cultural tradition. English models emphasize stable family surnames, historical surname types and optional middle names. Uzbek models emphasize patronymic relations, affixal and compound formation, semantic transparency and cultural symbolism. Both systems have undergone change under the influence of religion, migration, social modernization and globalization. The structural analysis of these models makes it possible to see names as organized linguistic systems rather than as random lexical items.

CONCLUSION

The structural analysis of anthroponymic models in English and Uzbek demonstrates that personal names are complex linguistic signs that reflect grammar, culture, history and social identity. English anthroponyms are mainly organized through a stable given-name and surname model, with middle names functioning as optional extensions. Their surnames preserve historical information about occupations, places, personal characteristics and patronymic descent, although these meanings are often less transparent in modern use.

Uzbek anthroponyms reveal a more morphologically expressive structure. Along with the given name and surname, the Uzbek system actively uses patronymic markers such as o'g'li and qizi, as well as name-forming elements such as -jon, -bek, -xon, -oy, -gul and -niso. Compound names and semantically motivated forms are common, which makes Uzbek anthroponymy closely connected with family values, religious tradition, beauty, respect and national worldview. The comparison shows that both languages perform the same nominative function, but they realize this function through different structural resources.

The study confirms the importance of anthroponymic models for comparative linguistics, translation studies and intercultural communication. Correct interpretation of name structure helps avoid mistakes in official documents, literary analysis, database processing and the translation of culturally marked names. Further research may examine regional variants, gendered surname changes, modern hybrid names and the influence of globalization on English and Uzbek naming practices.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

REFERENCES

1. Avloyorova G. Basic theoretical principles of personal names in English and Uzbek languages // European International Journal of Pedagogics. – 2024. – Vol. 4, No. 5. – P. 1–4.
2. Djuraeva I. A. Social significance of Uzbek anthroponyms // The American Journal of Social Science and Education Innovations. – 2021. – Vol. 3, No. 2. – P. 343–350.
3. Imomov E., Kuldashev A. M. Semantic features of proper names in English and Uzbek // Theoretical & Applied Science. – 2020. – No. 1. – P. 209–212.
4. Mustafoyeva M. A. Anthroponyms in English and Uzbek languages and their linguocultural classification // Bulletin News in New Science Society International Scientific Journal. – 2024.
5. Nazarova N. D. Structural-semantic and linguistic-cultural features of anthroponyms in English and Uzbek languages // Journal of International Scientific Research. – 2024. – Vol. 1, No. 3. – P. 332–337.
6. Salaev U. UzMorphAnalyser: A morphological analysis model for the Uzbek language using inflectional endings. – 2024. – arXiv:2405.14179.
7. Suvonova S. Anthroponyms as cultural markers: A comparative study // Lingvospektr. – 2025.
8. American Name Society. About Onomastics: Names and Naming. – 2024.