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

STRUCTURAL-SEMANTIC FEATURES AND DERIVATIONAL MODELS OF ANTHROPONYMS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Nazarova Nigora Djakhangirovna

Uzbekistan state world languages university

Abstract: This article explores the structural-semantic features and derivational models of anthroponyms in English and Uzbek languages through a comparative linguistic approach. Anthroponyms constitute an important part of the lexical and cultural heritage of every nation and reflect historical, social, religious, and cultural values. The study focuses on the semantic structure, morphological composition, and word-formation patterns of personal names in both languages. Special attention is paid to the derivational mechanisms involved in anthroponym formation, including affixation, compounding, abbreviation, borrowing, and semantic development. The research reveals both common and distinctive features of English and Uzbek anthroponymic systems. While English personal names demonstrate significant influence from historical language contacts and borrowing processes, Uzbek anthroponyms retain strong national and cultural characteristics expressed through meaningful lexical elements and productive derivational patterns. The findings contribute to the fields of comparative linguistics, onomastics, and linguocultural studies by providing a deeper understanding of the linguistic and cultural factors influencing personal naming practices in English- and Uzbek-speaking communities.

Keywords: anthroponymy, anthroponyms, onomastics, structural-semantic features, derivational models, word formation, personal names, English language, Uzbek language, comparative linguistics, naming traditions, linguocultural analysis.

INTRODUCTION

Anthroponyms, which include personal names, surnames, patronymics, nicknames, and other naming units associated with human beings, constitute one of the most significant branches of onomastics. They represent not only linguistic units used for identification but also valuable sources of information about the historical development, cultural traditions, social relations, religious beliefs, and national identity of a particular speech community. Throughout history, personal names have served as important markers of individual and collective identity, reflecting the worldview and value systems of different societies. The study of anthroponyms has attracted considerable attention in modern linguistics because names are closely connected with language evolution and cultural transformation. In contemporary onomastic research, scholars increasingly focus on the structural, semantic, cognitive, and linguocultural aspects of personal names. As a result of globalization, migration, intercultural communication, and technological development, naming systems have undergone significant changes, making comparative studies of anthroponyms especially relevant in the twenty-first century.

English and Uzbek anthroponymic systems provide a productive field for comparative linguistic analysis due to their distinct historical and cultural backgrounds. The English naming tradition has developed under the influence of various linguistic and cultural contacts, including Anglo-Saxon, Norman French, Latin, Greek, and Biblical traditions. Consequently, English anthroponyms

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

demonstrate considerable diversity in their structural composition and semantic motivation. Many English personal names have historical roots connected with religion, geography, occupations, and family heritage. Over time, these names have undergone phonological, morphological, and semantic changes, resulting in a rich and dynamic anthroponymic system.In contrast, Uzbek anthroponyms have evolved through the interaction of Turkic linguistic traditions, Islamic culture, Persian influences, and national customs. Uzbek personal names frequently possess transparent lexical meanings associated with desirable qualities, religious concepts, natural phenomena, historical figures, and cultural values. Names such as those expressing beauty, bravery, wisdom, prosperity, and happiness remain highly productive within Uzbek naming practices. The preservation of semantic transparency in many Uzbek anthroponyms distinguishes them from numerous English names whose original meanings are often no longer recognized by ordinary speakers. One of the important aspects of anthroponymic research is the investigation of derivational models used in personal name formation. Derivation plays a crucial role in the creation and modification of anthroponyms through various linguistic processes such as affixation, compounding, abbreviation, borrowing, clipping, and semantic transformation. The analysis of derivational mechanisms allows researchers to identify productive patterns within a language and to understand how social and cultural factors influence naming practices. Comparative examination of derivational models in English and Uzbek reveals both universal and language-specific tendencies in the formation of personal names.

The structural-semantic analysis of anthroponyms also contributes to broader linguistic disciplines, including morphology, lexicology, sociolinguistics, ethnolinguistics, and linguoculturology. Personal names often preserve linguistic elements that may disappear from other parts of the vocabulary, making them valuable sources for studying historical language development. Furthermore, anthroponyms function as cultural symbols that embody national traditions, social norms, and collective memory. The relevance of the present study is determined by the growing interest in comparative onomastics and the need to investigate the linguistic and cultural characteristics of anthroponymic systems in different languages. Despite numerous studies devoted to English and Uzbek anthroponyms separately, comparative research focusing specifically on their structural-semantic features and derivational models remains relatively limited. Therefore, a systematic comparison of these two anthroponymic systems can contribute to a deeper understanding of naming traditions and linguistic diversity. The aim of this study is to examine the structural-semantic characteristics and derivational models of anthroponyms in English and Uzbek languages and to identify their similarities and differences. The research seeks to analyze the morphological structure, semantic motivation, and word-formation mechanisms of personal names while highlighting the influence of historical, cultural, and social factors on the development of anthroponymic systems in both languages. The findings are expected to enrich comparative linguistic studies and provide valuable insights into the interaction between language, culture, and personal naming practices.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND METHODOLOGY

The study of anthroponyms has occupied a significant place in modern onomastic research, attracting the attention of linguists, sociologists, historians, and cultural scholars. Personal names are no longer viewed merely as identifying labels; instead, they are regarded as linguistic and cultural phenomena that preserve valuable information about social structure, ethnic identity, religious traditions, and historical development. Consequently, anthroponymic studies have evolved from descriptive investigations to comprehensive analyses incorporating structural, semantic, cognitive, and

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

linguocultural perspectives.The theoretical foundations of modern anthroponymy were established by scholars such as Superanskaya, who emphasized the systematic nature of proper names and their role within the lexical system of a language. Her research demonstrated that anthroponyms possess specific semantic and structural characteristics that distinguish them from common nouns while maintaining connections with broader linguistic processes. Subsequent studies expanded these ideas by exploring the relationship between naming systems and cultural identity. In English linguistics, anthroponymic research has focused on the historical evolution of personal names, surname formation, and the impact of language contact on naming traditions. Scholars have shown that English anthroponyms originate from diverse sources, including Germanic, Latin, Greek, French, and Biblical traditions. Many English surnames developed from occupations, geographical locations, physical characteristics, or family relationships. Research has also highlighted the influence of social mobility, migration, and globalization on contemporary English naming practices.

Uzbek anthroponymic studies have primarily concentrated on the national and cultural significance of personal names. Researchers have examined the semantic motivation of Uzbek anthroponyms and their connection with traditional values, religious beliefs, and historical heritage. Numerous studies indicate that Uzbek names frequently reflect positive qualities such as courage, wisdom, beauty, prosperity, and happiness. The preservation of meaningful lexical elements in Uzbek anthroponyms demonstrates the close relationship between language and culture in the Uzbek naming system. Recent developments in comparative linguistics have encouraged cross-linguistic investigations of anthroponyms. Comparative studies emphasize the importance of identifying universal naming tendencies as well as language-specific structural and semantic features. However, despite the growing body of research in onomastics, relatively few studies have provided a detailed comparison of the structural-semantic characteristics and derivational models of English and Uzbek anthroponyms. This gap highlights the necessity of conducting a systematic comparative analysis of personal naming systems in these languages.

From a methodological perspective, the present study employs a qualitative comparative research design. The research is based on the analysis of anthroponyms collected from linguistic dictionaries, onomastic databases, historical records, academic publications, and contemporary naming sources in both English and Uzbek languages. A representative corpus of personal names was selected to ensure the reliability and validity of the findings. Several research methods were applied during the investigation. First, the descriptive method was used to identify and classify the structural and semantic characteristics of anthroponyms in both languages. This method facilitated the examination of name composition, lexical meaning, and grammatical structure. Second, the comparative method was employed to determine similarities and differences between English and Uzbek anthroponymic systems. Through systematic comparison, recurring patterns and distinctive features were identified.

The study also utilized structural analysis to examine the morphological composition of anthroponyms. Particular attention was paid to simple, derived, compound, and borrowed names, as well as to the linguistic mechanisms involved in their formation. In addition, semantic analysis was conducted to investigate the motivational meanings embedded within personal names and to explore the cultural concepts reflected in naming practices. Furthermore, the derivational approach was adopted to analyze the word-formation processes responsible for the creation and modification of anthroponyms. Affixation, compounding, abbreviation, clipping, borrowing, and semantic derivation were examined as productive mechanisms in both languages. The frequency and functional

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

significance of these derivational models were evaluated in order to determine their role within the respective anthroponymic systems.

The methodological framework of this study is grounded in the principles of comparative linguistics, onomastics, and linguocultural analysis. By integrating structural, semantic, and derivational perspectives, the research aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the formation and development of anthroponyms in English and Uzbek. Such an approach enables a more profound interpretation of naming traditions and contributes to the broader study of language, culture, and identity.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The comparative analysis of English and Uzbek anthroponyms revealed significant similarities and differences in their structural organization, semantic motivation, and derivational mechanisms. The findings demonstrate that anthroponymic systems in both languages are shaped by linguistic, historical, cultural, and social factors, although these influences manifest themselves in different ways. One of the primary findings concerns the structural composition of anthroponyms. The collected data indicate that both English and Uzbek naming systems include simple, derived, compound, and borrowed personal names. However, the distribution of these categories differs considerably. English anthroponyms are characterized by a high proportion of historically borrowed names originating from Latin, Greek, Hebrew, French, and Germanic languages. Names such as Michael, Elizabeth, David, and Christopher illustrate the strong influence of religious and historical traditions on English anthroponymy. Many of these names have undergone phonetic and orthographic adaptation over centuries, resulting in forms that differ substantially from their original versions. In contrast, Uzbek anthroponyms exhibit a greater degree of semantic transparency. Personal names such as Dilshod (“happy heart”), Mehribon (“kind-hearted”), Baxtiyor (“fortunate”), and Doniyor (“wise”) retain clear lexical meanings that remain recognizable to contemporary speakers. This feature highlights the strong connection between naming practices and cultural values in Uzbek society. The analysis suggests that Uzbek parents often select names based on their positive semantic content, reflecting hopes, wishes, and social ideals associated with the child.

The semantic analysis further revealed that anthroponyms in both languages can be grouped into several major categories. These include names derived from religious concepts, personal qualities, natural phenomena, historical figures, occupations, geographical locations, and family traditions. Nevertheless, the frequency of these categories varies significantly. English anthroponyms demonstrate a greater prevalence of Biblical and saint-related names, whereas Uzbek anthroponyms more frequently reflect moral virtues, family aspirations, and cultural symbolism. Another important result concerns derivational models. The analysis identified several productive word-formation mechanisms in both languages. Affixation emerged as one of the most productive processes in Uzbek anthroponymy. Suffixes such as -bek, -boy, -jon, -xon, and -oy play a significant role in the creation of personal names and often carry additional cultural or emotional meanings. For example, names such as Otabek, Sherzodbek, and Nigoraxon illustrate the productivity of these derivational elements. These affixes not only contribute to name formation but also reflect social status, respect, affection, and traditional cultural values.

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

In English anthroponymy, derivational processes are comparatively less transparent in contemporary usage. Many derivational patterns became established historically and are no longer perceived as productive by ordinary speakers. Nevertheless, diminutive and hypocoristic forms such as Tom from Thomas, Liz from Elizabeth, and Will from William demonstrate ongoing processes of morphological reduction and adaptation. Abbreviation and clipping remain important mechanisms in modern English naming practices, particularly in informal communication. The study also identified substantial differences in the role of borrowing. English anthroponyms reflect centuries of linguistic contact and cultural exchange, resulting in extensive integration of foreign names into the national naming system. Uzbek anthroponyms similarly contain borrowed elements from Arabic, Persian, and Russian sources; however, these borrowed names are frequently adapted to Uzbek phonological and morphological norms. As a result, they often become fully integrated into the Uzbek linguistic and cultural environment. The findings further indicate that anthroponyms serve as carriers of cultural identity in both societies. In English-speaking communities, personal names often function as markers of family heritage, ethnic background, and religious affiliation. In Uzbek society, anthroponyms additionally perform an important symbolic function by expressing collective cultural values, parental expectations, and national traditions. This difference reflects broader distinctions between individualistic and collectivistic cultural orientations.

The comparative analysis confirms that while English and Uzbek anthroponymic systems share universal linguistic mechanisms such as naming, identification, derivation, and semantic motivation, they differ significantly in their structural complexity, semantic transparency, and cultural functions. English anthroponyms tend to preserve historical and religious traditions through inherited naming conventions, whereas Uzbek anthroponyms more actively maintain explicit semantic connections with cultural values and social ideals. Overall, the results demonstrate that anthroponyms represent a valuable source of linguistic and cultural information. Their structural-semantic characteristics and derivational patterns reveal not only language-specific features but also broader processes of cultural continuity, historical development, and social interaction. These findings contribute to comparative onomastic studies and provide a deeper understanding of the relationship between language, culture, and personal identity in English- and Uzbek-speaking communities.

CONCLUSION

The present study examined the structural-semantic characteristics and derivational models of anthroponyms in English and Uzbek languages from a comparative linguistic perspective. The analysis demonstrated that anthroponyms represent not only personal identification markers but also important linguistic and cultural units that preserve historical experience, social values, religious beliefs, and national traditions. As an integral component of the onomastic system, personal names provide valuable insights into the relationship between language, culture, and identity. The findings revealed that both English and Uzbek anthroponymic systems share several universal features, including the use of personal names for identification, social differentiation, and cultural representation. In both languages, anthroponyms are formed through various structural and derivational processes and reflect historical and social influences. However, significant differences were identified in their semantic motivation, morphological structure, and cultural functions. The research showed that English anthroponyms are largely shaped by historical language contact and borrowing from Latin, Greek, Hebrew, French, and other linguistic traditions. Many English names have gradually lost their transparent lexical meanings and function primarily as conventional naming

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

units. In contrast, Uzbek anthroponyms retain a stronger connection with their lexical origins and often convey explicit meanings related to positive personal qualities, religious values, family expectations, and cultural ideals. This semantic transparency makes Uzbek anthroponymy particularly rich in linguocultural content.

The analysis of derivational models confirmed that affixation, compounding, borrowing, abbreviation, and semantic transformation play important roles in the formation of anthroponyms in both languages. Nevertheless, derivational processes are more visibly productive in Uzbek, where affixes such as -bek, -boy, -jon, -xon, and -oy continue to contribute actively to name formation. English anthroponyms, on the other hand, demonstrate a stronger tendency toward historical preservation and adaptation of inherited naming forms. Another important conclusion is that anthroponyms function as repositories of cultural memory. They reflect social norms, collective beliefs, ethnic identity, and historical continuity within a speech community. The comparison of English and Uzbek anthroponyms illustrates how naming practices can reveal broader cultural differences while simultaneously demonstrating universal human tendencies in personal name formation. The study also highlights the significance of comparative anthroponymic research for contemporary linguistics. Understanding the structural and semantic organization of personal names contributes to the development of onomastics, lexicology, morphology, sociolinguistics, ethnolinguistics, and linguocultural studies. Furthermore, such research facilitates intercultural communication by promoting a deeper understanding of naming traditions and cultural values in different linguistic communities.

In conclusion, the comparative investigation of English and Uzbek anthroponyms confirms that personal names are complex linguistic phenomena shaped by historical, social, cultural, and cognitive factors. Their structural-semantic features and derivational patterns reveal important aspects of national identity and cultural heritage. Future studies may expand this research by examining anthroponyms from cognitive, pragmatic, corpus-based, or cross-cultural perspectives, thereby contributing to a more comprehensive understanding of personal naming systems in the modern world.

REFERENCES

1. Algeo, J. The Origins and Development of the English Language. 7th ed. Boston: Cengage Learning, 2020.
2. Crystal, D. The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2022.
3. Hough, C. (Ed.). The Oxford Handbook of Names and Naming. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021.
4. Coates, R. Anthroponymy and the Study of Personal Names in Contemporary Linguistics // Names: A Journal of Onomastics. 2021. Vol. 69. No. 3. P. 145–158.
5. Ainiala, T., Saarelma, M., Sjöblom, P. Names in Focus: An Introduction to Finnish Onomastics. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society, 2020.
6. Ahmedov, A. O‘zbek antroponimikasining lingvomadaniy xususiyatlari // Filologiya masalalari. 2022. № 4. B. 72–79.
7. Yuldashev, B. O‘zbek tilida antroponimlarning semantik tasnifi // O‘zbek tili va adabiyoti. 2021. № 6. B. 58–65.
8. Nurmonov, A., Mahmudov, N. O‘zbek tilshunosligi nazariyasi. Toshkent: Yangi Nashr, 2021.

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

9. Begmatov, E. O‘zbek ismlari ma’nosi va tarixi. Toshkent: O‘zbekiston Milliy Ensiklopediyasi, 2020.
10. Tojiyev, Y. O‘zbek onomastikasining dolzarb masalalari // Til va adabiyot ta’limi. 2023. № 2. B. 35–42.
11. Rahmatullayev, Sh. Hozirgi o‘zbek adabiy tili leksikologiyasi va onomastikasi. Toshkent: Akademnashr, 2022.
12. Iskandarova, Sh. Antroponimlarning struktur-semantik xususiyatlari va ularning tadqiqi // Xorijiy filologiya. 2024. № 1. B. 90–98.
13. Name Formation // Language Studies Review. 2024. Vol. 8. No. 1. P. 29–41.
14. Taylor, M. Cultural Meanings of Personal Names in Contemporary Society // Journal of Onomastic Research. 2023. Vol. 17. No. 3. P. 67–81.
15. Williams, R. Comparative Anthroponymy: Theoretical and Practical Approaches // International Review of Onomastics. 2025. Vol. 12. No. 2. P. 101–118.