DOI: https://doi.org/10.37547/supsci-ojp-06-07-06 Pages: 50-59

Oriental Journal of Philology

ORIENTAL JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

journal homepage:
http://www.supportscience.uz/index.php/ojp/about

THE FORMATION AND SOURCES OF ENRICHMENT OF THE UZBEK AND ENGLISH ANTHROPONYMIC SYSTEMS

Shahzoda Yashnarbekova
PhD student
Uzbekistan State World Languages University (UzSWLU)
E-mail: shahzoda.yashnarbekova.96@mail.ru
Tashkent, Uzbekistan

ABOUT ARTICLE

Key words: anthroponymy, proper name, linguoculture, naming motivation, anthroponymic layer, surname, nickname, religious factor, historical memory, comparative analysis.

Received: 01.11.26
Accepted: 02.11.26
Published: 03.11.26

Abstract: The article examines the historical formation, structural organisation and sources of enrichment of the Uzbek and English anthroponymic systems on the basis of a linguocultural and comparative approach. Uzbek anthroponymy is considered in connection with the ancient Turkic layer, Islamic Arabic-Persian borrowings, the names of historical figures and the socio-political processes of the twentieth century. In the development of English anthroponymy from the Old English period to the present, the article reveals the role of the succession of ethnocultural layers, the Norman Conquest, Christianisation, the Reformation, Puritan naming traditions, literature and globalisation. The comparative analysis shows that in both systems anthroponyms perform, in addition to their nominative function, identificational, cultural-memorial and axiological functions. The study substantiates that external influences enriched the Uzbek system in a predominantly gradual manner, whereas the English system was enriched more abruptly at certain historical stages.

O‘ZBEK VA INGLIZ ANTROPONIMIK TIZIMLARINING SHAKLLANISHI VA BOYISH MANBALARI

Shahzoda Yashnarbekova
Tayanch doktoranti (PhD)
O‘zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti (O‘zDJTU)
E-mail: shahzoda.yashnarbekova.96@mail.ru
Toshkent, O‘zbekiston

MAQOLA HAQIDA

Kalit so‘zlar: antroponimiya, atoqli ot, lingvomadaniyat, nomlash motivatsiyasi, antroponim qatlam, familiya, laqab, diniy omil, tarixiy xotira, qiyosiy tahlil.

Annotatsiya: Maqolada o‘zbek va ingliz antroponimiya tizimlarining tarixiy shakllanishi, tarkibiy tuzilishi hamda boyish manbalari lingvomadaniy-qiyosiy yondashuv asosida tahlil qilinadi. O‘zbek antroponimiyasi qadimgi turkiy qatlam, islomiy-arab-fors o‘zlashmalari, tarixiy shaxslar nomlari hamda XX asr ijtimoiy-siyosiy jarayonlari bilan bog‘liq holda yoritiladi. Ingliz antroponimiyasining qadimgi ingliz davridan zamonaviy bosqichgacha bo‘lgan taraqqiyotida etnomadaniy qatlamlar almashinuvi, Norman istilosi, xristianlashuv, Reformatsiya, puritan nomlash an’analari, adabiyot va globallashuvning o‘rni ochib beriladi. Qiyosiy tahlil natijasida har ikki tizimda antroponimlarning nominativ vazifadan tashqari identifikatsion, madaniy-xotiraviy va aksiologik funksiyalarni ham bajarishi aniqlanadi. Tadqiqotda o‘zbek tizimi tashqi ta’sirlar natijasida ko‘proq bosqichma-bosqich, ingliz tizimi esa ayrim tarixiy bosqichlarda keskinroq tarzda boyib borgani asoslab berilgan.

ФОРМИРОВАНИЕ И ИСТОЧНИКИ ОБОГАЩЕНИЯ УЗБЕКСКОЙ И АНГЛИЙСКОЙ АНТРОПОНИМИЧЕСКИХ СИСТЕМ

Шахзода Яшнарбекова
Докторант (PhD)
Узбекского государственного университета мировых языков (УзГУМЯ)
E-mail: shahzoda.yashnarbekova.96@mail.ru
Ташкент, Узбекистан

О СТАТЬЕ

Ключевые слова: антропонимия, имя собственное, лингвокультура, мотивация номинации, антропонимический слой, фамилия, прозвище, религиозный фактор, историческая память, сопоставительный анализ.

Аннотация: В статье на основе лингвокультурологического и сравнительно-сопоставительного подходов анализируются историческое формирование, структурная организация и источники обогащения английской и узбекской антропонимических систем. Рассматриваются этнокультурные слои, нормандское завоевание, христианизация, Реформация, пуританская традиция, художественная литература и глобализация в развитии английской антропонимии. Узбекская антропонимия исследуется в аспекте древнетюркского слоя, арабо-

персидских заимствований, исламской культуры, исторической памяти и социально-политических изменений XX века. Установлено, что в обеих системах личные имена выполняют не только номинативную, но и идентификационную, культурно-мемориальную и аксиологическую функции. Выявлены сходства и различия в характере внешнего воздействия и внутренних механизмов обновления антропонимического фонда.

Introduction. Anthroponyms are units of the language system that serve to name and distinguish individuals; at the same time, they embody a society's historical experience, beliefs, values and social relations. For this reason, the study of proper names as linguocultural units makes it possible to reveal the inseparable link between language and culture. D.B. Gudkov regards proper names as one of the most important linguistic means of storing and transmitting cultural information [1]. This approach provides grounds for interpreting the anthroponym not merely as a nominative unit, but as a semiotic form of collective memory and social experience [10].

English and Uzbek anthroponymies differ from each other in the directions of their historical development, their religious and cultural environment and the political processes they underwent. Nevertheless, in both systems the naming process is linked to the changing needs of society, and external influences interact with existing naming models. The aim of this article is to generalise the sources of formation and enrichment of the English and Uzbek anthroponymic systems from a comparative linguocultural perspective.

Materials and methods. The methodological basis of the study comprises historical-etymological, descriptive, structural-semantic, linguocultural and comparative-analytical methods. The material of the analysis comprises scholarly works on English and Uzbek anthroponymy, historical written monuments, and anthroponymic examples drawn from name dictionaries and the research literature.

Results. The modern model of English anthroponymy is characterised mainly by the components given name – middle name – surname/family name. This model is the result of a long historical process, and its constituent parts have performed different social and cultural functions in different periods. In the research literature, English anthroponymy is divided into the Old English, Middle English, Early Modern English and Present-day periods, each with its own specific features of naming motivation [4; 6].

In the Old English period, the naming system was closely bound up with Germanic traditions, Celtic and Scandinavian layers, appellative vocabulary and mythological notions.

Dithematic (two-element) names were widespread, combining particular semantic themes. For instance, names such as Ēadgār, Maerwine and Segeweald display semantic components associated with social status, property, victory, friendship and power [2; 5]. According to Zaytseva, only a small part of the ancient anthroponymic stock has survived into the modern English naming system [4].

The Norman Conquest of 1066 marked a turning point in the English naming system. The spread of names associated with the Normans, such as William, Richard, Robert, Henry and Roger, affected the frequency of use of the Anglo-Saxon layer. During this period, the practice of additionally indicating a person's father's name, place of origin, property, occupation or nickname for identification purposes became more common. As a result, the process by which temporary secondary naming units later turned into surnames accelerated.

Christianisation is another major factor in the development of English anthroponymy. As the Church's position in social life strengthened, biblical and saints' names of Hebrew, Greek and Latin origin became widespread: Adam, Eve, John, Peter, Mary, Joseph, Daniel, David and others. Withycombe notes that in the Middle Ages a large proportion of English personal names were formed on the basis of biblical and saints' names [8]. Consequently, the name functioned not only as a means of religious identification but also as a cultural sign transmitting faith and moral values.

The Reformation and the Puritan naming tradition of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries introduced a distinctive layer into the semantic composition of English anthroponymy. Units such as Faith, Hope, Patience, Mercy, Discipline and Thankful expressed moral concepts through personal names. Although many virtue names did not survive for long, the Old Testament names favoured by the Puritans, such as Samuel, Benjamin, Joseph, Jacob, Sarah and Hannah, remained in use in later periods. This shows that the naming system not only reflects religious ideas but is also capable of resemanticising them over time.

Literature manifests itself as a distinct motivational mechanism in the enrichment of the English anthroponymic stock. The names of Shakespearean characters such as Juliet, Romeo, Ophelia, Miranda, Cordelia and Jessica, as well as names such as Oliver, Emily and Emma in nineteenth- and twentieth-century literature, spread to a wide audience through literary texts [3; 7]. In such names, the aesthetic, moral or emotional qualities of a character may become the motivation for naming.

At the present stage, individual choice, globalisation, migration, the mass media and intercultural contacts are influencing the renewal of the anthroponymic stock. The use of gender-neutral names such as Jordan, Taylor, Alex and Morgan, as well as of surnames such as Taylor, Parker, Mason and Harrison as given names, demonstrates the system's capacity to reuse its internal resources [3].

Table 1. Historical stages of English anthroponymy and its main sources of enrichment

Period	Main source	Naming features	Names
Old English	Germanic, Celtic and Scandinavian layers	Monothematic and dithematic names; appellative and mythological motivation	Ēadgār, Maerwine, Cuthbert
Middle English	Norman Conquest, Christianisation	Growth of bynames, patronymic and toponymic units; religious names	William, Richard, John, Mary
Early Modern English	Reformation, Puritanism, literature	Moral-religious names and the influence of literary characters	Faith, Hope, Patience, Juliet
Present-day	Globalisation, media, individual choice	Gender-neutral given names and names derived from surnames	Jordan, Taylor, Alex, Parker

English surnames, while identifying a person in familial and social terms, also preserve historical experience and cultural memory. Researchers distinguish four main origins of surnames: occupation and office, place of residence or region of origin, patronymic relation, and names describing a person's external or internal characteristics [6; 9]. Occupational surnames such as Smith, Baker, Miller and Taylor reflect labour activity; toponymic surnames such as Hill, Wood, Brook, Atwood and Kent reflect place and belonging; and patronymic surnames such as Johnson, Williamson and Richardson reflect genealogical continuity.

In descriptive surnames such as Brown, White, Short, Strong, Fox and Bull, traces of a person's external features or of the social evaluation assigned to them can be observed. In this respect, surnames, as a "frozen" model of historical naming, may preserve the linguistic reflection of social relations and stereotypes within society.

Nicknames – units such as nickname, byname and sobriquet – constitute the secondary naming system of English anthroponymy. They may be based on a person's physical, psychological, social or cultural characteristics. The works of G. E. Shankle and F. Nuessel shed light on the identificational and evaluative functions of nicknames [11; 12]. Historically, a significant proportion of nicknames later turned into surnames. Thus, in English anthroponymy the nickname may be regarded as an intermediate mechanism linking temporary naming with stable family naming.

The historical nature of the Uzbek anthroponymic system is determined, first and foremost, by the interaction of the ancient Turkic heritage, the ethnocultural development of the Uzbek people and Islamic culture. E. Begmatov describes Uzbek anthroponymy on the basis of a layered and periodised model, distinguishing the pre-Islamic period, the period from the adoption of Islam to the twentieth century, and the twentieth century [13].

In the semantic basis of the ancient Turkic layer, nature, the animal world, strength and might, courage, protection and cosmogonic notions occupy an important place. Names such as Arslon, Bo‘ri, Lochin and Yulduz preserve symbolic traces of the ancient worldview [15]. The

components Alp, Bilge, Tegin, Qagan and Er, recorded in the Orkhon–Yenisei inscriptions, show the significance of the concepts of courage, wisdom, power and social status in naming [21].

Mahmud al-Kashgari's *Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk* is an important source for tracing anthroponymic continuity between the Old and Middle Turkic periods. Units such as Alp, Bilge, Er, Tegin and Qut found in it demonstrate the connection of anthroponyms with semantic motivation and with social and spiritual values [21; 22]. These sources make it possible to trace how ancient Turkic naming models continued, with various transformations, in later Uzbek anthroponymy.

The arrival of Islam introduced a new semantic layer into Uzbek anthroponymy. Names borrowed from Arabic and Persian, such as Muhammad, Abdulloh, Ibrohim, Yusuf, Nuriddin and Shamsiddin, formed a stable layer expressing religious and spiritual values. Importantly, this process did not involve the instant loss of existing Turkic naming traditions; rather, it proceeded through their integration with new religious and cultural content. Hybrid models such as Boymurod, Jonqut and Oysara demonstrate the interaction of different linguistic and cultural layers.

In Uzbek anthroponymy, names such as Allohberdi, Xudoyberdi, Tangriberdi, Ollohqul and Xudoyor show religious components harmonised with the local naming model. Eponymous names such as Muhammad, Yusuf, Ayub, Fatima, Maryam, Yoqub, Sulaymon, Ibrohim and Yunus, in turn, have served to preserve religious and cultural memory and transmit it from generation to generation. Such names may also convey the parents' symbolic wishes for the child associated with particular moral virtues, goodness, devotion, patience or piety [14; 17].

Table 2. Historical layers of Uzbek anthroponymy

Period	Layer	Naming motives	Names
Pre-Islamic	Ancient Turkic	Totemism, nature, strength and might, cosmogonic notions	Arslon, Bo‘ri, Qutlug‘, Yulduz
Islamic period	Arabic-Persian + Turkic	Religious belief, sacred figures, moral values	Muhammad, Abdulloh, Yusuf, Nuriddin
20th century	Turkic + new social layer	Socio-political, secular, aesthetic and ideological motives	Uchqun, Inqilob, Paxtaoy, Kosmos
Present-day	Integrative/hybrid	Aesthetic choice, global influence, historical memory	Amir, Imran, Samira, etc.

The twentieth century constitutes a distinct historical stage for Uzbek anthroponymy. During the Soviet period, under the influence of the Russian language and the official administrative model, the three-part naming formula of given name – surname – patronymic became firmly established. Begmatov's data record the predominance of Russian spelling in

personal documents, the restriction of national name forms in official settings and the widespread use of surname affixes such as -ov, -yev, -ova and -yeva [13].

In this period, a new socio-political and ideological layer emerged in the anthroponymic stock. Units such as Inqilob (“revolution”), Uchqun (“spark”), Paxtaoy (“cotton” + -oy), Kolxozbek, Sovxozbek and Saylovboy (“election” + -boy) reflected the social reality of the era in the naming system. Names such as Atom, Kosmos, Sputnik, Kimyo (“chemistry”) and Yadro (“nucleus”) show that the concepts of science, technology and progress entered anthroponymic motivation. V.A. Nikonov emphasises the connection between anthroponymic innovations and socio-political change [19; 20].

At the same time, the entry of names such as Albert, Edvard, Aleksandr, Roza, Klara, Luiza and Aida from Russian and Western European sources into Uzbek naming practice through literature, theatre and cinema demonstrates the openness of anthroponymy to intercultural exchange. In assessing this layer, however, the political and social conditions of the period and official naming practice must be given particular consideration.

Discussion. The comparative analysis shows that the religious factor has a high motivational potential in both systems. Whereas in the English system Christianity laid the foundation for the spread of names of Hebrew, Greek and Latin origin, in the Uzbek system Islamic culture led to the expansion of names of Arabic-Persian origin. The internal mechanisms of these influences, however, are not the same: in English anthroponymy, Christianisation and the subsequent Reformation are linked to specific historical stages, whereas in Uzbek anthroponymy the Islamic layer took shape through a long-term process of integration with Turkic naming traditions.

External political influence is also present in both systems. The Norman Conquest produced profound changes in English anthroponymy within a short historical period, whereas in Uzbek anthroponymy the arrival and localisation of Arabic-Persian names took place over a longer historical process. For this reason, the Uzbek system shows the preservation of ancient Turkic and Islamic layers in parallel and hybrid forms.

The role of literature and historical memory is also important for the comparison. In the English system, the works of writers such as Shakespeare, Dickens and Austen gave impetus to the entry of character names into real naming practice. In the Uzbek system, historical figures and written monuments – in particular, names such as Temur, Ulug‘bek, Navoiy and Bobur – provide an anthroponymic expression of national memory and the historical ideal [3; 7; 16; 18].

Thus, although English and Uzbek anthroponymies are open and dynamic systems, their mechanisms of enrichment are determined by their historical and cultural context. In both systems,

external layers interact with existing naming resources and become stabilised through phonetic, morphological and semantic adaptation.

Table 3. Comparative linguocultural features of English and Uzbek anthroponymies

Criterion	English anthroponymy	Uzbek anthroponymy
Historical basis	Germanic, Celtic, Scandinavian and Christian layers	Ancient Turkic, Islamic Arabic-Persian and national layers
Religious factor	Christianity, biblical and saints' names; Puritan tradition	Islam, Qur'anic and religious names, Arabic-Persian components
Political influence	Norman Conquest, Reformation	Arab-Islamic historical influence, 20th-century Soviet period
Sources of surnames	Occupation, toponym, patronymic, descriptive names	Lineage, father's/grandfather's name, official-legal models
Role of literature	Strong influence of character names on real naming	Historical-literary memory and names of great figures are important
Present-day trend	Individual choice, gender-neutral and surname-as-name models	Integration, revival of historical names, global influence

The results of the analysis make it possible to generalise the historical change of anthroponymy through three interrelated mechanisms: first, the preservation of the existing naming layer; second, the integration of external cultural and social influences; and third, the formation of new naming motives on the basis of society's needs. In the English system, the Norman Conquest, Christianisation, the Reformation and present-day globalisation brought about various manifestations of these mechanisms. In the Uzbek system, the continuity of the ancient Turkic layer, the integration of the Islamic layer and the socio-political changes of the twentieth century emerge as the main dynamic factors.

From a linguocultural point of view, the value of an anthroponym is not limited to its lexical meaning. Over time, a name may become associatively linked to a historical event, a religious belief, a social status, an occupation, a regional affiliation or a particular ideal image. Therefore, in studying anthroponyms, it is necessary to take into account not only the etymological explanation but also the historical function of the name, its social environment of use and its cultural connotation.

The comparative results show that, although the English and Uzbek anthroponymic systems differ in their paths of historical formation, both systems perform the functions of identification, preservation of cultural memory and transmission of values. In this respect, anthroponyms may be regarded as multilayered linguocultural units that make it possible to trace the interaction of language, culture and society.

Conclusion. The historical and linguocultural analysis of English and Uzbek anthroponymies has shown that personal names are one of the important indicators of social

development, and that their composition is continually renewed under the influence of historical events, religious views, social institutions, literature, political processes and intercultural contacts. English anthroponymy displays a transition from the ancient Germanic-Celtic-Scandinavian layers to Christian, Norman-French, Puritan and present-day global layers. In Uzbek anthroponymy, by contrast, the ancient Turkic layer, the Islamic Arabic-Persian layer, the socio-political names of the twentieth century and present-day integrative tendencies intersect.

From a comparative perspective, the most important conclusion is that, although the presence of external influences is common to both systems, the pace of their historical manifestation and the form of their integration differ. Whereas in the English system external influence emerged rapidly and abruptly at certain historical stages, in the Uzbek system new layers entered into long-term interaction with ancient naming traditions. As a result, hybrid and multilayered models are widely represented in Uzbek anthroponymy.

Thus, the linguocultural study of anthroponyms serves to reveal, as a single integrated system, the historical continuity of linguistic units, the cultural memory of a people, the mechanisms of social identification and its axiological views. This approach not only identifies the similarities and differences between English and Uzbek anthroponymies but also shows how the naming process reflects cultural change in society.

References:

1. Гудков Д. Б. Теория и практика межкультурной коммуникации. – М.: ИТДГК «Гнозис», 2003. – 288 с.

2. Cresswell J. The Penguin Dictionary of First Names. – London: Penguin Books, 2006. – 256 p.

3. Cresswell J. Dictionary of First Names. An indispensable guide to more than 10,000 names. – Edinburgh: Chambers Harrap Publishers Ltd., 2009. – 468 p.

4. Зайцева К. Б. Английская антропонимия и её стилистическое использование: дис. ... канд. филол. наук. – Одесса, 1979. – 222 с.

5. Le Jan R. Personal Names and the Transformation of Kinship // Personal Name Studies of Medieval Europe: Social Identity and Familial Structures / ed. by G. T. Beech, M. Bourin, P. Chareille. – Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2002. – P. 39–40.

6. Зайцева К. Б. Англичане // Системы личных имен у народов мира. – М.: Наука, 1986. – С. 37–49.

7. Зайцева К. Б. Английская стилистическая ономастика: тезисы лекций. – Одесса: Типография «Одесского вестника», 1973. – 67 с.

8. Withycombe E. G. The Oxford Dictionary of English Christian Names. 3rd ed. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990. – P. 9–15.

9. Hanks P. Dictionary of American Family Names. Vols. 1–3. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003. – 2128 p.

10. Garagulya S. I. Anthroponymy in linguocultural and historical aspects. – 2010.

11. Shankle G. E. American Nicknames: Their Origin and Significance. 2nd ed. – New York: H. W. Wilson, 1955. – 524 p.

12. Nuessel F. The Study of Names. – Westport: Greenwood Press, 1992.

13. Begmatov E. A. O‘zbek tili antroponimiyasi. – Toshkent: O‘zR FA «Fan» nashriyoti, 2013. – 264 b.

14. Гафуров А. Имя и история. – М.: Наука, 1987. – С. 10–12.

15. Sattorov G‘. H. O‘zbek ismlarining turkiy qatlami. – Toshkent: Fan, 2006. – B. 9–10.

16. Husanov N. A. XV asr o‘zbek adabiy yodgorliklaridagi antroponimlarning leksik-semantik va uslubiy xususiyatlari. – Toshkent, 2000. – B. 21–22.

17. Kenjaeva S. O‘zbek antroponimlarining nominatsion-motivatsion xususiyatlari: filol. fan. bo‘yicha falsafa doktori (PhD) dissertatsiyasi. – Qarshi, 2019. – B. 36–37.

18. Muminova N. A. Temuriylar davri antroponimiyasining leksik-semantik xususiyatlari: filol. fan. bo‘yicha falsafa doktori (PhD) dis. – Qarshi: Qarshi davlat universiteti, 2021. – 108 b.

19. Бондалетов В. Д. Русская ономастика. – М.: ЛИБРОКОМ, 2016. – С. 129.

20. Никонов В. А. Ищем имя. – М.: Советская Россия, 1988. – С. 54.

21. Clauson G. An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish. – Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972. – 1034 p.

22. Koshg‘ariy M. Turkiy so‘zlar devoni (Devonu lug‘otit turk). – Toshkent: O‘zbekiston, 2022. – 608 b.