



UDK:811.512

**Shahzoda YASHNARBEKOVA,**  
Uzbekistan State World Languages University Phd doctorant  
E-mail: shahzoda.yashnarbekova.96@mail.ru

PhD F.Sharipova taqrizi asosida

## UZBEK ANTHROPNOMY AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE IN LINGUISTICS

Annotation

This article discusses anthroponymy, a significant macro-scale component of the proper nouns category within onomastics, including its definition, relevance in linguistics, its study in global and Uzbek linguistics, linguistic characteristics, and the diachronic factors influencing the formation of anthroponyms.

**Key words:** Anthroponymy, diachronic method, name, surname, patronymic, nickname, pseudonym, mansab (status).

## O'ZBEK ANTROPONIMIYASI VA UNING TILSHUNOSLIKDA TUTGAN O'RNI

Annotatsiya

Ushbu maqola onomastika atoli otlar bo'limining katta makroko'lamni tashkil qiluvchi antroponimiya, mazkur termin tushunchasi, uning tilshunoslikda tutgan o'rnini, dunyo miqyosida hamda o'zbek tilshunosligida o'rganilganlik darajasi, lisoniy xususiyatlari va antroponimlarning diaxron shakllanish omillari haqida ma'lumot beradi.

**Kalit so'zlar:** Antroponimiya, diaxron metod, ism, familiya, sharif, laqab, taxallus, mansab.

## УЗБЕКСКАЯ АНТРОПОНИМИЯ И ЕЕ РОЛЬ В ЯЗЫКОЗНАНИИ

Аннотация

В данной статье представлена информация об антропонимии, которая составляет крупный макромасштаб раздела имен собственных в ономастике. Рассматриваются понятие этого термина, его место в лингвистике, уровень изученности в мировом и узбекском языкознании, лингвистические особенности и факторы диахронического формирования антропонимов.

**Ключевые слова:** Антропонимия, диахронический метод, имя, фамилия, отчество, псевдоним, должность.

**Introduction.** Currently, in contemporary linguistics, the examination of interconnected topics such as the representation of reality across various languages, the analysis of worldview through language, and the exploration of national-cultural characteristics of language is among the most pertinent fields. The distinctive features of a language are inseparable from the cultural characteristics and social structure of the corresponding nation.

This dissertation aims to conduct a scientific and critical analysis of significant research in English and Turkic nomenclature, particularly focusing on Uzbek anthroponymy. It will assess the current state and challenges within the fields of English and Uzbek anthroponymy, identify the principles governing their sources of enrichment, and outline the necessary scope of future work in this area. Anthroponyms evolve in conjunction with the progression of language. New terminology emerges related to social issues, with some terms becoming obsolete and ceasing to be utilized. Anthroponyms, as linguistic and cultural entities, provide a substantial resource for the examination of human personality. Anthroponyms hold a unique position within the lexical framework of the language. Until recently, linguists regarded all proper nouns, including anthroponyms, as distinct words; however, from the 1950s and 1960s onward, the discipline of onomastics has been examined rigorously by linguists and scholars. A component of an individual's name, which may alter due to legal or cultural practices, is utilized throughout one's lifetime. The name serves as a distinct identifier of an individual within the family, applicable across several domains, including official documentation [Stepanov, 2002:

172-179]. An anthroponymic system denotes a collection of personal names aligned with linguistic and national identity [R. A. Komarova, 1985].

Anthroponymy examines anthroponyms, derived from the Greek words *anthropos* meaning "human" and *onyma* meaning "name" or "title." In contemporary linguistics, the term "anthroponym" refers to any proper name associated with an individual or group, encompassing personal names, patronymics, surnames, nicknames, pseudonyms, and cryptonyms [ibid: 30]. Consequently, an anthroponym is a comprehensive notion that encompasses any method of designating an individual in both formal and informal contexts. The selection of a specific form of anthroponym is contingent upon multiple factors: national-cultural traditions, age, geographic location, literacy, aesthetic education, social milieu, and general common sense. Another characteristic of this onomastic category is that each form of anthroponym is utilized exclusively in particular linguistic contexts. Moreover, some nations have distinct anthroponymic models. There exist analogous naming conventions: monomial (utilizing solely a personal name), binomial (comprising a personal name and surname, or a name and nickname), trinomial (including a personal name, middle name, and surname, or a personal name, patronymic, and surname), and polynomial models (including a personal name, several middle names, and a surname).

A personal name emerged to differentiate an individual from the collective. Identification, specifically, constituted his principal function. The name was selected for each individual and served not only as a practical means of

identification but also fulfilled a mystical or religious purpose. In numerous cultures and tribes, a personal name functioned as an amulet, providing protection for an individual throughout their entire life journey.

Upon examining the foundations of personal names throughout many cultures, one may observe typological similarities, possibly stemming from borrowing, the reciprocal influence of names from diverse linguistic systems, and the effects of analogous independent evolution. This similarity is manifested in two aspects: the utilization of same components of speech in their construction and the incorporation of terms from specific lexical domains for this purpose.

**Methods and materials.** The historical technique utilized substantial historical, archaeological, and anthropological material, together with the analysis of onomastic vocabulary within its historical context. The essential characteristics of anthroponyms cannot be ascertained without considering the historical context of their formation. The concept of a personal name is complex, historically significant, and contradictory. The significant historical backdrop of its inception and growth inevitably influenced the specific framework of this linguistic entity. Consequently, when analyzing an anthroponym, it is essential to consider this matter not only synchronically but also diachronically, since historical events frequently exert significant influence on the development of a name.

A diverse array of themes influences the stylistic approach, encompassing the reliance of name construction and functions on literary direction, the nuances of name selection and usage in prose, poetry, theater, and the various forms of literary anthroponyms. Nonetheless, the extensive array of names in fiction is fundamentally sourced from the rich and diverse stylistic features present in spoken language. A wide variety of informal anthroponyms exists that differ from their formal counterparts through stylistic markers. Such varied and exceptionally fragile materials require a stylistic methodology.

**Result and discussion.** For centuries, scientific inquiry in the domain of anthroponymy has remained pertinent. In this context, Russian scientists have made considerable progress. A.M. Sobolevsky, N.M. Tupikov, V.M. Solntsev, L.V. Uspensky, V.N. Nikonov, A.V. Superanskaya, V.D. Bondaletov, S.I. Zinin, M. Morozov, and more linguists undertook scholarly research in this domain. These scholars extensively researched and developed Russian anthroponymy. Several scholarly publications concerning Russian onomastics have been released.

S.I. Garagulya observes that "the subclass of personal names is open, continually replenished, and subject to the same dynamic developmental processes, reinterpretation, and metaphorization as the class of names in general" [Garagulya 2010: 126]. The anthroponymicon of a specific populace is not established permanently; rather, it functions akin to a living organism, continuously renewing and eliminating obsolete names. This process is perpetual. However, from another perspective, V.V. Oshchepkova asserts that certain features of anthroponymy are characterized by a predilection for the prevalent utilization of specific systems [Oshchepkova 2004:195].

In Turkology, several publications focus on the examination of onomastic concerns. Notable scientists include A.N. Samoilovich, V.V. Radlov, N.A. Baskakov, S.A. Tokarev, A. Jafarog'li, G'F. Sattorov, T. Jonuzoqov, among others, have conducted significant research. [Nikonov, 1974, 85-86]

Uzbek anthroponymy. The examination of anthroponymic matters and their scholarly investigation in Uzbek linguistics possesses a distinct historical background. S.Ibrohimov, E.Begmatov, R.Kungurov, A.Mukhtorov,

G.Sattorov, and other scholars have significantly contributed to Uzbek anthroponymy through many scientific papers, treatises, and works. At this juncture, we shall examine numerous of their concepts.

The scholarly examination of the anthroponymic system within Turkic languages commenced in the 1960s. For the first instance in Turkic linguistics, Kazakh linguist T. Zhanuzakov undertook scholarly research on anthroponymy. In 1960, he defended his candidate dissertation titled "Personal Proper Nouns in the Kazakh Language." This research, focused on personal names in Turkic linguistics, offers insights into the idea of proper nouns, the transition of common nouns into proper nouns (onomasia), the motivations for naming a child, and the development and grammatical structure of names. T. Zhanuzakov furthered his research on anthroponyms and ethnonyms in the Kazakh language and defended his doctoral dissertation in 1976 on the subject "Fundamental Issues of Onomastics in the Kazakh Language." T. Zhanuzakov categorized the stages of anthroponymy development in the Kazakh language into four distinct periods. This periodization exhibits several deficiencies. In 1973, Tatar linguist G. Sattorov conducted a study on the anthroponyms of the Tatarstan region and subsequently released a monograph detailing his findings. Subsequently, he disseminated his doctoral dissertation. In 1981, he published an explanatory dictionary titled "The Meaning of Tatar Names," furthering his research on anthroponymy. In Uzbek linguistics, specific studies have been conducted on the system of proper nouns. Research focused on Uzbek anthroponymy utilizing contemporary scientific methodologies commenced in the 1960s. By that time, studies on popular science pertaining to personal names had been published.

The inaugural scientific treatise on the significations of Uzbek names was authored by Y. Menazhiev and Kh. Azamatov. This booklet presents several deficiencies concerning the significance of names and the motivations that underpin their meanings. Notable scientific research in Uzbek anthroponymy is linked to the distinguished Uzbek linguist Ernest Begmatov. E. Begmatov's 1965 dissertation, "Anthroponymy of the Uzbek Language," is the inaugural scholarly inquiry in this domain. This research examines the historical-ethnographic and linguistic characteristics of Uzbek anthroponyms in depth. The research focuses on the linguistic analysis of anthroponyms while also exploring them from historical, ethnolinguistic, and sociolinguistic viewpoints. E. Begmatov's following research extensively addressed the orthography of names and surnames, the identification of the lexical foundation of names, and the transcription of Uzbek names into other languages. E. Begmatov has authored numerous scientific and popular science publications that significantly contribute to the advancement of Uzbek anthroponymy.

The contributions of A. Ishayev, F. Abdullayev, N. Khusanov, S. Rakhimov, G. Sattorov, R. Khudoyberganov, Y. Avlakulov, and others to the field of Uzbek anthroponymy are substantial. E. Begmatov's research constitutes a significant theoretical resource in the examination of this subject.

Anthroponymy is a subfield of onomastics that examines anthroponyms—proper names of individuals—previously excluded from onomastic research in the 1960s and 1970s of the 20th century. In contemporary linguistics, the term "anthroponymy" encompasses two concepts: 1) The compilation of names of individuals within a specific linguistic group in a designated region; 2) The subdivision of onomastics that examines the origin, structure, semantics, usage, evolution, and distribution of personal proper names [ESSLTP, 2008: 25]. The term "anthroponym" is utilized in the initial context as well. Among anthroponyms, the

following categories are identified: personal names, patronymics, surnames, nicknames, pseudonyms (individual or collective), and cryptonyms (concealed names). Anthroponymy differentiates between literary and dialectal, as well as formal and informal variants of a same name [Podolskaya, 1998: 37].

At this juncture, the Uzbek linguist Khudoynazarov Ikrom also references the following ideas in his doctoral dissertation: "Anthroponyms may possess a shared speech or dialect based on their nature." Nonetheless, it is challenging to ascertain whether numerous names are literary or dialectal versions based on their structure. It is essential to gather and conduct a scientific analysis of the names exclusively present in the dialects of the Uzbek language.

The lexicon of Uzbek anthroponymy is categorized into two layers: the indigenous layer of names and the borrowed layer of names. In 1990, G. Sattorov defended his candidate dissertation titled "Turkic Layers of Uzbek Names." The research categorized the Turkic component of Uzbek names based on the underlying causes, therefore classifying Uzbek names into three categories: names of dedication, descriptive names, and names of aspiration. Researcher S. Rakhimov successfully defended his candidate dissertation titled "Khorezm Regional Anthroponymy," which focuses on the significance and inspiration behind historical and legendary names. This dissertation elucidates the rationale behind the utilization of Arabic names, historical Hebrew names, and personal names linked to many rituals and customs that emerged under the influence of Islam.

Another Uzbek linguist, R. Khudoyberganov, elucidated the notion of variability in anthroponyms and endeavored to ascertain the correlation of these variants with synonymy and onomastic parallelism. He recognized and meticulously examined the lexical and dialectal variations of anthroponyms, abbreviated forms of names, affectionate and diminutive forms of names, and orthographic variants of anthroponyms supported by substantial evidence.

N.A. Khusanov's PhD dissertation and several scholarly papers focus on the history of Uzbek anthroponymy. The researcher, examining anthroponyms in the language of 15th-century Uzbek literary works, categorizes them into creative and actual anthroponyms.

In her dissertation "Nominative and Motivational Foundations and Characteristics of Anthroponyms of the Uzbek Language," S. Kenjayeva undertook substantial scholarly research on the nominative and motivational foundations, lexical and semantic attributes, and classification of the Uzbek language, with a focus on the regional anthroponymy of the Kashkadarya region. During the 1970s, researchers examining the anthroponymy of Turkish languages, including V.A. Nikonov and Samarkand scholars L.I. Roysenzon, E.B. Magazanik, A.I. Isaev, among others, authored several articles utilizing quantitative methods to analyze naming trends for children in Samarkand.

Anthroponyms differ from other common nouns in that they convey the notion of denotation. While common nouns convey the notion of direct objectivity, anthroponyms lack this characteristic. They are frequently derived from common nouns and evolve into personal names influenced by parental preferences, societal desires, diverse customs, and religious beliefs.

The primary principle of anthroponymy, as with all branches of onomastics, is historicity. Historicity encompasses more than merely the presence of a specific set of names labeled as "names derived from historical figures"; it also entails the process of personal selection, referred to as classification.

Russian linguist Nikonov asserts that personal names exist solely within the context of society and for societal purposes; although appearing to be individually chosen, such choices are ultimately dictated by societal norms. He proposes that personal names invariably possess social meaning.

The primary objective of anthroponymic research is to identify the societal rules governing the assignment of individual names. This includes the principles by which naming categorizes individuals based on various criteria such as gender, clan affiliation, generation, and locality. It also encompasses the laws regulating the naming system, whereby an individual may receive multiple names shortly after birth or throughout their life. Additionally, it examines the syntagmatic characteristics that differentiate these nouns from other noun classes, as well as the public norms that prescribe or prohibit their usage in discourse [Bromberge 2012: 117].

Determining the semantic characteristics of anthroponyms is unfeasible without considering the history of their emergence. A personal name is a multifaceted, archaic, and paradoxical concept. The extensive history of its genesis and growth inevitably influences the structure of this linguistic unit. Consequently, while examining anthroponyms, it is essential to address this matter from both a synchronic and a diachronic perspective, as historical processes are significant factors. On certain instances, the primary influence on the creation of the name. Historically, Turkish anthroponym system are similarly founded on Arabic anthroponymic structures.

The late medieval Arabic anthroponymic system is arguably the most advanced. It comprises numerous components:

1. *Ism-alam* - a designation assigned at birth.
2. *Kunya* - the practice of naming children after their parents: Abu-Ahmed meaning 'father of Ahmed', Umm-Ibrahim meaning 'mother of Ibrahim', and Abu-Burdah literally translating to 'father of the cloak', which figuratively signifies "master of the cloak." *Kenu* lacks the designation of "place" following the birth of a child, referring to "mother of a son" or "mother of a daughter," and for multiple offspring, "mother of children"; the woman refers to her husband as "father of a son," "father of a daughter," or "father of children" [Ketz collection - II: 235].
3. *Nasab* - a designation originating from one's paternal or maternal lineage (infrequently): Ibn Sina, known in Europe as Avicenna, is the son of S.ina. In Iranian and Turkic languages, the term "son" functions as a postposition, exemplified by Mardan-zade and Temir-ogly, respectively. Present! This pertains to the patronymic in its contemporary forms: -icht, -ovich, -inich for males, and -ovna, -inichna for females, which were used until the last century. In shorter adjectival forms, -ov and -in were used, and even earlier, -s was employed, derived from the term 'son.'
4. *Laqab* is typically rendered as "nickname": Siddiq meaning 'truthful', Akhtab meaning 'toothless'; they are characterized as insulting, narrative, and descriptive under this category. Additionally, incorporate names by profession and titles (both official and honorary) such as shah, khan, bek, mirza, seid, etc., as well as names with components like -din meaning 'faith,' among others.
5. *Nisba* - a name derived from genealogy (patronymic ancestor's name - authentic, assumed, or invented), ethnicity, and subsequently geography (Moslavi 'from MOD Sula', Basrawi 'from Basra'); designations based on dependency and social affiliation.
6. *Mansab* - title based on profession.
7. *Takhallus* (Mahlas) pseudonym, also varies according to different sources: by birthplace - Ruda-Yaki, by occupation - Hafiz, by patronage - Saadi in tribute to Caailj

ben Zangi. All these species engage in diverse combinations. kunya and lakab, kunya and nisba, lakab and nisba, etc. [Belgorodsky: 222].

Names have evolved over an extended duration and are influenced by the cultural, historical, and linguistic characteristics of specific regions or nations. In our research, the anthroponym is regarded as the primary personal noun, a designation that facilitates the initial identification of an individual.

**Conclusion.** The anthroponymic systems of various cultures exhibit certain commonalities, attributable to the mutual influences across languages and cultures. The openness of the anthroponymic system facilitates the seamless borrowing of personal names from alternative systems. Various approaches are employed in the creation of new personal names. Formation of onomastic units: onymization of

common nouns, linguistic borrowing, and the artificial creation of names through vocabulary.

Anthroponyms, like all proper nouns, are primarily words that form part of the language's vocabulary. Simultaneously, they are not merely words, but lexical units possessing a variety of distinct characteristics. Anthroponyms are the most ancient legacy of a people's language, culture, and spirituality, encapsulating their historical narrative, linguistic characteristics, ethnographic identity, ancestral lifestyles, and their religious and philosophical perspectives, beliefs, aspirations, and goals.

The anthroponymic system must be examined from both synchrony and diachrony perspectives, as anthroponyms possess historical significance, and their contemporary relevance should be analyzed through etymological scrutiny.

## REFERENCES

1. Begmatov E. Антропонимика узбекского языка: Avtoref. diss., Toshkent: Fan, 1965. - Ташкент: Фан, 1965.
2. Menajiyev Y. Azamatov X. Ismingizning ma'nosi nima? Toshkent: Fan, 1964.
3. Sattarov F.F. Антропонимия Татарской АССР: Avtoref. dis ... Qozon, 1975.
4. Sattarov G'.H. O'zbek ismlarining turkiy qatlami: Filol. fan. nomz. ... dis. avtoref. Toshkent, 1990.
5. Xudoynazarov Ikrom. Antroponimlarning til lug'at tizimidagi o'rni va ularning semantic –uslubiy xususiyatlari (Ergash Jumanbulbul dostonlari asosida) filologiya fanlari nomzodi ilmiy darajasini olish uchun yozilgan dissertatsiya. Buxoro, 1998.
6. Белгородский — Н. А. Белгородский, Социальный элемент в персидских именах,— «Записки Института востоковедения», 1, Л., 1932.
7. Гарагуля, С.И. Антропонимия в лингвокультурном и исторических аспектах [Текст] / С.И. Гарагуля. — М.: Книжный дом ЛИБРОКОМ, 2010. — 136 с.
8. Джанузаков Т. Лично-собственные имена в казахском языке: Автореф. дисс... канд. филол. наук. — Алма-Ата, 1960. — С. 19.
9. Комарова Р. А. Семантическое преобразование антропонимов: автореф. дисс. ... канд. филол. наук. — Л., 1985. — 22 с.
10. Никонов, В.А. Имя и общество [Текст] - М.: Наука, 1974. 8 с
11. Никонов, В.А. Имя и общество [Текст] - М.: Наука, 1974. 85-86 с
12. Ощепкова, В.В. Язык и культура Великобритании, США, Канады, Австралии, Новой Зеландии [Текст] / В.В. Ощепкова. — М./СПб.: ГПОССА/КАРО, 2004. —336 с.
13. Подольская Н.В. Антропонимика // Большой энциклопедический словарь «Языкознание» / Под ред. В.Н.Ярцевой. М.: «Большая российская энциклопедия», 1998. С.36-37.