



# IJTIMOYIY-GUMANITAR SOHADA ILMIY-INNOVATSION TADQIQOTLAR

ILMIY METODIK JURNALI

DOI: 10.67227

ISSN 3060-5059



**VOL.3 № 6**

**2026**

**INGLIZ VA O‘ZBEK ANTROPOTOPONIMLARINING ETIMOLOGIK HAMDA  
SOTSIOLINGVISTIK XUSUSIYATLARI: ADDINGTON, ABERFORD, CHORBAKR VA  
NASRIDDINBEK CHEKI MISOLIDA**

**Zokirova Mahmuda Ravshan qizi**

Jizzax davlat pedagogika universiteti, mustaqil izlanuvchi

**Annotatsiya**

Mazkur maqolada ingliz va o‘zbek tillaridagi antropotoponimlarning etimologik hamda sotsiolingvistik xususiyatlari qiyosiy tahlil qilinadi. Tadqiqot obyektlari sifatida ingliz tilidagi Addington va Aberford hamda o‘zbek tilidagi Chorbakr va Nasriddinbek cheki antropotoponimlari tanlandi. Tahlil natijalari ingliz antropotoponimlarida genealogik mansublik va yer egaligi munosabatlari ustuvor ekanligini, o‘zbek antropotoponimlarida esa diniy, tarixiy va ijtimoiy omillar yetakchi o‘rin egallashini ko‘rsatdi. Shuningdek, antropotoponimlarning tarixiy xotira va madaniy identitetni shakllantirishdagi roli yoritildi.

**Kalit so‘zlar:** antropotoponim, etimologiya, sotsiolingvistika, toponimika, genealogik model, tarixiy xotira, identitet.

**ЭТИМОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ И СОЦИОЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКИЕ ХАРАКТЕРИСТИКИ  
АНТРОПОТОПОНИМОВ АНГЛИЙСКОГО И УЗБЕКСКОГО ЯЗЫКОВ (НА МАТЕРИАЛЕ  
ТОПОНИМОВ ADDINGTON, ABERFORD, ЧОРБАКР И НАСРИДДИНБЕК ЧЕКИ)**

**Зокирова Махмуда Равшан кизи**

Джизакский государственный педагогический университет, Независимый соискатель

**Аннотация**

В данной статье проводится сравнительный анализ этимологических и социолингвистических особенностей антропотопонимов английского и узбекского языков. В качестве объектов исследования были выбраны английские антропотопонимы *Addington* и *Aberford*, а также узбекские антропотопонимы *Чорбакр* и *Насриддинбек чеки*. Результаты анализа показали, что для английских антропотопонимов характерны отношения генеалогической принадлежности и землевладения, тогда как в узбекских антропотопонимах ведущую роль играют религиозные, исторические и социальные факторы. Кроме того, в статье раскрывается роль антропотопонимов в сохранении исторической памяти и формировании культурной идентичности.

**Ключевые слова:** антропотопоним, этимология, социолингвистика, топонимика, генеалогическая модель, историческая память, идентичность.

**ETYMOLOGICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF ENGLISH AND  
UZBEK ANTHROPOTOPONYMS: A CASE STUDY OF ADDINGTON, ABERFORD,  
CHORBAKR, AND NASRIDDINBEK CHEKI**

**Zokirova Mahmuda Ravshan qizi**

Jizzakh State Pedagogical University, Independent Researcher

**Abstract**

This article presents a comparative analysis of the etymological and sociolinguistic characteristics of anthropotoponyms in the English and Uzbek languages. The study focuses on the anthropotoponyms *Addington* and *Aberford* in English, and *Chorbakr* and *Nasriddinbek cheki* in Uzbek. The results of the analysis reveal that English anthropotoponyms are primarily characterized by genealogical affiliation and land ownership relations, whereas Uzbek anthropotoponyms are predominantly influenced by religious, historical, and social factors. The study also highlights the role of anthropotoponyms in preserving historical memory and shaping cultural identity.

**Keywords:** anthropotonym, etymology, sociolinguistics, toponymy, genealogical model, historical memory, identity.

In recent years, increasing attention has been paid to the study of place names as valuable linguistic units reflecting historical, cultural, and social processes. Among various types of toponyms, anthropotoponyms are of particular interest because they preserve information about personal names that have become embedded in geographical space [1, pp. 45–47]. Such names not only indicate historical

ownership or settlement patterns but also reflect collective memory, cultural identity, and social values [6, pp. 112–115]. In Uzbek and English linguistic traditions, anthroponyms developed under different historical conditions, which makes their comparative investigation especially relevant.

Recent developments in sociolinguistics and onomastics have increased scholarly interest in the interaction between language and society as reflected in geographical names. While English anthroponyms have been extensively investigated from historical and etymological perspectives, comparative studies examining English and Uzbek anthroponyms from both etymological and sociolinguistic viewpoints remain limited.

The purpose of this study is to identify the etymological origins and sociolinguistic functions of selected English and Uzbek anthroponyms and to reveal similarities and differences in their formation and semantic development.

This research is focused on examining the linguistic and sociocultural foundations of anthroponym formation in English and Uzbek. It explores the structural and semantic mechanisms underlying the creation of anthroponyms, analyzes the historical, cultural, religious, and social factors that contribute to their development, and investigates their role in preserving collective memory and cultural identity. By comparing anthroponyms from both languages, the study aims to identify similarities and differences in their etymological and sociolinguistic characteristics.

While collecting material for the present study, it became evident that anthroponyms occupy an important position in both English and Uzbek toponymic systems. Nevertheless, the semantic motivations behind their formation differ considerably, which prompted a more detailed comparative investigation.

During the analysis of English and Uzbek place-name dictionaries, it was observed that anthroponyms occupy a significant place in both linguistic traditions. This observation motivated the present comparative study.

#### **METHODS**

The research employs comparative-historical, etymological, and sociolinguistic methods to investigate the formation and development of anthroponyms in English and Uzbek. The study is based on four representative anthroponyms: Addington and Aberford from English, and Chorbakr and Nasriddinbek Cheki from Uzbek. These examples were selected due to their historical significance and their ability to reflect different naming traditions within the two linguistic communities. Data were analyzed through etymological interpretation, historical comparison, and sociolinguistic evaluation in order to determine the linguistic structure of the names and the cultural, social, and historical factors that contributed to their formation and preservation. This methodological framework enabled a comprehensive comparison of anthroponymic features in both languages.

The etymological analysis was conducted using historical linguistic sources, place-name dictionaries, and onomastic studies [5, pp. 78–82; 6, pp. 214–220]. The sociolinguistic analysis focused on identifying the social, cultural, religious, and historical factors influencing the formation and preservation of these place names.

Comparative analysis was used to reveal common and distinctive features in the anthroponymic systems of English and Uzbek.

#### **RESULTS**

The analysis revealed significant differences in the semantic and structural organization of anthroponyms in the two languages.

The English anthroponym Addington derives from the Old English personal name Eadda combined with the suffix *-ing* and the element *tūn* [7, pp. 31–32]. The name literally means “the settlement of Eadda’s people.” The suffix *-ing* denotes genealogical affiliation, while *tūn* refers to a settlement or village. This structure reflects the importance of kinship and land ownership in early English society.

The anthroponym Aberford originates from the Old English personal name *Æadburh* and the element *ford* [7, pp. 54–55], meaning “river crossing.” The place name can be interpreted as “*Æadburh*’s ford.” This example demonstrates the close relationship between personal ownership and geographical landmarks in English naming traditions.

Unlike the English examples, Chorbakr belongs to the religious and sacred layer of Uzbek toponymy [4, pp. 156–158]. The name means “Four Saints” and refers to a famous religious complex near Bukhara. It reflects the influence of Islamic culture and the veneration of spiritual leaders in the formation of geographical names.

The anthroponym Nasriddinbek Cheki combines the personal name Nasriddinbek with the

lexical unit chek, denoting a land allotment or territorial boundary. This place name preserves information about historical ownership patterns and social stratification within traditional Uzbek society [3, pp. 88–90].

The results indicate that English anthroponyms are predominantly characterized by genealogical and ownership semantics, whereas Uzbek anthroponyms are more strongly connected with religious, historical, and social factors.

### **DISCUSSION**

The findings demonstrate that anthroponyms serve as important linguistic markers of social organization and cultural memory [1, pp. 102–105].

In English anthroponymy, structural elements such as -ton, -ham, -ford, and -bury frequently indicate settlement types and territorial ownership. These morphological patterns reflect the social structure of Anglo-Saxon society, where family lineage and land possession played central roles.

In contrast, Uzbek anthroponymy reflects different sociocultural priorities. Religious figures, saints, rulers, and influential local leaders have played a major role in place-name formation [3, pp. 95–97; 4, pp. 201–204]. Consequently, Uzbek anthroponyms preserve collective memory associated with religious heritage, historical events, and traditional social institutions.

From a sociolinguistic perspective, English anthroponyms emphasize individual ownership and genealogical identity, while Uzbek anthroponyms emphasize collective cultural memory and spiritual values.

The comparative analysis also reveals a universal tendency: both linguistic communities use personal names as a mechanism for commemorating individuals and preserving their significance within geographical space. However, the motivations behind this process differ according to historical and cultural contexts.

A total of four anthroponyms were analyzed in the present study. Two examples represented English naming traditions and two represented Uzbek naming traditions. The analysis showed that ownership-related motivations dominated in the English material, whereas religious and historical motivations prevailed in the Uzbek examples.

### **CONCLUSION**

The study confirms that anthroponyms constitute an important category of geographical names that reflect linguistic, historical, and sociocultural processes.

However, the limited number of analyzed examples suggests that further research based on a larger corpus of anthroponyms is necessary.

The findings of the comparative analysis indicate that personal names serve as a common and universal basis for place-name formation in both English and Uzbek anthroponymic systems. Nevertheless, English anthroponyms mainly reflect genealogical relationships and patterns of land ownership, whereas Uzbek anthroponyms are largely influenced by religious, historical, and social factors. These place names not only identify geographical locations but also preserve cultural values, historical experiences, and social traditions.

Therefore, anthroponyms can be regarded as significant linguistic markers of collective memory and cultural identity within both linguistic and cultural communities. These findings contribute to a deeper understanding of anthroponymic systems and provide a foundation for further comparative research on English and Uzbek place names within etymological and sociolinguistic frameworks.

### **REFERENCES**

1. Суперанская А.В. Общая теория имени собственного. – М.: Наука, 1973.
2. Подольская Н.В. Словарь русской ономастической терминологии. – М., 1988.
3. Begmatov E. O‘zbek ismlari ma‘nosi. – Toshkent, 2007.
4. Rahmatullayev Sh. O‘zbek tilining etimologik lug‘ati. – Toshkent, 2000.
5. Campbell L. Historical Linguistics: An Introduction. – Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2013.
6. Hough C. The Oxford Handbook of Names and Naming. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.
7. Coates R. The Cambridge Dictionary of English Place-Names. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.