JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY SCIENCES AND INNOVATIONS
VOLUME 04, ISSUE 09
MOPNTHLY JOURNALS
ISSN NUMBER: 2751-4390
IMPACT FACTOR: 9,08

SYNTACTIC AND MORPHOSYNTACTIC REPRESENTATION OF ANTHROPONYMS IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH

Abdurahimova Durdona Tavakkaljon kizi
Phd researcher of Fergana state university
dabdurahimova00@gmail.com

Abstract: This article explores the morphosyntactic properties of anthroponyms in Uzbek and English, focusing on how personal names function within sentence structures. The study compares case variation, possessive marking, number and gender expression, phonological gender indicators, and the structural relation between given names and surnames. Uzbek anthroponyms demonstrate rich inflectional morphology that determines their syntactic role, while English anthroponyms rely mainly on word order and auxiliary words to convey grammatical meaning. The results show that despite functional similarities, the morphosyntactic mechanisms differ significantly across the two languages, reflecting their typological distinction between agglutinative and analytic systems.

Keywords: anthroponymy, morphosyntax, Uzbek, English, case, possession, syntax, gender

1. Introduction

Personal names, or anthroponyms, are among the most significant linguistic units reflecting both grammatical and cultural systems of a language. They serve as identifiers that connect linguistic structure with social reality (Crystal, 2008). The morphosyntactic behavior of anthroponyms—how they change or function within sentences—reveals the underlying grammatical organization of a language.

In Uzbek, an agglutinative language, anthroponyms are marked by a rich system of case suffixes and morphological endings that clearly determine syntactic roles. For example, the difference between Ali keldi (“Ali came”) and Alining kitobi (“Ali’s book”) illustrates how inflection defines grammatical relations. In contrast, English, as an analytic language, expresses these relations syntactically through word order and prepositions rather than morphological endings (Comrie, 1989).

The comparative analysis of Uzbek and English anthroponyms provides valuable insight into the typological contrasts between inflectional and positional grammatical systems. Moreover, the study of names as morphosyntactic units contributes to onomastics, translation studies, and contrastive grammar (Hough, 2016). This research aims to investigate the syntactic positions, case variation, possessive constructions, number and gender categories, and phonological markers of gender in anthroponyms of both languages.

2. Methods

The study applies a comparative-descriptive approach to analyze the morphosyntactic behavior of anthroponyms in Uzbek and English. The comparison focuses on grammatical markers, syntactic positions, and morphological indicators that define how personal names operate within sentence structures.

Primary data were collected from literary and standard language examples in both Uzbek and English, ensuring that the analysis reflects authentic usage rather than artificial or prescriptive forms. Uzbek examples illustrate inflectional patterns characteristic of agglutinative morphology, while English data demonstrate syntactic constructions typical of analytic structures.

The contrastive framework highlights three analytical dimensions:

1. Morphological expression (inflectional vs. syntactic marking)
2. Syntactic positioning (subject, object, possessive)
3. Functional interpretation (semantic and stylistic roles)

This combination of structural and functional perspectives allows for a comprehensive description of anthroponyms in both languages and emphasizes their role in the morphosyntactic system of human naming.

Results and Discussion

1. Syntactic Positions and Case Variation

In Uzbek, anthroponyms inflect according to six grammatical cases: nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, locative, and ablative. These case endings determine the syntactic function of a name within a sentence. For example:

- Ali kitobni berdi (“Ali gave the book”) — nominative, subject.
- Men Alini ko‘rdim (“I saw Ali”) — accusative, object.
- Alining kitobi (“Ali’s book”) — genitive, possession.

This morphological flexibility allows Uzbek anthroponyms to appear in diverse syntactic positions without losing grammatical clarity. Each suffix provides explicit information about grammatical relations, reflecting the agglutinative typology of the Uzbek language (Johanson & Csató, 1998).

In English, anthroponyms are morphologically invariable, and their syntactic role is determined by word order and prepositions:

- Ali gave the book (subject)
- I saw Ali (object)
- to Ali (recipient)

English relies on syntactic position and function words (e.g., to, of, for) to express relations that Uzbek encodes morphologically. This structural contrast exemplifies the distinction between synthetic and analytic languages (Greenberg, 1963).

2. Possessive Structures

Possessive constructions demonstrate clear morphosyntactic differences. In Uzbek, possession is expressed morphologically through the genitive suffix -ning and possessive agreement on the possessed noun:

- Alining kitobi ("Ali's book").

Here, the genitive suffix marks the possessor, and the possessed noun carries a possessive suffix. This double marking reflects syntactic and morphological alignment typical of Uzbek (Bozorov, 2010).

In contrast, English indicates possession syntactically by means of the clitic 's or the prepositional phrase of:

- Ali's book
- the book of Ali (formal)

While 's functions as a morphological marker, its use depends on syntactic adjacency rather than inflectional paradigms. Hence, Uzbek shows morphological dependency, whereas English expresses possession through structural positioning (Quirk et al., 1985).

3. Number Category

In Uzbek, anthroponyms can take the plural suffix -lar to indicate collectivity or respect rather than simple plurality:

- Ali → Alilar may refer to "Ali and his family" or serve as an honorific plural.

This pluralization expresses social and pragmatic nuances. In English, anthroponyms rarely pluralize except in family or collective reference:

- the Smiths ("the Smith family")
- two Johns ("two men named John")

Thus, Uzbek plural marking carries semantic and pragmatic extensions, while English uses pluralization strictly for numerical plurality.

4. Expression of Gender

Gender in anthroponyms reflects sociolinguistic tendencies rather than grammatical categories. In Uzbek, gender is not grammatical but lexical, often expressed through derivational morphemes such as -oy, -xon, -gul (e.g., Gulbahor, Zarnigor, Maftuna). These markers signal femininity through cultural convention (Begmatov, 2009).

English, similarly, lacks grammatical gender but distinguishes it lexically: John, William, James (masculine) versus Mary, Anne, Elizabeth (feminine). Feminine derivations such as Christina, Caroline, Henriette are historically borrowed from Latin or French forms (Hough, 2016).

5. Phonological Indicators of Gender

Phonological patterns in both languages suggest symbolic associations. Uzbek feminine names frequently end in open vowels (-a, -o, -e), e.g., Nigora, Zebo, Maftuna, while masculine names

end in consonants or closed vowels, e.g., Sherzod, Anvar. This aligns with Uzbek sound symbolism and cultural naming preferences (Sodikov, 2012).

In English, similar tendencies appear: feminine names often end in vowels (Julia, Anna, Maria), and masculine names end in consonants (Robert, Mark, David). These patterns, though non-grammatical, show phonesthetic gender association reinforced by historical linguistic influences (Algeo, 2001).

Conclusion

The comparative morphosyntactic analysis of English and Uzbek anthroponyms reveals that both languages employ distinct yet functionally parallel systems for encoding grammatical relations within personal names. Uzbek anthroponyms demonstrate agglutinative morphology, where case, number, and possession are overtly marked by suffixes. English anthroponyms, by contrast, rely on analytic means—word order, prepositions, and clitics—to express equivalent relations.

Reference

1. Algeo, J. (2001). The origins and development of the English language. Boston: Wadsworth.
2. Begmatov, E. (2009). O‘zbek ismlari tizimi va ularning lingvistik tahlili. Toshkent: Fan.
3. Bozorov, O. (2010). Hozirgi o‘zbek tili: Morfologiya. Toshkent: O‘zbekiston Milliy Ensiklopediyasi.
4. Comrie, B. (1989). Language universals and linguistic typology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
5. Crystal, D. (2008). A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics. Oxford: Blackwell.
6. Greenberg, J. H. (1963). Universals of language. Cambridge: MIT Press.
7. Hough, C. (Ed.). (2016). The Oxford handbook of names and naming. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
8. Johanson, L., & Csató, É. (1998). The Turkic languages. London: Routledge.
9. Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). A comprehensive grammar of the English language. London: Longman.
10. Sodikov, J. (2012). O‘zbek tilidagi ismlarning fonetik tizimi. Farg‘ona: FDU nashriyoti