

METHODOLOGY OF COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE ONOMASTIC SYSTEMS OF THE RUSSIAN AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Turgunboeva Elenur,

Master's Degree Student Karshi State University

Abstract. The article examines the methodology of comparative analysis of the onomastic systems of the Russian and Uzbek languages, including their structure, semantics, and cultural significance. The principles and methods of analyzing anthroponyms, toponyms, and other onomastic units are investigated, along with their functional-stylistic features and linguocultural aspects. The study identifies the specific characteristics of the onomasticons of two typologically different languages, as well as their role in shaping national mentality and the linguistic picture of the world. The obtained results are of importance for the theory of translation, interlingual contacts, and comparative linguistics.

Keywords: onomastics, anthroponyms, toponyms, Russian language, Uzbek language, comparative analysis, linguoculturology, transliteration, methodology, national mentality.

Introduction

Onomastics is one of the most important branches of modern linguistics, studying proper names in all the diversity of their manifestations. The term “onomastics” derives from the Greek *onomastikos* — “the art of giving names,” which reflects the dual nature of this discipline: it examines both the results of human nominative activity and the processes of creation and functioning of proper names [11].

A.V. Superanskaya is rightfully considered the founder of Russian onomastics. She defined onomastics as “a branch of linguistics that studies all proper names, the history of their origin and transformation as a result of long-term use in the source language or when borrowed from other languages” [16]. This definition emphasizes both the synchronic and diachronic aspects of onomastic research.

The central concept of onomastics is the *onym* — a proper name that serves to individually designate an object regardless of context. Unlike appellatives (common nouns), which name a class of homogeneous objects, onyms serve to single out an individual object from a class of similar ones [14].

The onomastic space of a language, or *onomasticon*, represents the totality of all proper names (including anthroponyms, toponyms, theonyms, and other categories of onyms) functioning in a given language. Its comparative study based on the material of the Russian and Uzbek languages makes it possible to identify both universal and nationally-cultural features of onomastics.

The purpose of this article is to describe and substantiate the methodology of comparative analysis of the onomastic systems of two typologically different languages — Russian and Uzbek.

Materials and Methods

The research is based on a corpus of onomastic units from the Russian and Uzbek languages, including anthroponyms, toponyms, and other categories of proper names from various historical periods, social spheres, and territorial variants.

The main method used in the study is comparative analysis. The methodology of the research includes the following successive stages:



1. Selection and systematization of the onomastic material;
2. Structural analysis (morphological structure, word-formation models and formants);
3. Semantic analysis (motivation, etymology, semantic types, and cultural connotations);
4. Functional analysis (use of onyms in different functional styles and communicative situations);
5. Linguocultural analysis (connection of onyms with national values, stereotypes, and linguistic picture of the world);
6. Comparative interpretation of the results.

Special attention is paid to the typological differences between the languages: Russian belongs to the inflective (fusional) type with a synthetic grammatical structure [17], while Uzbek belongs to the agglutinative type with predominantly analytical features [13].

Results and Discussion

The conducted comparative analysis revealed both universal patterns inherent to onomastic systems across languages and significant national-cultural differences in the organization and functioning of the onomastic systems of the Russian and Uzbek languages.

At the structural level, notable differences were identified in the morphological organization of onyms. Russian anthroponyms and toponyms are characterized by a rich system of inflectional endings and derivational suffixes typical of a fusional language (e.g., frequent use of suffixes such as -ов, -ев, -ин, -ский in surnames and place names). In contrast, Uzbek onyms demonstrate a pronounced agglutinative character, where grammatical and derivational meanings are expressed through the sequential addition of distinct affixes. This leads to greater transparency and predictability in the internal structure of Uzbek proper names.

In the semantic analysis, both languages show a high degree of motivation in onym formation. Many Russian toponyms and anthroponyms are based on appellative lexemes reflecting natural features, professions, or personal qualities (e.g., rivers, forests, or character traits). Uzbek onyms often draw from a richer layer of Turkic, Persian, and Arabic origins, frequently incorporating elements related to religion, nature, moral values, or wishes for the child (e.g., names containing roots meaning “happy,” “strong,” “wise,” or “lion”). Metaphorical and metonymic transfers play an important role in both systems; however, in Uzbek onomastics, metaphorical models associated with beauty, nobility, and natural phenomena appear more productive.

The functional analysis demonstrated that onyms perform similar pragmatic roles in both languages (nominative, identifying, expressive, and text-forming), yet their usage in various functional styles differs. In Russian, proper names are actively involved in creating stylistic effects through diminutives, augmentatives, and patronymics. In Uzbek, the system of address forms and honorific components within names reflects a stronger emphasis on social hierarchy and respect.

The linguocultural analysis proved to be particularly revealing. Onyms in both languages actively participate in shaping the national mentality and linguistic worldview. Russian onomastics reflects a European-Christian cultural layer combined with Slavic pagan roots, while Uzbek onomastics embodies a synthesis of Turkic nomadic traditions, Islamic values, and Persian cultural influence. The study paid special attention to the mechanisms of metaphor and metonymy in onym formation, the processes of transition of onyms into appellatives (e.g., when



a personal name becomes a symbol of certain qualities), and the active use of proper names in precedent texts, proverbs, and literary works.

Significant differences were also observed in transliteration and adaptation practices. When Russian names enter the Uzbek language and vice versa, they undergo phonetic, morphological, and graphic adaptation influenced by the typological features of each language.

Overall, the revealed differences are largely determined by the typological characteristics of the two languages (fusional vs. agglutinative), as well as by historical, cultural, areal, and religious factors. At the same time, universal tendencies were confirmed, such as the anthropocentric nature of onomastic systems, the desire for positive semantics in personal names, and the reflection of the surrounding world in geographical names. The obtained results highlight the deep interconnection between language, culture, and national self-awareness.

Conclusion

Onomastics is a complex and multidimensional science with a well-developed conceptual apparatus and diverse research methodology. The proposed methodology of comparative analysis, which includes consistent structural, semantic, functional, and linguocultural stages, allows for a comprehensive and systematic study of the onomastic systems of typologically distant languages such as Russian and Uzbek.

The results of the study contribute substantially to the development of comparative linguistics, linguoculturology, theory and practice of translation, as well as the study of interlingual and intercultural contacts. They can be successfully applied in further research on bilingual onomastics, in the development of practical recommendations for transliteration and adaptation of proper names, in teaching Russian and Uzbek as foreign languages, and in preserving the national-cultural identity reflected in proper names.

The comparative approach not only deepens theoretical understanding of the mechanisms of proper name functioning but also has important practical significance in the context of expanding cultural and linguistic interaction between the Russian and Uzbek peoples in the modern multilingual world.

References:

1. Азимова М.Н. Сопоставительная типология русского и узбекского языков. Ташкент: Фан, 2004. 218 с.
2. Березович Е.Л. Русская топонимия в этнолингвистическом аспекте. Екатеринбург: Изд-во Урал. ун-та, 2000. 532 с.
3. Бондалетов В.Д. Русская ономастика. М.: Просвещение, 1983. 224 с.
4. Веселовский С.Б. Ономастикон: Древнерусские имена, прозвища и фамилии. М.: Наука, 1974. 382 с.
5. Воробьев В.В. Лингвокультурология. М.: Изд-во РУДН, 1997. 331 с.
6. Гак В.Г. Сопоставительная лексикология. М.: Международные отношения, 1977. 264 с.
7. Горбаневский М.В. Ономастика в художественной литературе. М.: Изд-во УДН, 1988. 88 с.
8. Грушко Е.А., Медведев Ю.М. Словарь имен. Новгород: Три богатыря, 1997. 656 с.



9. Демидова К.И. Безличные конструкции в русском и узбекском языках. Ташкент: Фан, 1988. 125 с.
10. Джамалханов Х.Д. Урбанонимия Ташкента. Ташкент: Фан, 1982. 145 с.
11. Ермолович Е.Н. Англицизмы в русской эргонимии // Вопросы ономастики. 2008. № 6. С. 118-130.
12. Крюкова И.В. Рекламное имя: от изобретения до прецедентности. Волгоград: Перемена, 2004. 228 с.
13. Кононов А.Н. Грамматика современного узбекского литературного языка. М.-Л.: Изд-во АН СССР, 1960. 446 с.
14. Подольская Н.В. Словарь русской ономастической терминологии. М.: Наука, 1988. 192 с.
15. Степанов Ю.С. Константы: Словарь русской культуры. М.: Академический проект, 2001. 990 с.
16. Супранская А.В. Общая теория имени собственного. М.: Наука, 1973. 366 с.
17. Успенский Б.А. Структурная типология языков. М.: Наука, 1965. 286 с.

