

UZBEK AND GERMAN ANTHROPNYMS IN CONNECTION WITH INDO-EUROPEAN LANGUAGES**Atajanov Sherzod Shanazarovich**

Abstract: This article presents a comparative study of anthroponyms in the Uzbek and German languages. Although Uzbek and German personal names originate from different historical sources, their comparison makes it possible to identify both common features and differences. The linguocultural significance of anthroponyms is examined. Personal names are not merely means of individual identification but constitute an integral part of a nation's culture. National values, religious beliefs, historical events, and social systems are reflected in personal names. Therefore, anthroponymy is directly connected with linguoculturology.

Keywords: German language, Uzbek language, anthroponyms, personal names, proper names, Indo-European languages.

Comparative Study of Uzbek and German Anthroponyms. Although Uzbek and German personal names originate from different historical roots, their comparison reveals both similarities and differences.

Similarities:

Religious influence — Islam has had a strong impact on Uzbek personal names, while Christianity has significantly influenced German names;

Social stratification — representatives of higher social classes were often given special or distinctive names;

Ancient mythological basis — heroic names such as Alpomish in Uzbek and Siegfried in German tradition.

Differences:

German personal names are often compound in structure, whereas Uzbek names are frequently single-word forms with clear semantic meaning;

Uzbek anthroponyms show a strong Arabic and Persian lexical layer, while German names are predominantly based on Greek and Latin origins.

Linguocultural Significance of Anthroponyms. Personal names are not only a means of naming an individual but also an inseparable part of a nation's culture. National values, religious views, historical events, and social structures are reflected in personal names. Therefore, anthroponymy is directly related to linguoculturology [Karimov, 2015].

For example, the German name Friedrich reflects the people's ideals of peace and rulership, while the Uzbek name To'lqin symbolizes harmony with nature.

Thus, anthroponymy, as an important branch of linguistics, studies personal names from linguistic, historical, and cultural perspectives. Anthroponymic systems formed within Indo-European and Turkic languages have interacted with each other, creating rich layers that embody the historical memory of peoples.

A comparative study of personal names in Uzbek and German allows for a deeper understanding of the cultures and histories of the two nations. In this respect, anthroponymy serves as an important source not only for linguistics but also for historiography, ethnology, and cultural studies.

Stages in the Formation of Indo-European and Turkic Anthroponyms.

From the earliest stages of human society, the need to assign names to individuals emerged as a fundamental necessity. A name is not only a means of identification but also an important marker reflecting a people's worldview, religious beliefs, social life, and culture. Anthroponymic systems formed in Indo-European and Turkic languages demonstrate both similarities and differences.

As É. Benveniste noted, “The name is one of the most ancient and most stable elements of language, preserving the historical memory of peoples” [Benveniste, 1973, p. 88]. In this regard, the comparative analysis of Indo-European and Turkic anthroponyms represents an important scholarly task for linguistics and ethnolinguistics.

Stages in the Formation of Indo-European Anthroponyms.

Among Indo-European peoples, personal names have been known since ancient times, and religious, mythological, and social factors played a major role in their formation.

Ancient Greek and Roman anthroponyms:

In Greek: Alexandros (“defender of the people”), Sophia (“wisdom”), Dionysius (associated with the god Dionysus);

In Rome: Marcus (dedicated to the god Mars), Julius (“youthful, powerful”), Victoria (“victory”).

These names exhibit a strong mythological layer and semantics associated with deities [Nielsen, 1985].

Slavic personal names:

Vladimir (“ruler of the world”), Miroslav (“lover of peace”), Bogdan (“given by God”);

Among Slavic peoples, personal names often reflected religious beliefs, moral ideals, and social aspirations.

Among Slavic peoples, two-component personal names were widespread, often expressing moral values and social structure [Superanskaya, 1986].

German anthroponyms: Friedrich (“ruler of peace”), Heinrich (“head of the household”), Gertrud (“warrior woman”);

Among Germanic peoples, the semantics of personal names are more closely associated with symbols of warfare and power.

Indian anthroponyms: Vishnuprasad (“gift of Vishnu”), Devananda (“joy of the gods”), Ramakrishna;

In the Indian cultural context, personal names developed primarily within a religious and spiritual framework and were dedicated to deities mentioned in the Vedas and Upanishads.

Thus, among Indo-European peoples, the formation of anthroponyms was closely connected with religious-mythological foundations, social stratification, and cultural values.

Stages in the Formation of Turkic Anthroponyms Personal names among Turkic peoples also passed through distinct historical stages. Ancient Turkic written monuments (the Orkhon–Yenisei inscriptions and *Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk*) provide valuable information about this process.

Ancient Turkic period: Names were associated with natural phenomena and animals: Qor, Qutlug‘, Yulduz, Bo‘ri, Qaplan; Names denoting bravery and power were widespread: Alp, Batur, Tegin. Mahmud al-Kashgari wrote: “The Turks often gave their children names denoting strength and power, because they believed that a name influences one’s destiny” [Mahmud al-Kashgari, 1072/1982, p. 117].

Islamic period: From the 8th century onward, Arabic religious names were adopted: Muhammad, Ali, Hasan, Husayn, Abdullah; Under the influence of Persian-Tajik culture, names such as Rustam, Dilorom, and Gulnora became widespread.

Khanate period: Names reflecting local traditions: Qo‘chqor, To‘xtasin, Bo‘riboy; Religious titles and honorifics: Xo‘ja, Qori, Eshon.

Soviet period: Ideologically motivated names: Oktabr, Kim, Sotsial, Leninbek; Hybrid forms combining Russian and European names: Anvarbek, Ruslanbek. Independence period: Revival of ancient Turkic names: Shiroq, Alp, Barchin; National and religious awakening: Islom, Ozodbek, Mustaqil. The stages of Turkic anthroponyms are directly connected with the political and religious life and culture of the people, and their semantics clearly reflect changes within society [Holmatov, 2010].

Comparative Aspects of Indo-European and Turkic Anthroponyms Comparative analysis shows that there are both similarities and differences in the formation of Indo-European and Turkic anthroponyms.

Similarities and Differences between Indo-European and Turkic Anthroponyms. Similarities: In both groups, personal names originally associated with natural phenomena and the animal world were widespread;

The religious–mythological layer occupies a central position in both systems; Names expressing warfare, power, and strength constitute a dominant semantic field.

Differences: While names of deities and mythological figures are more frequent in Indo-European anthroponyms, Turkic names tend to emphasize nature and symbols of strength and power;

Two-component (composite) names are widespread in Slavic and Germanic traditions (Vladislav, Gertrud), whereas such formations are rare in the Turkic tradition;

During the Islamic period, Arabic religious names came to dominate completely among Turkic peoples, whereas Indo-European peoples did not develop a single, unified religious anthroponymic layer. Thus, the formation of Indo-European and Turkic anthroponyms occurred in close connection with historical, religious, and social processes. Their similarities reflect the shared worldview and values of humanity, while their differences indicate cultural and regional specificities. Anthroponyms represent the linguocultural memory of peoples, and their comparative study is important not only for linguistics but also for history, ethnology, and cultural studies.

Persian-Tajik, Arabic, and Indo-European Layers in Uzbek Anthroponyms The Role of the Persian-Tajik Layer Personal names borrowed from the Persian-Tajik language occupy a special place in the formation of Uzbek anthroponymy.

This is due to the long-standing and close interaction of the peoples of Central Asia with Persian-Tajik culture and literature over many centuries.

Examples: Rustam, Suhrob, Bahrom, Dilorom, Gulnora, Shirin. These names are widely found in the Shahnameh and other Persian-Tajik epic sources.

Sh. R. Rahmatullayev notes: “Names borrowed from the Persian-Tajik language constitute the poetic and aesthetic layer of the Uzbek anthroponymic stock. They became especially widespread through literature and folklore” [Rahmatullayev, 1990, p. 132].

Main characteristics of Persian-Tajik personal names: Aesthetic and figurative semantics (Gulchehra — “beautiful-faced,” Dilshod — “joyful heart”);

Wide dissemination through epic and heroic figures (Rustam, Siyovush);

Formation of hybrid structures through combination with Arabic names (e.g., Aliyor, Abdushukur, combining Arabic and Persian elements). The Role of the Arabic Layer From the 8th century onward, with the spread of Islam, Arabic personal names became the principal anthroponymic layer of the Uzbek people. Today, the largest proportion of Uzbek personal names has Arabic etymological roots.

Examples: Muhammad, Ahmad, Abdullah, Ismail, Yusuf, Zaynab, Fatima.

The distinctive feature of this layer is that Arabic personal names were accepted as a religious and spiritual component and became fundamental naming traditions in social life. V. A. Nikonov writes: “Among Muslim peoples, Arabic names function not only as religious markers but also as symbols of political and cultural unity” [Nikonov, 1974, p. 201].

Arabic personal names in the Uzbek language have developed in the following directions: Names based on religious foundations: Muhammad, Abdullah, Abdurrahman; Names of prophets and companions: Ismail, Yusuf, Ali, Umar; Names derived from religious terms: Imam, Qori, Eshon. In addition, Arabic names have combined with Persian-Tajik and Turkic elements to form new hybrid names (Shamsiddin, Nuriddin, Abdulqodir).

REFERENCES:

1. Sh, A. S., Turabayeva, M., & Ruzmetova, D. A. (2025). NEMIS TILIDAGI BIR KOMPONENTLI VA KO‘P KOMPONENTLI YURIDIK TERMINLAR TARJIMASI. *Pedagogy*, 1, 2-4.
2. Sh, A. S., Turabayeva, M., & Ruzmetova, D. A. (2025). NEMIS TILIDAGI SOF YURIDIK TERMINLAR TASNIFI VA LEKSIK XUSUSIYATLARI. *Journal of Modern Educational Achievements*, 2, 2-4.
3. Kadambayevna, A. N., Shanazarovich, A. S., & Atabayevna, R. D. (2023). NEMIS TILSHUNOSLIGIDA FRAZEOLOGIK BIRLIKLARNING LINGVISTIK TADQIQI. *Innovation: The journal of Social Sciences and Researches*, 1(5).
4. Атажанов, Ш. Ш. (2023). НЕМИС ТИЛИ ФРАЗЕОЛОГИК ИБОРАЛАРИНИНГ ТАРКИБИЙ ВАРИАЦИЯСИ. *Innovation: The journal of Social Sciences and Researches*, 1(4), 110-112.
5. Mahmudov R., Atajanov Sh., Ruzmatova D.A. (2024). Turkiy qavmlarda shaxsga ism berish an’analari va motivlari. XORAZM MA’MUN AKADEMIYASI AXBOROTNOMASI –4/4-2024.
6. Шамуратова, Н. Ш., Рузметова, Д. А., Саттарова, Н. А., & Нуруллаев, С. Х. (2024). ЖИРОНОКИСЛОТНЫЙ СОСТАВ ЛИПИДОВ ЗЕРНОВОГО СОРГО (SORGHUM) ВИДА «КАТТА-БАШ». *International Journal of Education, Social Science & Humanities*, 12(4), 1238-1245.
7. Sh, S. N., Ro’zmetova, O. S., Xusinbayev, I. D., & Sh, A. S. (2024). SURUNKALI BUYRAK KASALLIGIDA GIPOAZOTEMIK DORI VOSITALARINING TA’SIR SAMARADORLIGINI O’RGANISH ORQALI DAVONI MUQOBILLASHTIRISH.
8. Абаев, В. И. Историко-этимологический словарь. — М., 1979.
9. Holmatov, A. O‘zbek antroponimikasining asosiy bosqichlari. — Toshkent, 2010.
10. Mahmud Koshg‘ariy. Devonu lug‘otit-turk. — Toshkent, 1982.