FACTORS IN THE DIFFUSION OF NICKNAMES IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH[10]

Xusinova Shahodat Xusin qizi
Teacher of the department of
English language and literature,
Urgench State University,
Urgench, Uzbekistan
E-mail: xusinovashahodat@gmail.com
ORCID ID: 0000-0001-7750-677X

ABSTRACT	KEY WORDS
Anthroponyms are undoubtedly present in the lexical wealth of all languages, helping to distinguish individuals and express their unique characteristics. Nicknames, a type of anthroponym, reflect the national values of the people who use them and the relationships between ethnic groups. The formation and spread of nicknames, alongside the process of language development over centuries, can be traced back to ancient times. This article analyzes the factors contributing to the distribution of nicknames in Uzbek and English languages based on a comparative-theoretical approach. The research aims to identify cultural, social, and historical determinants influencing the formation and popularization of nicknames. The methodology employs comparative-typological, historical-descriptive, discursive-pragmatic, and onomastic methods of analysis. Results indicate that both languages exhibit similarities in occupational, regional, and mediatization factors. Differences are observed in the numerical predominance of clan and tribe-based nicknames in the Uzbek language, while in English, nicknames formed under the influence of political media are more common. Additionally, the phenomenon of self-designated nicknames spreading in the internet environment is highlighted as a contemporary trend. The article emphasizes that nicknames remain a stable means of cultural identification and social navigation, maintaining functional adaptability even in the context of the global information space.	

O'ZBEK VA INGLIZ TILLARIDA LAQABLARNING TARQALISH OMILLARI

Xusinova Shahodat Xo'sin qizi
Urganch davlat universiteti,
Ingliz tili va adabiyoti
kafedrasi o'qituvchisi,
Urganch, O'zbekiston
E-mail: xusinovashahodat@gmail.com
ORCID ID: 0000-0001-7750-677X

ANNOTATSIYA	KALIT SO'ZLAR
Barcha tillarning lug'aviy boyligi tarkibida albatta antroponimlar mavjud bo'lib, ular insonlarni farqlashda va o'ziga xos xususiyatlarini ifoda qilishda yordam beradi. Aynan antroponimlarning bir turi bo'lgan laqablar ham foydalanuvchi xalqning milliy qadriyatlari va elatlarning bir-biriga bo'lgan o'zaro munosabatlarini ko'rsatib beradi. Asrlar davomida tillarning shakllanish jarayoni bilan birgalikda laqablarning ham shakllanib, tarqalishi qadim asrlarga borib taqaladi. Ushbu maqola o'zbek va ingliz tillarida laqablarning tarqalish omillarini qiyosiy-nazariy yondashuv asosida tahlil qiladi. Tadqiqotning maqsadi laqablarning shakllanishi va ommalashuviga ta'sir etuvchi madaniy, ijtimoiy va tarixiy determinantlarni aniqlashdir. Metodologiya sifatida qiyosiy-tipologik, tarixiy-deskriptiv, diskursiv-pragmatik va onomastik tahlil usullari qo'llandi. Natijalar shuni ko'rsatadiki, ikkala til ham kasb-hunar, hududiy va mediatizatsiya omillarida o'xshashliklarini namoyon etadi. Farqlar esa urug', qabila asosli laqablarning o'zbek tilida son jihatdan ustunligi, ingliz tilida esa siyosiy-medianing ta'sirida shakllangan laqablar ko'p uchrashida ko'rinadi. Shuningdek, internet muhitida o'z-o'zini nomlash laqablarning tarqalishning xususiyati zamon ko'rsatkichlarida yoritildi. Laqablar madaniy identifikatsiya va ijtimoiy navigatsiyaning barqaror vositasi bo'lib, global axborot maydoni sharoitida ham funksional moslashuvchanlikni saqlab qolayotgani ta'kidlanadi.	Laqab, antroponimiya, onomastika, mediatizatsiya, honorifik tizim, qiyosiy tahlil, ijtimoiy indeksatsiya, folklore, internet nik, diskurs.

ФАКТОРЫ РАСПРОСТРАНЕНИЯ ПРОЗВИЩ В УЗБЕКСКОМ И АНГЛИЙСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ

Хусинова Шаходат Хусин кизи
преподаватель
кафедры английского языка и литературы,
Ургенчский государственный университет,
Ургенч, Узбекистан
E-mail: xusinovashahodat@gmail.com
ORCID ID: 0000-0001-7750-677X

АННОТАЦИЯ	**КЛЮЧЕВЫЕ СЛОВА**

В лексическом составе любого языка обязательно присутствуют антропонимы, которые помогают различать людей, выражая их уникальные характеристики. Прозвища, являющиеся одним из видов антропонимов, также отражают национальные ценности народа-носителя и взаимоотношения между этносами. Образование и распространение прозвищ, наряду с процессом формирования языков, уходит корнями в древние времена. В данной статье на основе сравнительно-теоретического подхода анализируются факторы, влияющие на распространение прозвищ в узбекском и английском языках. Целью исследования является установление культурных, социальных и исторических детерминант, влияющих на образование и популяризацию прозвищ. В качестве методологии применялись сравнительно-типологический, историко-дескриптивный, дискурсивно-прагматический и ономастический методы анализа. Результаты исследования показывают, что в обоих языках на распространенность прозвищ оказывают влияние профессиональные, территориальные и медийные факторы. Различия проявляются в количественном преобладании в узбекском языке прозвищ на основе рода и племени, в то время как в английском языке чаще встречаются прозвища, сформированные под влиянием политических медиа. Также в контексте временных показателей освещены особенности распространения самоназваний в интернет-среде. Подчеркивается, что прозвища являются устойчивым средством культурной идентификации и социальной навигации и сохраняют функциональную адаптивность даже в условиях глобального информационного пространства.

КЛЮЧЕВЫЕ СЛОВА: Прозвище, антропонимия, ономастика, медиация, honorific-система, сравнительный анализ, социальная индексация, фольклор, интернет-ник, дискурс.

INTRODUCTION

From the moment a person comes into this world until the end of life, language is the primary means of communication, and it is one of the most precious blessings bestowed upon us by God. In everyday discourse, it enables the exchange of ideas and crucially passes our people's rich spiritual and cultural heritage from one generation to the next. Every language's lexicon includes anthroponyms, which serve to differentiate individuals and express their distinctive qualities. Within the lexical wealth of every language, anthroponyms are necessarily present, they help distinguish individuals and express certain distinctive features. Nicknames, as a particular type of anthroponym, likewise reveal the national values of the community that uses them and the mutual relations among ethnic groups. Alongside the historical development of languages, the formation and spread of nicknames also trace back to ancient times. In his "Ismlarning sirli olami." E.Begmatov characterizes given names and nicknames as "monuments of culture" repositories of historical, cultural-spiritual, geo-environmental, and ethnographic knowledge. (Begmatov E., 2014, 29). In other words, anthroponyms are not merely arbitrary labels, they function as durable cultural artifacts that encode collective memory, local knowledge, and social experience. Historically, name-giving practices were motivated by observable and socially salient features. People bestowed names on one another with reference to outward appearance (e.g., distinctive physical traits), patterns of character and behavior, and affiliation with particular clans, lineages, or communities. Over time, as personal names became conventionalized and certain forms recurred across generations, the repeated use of the same given name inevitably produced homonymy within speech communities. To resolve this practical problem of identification, additional appellations ***nicknames*** emerged as a secondary naming layer. These auxiliary names circulated first in oral exchange, diffusing through everyday interaction, and gradually stabilized as recognizable social identifiers. Building on this premise, the present study sets out to explain the principal factors through which nicknames disseminate in Uzbek and English. At a general level, the spread and consolidation of nicknames are decisively shaped by

cultural norms including traditional values, evaluative stereotypes, and social dynamics such as group membership and social control norms. By foregrounding these cultural, social, and historical determinants, we aim to show how nicknaming practices both reflect and reproduce broader configurations of identity, authority, and belonging in the two linguistic environments.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Among Uzbek linguists, E. Begmatov in his mography explained uzbek nicknames and semantic meaning of the term (Begmatov, 1995, 12), R. Khudoynazarov in his dissertation dialectal and folk nicknames of uzbek culture (Khudoynazarov, 1998, 45), and dialectal anthroponymy was throughly described by S. Rahimov in his investigations. He devoted a chapter to the nicknames of Khorezm dialectal nicknames (Rahimov, 1998. 37). They have conducted scholarly research on Uzbek anthroponymy and have made substantial contributions to the flourishing of Uzbek naming practices. Among Russian linguists, the studies of A. O. Leonovich (Leonovich, 2002, 34-36) and A. V. Superanskaya (Superanskaya, 1988, 8-19) kategorized russian nicknames into several subgroups, and E. S. Manchenko(Manchenko, 2008) constitute rich sources on English anthroponymic nicknames. It is no exaggeration to say that the research of Edwin Lawson and Jane Morgan (Morgan, O'Neil, & Harré, 1979) has likewise made a significant contribution to English onomastics.

MAIN PART

Broadly speaking, the spread of nicknames in Uzbek and English has been shaped by cultural, social, and historical forces. The principal diffusion factors are:

1) Territorial and geographic affiliation

2) Oral tradition and customary practice

3) Clan/tribal membership and social organization

4) Occupation and social status

5) Historical and religious factors

6) Trade, migration, and warfare

7) Written literature and oral folklore

8) Mass media (television, radio, newspapers, magazines)

9) The internet, social media, film, and sport

10) Satire and humor

In Uzbek, territorial reference is one of the earliest and most productive bases for nickname diffusion. Turkish-speaking communities have long appended a place-based label to, or in place of, the personal name for instance, *Xorazmiy, Buxoriy, Shermat xivali, Roʻzmat manaq.* Such forms facilitate rapid social indexing and disambiguation. Comparable patterns occur in English: *Yorker "from York", Avon Willy "William Shakespeare of Stratford-upon-Avon", Londner "from London",* as well as ethnonyms functioning as by-names (e.g., Chesky "Czech"). Our observations suggest territorial nicknaming is more pervasive in Uzbek than in English, and the dialectal/oral channel is especially important for its spread. Because nicknames circulate most readily in spoken interaction (especially dialectal speech), oral tradition and customary gatherings are central in both languages. In Uzbek contexts, mahalla, weddings, and public festivities seed and propagate nicknames; (Qodirova, 2023, 43) in English settings, small friendship groups and local communities play an analogous role. (Morgan, O'Neil, & Harré, 1979, 87). Early in both traditions, nicknames could precede or condition the stabilization of given names, and family-internal usage often catalyzed broader diffusion. Uzbek anthroponymy preserves numerous relational nicknames signaling lineage or tribal affiliation. As Begmatov notes, prior to the October Revolution it was common to append the bearer's tribe or ethnicity after the given name; forms such as *barlos, doʻrmon, jaloyir, mangʻit, mingli, toʻrgʻay, turk, chigʻatoy, oʻzbek, qilich, qiyot, qatagʻon, qarluq, qipchoq, janoq, kenagas, sariq, saroy, as well as moʻgul, qaraqalpoq, qalmoq, qozoq, arab, tojik, hindu, tatar* index such affiliations (Begmatov, 1995, 12). By contrast, English social organization historically emphasized individualism; while a hereditary aristocracy existed, a clan-based onomastic layer is far less salient than in Uzbek practice. Occupational reference is a cross-linguistically robust driver of nickname formation and diffusion. In both Uzbek and English, professions and ranks readily surface as by-names in everyday

interaction, offering efficient cues to social role and esteem. Begmatov classifies religiously based Uzbek nicknames as relational and notes that they typically do not denote a trade; rather, they function as honorifics transmitted across generations: *vali, mulla, domla, mufti, maxsum, mutavvali, oxun, pir, so'fi, xo'ja, xalfa, eshon, shayx, xoji, qora, etc. Thus mahdum → mahdum (son), xo'ja → xo'ja (descendants),* an inheritance pattern that survives to the present (Begmatov, 1995, 17). English likewise affords religiously tinged nicknames or by-names—e.g., *Abbot, Bishop, Pilgrim, (John) Baptist, Saint Thomas* - which can invoke ecclesiastical standing or the commemorative aura of sacred history. (Delahunty, 2007, 121).

In The Canterbury Tales, each tale is recounted by a representative of a particular social group, and the narrators are identified not by personal names but by nicknames/titles: for example, The Knight's Tale, The Merchant's Tale, The Miller's Tale, and The Shipman's Tale. In these narratives, individual names are not used; instead, the characters are designated by their trade or activity, functioning effectively as nicknames. Throughout the work, Chaucer conveys the characteristics of the country's social classes by means of personal names and nicknames. For instance, The Knight is a character representing the highest estate in society, depicted as an honorable and respected warrior of the realm; his designation, The Knight, signals his social standing. At the same time, Chaucer, criticizing injustice and disorder, interprets members of the social orders through a stylistic palette dominated by humor, irony, and satire. In particular, The Friar - as a designation - often serves to expose injustice and deceit within the religious estate, referring to a figure who exploits a religious vocation for personal gain and thereby betrays public trust. In The Miller's Tale, the central figure John, "the carpenter", bears a designation that marks him as a simple village laborer; through this character and tale, Chaucer exposes the spread of moral corruption in society. Another designation foregrounded in the collection is The Cook Roger and his apprentice Perkin; the story illustrates how drunkenness and moral dissolution are strongly condemned in society. Other labels such as Clerk, Summoner, and Miller likewise occur throughout Chaucer's tales.

Interethnic contact via caravan trade, migration, and conquest introduces new personal designations and spreads existing ones. In Uzbek, commerce generated occupational nicknames such as *karvonchi, zargar, choychi, qozonchi*, and outsiders might be labeled with ethnonymic by-names (*iroqiy, xitoylik*). (Uzbek Language Explanatory Dictionary Editorial Board, 2006–2008).English historical sources show parallel mercantile labels *(merchant, spicer, hawker, draper)* ("Oxford English Dictionary," n.d.). Military valor also yields laudatory epithets in both traditions: Uzbek: *botir, jasur, shonli;* English: *Lionheart, the Brave.*

Both Uzbek and English literary canons and folk traditions are rich repositories of nicknames. Uzbek epics and narratives - Alpomish, Rustam, To'maris - contain numerous figurative by-names; modern prose by Abdulla Qahhor, Said Ahmad, G'afur G'ulom likewise popularizes memorable sobriquets. In English, Chaucer, Shakespeare, Defoe, and Swift integrate humorous or satirical epithets that pass into common parlance. As Sifakis notes, written versus oral nicknames may differ in psychological/physical descriptiveness and in their linkage to professional roles (Sifakis, 1984, 76).

From the nineteenth and especially the twentieth century onward, newspapers, magazines, radio, and television dramatically accelerated nickname diffusion - particularly for political leaders and public figures in English (where such epithets often become fossilized in public discourse). In Uzbek, intensive media-driven spread becomes especially visible from the 1960s.

In the twenty-first century, digital platforms have transformed nickname ecology. User-selected nicknames (nicknames / "handles") often diverge markedly from legal names and may shift with persona, mood, or context. Unlike many traditional nicknames assigned by others, online by-names are typically self-chosen and broadcast at scale. Film, music, and sport - high-salience attention markets - have further entrenched celebrity epithets, a trend particularly conspicuous in English, where entire lexica of sports and entertainment nicknames have been compiled.

Satire functions as a potent vehicle for evaluative nicknaming in literate publics. Where direct criticism is face-threatening or constrained, humorous labeling targets perceived flaws in political leaders, public officials, or morally transgressive figures. Salience, memorability, and repeatability enable such labels to circulate rapidly and stick (Pashkevich, 2006, 2-5).

In Uzbek culture, nicknames are commonly formed on the basis of a person's physical appearance (Qoraqul, Do'mbira), behavior (Shum bola, Bevafo), social standing (Mulla Qodir, Temirchi), or memorable life circumstances. Such appellations not only differentiate an individual from others, but also reveal the people's penchant for humor, irony, and figurative thought. Within Uzbek society, nicknames chiefly index communal spirit, intimacy, human warmth, and a vernacular, down-to-earth ethos. At the same time, some nicknames are linked to historical events, religious beliefs, and ethnic elements, thereby reflecting the nation's spiritual heritage.

By contrast, in English culture nicknames are more closely tied to personal individuality, social status, and public prominence. For example, metaphorical sobriquets for politicians *(Iron Lady - Margaret Thatcher),* popular epithets for athletes *(Golden Balls - David Beckham),* or hypocoristic shortenings (*William - Will/Bill)* are widely used. This pattern highlights the salience of personal freedom, individualism, and prevailing social stereotypes in English society.

In both cultures, however, nicknames function as a medium that expresses a people's moral world, values, customs, and social psychology; through them, national mentality, collective memory, and socio-cultural stereotypes become manifest. Accordingly, a comparative analysis of nicknaming practices in Uzbek and English cultures is significant not only for linguistics, but also for cultural studies and psychology.

CONCLUSION

In sum, Uzbek and English exhibit both convergences and divergences in the diffusion of nicknames. Convergences include territorial marking, occupational reference, and the role of literature/media. Divergences reflect distinct social formations: the Uzbek preservation of tribal/lineage indexing versus its relative absence in English; differences in religious honorific transmission; and varying channels and tempos of media uptake. Across both traditions, however, historical events, eminent figures (khans, kings, statesmen), and salient cultural scripts have consistently served as engines of nickname formation and spread.

REFERENCES

1. Begmatov, E. (1995). O'zbek antroponomikasi [Uzbek anthroponymy]. Candidate of Philology dissertation, Tashkent.

2. Rahimov, S. M. (1998). Xorazm mintaqaviy antroponomikasi [Regional anthroponymy of Khorezm]. Candidate of Philology dissertation, Urgench.

3. Khudoynazarov, I. (1998). Antroponimlarning til lug'at tizimidagi o'rni va ularning semantik-uslubiy xususiyatlari [The place of anthroponyms in the lexical system and their semantic-stylistic properties]. Candidate of Philology dissertation, Tashkent.

4. Leonovich, A. O. (2002). В мире английских имен [In the world of English names]. Moscow.

5. Superanskaya, A. V. (1988). К проблеме типологии антропонимических основ [On the typology of anthroponymic bases]. Moscow: Nauka.

6. Manchenko, E. S. (2008). Лингвокультурные и структурно-функциональные характеристики английских прозвищ [Linguocultural and structural-functional characteristics of English nicknames]. PhD dissertation, Astrakhan.

7. Qodirova, X. M. (2023). Xorazm shevalaridagi laqablarning struktur-semantik va funksional xususiyatlari[Structural-semantic and functional features of nicknames in Khorezm dialects].PhD dissertation, Khorezm.

8. Opie, I., & Opie, P. (1987). The lore and language of schoolchildren. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

9. Morgan, J., O'Neil, C., & Harré, R. (1979). Nicknames: Their origins and social consequences. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

10. Delahunty, A. (2007). Golden Balls and the Iron Lady: A Little Book of Nicknames. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

11. Uzbek Language Explanatory Dictionary Editorial Board. (2006-2008). O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati [Explanatory dictionary of the Uzbek language] (Vols. 1–5). Tashkent: National Encyclopedia of Uzbekistan.

12. Oxford English Dictionary. (n.d.). OED Online. Oxford University Press. https://www.oed.com (Accessed: October 1, 2025)

13. Sifakis, C. (1984). The dictionary of historic nicknames: A who's who of nicknames from world history. New York, NY: Facts On File.

14. Pashkevich, A. A. (2006). Структурные особенности сложных прозвищ и кличек [Structural features of complex nicknames and bynames]. Vestnik of Chuvash University: Humanities.