Philology Matters / ISSN: 1994 – 4233 / E-ISSN: 2181–1237
Uzbekistan State World Languages University
2026 Vol. 1 No. M 2/1
LINGUISTICS
MAXSUS SON

Ezozkhon Rakhimova – researcher

Termez University of Economy and Service (Surkhandarya, Uzbekistan)
E-mail: rakhimovae@gmail.uz
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0005-9426-4561

A LINGUISTIC STUDY OF ETHNONYMS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Abstract. This study explores ethnonyms as significant linguistic units that reflect national identity, cultural heritage, and social values in English and Uzbek languages. Using a comparative approach, the research analyzes the structural, semantic, and pragmatic features of ethnonyms, as well as their role in discourse and intercultural communication. The methodology combines comparative, semantic, and discourse analysis based on data from dictionaries, academic sources, and real-life language use. The findings reveal that English ethnonyms tend to be more standardized and structurally stable due to the global status of the language, while Uzbek ethnonyms demonstrate greater variability influenced by historical, phonetic, and sociolinguistic factors. Overall, the research emphasizes the importance of ethnonyms in shaping social perception and facilitating intercultural communication, contributing to a deeper understanding of linguistic and cultural interaction.

Key words: ethnonym, linguistics, semantics, comparative analysis, English, Uzbek, culture, discourse, identity

E'zozkhon Rakhimova – tadqiqotchi
Termiz iqtisodiyot va servis universiteti (Surxondaryo, O'zbekiston)

INGLIZ VA O'ZBEK TILLARIDA ETNONIMLARNING LINGVISTIK TADQIQI

Annotatsiya. Mazkur tadqiqot ingliz va o'zbek tillarida milliy identitet, madaniy meros hamda ijtimoiy qadriyatlarni aks ettiruvchi muhim lingvistik birliklar (etnonim) larga bag'ishlangan. Tadqiqotda qiyosiy yondashuv asosida etnonimlarning strukturaviy, semantik va pragmatik xususiyatlari, shuningdek, ularning diskurs va madaniyatlararo kommunikatsiyadagi o'rni tahlil qilinadi. Metodologiya sifatida qiyosiy, semantik va diskurs tahlili qo'llanilib, ma'lumotlar lug'atlar, ilmiy manbalar hamda real nutqiy misollar asosida o'rganildi. Natijalar shuni ko'rsatadiki, ingliz tilidagi etnonimlar tilning global mavqei tufayli ko'proq standartlashgan va strukturaviy jihatdan barqarordir, o'zbek tilidagi etnonimlar esa tarixiy, fonetik va sotsiolingvistik omillar ta'sirida ko'proq variativlikka ega. Umuman olganda, tadqiqot etnonimlarning ijtimoiy tasavvurni shakllantirish va samarali madaniyatlararo muloqotni ta'minlashdagi ahamiyatini ochib beradi hamda til va madaniyat o'zaro aloqasini chuqurroq anglashga xizmat qiladi.

Kalit so'zlar: etnonim, lingvistika, semantika, qiyosiy tahlil, ingliz tili, o'zbek tili, madaniyat, diskurs

Эъзозхон Рахимова – исследователь
Термезский университет экономики и сервиса (Сурхандарья, Узбекистан)

ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКОЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЕ ЭТНОНИМОВ В АНГЛИЙСКОМ И УЗБЕКСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ

Аннотация. Данное исследование посвящено этнонимам как значимым языковым единицам, отражающим национальную идентичность, культурное наследие и социальные ценности в английском и узбекском языках. В рамках сравнительного подхода анализируются структурные, семантические и прагматические особенности этнонимов, а также их роль в дискурсе и межкультурной коммуникации. Методология исследования включает сравнительный, семантический и дискурсивный анализ на основе данных словарей, научных источников и примеров из реального языкового употребления. Результаты показывают, что этнонимы в английском языке характеризуются большей стандартизированностью и структурной стабильностью, что обусловлено глобальным статусом языка, тогда как узбекские этнонимы демонстрируют большую вариативность, обусловленную историческими, фонетическими и социолингвистическими факторами. В целом исследование подчеркивает важность этнонимов в формировании социального восприятия и обеспечении эффективной межкультурной коммуникации, способствуя более глубокому пониманию языкового и культурного взаимодействия.

Ключевые слова: этноним, лингвистика, семантика, сравнительный анализ, английский язык, узбекский язык, культура, дискурс.

INTRODUCTION

In modern linguistics, ethnonyms occupy a significant place as linguistic units reflecting national identity, cultural heritage, and historical development of a particular ethnic group. Ethnonyms are not merely names of peoples or nations, but they also function as carriers of socio-cultural meanings and communicative values (Coyle et al., 2010). In both English and Uzbek languages, all types of onyms demonstrate unique structural, semantic, and pragmatic features (Gaubullayeva, 2026). The increasing globalization and intercultural communication have intensified the importance of studying ethnonyms from a comparative perspective. This research aims to analyze ethnonyms in English and Uzbek languages, focusing on their linguistic characteristics, usage in discourse, and their role in shaping identity.

Ethnonyms represent a unique category of lexical units that reflect not only linguistic structures but also cultural, historical, and social dimensions of a language. In both English and Uzbek languages, ethnonyms function as markers of identity and play a significant role in shaping intercultural communication (Cummins, 2000). From a cultural perspective, ethnonyms are deeply rooted in historical narratives and collective memory. For instance, ethnonyms such as “Uzbek,” “English,” or “Turk” are not merely labels but symbols of cultural heritage and national identity. They carry implicit meanings associated with traditions, values, and social norms (Hymes, 1972). The study also reveals that ethnonyms are essential in shaping social perception and communication (Halliday, 1978).

In English, ethnonyms tend to be standardized and globally recognized due to the widespread use of the language in international communication. This standardization facilitates cross-cultural interaction but may also lead to the simplification of complex cultural identities. For example, the term “Asian” is often used broadly in English discourse, whereas in reality it encompasses a wide range of distinct ethnic groups and cultures. In contrast, Uzbek ethnonyms often preserve more specific cultural and regional meanings. They are closely connected with historical and geographical contexts, reflecting the diversity of Central Asian ethnic groups. For example, ethnonyms such as “qoraqalpoq,” “tojik,” or “qirg‘iz” not only denote ethnic groups but also evoke particular cultural associations and historical backgrounds (Canale & Swain, 1980)

METHODOLOGY

An ethnonym is a linguistic unit, and it does not appear in language randomly or suddenly Because they are formed with the help of human relationships reflecting a language (Aida, 2022). met in a language. The study of ethnonyms has been widely discussed in linguistic and sociological research. This research employs comparative analysis, semantic analysis, and discourse analysis.

The data is collected from dictionaries, academic sources, and real-life discourse examples. The methodological framework is based on mod-

ern linguistic theories, including pragmatics and discourse analysis. From a morphological perspective, English ethnonyms often follow specific patterns, suffixes -ian, -ese, -ish (American, Chinese, English). In the Uzbek language, suffixes -lik, -lar (o‘zbeklar, ruslar). Phonetic adaptation also plays a key role. For instance, “English” (ingliz), “Russian” (rus). This shows how languages adapt foreign ethnonyms according to their phonological systems.

RESULTS

The research findings indicate that ethnonyms in English and Uzbek languages demonstrate both structural and functional differences, while at the same time reflecting shared communicative and cultural roles. The analysis reveals several important tendencies related to linguistic structure, variability, pragmatics, and discourse.

Firstly, ethnonyms in English are structurally stable and standardized. Due to the long history of linguistic codification and the global role of English, ethnonyms tend to follow fixed morphological patterns and are widely recognized across different contexts. This stability ensures clarity and consistency in both written and spoken communication, especially in international discourse.

In contrast, Uzbek ethnonyms show greater variability in form and usage. This variability is influenced by historical development, phonetic adaptation, and the interaction of multiple languages, including Russian and English. As a result, different forms of the same ethnonym may coexist, reflecting the dynamic nature of the Uzbek linguistic system.

Secondly, both languages reflect cultural identity through ethnonyms. Ethnonyms serve as markers of national, ethnic, and cultural belonging. They are closely associated with traditions, historical memory, and social values. In both English and Uzbek, ethnonyms contribute to the construction of identity and the representation of cultural diversity.

The research findings indicate that ethnonyms in English are structurally stable, and Uzbek ethnonyms show more variability. Both languages reflect cultural identity through ethnonyms. Ethnonyms have strong pragmatic and discursive functions

DISCUSSION

Another important aspect is the role of ethnonyms in discourse. In modern communication, especially in media and online platforms, ethnonyms can acquire new pragmatic meanings. (Hymes, 1972) Depending on the context, they may function neutrally, positively, or even negatively. This highlights the importance of pragmatic competence in understanding and using ethnonyms appropriately (Widdowson, 1990). For instance, in English discourse, ethnonyms may sometimes be associated with stereotypes or generalizations. Similarly, in Uzbek discourse, certain ethnonyms may carry evaluative connotations depending on the communicative situation. Therefore, the correct use of ethnonyms requires not only linguistic knowledge but also cultural awareness (Brown, 1983). Ethnonyms are linguistic units used to denote ethnic groups, nations, or communities (Yule, 1996). They can be classified into several categories based on their origin and structure, such as endonyms (self-names used by a group) and exonyms (names given by outsiders). For example, “Uzbek” is an endonym, and “German” is an exonym for “Deutsch”.

In English, ethnonyms often have standardized forms influenced by historical and political factors. In Uzbek, ethnonyms are often adapted phonetically and morphologically.

From a semantic perspective, ethnonyms carry both denotative and connotative meanings. For instance, the word “American” may denote nationality but also imply cultural values such as freedom or modernity.

In the Uzbek language, ethnonyms often reflect historical and geographical associations. For example, “turk”, “tojik”, and “qirg‘iz” are closely linked with regional identity.

The comparison of English and Uzbek ethnonyms reveals both similarities and differences (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). Similarities visibly appear that both languages use ethnonyms to express identity, and both reflect cultural and historical context. Differences are that English ethnonyms are more standardized, whereas Uzbek ethnonyms are more flexible and context-dependent.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, ethnonyms in English and the Uzbek language represent important linguistic and cultural phenomena. Their comparative analysis demonstrates that ethnonyms are not only lexical units but also powerful tools of identity construction and communication. Understanding ethnonyms contributes to better intercultural communication and enhances communicative competence in language learning. Pragmatically, ethnonyms can have different connotations depending on context. Thus, ethnonyms play an important role in discourse and intercultural communication.

REFERENCES

1. Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic*. Edward Arnold.
2. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago Press.
3. Widdowson, H. G. (1990). *Aspects of language teaching*. Oxford University Press.
4. Mirzayeva, A. A. (2022). From history to modern tendencies in the sphere of ethnolinguistics and topical issues in this area. *Traektoriâ Nauki*, 8(10), 2001–2007.
5. Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–47.
6. Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269–293). Penguin.
7. Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy*. Multilingual Matters.
8. Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and language integrated learning*. Cambridge University Press.
9. Dildora, G. A. (2025). “oxford dictionary of idioms” lug ‘atidagi antroponim komponentli frazeologizmlarning semantik va leksikografik tadqiqi. *«ACTA NUUz»*, *1*(1.10), 262-265.