American Journal of Philological Sciences

Structural And Derivational Aspects Of Recreational Place Names In English And Uzbek

Boltaboeva Nargizakhon Makhamadjon kizi

Independent researcher (PhD) of Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages, Andijan, Uzbekistan

Abstract: This study investigates the structural and derivational features of recreational place names in English and Uzbek, focusing on simple, derived, and compound toponyms. These place names are not only geographical identifiers but also encode the historical, cultural, and ethnolinguistic heritage of a nation. By analyzing and classifying the names of resorts in both languages, the research identifies typological similarities and differences in the formation of toponyms. The study utilizes descriptive and comparative linguistic methods, drawing on theoretical insights from leading scholars in toponymy. The results reveal that pleace names in both languages exhibit diverse lexical-semantic and morphological patterns, influenced by sociocultural and environmental factors. The article introduces the term "recreatonym" as a linguistically significant category within toponymy, providing a new lens through which such names can be understood.

Introduction: Toponymy, the study of place names, holds significant linguistic, cultural, and historical relevance. Within this field, the names of recreational destinations—referred to in this study as "recreatonyms"—are of particular interest, as they reflect not only geographic attributes but also national identity, environmental symbolism, and societal values. In both English and Uzbek, recreational place names appear in various morphological forms, shaped by specific structural and derivational rules. These toponyms go beyond the function of geographic markers; they act as cultural texts embedded with meaning.

This paper explores the morphosyntactic and semantic construction of recreational place names in English and Uzbek, focusing on three major structural types: simple, derived, and compound. For example, names like Brighton, Bath, and Cambridge in English, or Chorvoq, Shohimardon, and Zomin in Uzbek, illustrate different formation strategies that encapsulate geographic, historical, or religious nuances. By analyzing these formations, we aim to uncover both shared and unique features across the two linguistic systems.

Literature Review. The structural and derivational analysis of place names has been explored by various scholars across linguistic traditions. In Russian linguistics, A.V. Superanskaya (1973) provided a foundational classification of toponyms into simple, derived, and compound categories, emphasizing their morphological formation and syntactic integration. She noted that "toponyms are formed according to the morphological and syntactic laws of a given language."

In English toponymy, A.D. Mills (2011) and G. Room (1993) emphasized etymology and morphological structure. Mills categorized English place names according to their lexical origins, historical meanings, and grammatical composition. For instance, Blackpool combines the adjective black with the noun pool, forming a derived toponym.

Uzbek scholars, such as Sh. Rahmatullayev (1992), have likewise classified Uzbek place names based on their derivational patterns. He distinguished between simple names (Andijon, Samarqand), derived forms (Zarafshon, G'azalkent), and compound names (Qo'qon Shahri, Charvak), focusing on their morphological

complexity and lexical components. U.S. Turdimov (2002) expanded this analysis by categorizing toponyms into semantic and functional groups, including ethnonymic, hydronymic, and anthroponymic types. His structural-semantic approach aligns with global trends in socio-onomastic research, highlighting the dynamic interaction between language and societal functions.

Recent studies in linguistic geography (Hough, 2016; Tent & Blair, 2011) suggest that the naming of recreational sites is influenced by tourism, cultural memory, and environmental branding, further necessitating a nuanced analysis of these toponyms across languages.

Research Methodology. This study applies a descriptive-analytical and comparative linguistic approach to explore the structural and semantic properties of place names in English and Uzbek, focusing specifically on recreational toponyms. The methodology consists of four major phases: data collection, classification, comparative analysis, and theoretical contextualization. Each phase draws from established linguistic and onomastic frameworks developed by prominent scholars in the field.

Data Collection. A corpus of over 120 recreational place names was compiled from both English and Uzbek-speaking regions. These included historical, contemporary, and culturally significant toponyms gathered through:

• Official atlases and cartographic repositories (Ordnance Survey for England, Davlat Geodeziya Xizmatlari for Uzbekistan),

• Tourism platforms (VisitBritain, Uzbektourism.uz),

• Lexicographic databases including A Dictionary of British Place Names by A.D. Mills (2011), and O'zbekiston toponimlari lug'ati compiled under the supervision of T.J. Enazarov (2006).

Toponyms selected were those used to name parks, lakes, valleys, mountains, and resort towns — sites explicitly associated with leisure and recreation. The aim was to identify naming patterns that transcend the geographic function and reflect cultural identity.

Classification of Toponyms

The classification of toponyms follows a synthesis of models proposed by A.V. Superanskaya (1973), V.A. Nikonov (1965), and expanded by regional scholars like Sh. Rahmatullayev (1982) and U.S. Turdimov (2002). Each name was categorized according to its morphological structure, as follows:

1. Simple (Monomorphemic) Toponyms

These consist of a single root with no affixation or compounding.

English: Bath, York, Kent

Uzbek: Zomin, Chorvoq, Andijon

Superanskaya defines these as the "core toponymic units" (Superanskaya, 1973, p. 98), often the earliest in settlement naming traditions.

2. Derived (Affixational) Toponyms

These are formed via morphological processes such as suffixation, often signaling geographic or descriptive information.

English: Blackpool (black + pool), Oakham (oak + -ham)

Uzbek: G'azalkent (gazal + -kent), Qamishli (qamish + -li)

Rahmatullayev emphasized the productivity of suffixes like -kent, -obod, and -li in Uzbek, reflecting location attributes and settlement status (Rahmatullayev, 1982, pp. 67–69). Mills (2011) discusses similar morphological productivity in Old English through affixes like -ton, -ham, and -bury.

3. Compound Toponyms

These contain two or more lexical bases, frequently combining descriptive and geographic components.

English: Pleasure Island, Bournemouth Beach, Lake District

Uzbek: Yashil vodiy ("green valley"), Charvak Ko'li ("Charvak lake")

According to Eilert Ekwall (1960), such toponyms often indicate function, ownership, or landform. In Uzbek, compound names typically associate a color, flora, or symbolic noun with a natural feature (Enazarov, 2006).

4. Extended Categories (as adapted from Turdimov, 2002):

These include specialized structural variants like:

Reduplicated forms: Xo'ja Gur-Gur ota (Uzbek)

Abbreviated forms: Soho (South of Houston) or Koson (from Kosonsoy)

Thematic or metaphorical names: Paradise Island, Afrosiyob

These forms reflect deeper socio-cultural naming motivations, often rooted in folklore, religious history, or tourism marketing (Turdimov, 2002, pp. 143–147).

Comparative Framework. The comparative phase of the study analyzes the structural parallels and divergences between the two languages. Following methodologies described by Margaret Gelling (1978) and Carol Hough (2016), the study examines the interaction of morphology, semantics, and culture in toponym formation. For instance, English compound

names like Greenwich Park follow predictable adjective + noun structures, while Uzbek equivalents like Yashil vodiy display similar syntax but carry deeper environmental and cultural connotations rooted in Turkic etymology.

Theoretical Grounding: The theoretical foundation of this study is grounded in a range of authoritative contributions from both English and Uzbek onomastics and toponymy scholars. A.V. Superanskaya (1973) laid the groundwork for morphological and syntactic classification of place names by proposing a structural model that distinguishes between the etymological roots of a toponym and its functional use in communicative context. Her model highlights the dual nature of place names as both linguistic units and carriers of social meaning.

Complementing this, V.A. Nikonov (1965) introduced a tripartite semantic framework for understanding toponyms, which includes pre-toponymic (etymological and appellative), proper toponymic (literal geographical), and post-toponymic (cultural or emotional associations) layers of meaning. This model emphasizes the depth of cognitive and cultural information encoded in geographical names.

In the English tradition, A.D. Mills (2011) contributed significantly to the lexicographic and historical categorization of British place names. His dictionary provides both etymological explanations and structural analyses, illustrating the enduring influence of Old English, Celtic, and Latin elements on modern English toponyms.

In the Uzbek context, Sh. Rahmatullayev (1982) systematically applied principles of derivational morphology to the study of Uzbek place names. He identified common national affixal models such as -obod, -kent, and -li, which reflect geographic, administrative, or descriptive features within toponyms. His work set a precedent for structurally classifying Uzbek geographical names through the lens of native word-formation patterns.

Expanding on this, T.J. Enazarov (2006) explored the lexical and etymological foundations of Uzbek toponyms, examining their historical development and internal semantic stratification. His research underscores the diachronic layering of names, shaped by Turkic, Persian, and Arabic influences, and contextualized within Uzbekistan's regional geography.

Margaret Gelling (1978), a leading figure in English place-name studies, advanced the notion that many toponyms are intimately tied to physical landscape features. Her geographic-semantic model suggests that naming is not arbitrary but rather emerges from human interaction with the environment — a theory particularly relevant to recreational place names such as lakes, valleys, and parks.

Finally, Carol Hough (2016) views proper names as "cultural labels" embedded within language systems. She asserts that toponyms, particularly those related to public and recreational spaces, are vital indicators of societal values, collective memory, and linguistic identity. Taken together, these scholars contributions provide a robust theoretical framework for analyzing recreational place names. Their insights enable the structural decomposition of toponyms, the interpretation of their semantic load, and the contextualization of naming practices within broader cultural and linguistic paradigms. Through their collective lenses, this study situates Uzbek and English recreatonyms as meaningful linguistic artifacts shaped by morphology, history, geography, and social function.

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

a)   Structural Classification

English Recreatonyms

- Simple: Bath, York, Kent

- Derived: Blackpool (black + pool), Bexhill (Bex + hill)

- Compound: Lake District, Bournemouth Beach

- Abbreviated: Soho (South of Houston), Oxbridge (Oxford + Cambridge)

Uzbek Recreatonyms

- Simple: Zomin, Chorvoq

- Derived: Qamishli (qamish + -li), Soyli (soy + -li)

- Compound: Damko'l, Sho'rko'l

- Reduplicated: Xo'ja Gur-Gur ota

- Thematic: Piramida, Afrosiyob

- Abbreviated: Kosonsoy → Koson

- Descriptive phrases: Yashil vodiy (Green valley), Tog' etagi (Foothill)

These findings show that both languages rely heavily on affixation and compounding to derive toponyms. Uzbek exhibits a richer array of affixal derivation (-li, -kent, -shahr), while English tends to use compounding and abbreviation more frequently.

b)   Semantic and Etymological Aspects

English recreational names often preserve ancient Celtic or Anglo-Saxon roots (Cambridge from Cam river + bridge). Uzbek names reflect natural landscapes or cultural-historical references (Shohimardon—"place of the saint Mardon").

c)   Sociolinguistic Relevance

The development of tourism, environmental

protection, and regional branding has intensified the naming of new recreational areas, thus creating a new wave of thematically motivated toponyms. These names often serve dual functions: identifying geographic space and promoting socio-cultural identity.

CONCLUSION

The structural and derivational analysis of recreational place names in English and Uzbek reveals both universal and language-specific patterns. Both linguistic systems employ simple, derived, and compound formations, shaped by their own morphological rules and cultural semantics. Uzbek recreatonyms show greater morphological variety due to productive affixation, whereas English favors compositional structures and historical etymology.

By introducing the term "recreatonym," this study proposes a more precise linguistic category for toponyms associated with leisure and tourism. Understanding the formation of these names provides insights not only into linguistic processes but also into the socio-cultural values embedded in place naming.

Future research may explore the pragmatic, branding, and internationalization aspects of recreatonyms in multilingual settings.

REFERENCES

Superanskaya, A.V. (1973). General Toponymy. Moscow: Nauka.

Nikonov, V. A. (1965). Imya i obshchestvo [Name and Society]. Moscow: Nauka.

Gelling, M. (1978). Signposts to the Past: Place-Names and the History of England. London: Dent.

Mills, A.D. (2011). A Dictionary of British Place Names. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Boltaboeva N. M. Transliteration problems of recreational place names (toponyms) in English and Uzbek // Journal of Advanced linguistic studies. (Vol. 12, Issue 2). – India, Delhi University Bahri Publications, Jan-Jun 2025.

Room, G. (1993). Dictionary of Place Names in the British Isles. Bloomsbury.

Rahmatullayev, Sh. (1992). O'zbek tilining so'z yasalish sistemasi. Toshkent: Fan.

Turdimov, U.S. (2002). Toponimika: nazariy va amaliy masalalar. Samarqand: Samarqand Universiteti.

Enazarov, T. J. (2006). O'zbekiston toponimlari: lug'aviy asoslari va etimologik tadqiqi yo'llari. Tashkent: Fan.

Hough, C. (2016). The Oxford Handbook of Names and Naming. Oxford University Press.

Tent, J., & Blair, D. (2011). Motivations for naming: The development of a toponymic typology for Australian placenames. Names, 59(2), 67–89.