

RESULTS OF THE ANALYSIS OF MORPHOLOGICAL AND ETYMOLOGY FEATURES OF TOPONYMS

Utkir Burkhonov Farkhod oglu

*Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages
Department of Spanish and Italian Philology
Associate Professor, Doctor of Philosophy in Philological Sciences (PhD)
burkhonov@samdchti.uz
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3611-212X>*

Dinora Abduvoseyeva

*Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages
Faculty of Romance-Germanic Languages
Philology and Language Teaching (Spanish)
Direction, student of group 2215*

Annotation: This article provides a comparative analysis of the morphological and etymological features of Spanish and Uzbek toponyms. During the study, the structural composition of toponyms of both languages, word formation models, used morphemes and their semantic properties were studied. Also, historical, cultural and geographical factors that influenced the formation of toponymic systems were analyzed. The results of the study showed that Spanish toponyms were formed mainly under the influence of Latin and Arabic language layers, while elements of Turkic, Persian and Arabic languages play an important role in Uzbek toponyms. As a result of the comparative analysis, common and different aspects between toponyms of both languages were identified, and their connection with historical development and cultural heritage was highlighted. The results obtained serve to enrich research in the fields of onomastics, historical linguistics and comparative linguistics.

Keywords: Spanish toponyms, Uzbek toponyms, toponymy, morphological analysis, etymological analysis.

Toponyms, as linguistic units denoting geographical objects, represent an important layer of the lexical system of the language and serve as valuable sources for the study of historical, cultural and linguistic processes. The analysis of place names allows researchers to observe the interaction between language and society, to reveal how geographical features, historical events, ethnic composition and cultural traditions are reflected in naming practice. Therefore, toponymy plays an important role in onomastics and historical linguistics. The morphological and etymological study of toponyms is very important, as it reveals the structural mechanisms and semantic motivations that underlie the formation of place names. While morphological analysis focuses on word-formation patterns, including the use of roots, suffixes, compounds and syntactic constructions, etymological analysis studies the historical

origin of toponyms and the linguistic layers that influenced their development over time. Together, these approaches provide a comprehensive understanding of how toponymic systems develop and function in different languages.

Spanish and Uzbek toponyms, due to their unique typological features and rich historical origins, provide a fruitful field for comparative linguistic analysis. Spanish toponymy is shaped by multiple linguistic layers, including Latin and Arabic influences, which are reflected in prefixes, suffixes, and compound structures. In contrast, Uzbek toponyms are largely derived from Turkic roots, with significant contributions from Persian and Arabic, and are often associated with geographical features, tribal names, professions, and socio-historical contexts. By examining selected examples from both toponymic systems, the study seeks to highlight the role of toponyms as linguistic markers of historical continuity and cultural heritage.

Main Part

1. Morphological structure of Spanish and Uzbek toponyms.

The morphological structure of toponyms in Spanish and Uzbek reflects the typological characteristics of each language. As a Romance language, Spanish mainly uses suffixes, conjunctions, articles and prepositions, while Uzbek, an agglutinative Turkic language, relies heavily on suffixes and lexical bases derived from nouns and adjectives.

In Spanish toponymy, suffixes such as -a, -ia, -ero and -al are often used to form place names. For example, the toponym Valencia comes from the Latin name Valentia and means “strength”, “power”. This name was given to a colony founded in Roman times and later, as a result of phonetic changes, took the form of modern Valencia.

Granada, on the other hand, reflects historical and cultural stratification under the influence of Arabic sources. Complex structures are also common, as seen in Puerto Rico (puerto “port” + rico “rich”), where semantic transparency is directly related to geographical and economic features.

In contrast, Uzbek toponyms are often formed by the combination of a lexical root and productive suffixes such as -tepa, -obod, -kent, and -qishloq. For example, Yunusobod (Yunus + -obod) denotes a settlement associated with a personal name, while Chilonzor (chilon + -zor) reflects a plant-based naming. Unlike Spanish, Uzbek toponyms rarely contain articles, but exhibit a high degree of morphological regularity due to agglutination. In comparison, Spanish toponyms are more influenced by inflectional morphology and syntactic constructions, while Uzbek toponyms exhibit structural clarity and additional productivity. This contrast highlights the typological difference between the two languages and reveals common tendencies toward descriptive naming.

2. Etymological layers and historical influences.

Etymological analysis shows that Spanish toponyms have preserved several historical layers, such as Latin, Arabic and Christian elements. The Arabic influence is especially evident in toponyms beginning with Guad-, which comes from the word Guadalajara and Guadalquivir Wadi al-Kabir (“great river”). These names reflect the historical presence of the

Arabic-speaking population and their role in shaping the geographical nomenclature of the Iberian Peninsula. Uzbek toponyms, on the other hand, reflect a mainly Turkic origin, with significant contributions from Persian and Arabic due to historical contact, trade and religious influence. Toponyms such as Bukhara and Samarkand show Persian roots, while names containing the words -rabat or -masjid show Arabic influence related to Islamic culture. A strong comparative difference emerges in the function of etymology: Spanish toponyms often retain old linguistic forms that are no longer productive in the modern language, while Uzbek toponyms often retain transparent meanings that remain understandable to modern speakers. This difference highlights the dynamic relationship between language change and cultural continuity in the two toponymic systems.

3. Semantic analysis and cultural context.

Semantic analysis plays a central role in the formation of toponyms in both languages. In Spanish, place names often reflect physical geography, religious information, or colonial history. For example, Los Angeles shows the influence of Christian symbolism, while Montevideo (monte "mountain" + video "view") emphasizes topographical appearance. On the other hand, Uzbek toponyms often encode information about natural features, tribal affiliation, or economic activity. Names such as Kokand and Qiziltepa ("red hill") directly describe landscape features, while others reflect social organizations or historical figures. From a comparative perspective, Spanish toponyms tend to emphasize symbolic and historical information, while Uzbek toponyms prioritize descriptive and functional naming. Despite this difference, both systems serve as repositories of cultural memory, reflecting the values and experiences of their respective speech communities.

4. Comparative analysis and discussion.

The comparative analysis shows that, although the Spanish and Uzbek toponymic systems differ in morphological structure and etymological depth, they share common semantic principles based on geography, history, and culture. Spanish toponyms reveal a multi-layered historical narrative shaped by language contact and political change, while Uzbek toponyms reflect continuity, productivity, and transparency in word formation. This contrast highlights the broader linguistic difference between inflectional and agglutinative languages, while also highlighting the universal tendency of people to name places based on meaningful, culturally significant features.

A comparative study of Spanish and Uzbek toponyms also raises important questions about the relationship between toponymy and collective knowledge. According to E. Benveniste, proper names, which include place names, occupy a special place in language because they directly link linguistic form with social experience. Spanish toponyms often encode abstract or symbolic meanings that have become traditional over time, while Uzbek toponyms tend to maintain a closer connection between linguistic form and perceptual reality, reflecting a direct mapping between language and environment.

While Spanish and Uzbek cultures value historical continuity, this value is encoded differently in toponymy. Spanish place names often mine past socio-political realities that are

no longer transparent to speakers, while Uzbek toponyms continue to function as semantically interpretable units in the modern linguistic system. This contrast illustrates the different balances between linguistic conservatism and functional transparency. Finally, the discussion highlights the methodological value of contrasting toponymic analysis. As R. Coates has noted, comparative onomastics allows researchers to go beyond isolated description and identify universal and language-specific naming principles. The Spanish-Uzbek comparison shows that while morphological strategies and etymological depth may differ significantly, the basic human drive to encode space through culturally meaningful language remains consistent. This concept confirms the importance of toponymy as a bridge between linguistics, anthropology, and historical geography.

This article uses a qualitative comparative research design aimed at identifying structural and historical patterns in Spanish and Uzbek toponymy. The analysis is based on a selected corpus of toponyms representing urban and rural settlements, hydronyms, and oronyms from both linguistic traditions. The data were collected from authoritative toponymic dictionaries, historical maps, and academic linguistic sources to ensure reliability and diachronic depth. The research process consisted of several stages. First, the collected toponyms were classified according to their formal structure, which included simple, derived, compound, and multi-component forms. This classification allowed for a systematic comparison of naming strategies across the two languages. Second, each toponym was subjected to component segmentation to identify lexical bases and derivational elements. This stage focused on structural relationships rather than surface meanings.

A diachronic approach was used for the etymological study, tracing the origin of each toponym back to its earliest documented form. Historical phonological changes and semantic shifts were taken into account to determine the original motivation of the name. In cases where multiple etymological interpretations were available, preference was given to those supported by historical documents and scholarly consensus.

Conclusion

The research and analysis conducted in the article have shown that morphological and etymological examination of Spanish and Uzbek toponyms provides valuable insights into the interaction between language structure, historical development, and cultural perception of space. The comparative approach used in the study allowed us to identify convergent and divergent trends in the formation of place names in two typologically different languages. The analysis confirms that toponyms function not only as geographical labels, but also as stable carriers of historical memory and cultural values. Spanish toponymy reflects a complex historical stratification resulting from long-term language contact and socio-political changes, while Uzbek toponymy reveals a stronger continuity between linguistic form and semantic motivation. These differences highlight how different linguistic systems encode spatial information in ways shaped by their cultural and historical contexts.

At the same time, the study shows that universal principles underlie toponymic naming practices in both languages. Despite structural and etymological differences, Spanish and

Uzbek toponyms consistently rely on meaningful associations related to the environment, human activity, and social organization. This confirms the relevance of comparative toponymy as a fruitful field for uncovering common cognitive and communicative mechanisms in language. The results of this study contribute to the broader fields of onomastics and historical linguistics by proposing a counterfactual model for analyzing toponymic systems. Future research could broaden the scope of the study by adding quantitative methods, additional language pairs, or regional case studies, thereby deepening the linguistic and cultural aspects of place names.

LIST OF REFERENCES USED

1. Benveniste, É. (1971). *Problems in General Linguistics*. University of Miami Press.
2. Coates, R. (2006). "Properhood". *Language*, 82(2), 356–382.
3. Corominas, J., & Pascual, J. A. (1980–1991). *Diccionario crítico etimológico castellano e hispánico*. Madrid: Gredos.
4. García Sánchez, J. J. (1995). *Toponymia mayor de Andalucía*. Granada: Universidad de Granada.
5. Malov, S. E. (1952). *The Ancient Turkic Languages*. Moscow: Academy of Sciences Press.
6. Menéndez Pidal, R. (1952). *Toponymia prerrománica hispana*. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.
7. Murzaev, E. M. (1974). *Essays on Toponymy*. Moscow: Nauka.
8. Nikonov, V. A. (1965). *Introduction to Toponymy*. Moscow: Nauka.
9. Sapir, E. (1921). *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Company.
10. Stewart, G. R. (1954). *Names on the Land: A Historical Account of Place-Naming in the United States*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.