Western European Journal of Linguistics and Education
Volume 4, Issue 2, February 2026
https://westerneuropeanstudies.com/index.php/2
ISSN (E): 2942-190X Open Access| Peer Reviewed

STRUCTURAL TYPOLOGY OF HYDRONYMS AND AN ANALYSIS OF MORPHEMIC COMPOSITION IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH RIVERINE TOPONYMS

Sanginova Umeda Umbarovna
Student of Denau Entrepreneurship and Pedagogy institute
Zafarova Parvina Rustam qizi
Student of Denau Entrepreneurship and Pedagogy institute
Supervisor: Murodova Sevara
Teacher at Denau Entrepreneurship and Pedagogy institute

Abstract. This article explores the general concept of hydronyms, their fundamental definitions, and the reasons why they should be studied. It provides a comparative analysis of hydronyms in Uzbek and English, examining their ancient origins, morphological structures, and their role within the theories of morphology and toponymy. Particular attention is given to the historical roots and structural features of the most frequently occurring suffixes in both Uzbek and English hydronyms.
Key words: river, Uzbek, English**,** linguistics, feature, roots, historical, river, lake, stream.

Introduction

The term hydronym originates from Greek, where hydro means “water” and hydronym means “name.” Hydronym is the field of study that focuses on the names of water-related geographical objects. This field includes all names and toponyms connected with water bodies and water-related features, such as rivers, lakes, oceans, seas, canals, and other similar entities. Each of these hydronyms can be classified according to their size, water composition (such as saline or fresh), and other natural characteristics, which result in a variety of distinct names. From a structural and typological perspective, hydronyms are generally divided into five main categories. These include helonyms, which are the names of swamps, marshes, and bogs; limnonyms, referring to the names of lakes and ponds; oceanonyms, which denote the names of oceans; pelagonyms, used for the names of seas; and potamonyms, which are the names of rivers and streams. Hydronyms occupy a distinct and significant place in linguistics, as they represent an important field that contributes to the enrichment of language. The naming of hydronyms in Uzbek and English does not differ substantially; however, since the two languages belong to different language families, certain distinctive features can be identified. For instance, as Uzbek belongs to the Turkic language family, hydronyms in this language often include descriptive elements such as small (kichik), large (katta), main(asosiy), saline (tuzli), and fresh (toza), among others. Similarly, in English, which belongs to the Indo-European language family, comparable descriptive elements can also be found.

In English hydronyms, these elements are frequently formed through a combination of a root and a geographical term, and in some cases, new hydronymic forms emerge either as simple lexical items or through the addition of various suffixes. For example, just as Uzbek uses names such as Buyuk Daryo (Great River), Orol Dengizi (Aral Sea), and tuzli Suv (Saline

Western European Journal of Linguistics and Education
Volume 4, Issue 2, February 2026
https://westerneuropeanstudies.com/index.php/2
ISSN (E): 2942-190X Open Access| Peer Reviewed

Water), English likewise employs corresponding forms such as Great River, Aral Sea, and Salt Water.

When considering hydronymic terms related to rivers in the Uzbek and English languages, certain differences can be observed. Many scholars note in their research that English hydronyms frequently employ various suffixes, compound forms, and, in some cases, opaque elements that preserve ancient and often obscure historical roots. A similar phenomenon can be found in Uzbek hydronyms; however, they more commonly make use of productive suffixes such as -soy, -lik, and others. Despite these differences, scholarly studies indicate that both languages predominantly follow a shared structural pattern, namely descriptor + noun, in the formation of hydronymic names.

In analyzing water-related terminology, special attention should also be paid to lexical markers indicating the type of water body. In Uzbek hydronyms, frequently recurring terms such as daryo (river), ko‘l (lake), and soy (stream), as well as their English equivalents river, lake, and stream, are commonly used. These elements clearly indicate the geographical classification of hydronyms and specify the type of water object to which they belong.

Zdorova (2009) presents a scientific article dedicated to comparing English and Uzbek

morphology, particularly illustrating differences and similarities in the verb category with clear examples. This work served as an analytical basis for our study. Similarities:

In both languages, verbs change according to tense (present, past, future) and person. Verbs are partially formed by affixes (English uses -s, -ed, -ing; Uzbek expresses tense and person through suffixes).

Both languages have main (simple) and auxiliary verbs. In many cases, the names of rivers, lakes, and other water bodies reflect specific physical or geographical features such as size, cleanliness, direction of flow, or relative position (for instance, whether a river comes from the left or right side). These linguistic patterns reveal how humans have historically perceived and interacted with their natural environment.

Differences: English is morphologically analytic, often expressing grammatical meanings via auxiliary words; Uzbek is synthetic, frequently expressing meaning through suffixes. Uzbek verbs undergo extensive morphological changes with many suffixes and categories (tense, person, aspect, conditional), whereas English shows fewer such changes. English verbs usually remain unchanged, using auxiliary verbs (e.g., will, have) to indicate tense; in Uzbek, verbs often change directly through suffixes.

Method: Many scholars have conducted extensive research on hydronyms. Among them is Hans Krahe (born on 7 February 1898 and died on 25 June 1965), who studied Old European hydronyms. In his work, he examined hydronyms in Indo-European languages, focusing on Central, Northern, and Western Europe.

Another prominent scholar is Wilhelm Fritz Hermann Nicolaisen (1927–2016). In his book Names and Narratives, he emphasized that names should be understood as a cultural register rather than a fixed cultural level, highlighting the dynamic and contextual nature of naming practices. Elena Berezovich is also a well-known researcher in this field. Her main areas of study include onomastics, etymology, semantics, linguistic reconstruction, as well as dialectology and ethnolinguistics.

Conclusion.

In conclusion, a considerable number of scholars have investigated hydronyms and made valuable contributions to the development and enrichment of this field. In the present article, based on their classifications and theoretical approaches, we examined hydronyms in

Western European Journal of Linguistics and Education
Volume 4, Issue 2, February 2026
https://westerneuropeanstudies.com/index.php/2
ISSN (E): 2942-190X Open Access| Peer Reviewed

the English and Uzbek languages, with particular attention to their morphological and topological features.

Furthermore, the similarities and differences between the two languages were analyzed, along with the historical enrichment of hydronymic names and the affixes involved in their formation. This analysis enables a deeper and more comprehensive understanding of hydronyms and their linguistic structure. Further engagement in comparative research can shed deeper light on the mechanisms of linguistic categorization and naming traditions across different cultures. The morphological composition of hydronyms in English and Uzbek demonstrates a close relationship between language, culture, and geographical context. English hydronyms frequently preserve ancient lexical elements and reflect colonial history as well as descriptive naming conventions. Conversely, Uzbek hydronyms are characterized by agglutinative structures and a strong presence of descriptive meanings and cultural symbolism. This comparison highlights the richness and variety of hydronymic naming practices and underscores the profound linguistic heritage embedded in place names

Reference

1. G‘aniyeva D. P. The morphological features of hydronyms in English and Uzbek languages / Master’s thesis. – Termez: TERSU, 2024.
2. Karimov A. Morphological features of the English language. – Tashkent, 2017.
3. Kayumova S. K. Translation problems of proverbs with hydronym components in English and Uzbek languages // American Journal of Interdisciplinary Research and Development. – 2024. – Vol. 20. – No. 1. – P. 117–123.
4. Norova Shakhnoza. Comparative analysis of morphological structures of English and Uzbek languages: Similarities and differences in the verb category. – Tashkent: TATU, 2025.
5. Rakhmonov B. Uzbek language morphology. – Tashkent, 2010.
6. Sidorov A. Comparative study of English and Turkic languages’ morphology // Central Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Management Studies. – 2014. – Vol. 2. – Issue 10.
7. Sobirov R. H. Word formation typological features in the English language. – 2024.
8. Zdorova N. Comparative analysis of English and Uzbek morphology (verb category) // Scientific article. – 2009.