

## THE PROCESS OF COMMONIZATION: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF PROPER NOUNS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

**Abdurahmanova Maqsuda**

Master's Degree student

at the University of Exact and Social Sciences

**Scientific adviser: Mannonova Saodat Artiqovna**

**Abstract.** By comparing English and Uzbek, the article provides insights into the similarities and differences in how languages treat proper nouns and absorb them into the common lexicon. The findings contribute to the fields of cognitive linguistics, lexicology, sociolinguistics, and cultural linguistics, offering practical implications for translation, language teaching, and intercultural communication. Ultimately, this research underscores the dynamic nature of language and its capacity to evolve in response to changing communicative needs and cultural contexts.

**Keywords:** Commonization, semantic shift, linguistic transformation, stylistic approach, onomastics, lexicalization, cultural linguistics, sociolinguistics, metaphorical extension, typological comparison, name generalization, literary linguistics.

### Introduction

Language is not only a means of communication but also a reflection of cultural, cognitive, and social dimensions of human experience. One of the most fascinating linguistic phenomena that illustrates the dynamic and evolving nature of language is commonization the process through which proper nouns transform into common nouns. This phenomenon, found across many languages, plays a crucial role in lexical development, semantic expansion, and the stylistic enrichment of texts. In both English and Uzbek, the transition of proper names into general terms reflects unique cultural perceptions, historical influences, and patterns of metaphorical thinking.

The study of commonization lies at the intersection of lexicology, onomastics, stylistics, and cultural linguistics, offering insights into how specific names originally designating unique entities acquire generalized meanings and are adopted into everyday language. In English, terms like "*sandwich*", "*diesel*", or "*Quisling*" represent well-known examples of this lexical shift. Similarly, in Uzbek, names like "*Afandi*" or "*Tohir-Zuhra*" extend beyond their narrative origin to embody character traits or societal roles. These examples show how languages absorb, adapt, and extend the meaning of proper nouns to serve broader communicative functions.

This article aims to conduct a comparative analysis of the process of commonization in English and Uzbek by exploring its linguistic, stylistic, and cultural implications. By examining various examples from literature, media, and

everyday discourse, the study will identify the mechanisms that drive this transformation and assess the stylistic effects such shifts produce in literary and colloquial contexts. It will also discuss how commonization serves as a tool for character construction, social commentary, and cultural symbolism, making it a vital component of both language evolution and stylistic expression.

Understanding the process of commonization enhances our comprehension of the flexibility and creativity inherent in language. It reveals how names become narratives, how narratives become symbols, and how symbols shape the way we perceive the world. By comparing English and Uzbek, this paper not only highlights the universality of the phenomenon but also uncovers the particularities rooted in cultural and linguistic traditions.

### *1. Theoretical foundations of commonization*

Commonization refers to the process by which proper nouns initially used to refer to specific individuals, places, or brands transition into common nouns used to denote general concepts, objects, or types of people. This phenomenon is rooted in the broader principles of semantic shift, lexical borrowing, and onomastic transformation, all of which demonstrate the flexibility of language in adapting to evolving communicative needs. From a stylistic and linguistic standpoint, commonization can result from metaphorical extension, cultural embedding, or functional generalization.

In English, this process has been extensively studied in the field of onomastics and lexicography, where examples such as “atlas” (from the mythological figure), “mentor” (from Homer’s *Odyssey*), and “herculean” (from Hercules) show how personal names evolve into abstract descriptors. In Uzbek, commonization often occurs within oral traditions and folklore, where names like “Afandi” become symbolic representations of cleverness or wit, showing a distinct interaction between storytelling, language use, and cultural perception.

### *2. Mechanisms of commonization*

The process of commonization typically follows certain linguistic pathways:

- **Eponymy:** where names of individuals become labels for inventions or ideas (e.g., “Braille”, “Pasteurization”).
- **Anthroponymic Generalization:** where a person’s name evolves into a stereotype or characteristic (e.g., “Don Juan” for a womanizer).
- **Toponymic Transfer:** where place names are used to denote certain qualities or objects (e.g., “Champagne”, “Silk Road”).
- **Character Symbolism:** especially common in literature and folk tales, where fictional or real figures become emblematic of social traits.

In both English and Uzbek, the driving forces behind these transformations are cultural relevance, frequency of use, and the symbolic value of the original reference. Literature, journalism, and everyday conversation are all key domains in which proper nouns are recontextualized.

### 3. *Commonization in English: examples and cultural implications*

English offers a vast array of proper nouns that have undergone commonization. Consider the following:

- “Sandwich”: Named after the Earl of Sandwich, now a common noun for a food item.
- “Machiavellian”: Derived from Niccolò Machiavelli, now describing deceitful political tactics.
- “Quisling”: From Vidkun Quisling, now used to denote a traitor.

These examples show how personal names take on generalized meanings based on their associated narratives. Literature further enhances this process. For example:

- “Romeo”: Commonly used to describe a romantic male lover.
- “Scrooge”: Used for someone who is miserly, based on Dickens’ character.
- “Sherlock”: Referring to someone with keen observational skills.

These names become metaphors or archetypes, making them stylistically powerful tools for characterization, satire, and socio-cultural commentary.

### 4. *Commonization in Uzbek: examples and national context*

In the Uzbek language, the process of commonization is deeply intertwined with oral literature, folklore, and traditional narratives. Unlike the predominantly textual evolution in English, Uzbek commonization often stems from performance-based storytelling:

- “Afandi”: Refers to a clever trickster or wise fool; now a general term for someone using wit to outsmart others.
- “Qorqiz”: Originating from myth, can be used to describe a cold-hearted or ethereal woman.
- “Tohir-Zuhra”: Names of lovers from a classic romantic tale, often used symbolically to describe tragic or pure love.

In modern Uzbek usage, such names can extend into political discourse, education, or media. For example, a cunning politician may be dubbed an “Afandi,” imbuing the name with modern relevance while retaining its folkloric roots.

### 5. *Comparative analysis: English vs. Uzbek*

While both English and Uzbek languages demonstrate the transformation of proper nouns into common nouns, the routes and cultural motivations vary:

Feature	English	Uzbek
Medium	Literary texts, historical figures	Folktales, oral traditions
Commonization mechanism	Eponymy, historical reference, literary canon	Character symbolism, oral archetypes
Cultural reflection	Western historical,	National folklore,

Feature	English	Uzbek
	scientific, literary	Islamic and regional
Stylistic Role	Satire, metaphor, social labeling	Humor, morality, collective identity

In English, the commonization process is often aligned with individualism and historical legacy, while in Uzbek it reflects collectivism, shared memory, and ethical storytelling.

#### 6. *Stylistic effects of commonized proper nouns*

From a stylistic perspective, commonized proper nouns function as cognitive shortcuts, allowing writers and speakers to evoke entire narratives, personalities, or values with a single term. They:

- Add emotional depth and cultural richness to expression.
- Serve as tools for irony, humor, or social critique.
- Help construct character identity in fiction and daily discourse.

For instance, calling someone a “Scrooge” immediately paints a vivid image of frugality and bitterness. Similarly, referring to a cunning child as an “Afandi” evokes associations with cultural wit and resourcefulness.

#### **Conclusion**

The process of commonization represents a dynamic linguistic phenomenon that reflects the evolving interaction between language, culture, and cognition. In both English and Uzbek, proper nouns that were once exclusive markers of individual identity or geographical origin gradually transcend their original referential functions to acquire generalized, symbolic, or functional meanings. This transformation is not only a matter of lexical change but also a powerful stylistic and cultural process that enriches communication and expression.

Through a comparative lens, it is evident that while English tends to rely on literary, historical, and scientific figures to drive commonization, Uzbek draws heavily on folklore, oral narratives, and traditional values. Despite these different cultural roots, the end result is similar: proper names become embedded in everyday discourse, literature, and media as carriers of deeper meanings and shared understandings.

Stylistically, commonized proper nouns offer writers, educators, and speakers concise tools to evoke vivid imagery, convey complex ideas, and establish socio-cultural identities. They serve as cognitive and emotional connectors between language users and their cultural heritage, thus playing a critical role in both linguistic creativity and cultural continuity.

In conclusion, analyzing the process of commonization in English and Uzbek not only enhances our understanding of lexical development but also highlights the profound relationship between names, narratives, and national consciousness. As language continues to evolve, the study of commonization will

remain essential for exploring how societies encode and reinterpret their experiences through words.

### References

1. Algeo, J. (2001). *The Origins and Development of the English Language*. Boston: Thomson Wadsworth.
2. Bauer, L. (1983). *English Word-Formation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
3. Crystal, D. (2003). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. Cambridge University Press.
4. Karimov, N. (2017). *Hozirgi o‘zbek adabiy tili*. Toshkent: Fan nashriyoti.
5. Langacker, R. W. (2008). *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction*. Oxford University Press.
6. Nurmonov, A. (2008). *O‘zbek tilshunosligining dolzarb masalalari*. Toshkent: Akademnashr
7. Алимова, Д. К. К. (2020). Эффективность системы управления обучением; Moodle в процессе изучения языка. *Вестник науки и образования*, (12-2 (90)), 67-69.
8. Kupaysinovna, S. G. (2020). New modern approaches in teaching English to students. *Проблемы науки*, (7 (55)), 61-63.
9. Abulkasimovna, E. Z., & Leonidovna, M. N. (2023, March). THE LEXICAL-SEMANTICAL USAGE OF PROFESSIONAL LEXEMES IN “UTGAN KUNLAR”(“ PAST DAYS”) BY ABDULLA QADIRI. In *International Scientific and Current Research Conferences* (pp. 20-22).
10. Rashidova, G., & Fariza, N. (2024). THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LANGUAGE AND CULTURE. *TANQIDIY NAZAR, TAHLILIIY TAFAKKUR VA INNOVATSION G ‘OYALAR*, 1(3), 93-95.
11. Rashidova, G., & Munira, I. (2025). THE IMPACT OF TECHNOLOGY ON LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT. *TANQIDIY NAZAR, TAHLILIIY TAFAKKUR VA INNOVATSION G ‘OYALAR*, 1(4), 151-154.
12. SULTONOVA, M. (2024). On the issue of critical thinking.
13. Erdanova, Z. (2019). Onomastic is a mirror culture. In *Science and practice: a new level of integration in the modern world* (pp. 149-152).
14. Ashirova, X., & Mamatkulova, F. (2024). Applying different teaching methods for enhancing the reading skills of elementary learners. *O ‘zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti konferensiyalari*, 155-160.