

Miramgul Mnaidarova¹ , Gulnar Sarseke¹ , Ibrahim Sahin² 

Anthroponyms in the Kazakh and Turkish Languages: A Historical Review of Their Studies and Structural Features

Abstract

This study examines the origin and historical development of anthroponyms in the Kazakh and Turkish languages. Drawing on 21 academic sources, including books, peer-reviewed articles, and conference papers, it aims to detect similarities and differences in the evolution of anthroponyms and their use in contemporary linguistic contexts. The analysis revealed a lack of specific studies on the morphological structure of anthroponyms in both Kazakh and Turkish. The study confirmed the significance of general onomastics and anthroponymy in understanding the morphological structure of anthroponyms in these languages and highlighted ongoing disagreements on the role of the Turkic linguistic basis in their emergence and development. The obtained results can be used in the teaching of Kazakh and Turkish in academic settings and can also support efforts to preserve cultural heritage.

Keywords

grammar, history, structure, onomastics, etymology

Corresponding author

Miramgul Mnaidarova, Department of Kazakh Linguistics, L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Republic of Kazakhstan; **e-mail:** mnai.miram@gmail.com; **ORCID:** <https://orcid.org/0009-0001-8057-7701>

¹ Department of Kazakh Linguistics, L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Republic of Kazakhstan

² Department of Turkish Language and Dialects, Ege University, Izmir, Turkey

1. Introduction

Anthroponyms hold a special place in every language, while anthroponymy – as a branch of onomastics that studies them – is gaining increasing significance. The term anthroponymy is of Greek origin and is composed of two roots: *anthrōpos*, meaning human, and *onoma*, meaning name. Thus, anthroponymy refers to the study of anthroponyms as individual or collective names of human beings. Formation, development, etymology, semantic aspects, structural system, transmission, and other aspects of anthroponyms have been widely explored. Nevertheless, anthroponymy is still considered a relatively new branch of science, leaving numerous gaps in existing data. Therefore, it is possible to assert that the study of anthroponyms is a relatively young yet highly promising area of science.

This study is relevant because proper names constitute an integral part of the linguistic corpus and can reflect the emergence and evolution of a particular language. Furthermore, studies in anthroponymy can contribute to other disciplines, including history, sociology, or human geography, thereby fostering interdisciplinary research.

According to Siebenhütter (2020), anthroponymy (or anthroponomastics) studies proper names that can take a plethora of forms, including, but not limited to, given names, patronymics, surnames, pseudonyms, cryptonyms, suffixes, andronyms, and gyneconyms. Arifoğlu (2020) notes that anthroponymy investigates the functions performed by these linguistic units, including socio-cultural, ethnic, confessional, and aesthetic aspects. Akar et al. (2023) further emphasise that, since most of these functions have evolved over time, the study of anthroponyms often relies on a historical lens.

Emelia and Hasibuan (2021) observe that a historical perspective is equally applicable to the study of anthroponyms in the Kazakh and Turkish languages, which, due to their shared Turkic basis, are believed to have much in common. The present study, however, stresses that despite this common basis, the anthroponymic corpus of each nation has developed in direct connection with its history, language, customs, traditions, religion, worldview, and other characteristics. This assumption rests on the studies of Ainabek et al. (2024) and Jagessar (2020) and implies that notable differences emerge when anthroponymic resources formed over the long history of these nations are compared. Koile et al. (2022) argue that one of the main reasons for these differences is that people of similar origin, speaking the same language but living in two different geographic environments, are influenced by diverse fac-

tors such as history, politics, society, and culture of the neighbouring nations.

The study aims to provide a comprehensive assessment of anthroponyms in Kazakh and Turkish. Specifically, it seeks to define anthroponyms and their place in both languages; differentiate between the various types of anthroponyms in Turkic languages; examine the morphological features of personal names in modern Kazakh and Turkish; and examine the rules governing the creation of anthroponyms in these languages.

211

2. Materials and Methods

The study employed secondary data analysis to gain a comprehensive understanding of the features and roles of anthroponyms in the Kazakh and Turkish languages. A diverse range of sources was utilised, including historical texts, linguistic databases, ethnographic studies, and cultural anthropology research. These sources were selected based on their relevance to the evolution of anthroponyms and their reliability in providing accurate linguistic and socio-cultural insights. Selection criteria included academic credibility, depth of analysis, and relevance to the study's objectives. Only sources published in reputable journals, endorsed by linguistic experts, and directly relevant to the study of anthroponyms were included. This rigorous selection process ensured the dependability and usefulness of the data, enhancing the methodological basis of the research.

The analysis began with defining anthroponyms and identifying their significance in Turkish and Kazakh. This involved synthesising data from academic journals, language dictionaries, and historical records to trace the origins and functions of proper names in both languages. The study then delved into the socio-cultural, ethnic, confessional, and aesthetic dimensions of anthroponyms, analysing how these factors have influenced their evolution over time. A key part of this analysis was evaluating the role of anthroponyms in the 21st-century Kazakh and Turkish and comparing these roles to the functions ascribed to specific anthroponyms in previous decades or centuries to detect whether the onomastic units under study have maintained their relevance over time. It was also crucial to identify areas such as education and cross-cultural communication where an understanding of anthroponyms preconditioned successful interactions.

The study further implied differentiating between various types of anthroponyms in Turkic languages. This stage involved the analysis of a

sample of anthroponyms from both languages to gain a nuanced understanding of how they originated and what functions were assigned to them at different points in their history. Anthroponyms were classified into four distinctive categories to illustrate the evolution of Kazakh and Turkish languages under the influence of geographical and other external factors. Moreover, a deeper historical analysis was conducted to see whether anthroponyms in the selected languages shared common origins.

Further research encompassed theoretical approaches to the study of morphological features of personal names in modern Kazakh and Turkish. A secondary analysis of data collected since 1999 was performed to differentiate between five types of morphological structures in these languages. The decision to gather data since 1999 was driven by significant historical and linguistic events that occurred around this period. For instance, the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991 led to substantial cultural and linguistic shifts in Kazakhstan, influencing naming conventions and the use of anthroponyms. Similarly, Turkey experienced socio-political changes that impacted language use and naming practices. By focusing on this period, the study aims to capture the dynamics of anthroponyms in response to these transformations. Comparative analyses across linguistic, philosophical, and socio-cultural dimensions were conducted to assess the possibility of creating a universal cultural space in the 21st-century reality.

The final stage of the study involved formulating the rules of creating anthroponyms in Kazakh and Turkish. At this stage, a thorough comparative analysis of the most common anthroponyms in both languages was carried out to illustrate how different approaches to constructing anthroponyms preconditioned their meanings and their evolution over time. Further assessment was performed to examine whether the detected rules remain relevant today and how they might inform research in linguistics, history, sociology, or interdisciplinary studies.

3. Results

Pseudonyms are used to replace personal names, such as Sabalaq, Bürkit, Qyrağy, Qortyq, Bolys. Cryptonyms and pseudonyms are used to maintain anonymity, such as Qoñyr, Qyr balasy, Aqyn, Ūmytylğan, Azamat. An andronym is a name that links a woman's name to her husband's surname, which is a widespread practice among Slavic peoples. Examples include Dolina – Dolinuşka and Morozova – Morozihä. Different shades of morphological, derivational, and lexical-semantic features

emerge from several of these structural types of anthroponyms. Lexical and grammatical features also change depending on the function of structures that give colour or alter the meaning of a word. Personal names are not static; the complex structure of names in Kazakh and Turkish reflects family traditions, folk values, connection with nature, and human aspirations. Therefore, anthroponyms have many derivatives and complex structures. The anthroponyms of each nation exhibit lexical, semantic, grammatical, and phonetic features. Furthermore, anthroponyms serve several key functions, including sociocultural, ethnic, confessional, and aesthetic functions (Table 1).

Table 1: Functions of anthroponyms in Kazakh and Turkish

Function	Description	Examples/Impact
Sociocultural	Reflects societal values, traditions, and cultural heritage.	– Bolys : Reflects traditional values and family ties.
Ethnic	Indicates ethnic identity and heritage.	– Qortyq : Demonstrates cultural significance in naming practices.
		– Sabalaq : Represents ethnic roots and traditions.
		– Bürkit : Highlights ethnic pride and historical significance.
Confessional	Relates to religious beliefs and practices.	– Azamat : Reflects Islamic influence on naming practices.
		– Aqyn : Indicates religious and spiritual connotations.
Aesthetic	Emphasises beauty, elegance, or positive qualities.	– Qyrağy : Conveys aesthetic appeal and positive attributes.
		– Ümytylğan : Represents beauty and elegance in naming.

Source: Authors' own representation.

Turkish anthroponyms have not changed significantly under the influence of historical and sociocultural factors (Shashkina et al. 2025; Kongyratbay 2020). It is easy to determine the bases of anthroponyms in the Kazakh and Turkish languages (Emelia & Hasibuan 2021). However, the knowledge that came with Islam formed a new group of Kazakh and Turkish names. Earlier Turkic names were typically associated with concrete, material concepts, whereas abstract names were more common in the anthroponyms of the Arabic language. In any vernacular language, anthroponyms are divided into male and female names

(Ovcharuk 2024). However, names such as Baian, Janat, Saltanat, Nürly, Symbat, and Qymbat in Kazakh, and İağmur, Seven, and Sanaz in Turkish can be used for both males and females.

There is no generic category in the Turkic languages (Romaniuk & Yavorska 2022). This term refers to a broad classification that encompasses various specific instances. In the context of Turkic languages, the lack of a generic category for names means that there is no overarching system dictating the form or structure of names based on gender or other characteristics. This allows for greater flexibility and diversity in naming practices. Therefore, there was no need to use final sounds to mark the difference between male and female names. By contrast, in Arabic, male and female names are often deliberately distinguished by their final sounds. When Arabic names were incorporated into Turkic anthroponyms, forms such as Äli – Älia, Ğali – Ğalia, Sälım – Sälima, Ait – Aida emerged, maintaining the Turkic naming style. In the Kazakh language, similar variants appear, such as Gülnär – Gülnära, Aizat – Aizada, Aiperı – Aipara. With a single change of sound, several related names were formed: Ğabbas, Qapas, Qappas, Qadır – Kädir, Hakım – Käkım, Ğalymbek – Qalymbek.

Turkic identity was shaped by both economic and geographical features. Therefore, Kazakh and Turkish names can be grouped according to the semantic features of common personal names:

1. Anthroponyms that preserve elements from the language of the ancient Turkic period.
2. Anthroponyms that are formed through the interaction of languages.
3. New names that are created by political, social, and economic changes in society.
4. New names that are created through meaning changes influenced by sound interactions.

The European Huns formed political alliances with several Turkic peoples (such as the Bulgars, Avars, on-Ogur) or Turkic-related groups (such as the Mazhar), who had settled in Eastern Europe. They were known to have spoken Turkish. The names of individuals from ruling dynasties, such as Karaton, Munjuk (meaning beads or flags), Attila, İlek, Dengizik (meaning sea), İrnek, Aybars, Oktar, Arykan, Basyk, Kursyk, Atakam, Eshkam were retained (Urban 2021).

In the anthroponymy of the Kazakh and Turkish languages, continuities with ancient Turkic materials can be proven. The use of personal names during this period displays various structures, including root words, derivative words, and compound words. The morphological fea-

tures of personal names in modern Kazakh and Turkish are based on lexical meanings (Stadnik 2024; Kononchuk 2024). The regularity of the creation of anthroponyms has been preserved in Turkic knowledge. In modern Kazakh and Turkish, five morphological types of anthroponyms can be identified:

1. Personal names, given to children, usually with the consent of the family, clan, tribe, and siblings.
2. Men's names, provided based on customs and traditions linked to heroism, passing a certain life stage, and fulfilling the goals and objectives of a certain social environment. Works on anthroponymy (Sümer 1999) describe these as signs of adulthood, integration into society, and reaching a new stage of life. This is evidenced by the poems *Qorqyt ata jyrlarynan*, *Alpamys*, *Manas*, *Er Tūğyryl*, and *Er Tarğyn*. At the next stage, the descriptive name *Er* is added to men who have earned masculine names. Based thereon, new names appeared in later periods: *Ermūrat*, *Erlan*, *Erjigit*, *Erjan*, *Ernūr*, and *Erman*.
3. Tribal names, associated with anthroponymy and believed to be a combination of the names *Ashina-Bor-kin*, *Ashina-Mish*, and *Ashina-Nizok*. This pattern is found in complex anthroponyms in modern Kazakh and Turkish such as *Karakerey Kabanbai*, *Shakshak Zhanibek*, *Kerey Zhanibek*, *Kanzhigaly Bogenbai*, *Shapirashty Nauryzbai* in Kazakh, with comparable examples in Turkish.
4. Dynasty or state names, examples of which include *Alp Qūtlūq*, *Bilge qağan*, *Eltemiş-Bilge qağan*, *Kū-lüg-Bilge qağan*. This category also includes anthroponyms with newer semantics, such as *Atatūrik* and *Elbasy* in both Turkish and Kazakh.
5. Individual names assigned to identifiers, such as *Eñsegei boily Er Esım*, *Qarğa boily Qaztuğan*, *Aqsaq Temır*, *Aldar köse*, *Qoja Nasyredin*, *Sudyr Ahmet*, *Qanışer Abylai*, and *Pañ Nūrmağambet*.

Both Turkish and Kazakh feature numerous anthroponyms derived from the names of tribes and clans. Names such as *Qazaqbai*, *Tūrikpen*, *Tūrik*, *Ertūrik*, and *Oğyz* are found in both languages. In addition, the study of personal names in Kazakh and Turkish can be divided into *Kypchak* and *Oguz* anthroponyms. The same pattern is observed in other branches of the Turkic languages. Although the Turkic peoples were divided into different branches, the foundations of each branch have been preserved among other people.

The linguistic analysis of modern Kazakh and Turkish anthroponyms reveals that various open derivational suffixes have been employed

over time, many of which trace their roots to ancient Turkic and Indo-European language structures. These suffixes not only contribute to the construction of names but also shed light on the deep historical and cultural connections between Turkic and Indo-European-speaking peoples:

1. *-ar/-r*:

This suffix is a common feature in Turkic tribal names and also appears in personal names. It denotes association with a particular group, often indicating ethnic or geographical affiliation. It can be seen as a marker of origin or belonging. This suffix has ancient roots in Turkic languages, likely used in the formation of ethnonyms for various Turkic tribes (e.g., Tat-ar, Bulg-ar, Khaz-ar, Maz-ar). These suffixes reflect the early development of Turkic-speaking societies and their organisational structure based on tribal affiliations. In modern anthroponyms, this suffix continues to denote collective identity and heritage, as seen in names like Zhan-ar, Suv-ar, and Man-ar. The persistence of this suffix highlights the continued relevance of tribal connections in personal naming traditions.

2. *-man/-men*:

The suffix *-man* or *-men* is an Indo-European-derived suffix that is typically used in personal names. It often denotes a person belonging to a certain group, tribe, or ethnicity and is commonly found in the names of notable individuals or ancestors. Historically, it carried meanings like man or son of. Its use in Turkic languages, particularly in anthroponyms like Tugman, Ayman, and Uzman, reflects the historical contact between Turkic and Indo-European-speaking populations, possibly through migration or trade. Furthermore, it appears in ethnonyms such as Turk-men, Ku-man, and Chu-man, highlighting the linguistic and cultural exchanges between these groups.

3. *-as (-az, -ys)*:

The suffix *-as* (and its variants *-az*, *-ys*) can serve as a marker of association, sometimes reflecting a personal or professional characteristic. It is often used in both personal and ethnonym formation. It can suggest nobility or a special status and shows both Turkic and Iranian language influences. Examples include names like Sanaz, Elmas, and Savas, as well as ethnonyms like *qyrǵ-ys* and *hak-as*, reflecting the influence of pre-Islamic and early Islamic Turkic culture. The use of this suffix suggests a process of cultural assimilation and the integration of foreign naming conventions into Turkic languages over centuries. It also indicates the role of honorifics and societal roles in naming conventions.

4. *-aq* (*-ek*, *-yq*, *-q*, *-ik*, *-k*):

The suffix *-aq* (and its variants *-ek*, *-yq*, *-q*, *-ik*, *-k*) generally signifies belonging or origin and is often used in tribal or ethnonymic contexts. It is found in both Kazakh and other Turkic language groups, forming names that indicate geographical or ethnic affiliation. This suffix is particularly important in the formation of Turkic ethnonyms, as seen in names like Kazakh, Kumyk, Kipchak, and Pecheneg. It reflects a time when people were primarily identified by their tribe or region, a common feature of pre-modern societies. This suffix also appears in modern Kazakh and Turkish anthroponyms such as Safak, Adaq, Ardaq, and Erik, indicating the continued presence of ethnic and tribal identification in personal naming practices.

The use of these suffixes in Kazakh and Turkish anthroponyms reveals a rich linguistic history. Ancient suffixes like *-ar/-r* and *-man/-men* showcase the long-standing interactions between Turkic and Indo-European-speaking peoples. These suffixes have evolved but their core meanings have been preserved, reflecting the persistence of ethnic identity and social organisation in these cultures. The incorporation of Indo-European elements, such as *-man/-men*, suggests early intercultural contact, likely during periods of migration, trade, or conquest. Furthermore, the usage of suffixes like *-as* and *-aq* indicates the importance of names as markers of both personal and collective identity, a concept that has been preserved in modern naming conventions.

The semantic categories of anthroponyms in Kazakh and Turkish can be grouped as follows:

1. Names of animals, birds, and weapons, reflecting the nomadic lifestyle and habitat: Ertūğyryl, Tai, Qūrtqa, Barys, Qabylan, Alparslan, Arystan, Qasqyrbai, Bōribai, Attyly, Jylqybai, Altūq.
2. Relative names: Nağaşybai, Bauyrjan, Ağabek, Atabai, Anapa, Atabek, Äkejan, Ağastan, Emre.
3. Tribal and clan names: Dulat, Üisinbai, Naiman, Arğynbai, Qoñyratbai, Oğyz, Kerei.
4. Anthroponyms derived from the names of special professions and degrees: Tarhan Darqan, Qağan, Batyr. There are also many anthroponyms derived from the name of the ancient Turkic language *bi/bek*: Atabek, Atabi, Älibi, Batyrbek, Janarbek, Syrlybek.

Adjectives that have become nouns in Kazakh and Turkish are frequently used as personal names. Variants of substantive adjective forms are also found in Kazakh: Emrin (reconciliation), Qiubat (rude), Eren (saint), Erdoğan (strong eagle), Erol (strong), Emin (honest), Beiza, Kōrkem,

Ädemi, Äsem, Dana, Erdem (kind), and Ediz (tall). Some names feature numerals: Besbai, Jetpısbai, Alpys, Myñbai, Jüzbai, Birche, Birimli, Toquz.

There was also an appeal to numerals in case of Kenje (*bek, gül, bai*) and Tūñğyş(*bai*). Pronouns-based names include Özal, Özak, Bukul, Butın, Özbir. Additionally, some names derive from verbs: Tölegen, Bölegen, Jaras, Qoldas, Gelmek, İylmaz, Solmaz, Durdy, Tapdyg, Tabyldyk, İrtumyş. The structure of anthroponyms in modern Kazakh and Turkish stems from:

1. Root words: Batyr, Mange (Möñke, meaning eternal), Alyp, Quan, Quat, Marqai, Torğai, Tarqan (Darqan), Mehmet (Mahmet), Mūrat, Nazar, Ömir, Temir, Jıgit, Qylyş, Berik, Eren, Arzu, Azel, Teñiz, Zeinep, Jūldyz, Ümit, Şeşek, İlkin, (İlki- first), Tug, Tün.
2. Derivative words (root and suffix): Aidyn, Aidan, Maily, Qobylandy, Qojban, Aitas- Aitaş, Ağeke, Ağaly, Ailin (Aily), Aişel (Aişe), Kökşe, Attyly, Küler, Sezım (Sezen), Sana (Sanaz), Qūtsal (Qūtşy), Qarasa (Qaraşa), Konker, Dirench, Moldan.
3. Compound words: Qarlyğaş, Ainūr, Erlan, Mūratbek, Kenjebek, Tūñğyşbai, Aqjūldyz, Aijūldyz, Baibarys (Beibarys), Ertūğyryl, Aichoban (Aişopan), Gohan (Kökhan).

The first notable feature in the use of the anthroponyms Teñiz (*bai*) and Deniz in Kazakh and Turkish is that they are used either individually or in combination with words. The second feature refers to the obsolete form of the root they share. In modern Kazakh, the common root of the words *teren*, meaning deep, and *teniz*, meaning sea, is *te*, which is now considered a dead root. The original form of this dead root is *tan* (with *te-ta* also used in ancient Turkic). Notably, Kazakh root words do not contain two consecutive consonants.

Therefore, anthroponyms in Turkish, as in other Turkic languages, are analysed to determine whether the original root is combined with an additional morpheme. It is also necessary to analyse the complex forms of anthroponyms in the Kazakh and Turkic languages. Complex anthroponyms in Kazakh reveal a broad range of social activities.

Valikhanov (1958) also notes the functions of complex anthroponyms. Anthroponyms in Kazakh and Turkish include names tied to beliefs such as İeter, Tursun, Turdy, Toqtar, and Qalsyn. The morphological structures of complex anthroponyms fall into four main types:

- combined anthroponyms;
- integrated anthroponyms;
- phrasal anthroponyms;
- abbreviated anthroponyms.

Combined anthroponyms have been widely used since ancient times. The genesis of their constituent parts differs. Examples include complex words like Qalibek, Nürlybek, İslambek, Zamanbek, Bazarbai, Turgut, Furkan, Nürbai, Asanbai, Mamanbai, Batyrbai, Erğazy, Erbai, Erbol, Aidogan, Tanriverdi, Tezer, Teker. Many Kazakh anthroponyms derive from Turkic and Arabic-Persian languages.

Among the combined anthroponyms, a new feature in both languages, especially over the last century, is the creation of personal names from the first syllables of parents' names. For example, Ilfa – the name of the daughter of Zhansugurov and Gabitova – consists of the first syllables of the names of her parents. In the Kazakh language, such anthroponyms were used widely in Soviet times, including politicised, ideologised names such as Marklen (Marks – Lenin), Mels (Marks – Engels – Lenin – Stalin), and Vilena (Vladimir Ilyich Lenin). A similar morphological structure is found in Turkish names. For example, the father's and mother's names are Ilkay and Emine, respectively, and their child is named Ilkem.

Integrated anthroponyms – compound words that have undergone morphological changes – include Altan, Arykan, Berkant, Bojkurt, Joşkun, Aiten, Dogujtug, Mahambet, Gülbaram, Mūqadil, Narkes, and Qojban. Phrasal anthroponyms, common in the Turkic period, include Aisūlu, Künsūlu, Erbai, Küntudy, Aituğan, Täñirberdi, Qūdaibergen. The first foundation for the collaborative creation of such personal names is word combination. The meanings were later combined.

Turkish two-component anthroponyms also differ. For example, Gilmaz Garatokimli, Seljuk Umit are used both with and without affixes. Among the Kazakh and Turkish names, some even derive from pseudonyms. For example, Nesin in the name Aziz Nesin is an affixed word that was transferred to the derivational function. These kinds of features determine the complex morphological structure of anthroponyms in modern Kazakh and Turkish languages. The names Karaman, Karasai, Karmys (people), Kozhban, Koldas, and Möñke are not used by modern Kazakhs and Turks but are often found in ancient scriptures and are thus purely Turkic.

Notably, the meaning of components of a word can change in contact with the second word. For example, in names like Karaman and Karasai, the component man means person and has long been used in the Turkic languages, while sai – soi means origin or place of origin. Used in combination with these words, kara (usually meaning black) is not used in the usual sense of colour, but to represent strength.

Additionally, the first component of the name *Kozhban* – *koz* is not used separately in the Kazakh language. In the ancient Turkic languages, verbs such as *kozhyraigan* and *kozhyrap* were formed from the word *koz*, which means *orasan ulken* (huge or big). This is probably why these names have become obsolete due to semantic changes in their subsequent meanings. *Möñke* has not been used as a name in the meaning of eternal for the past 70–80 years.

4. Discussion

The study of anthroponymy, or the linguistic analysis of personal names, remains a vital and dynamic field within linguistics, particularly in the context of the Kazakh and Turkish languages. This field has retained its relevance from the 19th century to the present day, offering valuable insights into the shared Turkic foundations of these languages and their cultural significance. By examining the types, roles, and compositions of anthroponyms, researchers can uncover the intricate linguistic and cultural tapestry that binds these languages.

Early investigations into Kazakh and Turkish anthroponyms revealed their deep-rooted connections to the ancient Turkic period, where names often carried concrete, material meanings. However, with the advent of Islam, a new group of names emerged, characterised by more abstract and spiritual connotations. This evolution underscores the dynamic nature of anthroponyms, which adapt to political, social, and cultural changes over time. Researchers such as Ashimbayeva and Zhannabekova (2023), Giraut (2020), and Temirgazina and Andryushchenko (2023) emphasised the importance of anthroponyms in understanding modern Turkic languages, highlighting their role in reflecting societal values, traditions, and cultural heritage.

While many researchers highlight the similarities between Kazakh and Turkish anthroponyms, it is crucial not to oversimplify their relationship. The notion of a common linguistic and cultural space for these languages was explored by Siebenhütter (2020) and Yelibayeva et al. (2019), who support the idea that the shared elements in anthroponyms across Kazakh and Turkish languages reflect a deeper cultural unity. However, this research also challenges the popular belief that Kazakh and Turkish anthroponyms are purely of Turkic origin, an issue that requires further scrutiny.

Contemporary anthroponyms in Kazakh and Turkish languages continue to evolve, reflecting the influence of various languages and cultures (Denys 2024; Toktagazin et al. 2016). The integration of historical

and modern perspectives is crucial in language learning strategies, as it enhances understanding and aids in teaching language evolution and continuity over time (Ternov et al. 2024; Romaniuk 2021). Understanding the differences between anthroponyms in the two languages is just as important as recognising their shared characteristics, as these differences reflect the distinct political and social contexts in which each language has developed (Ainabek et al. 2024; Shaimerdivina 2022).

The morphological structure of anthroponyms in Kazakh and Turkish languages is complex and multifaceted (Chyzykova 2024; Kongyratbay 2021). These names often comprise root words, derivative suffixes, and compound structures, each contributing to their lexical, semantic, grammatical, and phonetic features. The use of open derivational suffixes, such as *-ar/-r*, *-man/-men*, *-as*, and *-aq*, highlights the historical and cultural connections between Turkic and Indo-European languages. These suffixes not only aid in the construction of names but also reflect the deep-seated ethnic and social organisation within these cultures. Urban (2021) addressed this gap by exploring these structures, revealing the legitimacy of morphological formation in the two languages, both belonging to the agglutinative language group.

While the historical lens has contributed greatly to our understanding of the development of Kazakh and Turkish, it is important to acknowledge that these languages continue to evolve. Contemporary anthroponyms in both languages reflect influences from Turkish, Arabic, Persian, Russian, and European languages (Yerekhanova et al. 2023). These developments highlight the dynamic nature of the languages as they adapt to political, social, and cultural changes over time. The integration of historical and modern perspectives is considered a vital component of language learning strategies, as emphasised by Sarsenbay et al. (2023) and Turayevich (2021).

Anthroponyms serve various functions, including socio-cultural, ethnic, confessional, and aesthetic roles. For instance, names like Bolys reflect traditional values and family connections, while Qortyq and Sabalaq signify ethnic identity. The confessional function is evident in names like Azamat, which reflects Islamic influences. Aesthetic names, such as Qyrağy and Ümytylğan, emphasise beauty and positive qualities. These functions illustrate the broader communicative tasks that anthroponyms perform across different contexts, contributing to a more comprehensive understanding of their role in society (Isaeva et al. 2023).

While many researchers highlight the similarities between Kazakh and Turkish anthroponyms, it is crucial not to oversimplify their relationship. As noted by Ainabek et al. (2024) and Shaimerdivina (2022), understanding the differences between anthroponyms in the two lan-

guages is just as important as recognising their shared characteristics. These differences, particularly in relation to Arabic and Persian influences, reflect the distinct political and social contexts in which each language has developed. Despite these differences, the root, derivative, and complex structures in Kazakh anthroponyms have largely retained their Turkic origin, highlighting the resilience of traditional linguistic forms.

In conclusion, the study of Kazakh and Turkish anthroponyms reveals both shared linguistic and cultural roots and distinctive developments shaped by political, social, and religious influences. The morphological structure of these names, comprising roots, derivatives, and compound forms, reflects deep historical connections to both Turkic and Indo-European language families, underscoring the dynamic evolution of these languages. While both languages retain common features in their personal naming practices, such as the use of open derivational suffixes and socio-cultural functions, they also exhibit differences, particularly in the integration of Arabic, Persian, and European influences. These differences, along with the continued evolution of names in contemporary contexts, highlight the adaptability of anthroponyms to societal changes. By examining both the similarities and unique characteristics of Kazakh and Turkish anthroponyms, researchers can gain a deeper understanding of the cultural and linguistic identity of these two closely related but distinct languages.

5. Conclusions

The only notable differences in the morphological structures of anthroponyms in Kazakh and Turkish are related to pronunciation; otherwise, their forms and morphological features have much in common. There are practically no scientific works studying the morphological structures of anthroponyms in these languages; existing research tends to address only the social meanings, motivations, semantic groups of anthroponyms, and the historical emergence and use of personal names.

Many questions also remain concerning the general problems of anthroponyms, particularly the etymology of individual names. However, no studies in which the morphological features of specific anthroponyms would be revealed and each type would be analysed separately were found. Opinions about the morphological structure of anthroponyms are often found in scientific works devoted to different stages of language development. Ideas, opinions, claims, and statements about the morphological structure of anthroponyms are found in research work. These insights help determine the vocabulary and word composition of

each period of the history of the language, analyse sentence structure, indicate the position of word groups, and identify phonetic features.

These opinions were collected while studying the morphological structure of personal names in Kazakh and Turkish. Summarising this research, it may be concluded that:

223

1. There are no specific studies on the morphological structure of anthroponyms in the Kazakh and Turkish languages.
2. Opinions and reflections on the morphological structure of anthroponyms in the Kazakh and Turkish languages appear mainly in the studies on general onomastics and anthroponymy.
3. The opinions on Kazakh and Turkish anthroponyms suggest that they do not deviate from their Turkic basis, though they vary in later periods due to social transitions and differences in thoughts, perspectives, and cognition.
4. The morphological structures of anthroponyms in the Kazakh and Turkish languages share similarities, particularly in semantic continuity and grammatical organisation of semantic units.
5. The morphological structures of personal names in these languages can serve as markers of historical periods and reflect spiritual and traditional values.

The results of this research can inform further linguistic studies seeking to understand the evolution of anthroponyms in both languages and their role in present-day Kazakh or Turkish language environments. The obtained findings can also be applied in language learning, especially to reveal the dynamic nature of language and how it transforms over time to meet the demands of changing linguistic, cultural, economic, and socio-political contexts.

Furthermore, research results can support efforts aimed at preserving cultural heritage. In this case, a nuanced understanding of anthroponyms reveals the richness of national languages and can motivate their promotion not only within their countries but also internationally. Despite extensive academic investigation, this study has several limitations, notably its inclusive focus on recent academic studies, most of which were published in the past five years.

For future research, it is suggested to compare recent academic studies with older ones to gain a nuanced understanding of how interpretations of anthroponyms in the Kazakh and Turkish languages have changed over time. It is also recommended to analyse how the changed interpretation of anthroponyms in the Kazakh and Turkish languages has transformed the teaching of these languages to native speakers and foreign students.

References

- Ainabek, A., Abdualiuly, B., Molgazhdarov, K., Artymbayeva, B., Aubakirova, A. & Zhuanyshpaeva, S., 2024. Effects of Language Learning Strategies on Teaching Toponyms and Folk Geography Terms in Kazakh and Nogai Languages. *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Studies* 11 (2), 140–163, doi: <https://doi.org/10.29333/ejecs/2071>
- Akar, A., Pirmanova, K. K., Shaimerdenova, N. Zh. & Shalabayeva, I. M., 2023. Methods of Transferring Full Word-Formation Affixes in the National Corpus of the Kazakh Language. *Tiltanym* 3, 3–14, doi: <https://doi.org/10.55491/2411-6076-2023-3-3-14>
- Arifoğlu, Y., 2020. Naming, Toponymy and the Naming Tradition in Turkification of Anatolia. *Black Sea International Scientific Journal* 46, 123–134, doi: <https://doi.org/10.17498/kdeniz.701681>
- Ashimbayeva, N. M. & Zhanabekova, A. A., 2023. The Study of Ancient Names in the Implementation of the System of Linguistic and Cultural Knowledge in the National Corpus. *Tiltanym* 3, 25–37, doi: <https://doi.org/10.55491/2411-6076-2023-3-25-37>
- Chyzhykova, O., 2024. Analyzing Lexical Features and Academic Vocabulary in Academic Writing. *International Journal of Philology* 28 (1), 72–80, doi: [https://doi.org/10.31548/philolog15\(1\).2024.08](https://doi.org/10.31548/philolog15(1).2024.08)
- Denys, I., 2024. Language As an Important Means of Information Encoding. *Library Science. Record Studies. Informology* 20 (1), 8–11, doi: <https://doi.org/10.63009/lrsi/1.2024.08>
- Emelia, T. W. & Hasibuan, S. H., 2021. The Toponymy of Plantation Areas in Medan (Linguistic Anthropology Study). *Journal of Communication in Scientific Inquiry* 3 (2), 54–63.
- Giraut, F., 2020. Plural Toponyms: When Place Names Coexist: Introduction. *EchoGéo* 53, 1–8, doi: <https://doi.org/10.4000/echogeo.20760>
- Isaeva, G. S., Serikkyzy, M. & Utebayeva, E. A., 2023. Cultural and Semantic Markup in the Development of the Linguocultural Subcorpus. *Tiltanym* 3, 135–143, doi: <https://doi.org/10.55491/2411-6076-2023-3-135-143>
- Jagessar, P., 2020. Geography and Linguistics: Histories, Entanglements and Departures. *Geography Compass* 14 (11), doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/gec3.12540>
- Koile, E., Chechuro, I., Moroz, G. & Daniel, M., 2022. Geography and Language Divergence: The Case of Andic Languages. *PloS One* 17 (5), e0265460, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0265460>
- Kongyratbay, T. A., 2020. To the Methodology of Studying the Ethnic Nature of the Heroic Epic (Historiographic Aspects). *Eposovedenie* 17 (1), 5–22, doi: <https://doi.org/10.25587/SVFU.2020.17.58362>

- Kongyratbay, T. A., 2021. Some Problems of Ethnic Study of the Heroic Epic. *Epo-sovedenie* 24 (4), 15–22, doi: <https://doi.org/10.25587/e4294-4960-9721-z>
- Kononchuk, I., 2024. Translation and Adaptation: Intersecting Relationships. *International Journal of Philology* 28 (2), 32–42, doi: [https://doi.org/10.31548/philolog15\(2\).2024.04](https://doi.org/10.31548/philolog15(2).2024.04)
- Ovcharuk, O., 2024. Humanitarian Strategies in Culture in Forming the Newest Tendencies in the Ukrainian Cultural Space. *Culture and Contemporaneity* 26 (1), 66–75, doi: <https://doi.org/10.63009/cac/1.2024.66>
- Romaniuk, O., 2021. Expression and Interpretation of Attraction and Interpersonal Intimacy: A Comparative Study of Female Nonverbal Behaviour. *Annals of the University of Craiova. Series Philology. Linguistics* 43 (1/2), 220–237, doi: <https://doi.org/10.52846/aucssflingv.v43i1.18>
- Romaniuk, O. & Yavorska, L., 2022. Complimenting Behaviour in Young Adults' First Impression Scripts. *Annals of the University of Craiova. Series Philology. Linguistics* 44 (1/2), 168–187, doi: <https://doi.org/10.52846/aucssflingv.v44i1-2.58>
- Sarsenbay, Z., Salkynbay, A., Ramazanova, S., Ashirova, A., Igilikova, S., Alimtayeva, L. & Kaspikhan, B., 2023. Modern Kazakh Language Trends: Norms and Uses Features. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language* 11 (3), 188–201.
- Shaimerdinova, N. G., 2022. The Word-Formation Potential of Affixes in the Ancient Turkic Runic Texts. *Turkic Studies Journal* 4 (3), 118–127, doi: <https://doi.org/10.32523/2664-5157-2022-3-118-127>
- Shashkina, G., Ibraeva, Z., Tussupova, A., Zhapanova, M. & Anichshenko, O., 2025. Flower Representations in the Lyrics of A. A. Fet. *Open Cultural Studies* 9 (1), 20250047, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1515/culture-2025-0047>
- Siebenhütter, S., 2020. Sociocultural Influences on Linguistic Geography: Religion and Language in Southeast Asia. In S. Brunn & R. Kehrein (eds.) *Handbook of the Changing World Language Map*. Springer, Cham, 2825–2843.
- Stadnik, O., 2024. Cultural and Sociological Studies: Interdisciplinary and Transdisciplinary Fields. *Culture and Contemporaneity* 26 (2), 30–38, doi: <https://doi.org/10.63009/cac/2.2024.30>
- Sümer, F., 1999. *Names of Individuals in the History of Turkish States*. Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları Vakfı, İstanbul.
- Temirgazina, Z. & Andryushchenko, O., 2023. Desemantization of the Old Turkic khan, baj, beg in the Modern Kazakh Anthroponyms. *Turkic Studies Journal* 5 (1), 131–144, doi: <https://doi.org/10.32523/2664-5157-2023-1-131-144>
- Ternov, N., Nurtazina, R. & Serikzhanova, A., 2024. The Sociopolitical January 2022 Protests in Kazakhstan's Telegram Channels: Agenda Interception. *Global Perspectives* 5 (1), 120497, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1525/gp.2024.120497>

- Toktagazin, M. B., Turysbek, R. S., Ussen, A. A., Nurtazina, R. A., Korganbekov, B. S. & Hradziushka, A. A., 2016. Modern Internet Epistolary in Information and Media Discourse. *Mathematics Education* 11 (5), 1305–1319, <https://www.iejme.net/download/modern-internet-epistolary-in-information-and-media-discourse.pdf> (accessed 14 May 2025).
- Turayevich, T. M., 2021. Turkish Toponymy and Its Stages of Development. *Texas Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies* 3, 182–185.
- Urban, M., 2021. The Geography and Development of Language Isolates. *Royal Society Open Science* 8 (4), 202232, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.202232>
- Valikhanov, Ch. Ch., 1958. *Selected works*. Kazgoslitizdat, Alma-Ata.
- Yelibayeva, G., Mukanova, A., Sharipbay, A., Zulkhazhav, A., Yergesh, B. & Bekmanova, G., 2019. Metalanguage and Knowledgebase for Kazakh Morphology. In S. Misra et al. (eds.) *Computational Science and Its Applications – ICCSA 2019: 19th International Conference, Saint Petersburg, Russia, July 1–4, 2019, Proceedings, Part III*. Springer, Cham, 693–706.
- Yerekhanova, F. T., Satylkhanova, G. A. & Zhorabekova, A. N., 2023. Brief Characteristics of Proper Names. *Bulletin of L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University* 145 (4), 19–34, doi: <https://doi.org/10.32523/2616-678X-2023-145-4-19-34>

Antroponimi v kazaščini in turščini: zgodovinski pregled študij in strukturnih značilnosti

Izvleček

Študija preučuje izvor in zgodovinski razvoj antroponimov v kazaškem in turškem jeziku. Podatke črpa iz 21 akademskih virov, vključno s knjigami, recenziranimi članki in konferenčnimi prispevki, s pomočjo katerih skuša opredeliti podobnosti in razlike v razvoju antroponimov in njihovi rabi v sodobnih jezikovnih kontekstih. Analiza omenjenih virov nakazuje na manko specifičnih študij o morfološki strukturi antroponimov tako v kazaščini kot v turščini. Študija potrjuje pomen splošne onomastike in antroponimije pri razumevanju morfoloških značilnosti antroponimov v teh dveh jezikih in opozarja na še vedno prisotna nesoglasja glede vloge turške jezikovne osnove pri njihovem nastanku in razvoju. Pridobljeni rezultati so lahko uporabni pri poučevanju kazaščine in turščine v akademskem okolju ter kot podpora prizadevanjem za ohranjanje kulturne dediščine.

Ključne besede

slovnica, zgodovina, struktura, onomastika, etimologija