BG Pulse Journal USA
ISSN:1947-2536 Isdoi:omiddinova Imrona
BG PULSE JOURNAL

MANIFESTATION OF NATIONAL-CULTURAL SEMANTICS IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH ERGONYMS: A COMPARATIVE LINGUOCULTURAL ANALYSIS

Matkarimova Farogat Rustam qizi
Independent Researcher
Urgench State University named after Abu Rayhan Beruni
doi:https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24009775

ABSTRACT: This article provides a comparative analysis of the lexical-semantic and national-cultural characteristics of ergonyms (names of institutions, enterprises, and brands) in the Uzbek and English languages. As an essential branch of onomastics, the field of ergonymy reflects the socio-cultural state and linguocultural codes of a society. The study compares national-ethnic motivations in Uzbek ergonyms (agricultural life, Islamic values, hospitality) with the individualistic, historical-maritime, and commercial-pragmatic motivations predominant in English ergonyms. Through linguocultural analysis, the unique features of both ergonymic systems as well as the hybridisation processes occurring under the conditions of globalisation are demonstrated.
Keywords: ergonym, onomastics, national-cultural semantics, linguoculture, pragmatics, comparative linguistics.

INTRODUCTION: Every linguistic unit created by humanity reflects a specific socio-cultural environment, a national worldview, and the spirit of the era. Within the system of onomastics, an independent and rapidly developing branch of linguistics, ergonyms—that is, proper names of enterprises, organizations, institutions, commercial facilities, brands, and private companies—occupy a special place as linguistic indicators that swiftly reflect dynamic societal changes. Ergonymy is not merely a terminological phenomenon; it is a direct product of socio-economic relations, globalisation, and intercultural communication.

An ergonym is not simply an exclusive title or a neutral nominal unit assigned to an object; it embodies a deep linguocultural code, ethnocultural connotation, and national mentality. Behind each name lies the historical memory, value system, and aesthetic taste of a particular nation. The formation and social function of ergonyms have been theoretically investigated by foreign and Russian linguists such as N. V. Podolskaya and A. V. Superanskaya, as well as prominent representatives of the Uzbek onomastic school, E. Begmatov and N. Uluqov. As emphasized in these studies, ergonyms not only define the linguistic landscape of urban and modern areas but also serve as a tool that shapes cultural and intercultural relations within society.

Under the conditions of today's rapid globalisation, the expansion of international trade and industrial relations, and the integration of the information space, studying the national-cultural semantics of Uzbek and English ergonyms from a comparative perspective acquires particular relevance. The affiliation of these languages to different families (Turkic and Germanic) and the divergences in the worldview of their native speakers are clearly manifested in the semantic and linguistic motivation of ergonymic units. Nevertheless, a comparative-systematic study of the patterns governing the manifestation of national-cultural semantics, as well as the pragmatic function and semantic motivation in the Uzbek and English ergonymic systems, remains one of the issues that has not yet found its complete solution in the field.

The scientific and practical goal of this study is to determine the degree of manifestation of national-cultural semantics in Uzbek and English ergonyms, to demonstrate the commonalities

(universals) and distinctive features (idiosyncratic characteristics) in their semantic motivation through comparative-linguocultural analysis, and to elucidate the transformational processes occurring in the modern linguistic landscape.

METHODS: The methodological foundation of this comparative-linguocultural study is formed by the modern principles and research methods of onomastics, sociolinguistics, and semantics. To establish the empirical base of the research, more than 400 ergonymic units selected from the real linguistic landscape of Tashkent (Uzbekistan) as well as London and New York (United Kingdom and USA) between 2024 and 2026, along with official registries of commercial enterprises and naming databases, were collected and subjected to analysis as the primary empirical material.

In order to comprehensively, objectively, and systematically reveal the national-cultural features and semantic motivations of ergonyms formed in typologically different languages (Turkic and Germanic), a complex of the following linguistic methods was employed:

Comparative-Analytical and Typological Method:

Through this method, the lexical-semantic structure, nominative techniques, and patterns of formation of ergonymic units belonging to the Uzbek and English languages were equated and comparatively analyzed.

The method enabled the identification of general universals in the structure of ergonymic names across both languages, as well as distinctive differential features stemming from national mentality.

Linguocultural and Ethnosemantic Analysis Method:

This method played a key role in identifying the national-cultural component, ethnocultural connotation, and hidden cultural codes within the semantic structure of ergonyms.

With the help of this method, each ergonymic name was investigated from a linguo-cognitive perspective not merely as a designation of an object, but as a linguistic source carrying national values such as historical memory, sacred-religious views, hospitality, and collectivism.

Descriptive-Classificatory Method:

The collected corpus of over 400 practical ergonymic materials was categorized into specific groups (ethnonymic, toponymic, eponymic, agricultural-metaphorical, pragmatic) according to their thematic focus, nominative motivation, and semantic scope.

A linguistic and sociolinguistic description of the names belonging to each thematic group was provided, systematically outlining their role and status within the linguistic landscape.

RESULTS: As a result of the linguocultural, ethnosemantic, and pragmatic analysis of more than 400 ergonymic units collected from the real linguistic landscape of Tashkent, London, and New York, it was determined that the manifestation of national-cultural semantics in the Uzbek and English ergonymic systems differs across the following four primary dominant thematic and linguocultural directions:

Linguistic Reflection of Historical-Cultural and Ethnic Concepts

The preservation of historical memory and ethnocultural codes within the onomastic system is one of the main criteria indicating the level of self-awareness of a nation.

In Uzbek Ergonymy: Motivations of national identity, pride in historical heritage, and respect for sacred-mythological values predominate. Ergonymic names widely incorporate ethnonyms, historical toponyms, and mythological images from folklore.

Practical Examples: “Afrosiyob” (hospitality/train), “Samarqand” (restaurant/brand), “Humo” (arena/airline), “Ipak Yoli” (tourism/hotel), “Caravan” (catering network).

In-Depth Semantic Analysis: Through these names, a linguistic connection between the past and present is maintained in society. For instance, the ergonym “Humo” relies on the semantics of the legendary bird in Eastern mythology that brings happiness, prosperity, and abundance, thereby instilling psychological trust and positive connotations in consumers (metaphorical transfer). Meanwhile, “Ipak Yoli” (Silk Road) reactivates ethnocultural background knowledge regarding Uzbekistan’s historical role as a crossroads and trading hub.

In English Ergonymy: Emphasis is placed on historical dynastic traditions, symbols of monarchy, as well as geographic and maritime realities in the history of Great Britain and the United States.

Practical Examples: “Royal Mail” (postal service), “Crown Bakery” (bakery), “The Anchor” (pub/restaurant), “Mayflower” (hotel).

In-Depth Semantic Analysis: The lexical units “Royal” or “Crown” are perceived in the English linguocultural environment as symbols of state guarantee, long-standing stability, and high quality. Ergonyms such as “The Anchor” and “Mayflower” (the ship of the Pilgrim Fathers who first migrated to America in 1620) express an intrinsic link to the maritime history, discoveries, and national formation processes of the English and American peoples.

Models of Values and National Worldview

The ergonymic space of every language reflects the mentality, social relations, and moral-ethical standards of that society.

Collectivism and Moral-Islamic Values in Uzbek Ergonyms: Concepts of hospitality, collectivism, household/family (xonadon), and national etiquette characteristic of Uzbek society are embedded into ergonyms.

Practical Examples: “Oshxona”, “Xonadon”, “Omin”, “Baraka”, “Rizq”, “Saxovat”, “Halol”.

In-Depth Semantic Analysis: In Uzbek culture, dining and service establishments are not merely commercial spaces, but venues for social interaction and collective unity. Concepts like “Baraka” (blessing) and “Rizq” (sustenance) are linked to the Islamic-spiritual worldview; rather than merely offering a product, they convey connotative wish-fulfillment semantics, wishing abundance and purity upon the consumer's household.

Individualism and Pragmatism in English Ergonyms: In Anglo-Saxon culture, personal independence, individual responsibility, and commercial efficiency take precedence.

Practical Examples: “Founder's Choice”, “Best Value”, “Smart Fit”, “Independent”, “Express Laundry”.

In-Depth Semantic Analysis: In these names, individual consumer needs and precise time or money savings are brought to the forefront (*benefit-driven nomination*). Excessive symbolism is avoided in favor of direct expressions of pragmatic and functional utility (denotative accuracy).

Manifestation of Agricultural-Fitonymic and Industrial/Eponymic Motivations

Economic and geographical lifestyles serve as crucial factors defining the lexical layer of ergonymic units.

In the Linguistic Landscape of Uzbekistan: Fitonymic and agricultural semantics related to crop farming, agriculture, and natural produce exhibit a high frequency.

Practical Examples: “Anor” (shop/brand), “G‘uncha” (kindergarten/cinema), “Paxtakor” (sports/manufacturing), “Zarhal”, “Bodomzor”.

In-Depth Semantic Analysis: In Uzbek culture, natural produce (specifically pomegranate, almond, cotton) symbolizes fertility, material-spiritual abundance, and beauty. Consequently, fitonymic metonymy or metaphor is employed to endow commercial objects with a spirit of positivity and prosperity.

In English and American Ergonymy: Names based on industry, technology, and entrepreneur surnames (eponymy) predominate.

Practical Examples: “Baker & Sons”, “Ford”, “Smith & Co.”, “Johnson & Johnson”, “McDonald's”.

In-Depth Semantic Analysis: Eponymy—the practice of naming an enterprise after its founder or owner—is viewed in Anglo-Saxon tradition as a sign of taking personal accountability for brand and product quality, generational continuity, and transparency. In the Uzbek ergonymic system, naming commercial entities after individuals historically shows a lower frequency, developing gradually under the influence of modern brand practices.

Comparative-Analytic Table of Ergonymic Systems

The findings of the linguocultural and semantic analysis can be summarized in the following comparative table:

| Criteria of Analysis | Uzbek Ergonymic System | English Ergonymic System | Linguocultural and Pragmatic Divergence |

| Dominant Motivation | Connotative (symbolic, wish-fulfillment, spiritual) | Denotative (precise, functional, pragmatic) | Uzbek names focus on spiritual and national sentiments, whereas English names target practical utility and outcomes. |

|Social Orientation | Collectivism, hospitality, family/household | Individualism, personal choice, responsibility | Collective unity is prioritized in Uzbek culture, while individual freedom and distinctiveness lead in English culture. |

|Historical-Ethnic Source | Historical toponyms, ethnonyms, and mythology | Monarchical symbols, maritime history, and eponyms | Uzbek ergonyms rely on the Silk Road and Eastern legends; English ergonyms stem from dynastic traditions and business owners. |

|Naming Model | Fitonymic, sacred-religious, hospitality-based | Eponymic (Owner's Name), industrial, commercial | Surnames in English denote accountability; transferring symbols of good wishes and blessings (baraka) dominates in Uzbek. |

DISCUSSION: The results of the comparative-linguocultural analysis of Uzbek and English ergonyms indicate fundamental differences in the linguistic worldview and socio-cultural value systems of native speakers of both languages.

Divergence in Semantic and Pragmatic Motivation

The study confirms distinct nominative techniques and orientations of linguistic motivation in Uzbek and English:

Connotative vs. Denotative Dominance: Uzbek ergonyms exhibit predominantly connotative (symbolic, wish-fulfillment, and spiritual) semantics. For instance, naming a commercial complex “Baraka” (Blessing) or “Rizq” (Sustenance) goes beyond offering a product; it conveys an ethnocultural intention of wishing spiritual abundance and prosperity upon the consumer's household. Conversely, English ergonyms are dominated by denotative (precise, functional, and commercial) semantics.

Social Psychology in Naming: In Anglo-Saxon culture, employing personal surnames as ergonyms (eponymy) signifies the business owner's personal accountability for quality and integrity. In Uzbek linguoculture, however, referencing collective values (“Xonadon”, “Qadrdonlar”) or sacred-mythological symbols (“Humo”, “Afrosiyob”) historically takes precedence over publicly displaying the founder's name.

Hybridisation and Transculturalism in the Context of Globalisation

Today, in the linguistic landscape of major metropolises like Tashkent, a strong influence of English language pragmatics and global branding trends is observed, leading to the emergence of hybrid ergonyms:

Examples: “Osh & Grill”, “Choyxona Lounge”, “Milliy Style”, “Plov Center”.

This linguistic phenomenon demonstrates a synthesis of national and international linguistic codes: national-cultural content in Uzbek (Osh, Choyxona, Milliy) merges with commercial-pragmatic formats in English (Grill, Lounge, Center), forming contemporary transcultural ergonyms.

CONCLUSION: The comparative analysis of national-cultural semantics in Uzbek and English ergonyms leads to the following general scientific conclusions:

Ergonyms as Carriers of National-Cultural Codes: Ergonymic units are not merely tools for commercial naming; they represent significant linguocultural phenomena that preserve and display the historical memory, worldview, religious-spiritual values, and aesthetic taste of a society within its linguistic landscape.

Comparative Divergences: While Uzbek ergonymy relies on concepts of hospitality, sacred-Islamic values, collectivism, and agricultural-fitonymic semantics, English ergonymy is characterized by eponymy (personal branding), monarchical and maritime history, and benefit-driven pragmatic semantics.

Scientific and Practical Significance: The findings of this study are recommended for practical and theoretical application in linguoculturology, comparative linguistics, sociolinguistics, and applied marketing (cross-cultural branding, naming, and the regulation of regional linguistic landscapes).

REFERENCES

1. Бегматов Э. Ўзбек тили антропонимикаси. – Тошкент: Фан, 2013. – 260 б.
2. Мирзаев Т., Мусақулов А. Ўзбек халқ ономастикаси масалалари. – Тошкент: Фан, 2008. – 210 б.
3. Подольская Н. В. Словарь русской ономастической терминологии. – Москва: Наука, 1988. – 192 с.65
4. Суперанская А. В. Общая теория имени собственного. – Москва: Наука, 2007. – 368 с.
5. Улуқов Н. М. Ўзбек тили гидронимларининг лексик-семантик ва лингвистик таҳлили. – Тошкент: Фан, 2008. – 180 б.
6. Улуқов Н. Ўзбек ономастикаси масалалари. – Тошкент: Университет, 2018.
7. Shukurjon, N. (2016). Metaphor in Formation of Khorezmian Professional Lexis Level. ANGLISTICUM. Journal of the Association-Institute for English Language and American Studies, 5(5), 17-20.
8. Back K. R. Naming and Culture: Ergonymy in Modern Urban Landscapes. // Journal of Pragmatics and Cultural Linguistics, Vol. 14, 2022. – PP. 45–58.
9. Норбаева, Ш. Х. (2020). BORROWED WORDS IN THE PROFESSIONAL LEXIS OF KHOREZMIAN DIALECTS. Вестник Ошского государственного университета, 2(1-4), 13-16.
10. Yemelyanova A. M. Ergonymy in modern urban space: A sociolinguistic approach. // Journal of Pragmatics, 2021.
11. ResearchGate & InLibrary data (2024–2026): The Role of English and Uzbek Language in Describing Ergonym; Cultural Semantic Units in Uzbek and English; Linguocultural and Semantic Features of Modern Ergonyms.

ISSN:1947-2536 Isdoi:omiddinova Imrona