BG Pulse Journal USA
ISSN:1947-2536 http://www.bgpulseusa.com/index.php/bg
BG PULSE JOURNAL

LINGUOCOGNITIVE AND LINGUOCULTURAL ANALYSIS OF UZBEK AND ENGLISH ANTHROPONYMS: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF PERSONAL NAMES AS CULTURAL CODES.

Nilufar Maxmudovna Madraximova
English Language Instructor,
Department of Language Teaching Methodology,
Pedagogical Skills Center of Khorezm Region, Uzbekistan
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20490850

Abstract: Anthroponyms, as personal names, represent one of the most important components of a nation's linguistic and cultural heritage. In contemporary linguistics, anthroponyms are studied not only as nominative units but also as carriers of cognitive, social, historical, and cultural information. The present article investigates the linguocognitive and linguocultural characteristics of Uzbek and English anthroponyms through a comparative approach. The study focuses on the semantic structure, cultural symbolism, cognitive representation, and social functions of personal names in both linguistic traditions. The research demonstrates that Uzbek anthroponyms are closely connected with family values, religious beliefs, social aspirations, and historical traditions, while English anthroponyms reflect historical development, religious influences, social stratification, and cultural continuity. The article also examines the role of anthroponyms as cultural codes that preserve collective memory and national identity. The findings reveal both universal and culture-specific naming patterns that contribute to the understanding of language, cognition, and culture. The research is based on scholarly literature in onomastics, anthropological linguistics, and linguocultural studies and relies exclusively on documented scientific sources.

Keywords: anthroponymy, anthroponym, linguocognitive analysis, linguocultural analysis, Uzbek language, English language, personal names, cultural codes, onomastics, cognition, cultural identity, comparative linguistics

Introduction

Anthroponymy, a branch of onomastics, studies personal names and their linguistic, historical, and cultural characteristics. According to contemporary onomastic research, anthroponyms function not only as means of identification but also as important markers of cultural identity and collective memory [1]. Personal names preserve information about social values, religious traditions, historical events, ethnic origins, and cognitive perceptions of a particular community.

The relationship between language and culture has become one of the central issues of modern linguistics. Linguocultural studies emphasize that language units reflect cultural knowledge accumulated by society over centuries. Anthroponyms occupy a special position among such units because they directly represent human beings and often embody cultural expectations, beliefs, and symbolic meanings [2].

In Uzbek culture, personal names are traditionally associated with positive wishes, religious values, family expectations, and social ideals. Names such as Dilshod, Baxtiyor, Umida, and Mohira are selected because of their positive semantic content and symbolic significance. In English-speaking societies, many personal names originate from biblical, Germanic, Latin, Greek, and French traditions. Names such as John, Mary, William, and Elizabeth have maintained their popularity for centuries due to religious and historical influences [3].

The purpose of this study is to analyze the linguocognitive and linguocultural features of Uzbek and English anthroponyms and to identify similarities and differences in their functioning as cultural codes.

Methodology

The study employs a comparative linguocultural approach to examine anthroponyms in Uzbek and English. Several research methods were applied:

Comparative analysis was used to identify similarities and differences between Uzbek and English naming systems.

Semantic analysis was employed to investigate the meanings and symbolic functions of anthroponyms.

Linguocognitive analysis was applied to examine how personal names reflect conceptual structures and cognitive models within each culture.

Descriptive and interpretative methods were used to analyze scholarly literature on anthroponymy, linguoculturology, and onomastics.

The theoretical framework of the study is based on contemporary research in anthroponymy and cultural linguistics, which considers personal names as linguistic signs that encode cultural knowledge and social experience [4]. The research relies on documented linguistic studies, monographs, and academic articles concerning Uzbek and English anthroponyms.

Results

The analysis demonstrates that anthroponyms in both Uzbek and English function as complex cultural signs containing linguistic and cognitive information.

One of the most significant findings is the strong connection between anthroponyms and cultural values. Uzbek names frequently express wishes for happiness, prosperity, wisdom, beauty, and health. Examples include Baxtiyor ("fortunate"), Umida ("hope"), and Doniyor ("wise"). Such names reveal the importance of positive life expectations in Uzbek culture [5].

English anthroponyms often derive from historical, religious, and linguistic traditions. Many common English names have biblical origins, including John, Joseph, Mary, and Elizabeth. Others originate from Old English, Germanic, Greek, or Latin sources and reflect historical processes of cultural contact and language development [6].

The study also reveals differences in structural formation. Uzbek anthroponyms frequently employ meaningful lexical roots combined with derivational elements. The agglutinative nature of the Uzbek language facilitates the formation of semantically transparent names. Linguistic research confirms that Uzbek morphology relies heavily on affixation and word formation processes [7].

English anthroponyms often preserve historical forms whose original meanings are no longer transparent to contemporary speakers. For instance, William derives from Germanic elements meaning "will" and "protection," while Robert historically signifies "bright fame." Although these etymological meanings are documented, they are not always cognitively active in modern language use [8].

Another important finding concerns gender representation. Both naming systems demonstrate gender differentiation; however, cultural patterns vary. Studies of personal naming practices indicate that names often reflect culturally constructed expectations associated with gender roles [9].

Analysis and Discussion

From a linguocognitive perspective, anthroponyms can be viewed as conceptual units that organize cultural knowledge. Personal names activate specific cognitive associations related to identity, family, religion, history, and social status.

In Uzbek culture, anthroponyms frequently function as verbal representations of parental aspirations. Many names embody concepts such as happiness, prosperity, courage, beauty, and spiritual purity. These concepts constitute important elements of the Uzbek cultural worldview. Therefore, the act of naming is not merely a linguistic procedure but also a cognitive and cultural practice that transmits values from one generation to another [10].

Religious influence plays a particularly important role in Uzbek anthroponymy. The spread of Islam contributed significantly to the adoption of Arabic and Persian names throughout Central Asia. Names such as Muhammad, Ali, Fatima, and Hasan remain widespread due to their religious significance and historical prestige. These anthroponyms function as cultural symbols connecting individuals with broader religious traditions [11].

English anthroponymy demonstrates a different historical trajectory. The Norman Conquest of 1066 significantly influenced the English naming system through the introduction of French and continental European names. Over time, biblical names became dominant in English-speaking societies. Historical records indicate that names such as John, Thomas, Mary, and Anne maintained high frequency for several centuries due to religious traditions and social continuity [12].

The linguocultural analysis further demonstrates that anthroponyms serve as cultural codes. Cultural codes can be understood as systems of signs through which societies preserve and transmit cultural meanings. Personal names encode information about historical periods, ethnic origins, religious affiliations, and social values.

For example, Uzbek anthroponyms frequently preserve cultural concepts related to family continuity, respect for elders, and collective identity. Names derived from words meaning "hope," "prosperity," or "happiness" reveal culturally significant ideals. Such names function as symbolic representations of social expectations and collective aspirations [13].

English anthroponyms similarly preserve cultural memory. Historical names associated with monarchs, saints, or prominent historical figures often remain in use because they symbolize continuity and tradition. The persistence of names such as Elizabeth, Henry, Edward, and Victoria illustrates the connection between anthroponymy and historical consciousness [14].

A significant difference between the two traditions concerns semantic transparency. In Uzbek, many anthroponyms retain meanings that are readily understood by contemporary speakers. For example, Baxtiyor directly conveys the concept of happiness, while Umida clearly denotes hope. In English, however, many names have undergone semantic opacity due to linguistic change. Although etymological meanings remain documented, modern speakers rarely associate names such as Richard or Margaret with their original semantic content.

Despite these differences, both naming systems demonstrate the universal human tendency to use names as carriers of social and cultural meaning. Anthropological and linguistic studies confirm that personal names function as important markers of identity across cultures [1].

The comparative analysis also supports the view that anthroponyms contribute to the preservation of cultural heritage. Through naming practices, communities transmit historical memory, cultural values, and social norms. Consequently, the study of anthroponyms provides valuable insights into the relationship between language, cognition, and culture.

Conclusion

The comparative linguocognitive and linguocultural analysis of Uzbek and English anthroponyms demonstrates that personal names function as significant cultural codes reflecting collective knowledge, historical memory, and social values. Although Uzbek and English naming systems developed under different historical and cultural conditions, both exhibit strong connections between language and culture.

Uzbek anthroponyms are characterized by semantic transparency, positive evaluative meanings, and close association with family values and religious traditions. English anthroponyms, while often historically motivated, reflect complex processes of linguistic change, cultural contact, and religious influence.

The research confirms that anthroponyms serve not only as identifiers but also as repositories of cultural information. Their study contributes to a deeper understanding of cognitive processes, cultural identity formation, and intercultural communication. Future research may expand the comparative analysis by incorporating larger corpora of personal names and examining contemporary naming trends in both linguistic communities.

References

1. Room, A. An Alphabetical Guide to the Language of Name Studies. Lanham: Scarecrow Press, 1996. pp. 6–39.
2. Bruck, G., Bodenhorn, B. An Anthropology of Names and Naming. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. pp. 1–20.
3. Hanks, P., Coates, R., McClure, P. The Oxford Dictionary of Family Names in Britain and Ireland. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016. pp. 15–45.
4. Superanskaya, A. V. Obshchaya Teoriya Imyeni Sobstvennogo. Moscow: Nauka, 1973. pp. 98–145.
5. Khujaeva, M. Anthroponyms in the Uzbek Language. Tashkent: Fan Publishing House, 2018. pp. 25–49.
6. Withycombe, E. G. The Oxford Dictionary of English Christian Names. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977. pp. 11–60.
7. Salaev, U. UzMorphAnalyser: A Morphological Analysis Model for the Uzbek Language Using Inflectional Endings. 2024. pp. 1–12.
8. Hanks, P., Hardcastle, K., Hodges, F. A Dictionary of First Names. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006. pp. 17–85.
9. Van Buskirk, I., Clauset, A., Larremore, D. B. An Open-Source Cultural Consensus Approach to Name-Based Gender Classification. 2022. pp. 2–18.
10. Nazarova, N. D. Structural, Semantic, and Linguo-Cultural Features of Anthroponyms in English and Uzbek. International Journal of Artificial Intelligence, 2025. pp. 1074–1077.
11. Juraeva, I. A., Yakhshilikova, G. A. Q. Linguistic and Cultural Features of Anthroponyms of Humor and Satire in the English and Uzbek Languages. Pindus Journal of Culture, Literature, and ELT, 2022. pp. 17–19.
12. Scott, M. The History of English Personal Names. London: Routledge, 2015. pp. 55–94.
13. Anthroponyms in the Uzbek Language. CyberLeninka, 2023. pp. 1–8.
14. Herdağdelen, A. Personal Names in Modern Turkey. 2017. pp. 1–18.