

Anthroponyms as Cultural Markers: A Comparative Linguistic Study

Suvonova Sabina Olimovna
sabincham2003@gmail.com

Master's student
Uzbekistan State World Languages University

Nasirov Abduraxim Abdimutalipovich
Doctor of Philology, Associate Professor
Uzbekistan State World Languages University

Annotation: *This article studies the linguocultural characteristics of anthroponyms in English, French, Russian and Uzbek. The study, conducted using comparative and descriptive methods, sheds light on the cultural values, social norms, historical processes and national identity embodied in each language community through personal names. Based on literary texts, dictionaries and socio-cultural sources, the semantic, etymological and stylistic features of names are analyzed in a cultural context. The results show that anthroponyms are not only linguistic units, but also serve as an important source of information on the formation of worldview and identity, embodying the historical memory and cultural symbolism of the people. Through a comparative analysis of different languages, the article shows that anthroponyms represent different naming traditions, but there are also commonalities among them. The results obtained contribute significantly to research in the fields of linguistic anthropology, cultural linguistics, and onomastics, highlighting anthroponymy as an important tool in understanding the relationship between language and culture.*

Key words: *anthroponyms, linguocultural analysis, etymology, naming traditions, identity, cultural semantics, onomastics*

Антропонимы как культурные маркеры: Сравнительное лингвистическое исследование

Сувонова Сабина Олимовна
sabincham2003@gmail.com

Магистрант
Узбекский Государственный Университет Мирových Языков

Насиров Абдурахим Абдимуталипович
Доктор филологических наук, доцент, профессор
Узбекский Государственный Университет Мирových Языков

Аннотация: *В данной статье рассматриваются лингвокультурные особенности антропонимов в английском, французском, русском и узбекском языках. Исследование, проведённое с использованием сравнительного и описательного методов, позволяет выявить культурные ценности, социальные нормы, исторические процессы и национальную идентичность, отражённые в личных именах каждого языкового сообщества. На основе литературных текстов, словарей и социокультурных источников анализируются семантические, этимологические и стилистические особенности имён в культурном контексте. Результаты показывают, что антропонимы являются не только языковыми единицами, но и важным источником информации о формировании мировоззрения и идентичности, воплощая историческую память и культурную символику народа. Сравнительный анализ различных языков демонстрирует, что антропонимы отражают разнообразные традиции именования, при этом имеют и общие черты. Полученные данные вносят весомый вклад в исследования в области лингвистической антропологии, культурной*

лингвистики и ономастики, подчёркивая значение антропонимии как важного инструмента в понимании взаимосвязи языка и культуры.

Ключевые слова: антропонимы, лингвокультурный анализ, этимология, традиции именования, идентичность, культурная семантика, ономастика

Antroponimlar – madaniy belgilar sifatida: Qiyosiy tilshunoslik tadqiqoti

Suvonova Sabina Olimovna
sabincham2003@gmail.com

Magistratura talabasi
O‘zbekiston Davlat Jahon Tillari Universiteti

Nasirov Abduraxim Abdimutalipovich
Filologiya fanlari doktori, dotsent, professor
O‘zbekiston Davlat Jahon Tillari Universiteti

Annotatsiya: Ushbu maqolada ingliz, fransuz, rus va o‘zbek tillaridagi antroponimlarning linguamadaniy xususiyatlari o‘rganilgan. Qiyosiy va tavsifiy usullar asosida olib borilgan tadqiqot har bir til jamoasida shaxs ismlari orqali ifodalanadigan madaniy qadriyatlar, ijtimoiy me‘yorlar, tarixiy jarayonlar va milliy o‘zlikni yoritadi. Badiiy matnlar, lug‘atlar va sotsiomadaniy manbalar asosida ismlarning semantik, etimologik va uslubiy xususiyatlari madaniy kontekstda tahlil qilingan. Natijalar shuni ko‘rsatadiki, antroponimlar faqat til birliklari emas, balki xalqning dunyoqarashi va o‘zligini shakllantirishga doir tarixiy xotira hamda madaniy ramzlarning muhim manbai hisoblanadi. Turli tillarning qiyosiy tahlili orqali maqolada antroponimlar xilma-xil nomlash an‘analari aks ettirishi bilan birga, ular o‘rtasida umumiyliklar ham mavjud ekani aniqlanadi. Olingan natijalar lingvistik antropologiya, madaniy tilshunoslik va onomastika sohalaridagi tadqiqotlarga muhim hissa bo‘lib xizmat qiladi hamda antroponimiyani til va madaniyat o‘rtasidagi munosabatni tushunishda muhim vosita sifatida ko‘rsatadi.

Kalit so‘zlar: antroponimlar, linguamadaniy tahlil, etimologiya, nomlash an‘analari, o‘zlik, madaniy semantika, onomastika

Introduction

Names are one of the most important aspects of human communication. They are not just signs, but also have social, cultural, historical and even psychological significance. Throughout civilizations, names have played an important role in forming identity, defining relationships and preserving cultural heritage. From ancient times to the age of digital technologies, the act of naming has been one of the necessary processes for humanity, reflecting not only linguistic regularities, but also showing the deep roots of traditions, beliefs and social structures. Personal names, or anthroponyms, are one of the most fundamental and culturally significant elements of language. They are not only a means of identifying a person, but also a reflection of the worldview, traditions, and values formed in society. In recent years, the study of personal names has become one of the most relevant topics in several areas of linguistics, in particular, in the areas of sociolinguistics, cultural linguistics, and onomastics. Onomastics is a branch of linguistics that studies the origin, structure and cultural significance of names. Onomastics studies linguistic units called *onyms* (proper names) and their forms and types. These include **anthroponyms, toponyms, zoonyms, phytonyms, hydronyms, theonyms**, and others. The mentioned terms are general names for types of onomastic units. In fact, each of these onomastic units consists of a number of **micro-onomastic** units. (E.Begmatov, 2013) As an important field of onomastics, anthroponymy studies human names (given names, surnames, nicknames, pseudonyms). In Collins dictionary anthroponymy is defined as “(,ænrəˈpɒnəmi)

the science dealing with the laws regulating the development of the human organism in relation to other organisms and to environment”.

Anthroponyms do not exist simply as signs, but often have etymological, historical and cultural connotations, revealing important information about the identity of a person, their social status and the historical period to which they belong. From a linguistic point of view, anthroponyms, in addition to having their place in syntactic, morphological, and phonological systems, also carry an important semantic load. They often embody historical layers and provide important information about ancestry, geographical location, and trends in the development of society. Furthermore, in multilingual and multicultural societies, names are subject to adaptation, translation, or even ideological changes, making them one of the most productive areas for linguistic research. Analyzing names in a multilingual and multicultural context helps to understand linguistic diversity and cultural commonalities more deeply. The four languages considered in this article – English, French, Russian, and Uzbek – each have their own naming systems based on their own history, religious influences, social structure, and linguistic norms.

This study aims to conduct a comparative linguocultural analysis of anthroponyms in selected languages and seeks answers to the following questions:

- What semantic and cultural features are embodied in anthroponyms in these languages?
- How do naming traditions reflect national identity and historical memory?
- What stylistic and metaphorical features are present in the composition of personal names?

Approaching anthroponyms through a linguocultural approach helps to understand the relationship between language and culture more deeply. Names are seen as language units with an increased historical and cultural load, and they are an important source in terms of cultural memory, social values and identity formation. Anthroponymy is one of the areas that is actively studied in different languages and cultures, and many researchers have conducted significant scientific research in this area. This chapter will focus on the main areas and works of representatives of anthroponymic research in English, French, Russian and Uzbek languages in a comparative analytical approach.

The study of personal names in English has become a well-established scientific discipline. For example, E.G. Withycombe's *The Oxford Dictionary of English Christian Names* analyzes the etymology and historical development of English names. Patrick Hanks' *Dictionary of American Family Names* and *The Oxford Dictionary of Family Names in Britain and Ireland* are devoted to the origin, meaning and regional characteristics of English surnames, highlighting the interrelationship of linguistics, migration and cultural change. David Mills' *A Dictionary of British Place-Names* and Richard Coates' numerous works on onomastics reveal the connection between anthroponyms and toponyms. This makes a significant contribution to the understanding of cultural geography. C.W. Bardsley's *A Dictionary of English and Welsh Surnames* is one of the first major studies aimed at studying the formation and change of historical surnames.

In French onomastics, Albert Dauzat's *Dictionnaire étymologique des noms de famille et prénoms de France* is the main scientific source. He analyzed the etymology and historical development of French names. Marie-Thérèse Morlet, in her work *Les Noms de Personne sur le Territoire de l'Ancienne Gaule*, studied personal names used in ancient Gaul and revealed the historical layers of French names. Jean-Louis Beaucarnot, through his scientific and popular works, analyzes modern French surnames from a sociolinguistic perspective. Pierre-Henri Billy and Ernest Nègre connect anthroponyms with toponyms, dialectology, and regional language features.

As a result of the comparison, it becomes clear that both the English and French research traditions emphasize etymology and historical continuity. However, while French scholars tend to study more regional dialects and Romano-Gallic influences, English researchers pay particular attention to Anglo-Saxon, Celtic, and Norman linguistic factors.

Scientific research on Russian anthroponymics is deeply rooted in historical and philological traditions. N.M. Tupikov's work *Slavyanskiye imena v drevnerusskikh pamyatnikakh* is one of the first attempts to catalog and interpret Slavic names found in ancient Russian manuscripts. A.V.

Superanskaya, a leading scholar of Russian onomastics, developed the theoretical foundations of Russian names in her work *Obshchaya teoriya imeni sobstvennogo* and compiled a comprehensive resource called *Slovar russkikh lichnykh imen*. Her work combines the grammatical, semantic, and cultural dimensions of Russian personal names. N. M. Petrovsky created a comprehensive lexicographic work on Russian names, while V.A. Nikonov analyzed the role and functions of names in Russian society in his work “*Imya i obshchestvo*” based on a sociolinguistic approach. Also, B.O. Unbegaun’s work “*Russian Surnames*” is an important study that deeply studied the formation and origin of Russian surnames, and is still valued as a main source today.

The works of Ernest Begmatov occupy an important place in Uzbek anthroponymy. He analyzed Uzbek names from a linguistic, historical and cultural perspective through his works “*Anthroponomy of the Uzbek Language*” and “*Explanation of Uzbek Names*”. His research pays special attention to Turkic roots, the influence of Islamic culture, and the changing social and cultural meanings of names. While Russian anthroponymy has placed more emphasis on religious, Slavic origins, and social stratification, Uzbek studies focus on tribal affiliation, religious beliefs, and symbols of national identity. In Russian and Uzbek traditions value historical documents and the cultural role of names, but while Russian scientific research is based more on theoretical aspects and lexicography, Uzbek research is particularly closely linked to ethnography and folklore.

In order to fully grasp the complexity and cultural depth of anthroponyms, it is essential to examine the ways in which scholars across different linguistic traditions have approached their classification. Linguists from various countries have proposed distinct frameworks that reflect the cultural, historical, and structural nuances of their respective languages. These categorizations not only highlight the diversity of anthroponymic systems but also provide valuable insights into naming practices, identity formation, and linguistic evolution. The following section presents a comparative overview of anthroponym classifications as proposed by key linguists in English, Russian, French, and Uzbek studies.

English naming systems, examined by researchers like Patrick Hanks and Richard Coates, focus on etymology, historical surname formation, and socio-professional origins (e.g., Baker, Smith). However, the cognitive and social psychology behind modern name choices, including digital pseudonyms, offers new territory for linguacultural exploration. Patrick Hanks and Richard Coates categorize anthroponyms into following groups:

1. **Given names:** e.g. *William, Elizabeth* – from Christian and Anglo-Saxon roots.
2. **Surnames (Family names):** **occupational:** *Smith, Baker*; **topographic:** *Hill, Rivers*; **descriptive:** *Strong, White*.
3. **Patronymic:** *Johnson* (“son of John”).
4. **Nicknames:** e.g. *Red* (for red hair), *Tiny* (for small stature).
5. **Pseudonyms:** e.g. *Mark Twain* (real name: Samuel Clemens).

English surnames developed primarily between the **11th–14th centuries**, when feudal and administrative systems required clear identity markers. The focus on **occupation, geography, and family lineage** illustrates medieval social structure. Patronymics faded but survive in surnames (*Richardson*). Nicknames remain informal and expressive of **individual traits**.

In **French**, scholars like Dauzat and Morlet have highlighted traditional naming patterns, patronymic endings (-eau, -ier), and regional surname formations. However, linguistic-cultural links – especially those influenced by history, class, or geography – demand further theoretical integration:

1. **Given names (Prénoms):** e.g. *Jean, Claire* – mostly Christian, Latin, or Germanic in origin.
2. **Surnames (Noms de famille):** **occupational:** *Boulangier* (baker), *Charpentier* (carpenter); **geographical:** *Dupont* (“from the bridge”), *Lemoine*; **descriptive:** *Legrand* (tall), *Petit* (short).
3. **Patronymic:** e.g. *Martin, Henriot*.

4. **Pseudonymes (Surnoms):** e.g. *Voltaire* (François-Marie Arouet) – often used in literature and politics.

French anthroponymy mirrors the **social stratification of feudal France**, especially via surnames. Many French surnames arose after **King François I's 1539 decree** demanding civil registration. The **pseudonym tradition** remains strong in French literary and revolutionary history, indicating the importance of **individual identity vs public persona**.

Russian anthroponymy, shaped significantly by scholars like Superanskaya and Nikonov, emphasizes the tripartite structure of full names (given name + patronymic + surname) and showcases religious, ethnic, and imperial legacies. Yet, the **functional roles of diminutives and affectionate forms** still require expanded analysis:

1. **First names (Имена):** e.g. *Ivan, Olga* – many from Orthodox saints.
2. **Patronymics (Отчества):** e.g. *Petrovich, Ivanovna* – formed by father's name + suffix.
3. **Surnames (Фамилии):** **occupational:** *Kuznetsov* (blacksmith); **descriptive:** *Belyaev* (white one); **geographical:** *Moskovsky* (from Moscow).
4. **Nicknames (Прозвища):** e.g. *Kosoy* (cross-eyed), *Tolstoy* (fat).
5. **Pseudonyms (Псевдонимы):** e.g. *Lenin* (real name: Vladimir Ulyanov).

Russian names follow a **strict tripartite structure:** given name + patronymic + surname. This reflects the **Orthodox tradition and bureaucratic culture** of Tsarist and Soviet Russia. The patronymic is obligatory and marks **filial respect**. Descriptive surnames and nicknames highlight **historical rural life and traits**.

In **Uzbek**, for instance, Ernest Begmatov has outlined six primary categories of anthroponyms: given names, nicknames, pseudonyms, ancestral naming conventions (e.g., "o'g'li", "qizi"), historical Arabic-based genealogical patterns (like "ibn"), and Soviet-influenced surnames and patronymics. While this framework offers foundational clarity, research into **the literary, folkloric, and conversational roles of pseudonyms and dialectal nicknames** remains largely insufficient:

1. **Personal names (Ismlar):** e.g. *Dilshod, Zilola* – used to identify individuals.
2. **Nicknames (Laqablar):** e.g. *Ko'zi ojiz Muhammad* – based on personal traits or conditions.
3. **Pseudonyms (Taxalluslar):** e.g. *Zulfiyaxonim* (Usta Zulfiyaxonim's poetic name).
4. **Patronymic constructs:** e.g. *Nodira qizi Dilbar, Rustam o'g'li Bahodir*.
5. **Historical Arabic patronymic models:** e.g. *Ibn Sino* ("son of Sino") – found in classical texts.
6. **Russian-style surnames and patronymics:** e.g. *Karimov Anvar Muxammadovich* – introduced during the Soviet era.

Uzbek naming practices have evolved under the influence of **Turkic, Islamic, and Soviet traditions**. Patronymic forms like "qizi" and "o'g'li" reflect **patriarchal lineage**, while Arabic constructions (ibn) are historical remnants from **Islamic scholarship**. Post-1920s Soviet influence institutionalized **Russian-style surnames** and patronymics, shaping modern identity formats.

Thus far, much of anthroponymic research – particularly in non-European contexts – has been conducted descriptively. A growing scholarly consensus now advocates for **theoretical and interdisciplinary approaches**, viewing anthroponyms through anthropocentric, cognitive, and linguacultural lenses. Such frameworks enable the study of personal names not merely as linguistic units but as markers of identity shaped by **ethnolinguistic heritage, cultural-historical background, psychological significance, social and aesthetic norms, religious and moral values**.

Methodology of research

The purpose of this research is to conduct a comparative linguocultural analysis of anthroponyms in the English, French, Russian, and Uzbek languages. The study aims to explore the semantic and cultural features embodied in personal names, to understand how naming traditions reflect national identity and historical memory, and to analyze the stylistic and metaphorical features of these names. This study will be based on a qualitative research design, specifically a comparative and descriptive approach. The analysis will focus on the etymology, morphology, and semantics of

anthroponyms, examining their linguistic and cultural significance in each of the four languages. The data will be analyzed from a linguocultural perspective, considering how names reflect the social, cultural, and historical contexts in which they are used. The data for this study will be gathered from various scholarly sources, including dictionaries, onomastic works, and linguistic studies of anthroponyms. The primary sources of data will include Patrick Hanks' *Dictionary of American Family Names*, E.G. Withycombe's *The Oxford Dictionary of English Christian Names*, and Richard Coates' research on anthroponymic toponyms in English and Albert Dauzat's *Dictionnaire étymologique des noms de famille et prénoms de France*, Marie-Thérèse Morlet's *Les Noms de Personne sur le Territoire de l'Ancienne Gaule*, and Jean-Louis Beaucarnot's sociolinguistic works in French. While in Russian N.M. Tupikov's *Slavyanskiye imena v drevnerusskikh pamyatnikakh*, A.V. Superanskaya's *Obshchaya teoriya imeni sobstvennogo*, and B.O. Unbegaun's *Russian Surnames are focused to analyze in Uzbek* Ernest Begmatov's works such as *Anthroponomy of the Uzbek Language* and *Explanation of Uzbek Names are studied*. Secondary data from academic articles, theses, and research papers on the study of anthroponyms will also be reviewed to enhance the understanding of naming systems in these four languages. The collected data will be analyzed using **etymological, sociolinguistic, semantic, comparative analysis and linguocultural approach**. **Regarding etymological analysis** the origins and historical development of names will be traced to understand how they have evolved over time. This will include the examination of linguistic roots, historical events, and cultural shifts that may have influenced naming practices in each language. **Sociolinguistic point of view** the study will explore how naming traditions in each language reflect the social structure and cultural values of the society. This will involve examining the roles of names in societal identity formation, social hierarchy, and regional identity. **In semantic analysis** the meanings and connotations of names will be analyzed to determine how they embody cultural values, historical memory, and social status. This analysis will focus on the metaphorical and symbolic aspects of names, such as how names reflect personal traits, religious beliefs, or ethnic identity. A cross-linguistic comparison will be made to identify similarities and differences in the categorization, structure, and significance of names in English, French, Russian, and Uzbek cultures. This will highlight how each language's naming system reflects its cultural, historical, and social characteristics. In line with the linguocultural approach, this study will consider how language and culture interact to shape naming practices. Anthroponyms will be examined not only as linguistic units but also as cultural symbols that convey identity, social norms, and collective memory. This approach will provide a deeper understanding of the cultural meaning embedded in names across different linguistic traditions.

The study will be framed within the context of linguistic anthropology and sociocultural linguistics, recognizing that personal names serve as both linguistic markers and cultural symbols. The theoretical framework will draw on the following concepts:

Onomastics: The study of names and their meanings, particularly focusing on anthroponyms as cultural and historical artifacts.

Sociolinguistics: The analysis of how names reflect social identity, group membership, and power relations in different cultures.

Cultural Linguistics: An interdisciplinary field that studies how language shapes and is shaped by culture. This framework will guide the exploration of how naming practices in different languages reflect cultural beliefs, historical events, and social structures.

While this research provides a comparative study of anthroponyms across four languages, it is limited to the analysis of specific naming traditions in each language. Variations within regional dialects or specific sociolinguistic groups may not be fully explored. Additionally, the study will primarily rely on existing scholarly sources, which may limit the scope of primary data collection. This methodology aims to provide a comprehensive and culturally sensitive analysis of anthroponyms across English, French, Russian, and Uzbek languages. By applying a linguocultural approach, this research will contribute to a deeper understanding of how names function as linguistic, social, and

cultural symbols. Through a comparative analysis, this study will highlight the richness and diversity of naming practices across these languages and offer new insights into the relationship between language and culture.

Findings and results

Current findings suggest that anthroponyms demonstrate unique structural patterns and diverse mechanisms of formation across languages. These include functional universality of certain lexical elements, instances of semantic disconnection between name components, and the presence of names derived from natural phenomena or imitative origins. Such intricacies underscore the importance of a more comprehensive and quantitative analysis of anthroponymic data. However, not all types of anthroponyms have been equally studied. For instance, in Uzbek, pseudonyms and regionally nuanced nicknames still require focused research. Particularly underexplored are the **linguopoetic functions of pseudonyms** in literary texts, folklore, public discourse, and oral communication. To date, most anthroponymic research – especially in Uzbek onomastics – has been conducted through descriptive methods. The current academic shift favors theoretical approaches, encouraging exploration from anthropocentric, cognitive, and linguacultural perspectives. This paradigm allows for a deeper understanding of anthroponyms not only through a **linguistic lens**, but also from **ethnolinguistic, ethnocultural, psychological, sociolinguistic, aesthetic, and religious-historical** viewpoints. Such a multidimensional study is essential in recognizing the broader communicative and cultural roles that personal names play in different linguistic and societal contexts. Therefore, future research across languages like English, French, Russian, and Uzbek should aim to address these dimensions more equitably, enriching the comparative onomastic landscape. To better illustrate the comparative analysis of anthroponyms across four languages – English, French, Russian, and Uzbek – the following table provides a synthesized overview of their key linguacultural characteristics:

Feature	English	French	Russian	Uzbek
Lexical-functional universality	Common use of names like John, Mary which are flexible across contexts	Universal names like Jean, Marie with high frequency	Widespread use of names like Ivan, Anna in various forms	Traditional names like Ali, Zaynab used broadly in speech and documents
Lack of semantic cohesion in multi-part names	Surnames like Johnson (son of John) or Smith-Walker may lack unified meaning	Compound surnames like Durand-Leclerc may not convey connected meanings	Full names (e.g., Sergei Ivanovich Petrov) often include inherited parts with no semantic link	Traditional constructions like Abdulla o‘g‘li + Soviet surname may seem semantically inconsistent
Natural or imitative derivations	Names from occupations (Baker, Hunter), nature (Rose, Sky)	Derived from nature or traits (Blanche – white, Renard – fox)	Use of symbolic or nature-based names (Lebed – swan, Medvedev – bear)	Metaphoric or nature-related names (Shodiyor – joyful, Qorovul – guard) common in folk tradition

Anthroponyms are not merely names but semiotic systems deeply embedded in the **linguacultural fabric** of societies. They function as carriers of **values, beliefs, traditions, and social structures**, often encoding **cultural narratives and ideologies**. In English-speaking cultures, personal names are embedded in historical, religious, and socio-cultural discourses. Many English names reflect Judeo-Christian traditions (e.g., *Mary, John*) and are laden with biblical and moral connotations. English personal names act as verbal fossils, preserving traces of earlier cultural,

religious, and linguistic phases (Coates, Richard, 2006). Occupational surnames like *Miller*, *Taylor*, and *Shepherd* highlight the significance of one's profession in defining identity within the feudal class system. These names also functioned as sociolinguistic markers of class and occupation. Furthermore, the widespread use of nicknames or diminutives (*Lizzy* for *Elizabeth*, *Jack* for *John*) reflects English-speaking cultures' informal register and sociability, a key cultural trait.

French anthroponyms often serve as **symbols of regional and linguistic diversity**. Surnames such as *Lemoine* or *Dubois* originate from geographical or toponymic roots, linking individuals to physical landscapes and local identities. French naming practices also reflect **social hierarchies** and linguistic stratification. The adoption of double-barrelled surnames among the aristocracy (*de la Rochefoucauld*, *de Gaulle*) signals lineage and noble descent. These names are cultural texts in themselves, encoding **feudal and linguistic prestige**. Moreover, certain given names such as *René*, *Marguerite*, or *Thérèse* have deep **Catholic and literary associations**, linking anthroponyms to national heritage.

In Russian culture, anthroponyms embody **patriarchal values, collectivism, and ideological history**. The **triple-name structure** (given name + patronymic + surname) illustrates the centrality of **lineage and family respect** in Russian tradition. Post-revolutionary Soviet naming also brought ideological shifts. Names like *Vladlen* (from Vladimir Lenin) or *Oktyabrina* (from the October Revolution) functioned as **political-linguistic constructs**, reflecting the rise of Soviet ideology and the use of language as a tool for cultural engineering.

Uzbek anthroponyms are **deeply intertwined with family history, Islamic beliefs, and Turkic heritage**. Names like *Sherzod* ("son of a lion") or *Gulnora* ("pomegranate flower") reveal poetic and symbolic dimensions. "Har bir o'zbek ismi xalqning urf-odati, diniy e'tiqodi, tarixiy xotirasi bilan chambarchas bog'langan." (E. Begmatov, 2013) Names such as *Muhammadjon*, *Zaynab*, or *Fayzullo* demonstrate the **linguacultural fusion of Arabic-Islamic elements with Turkic morphology**, showing both religious respect and linguistic adaptation. Additionally, the use of **expressive nicknames** and **kinship-based pseudonyms** in everyday Uzbek speech reflects the importance of age, gender, and family status in interpersonal relations – for example, calling a child *Qizaloq* ("little girl") or an elder *Bobojon* ("respected grandfather"). Across all four languages, anthroponyms emerge not just as linguistic signs, but as **linguacultural markers** that encode and reflect the **ideologies, traditions, and collective identities** of a people. Through names, languages preserve **worldviews, historical memory, and socio-political structures**. As such, the study of anthroponyms provides a unique lens into understanding not only **language systems**, but the **cultures that produce and sustain them**. **Discussions**

The analysis of anthroponyms across English, French, Russian, and Uzbek languages reveals that names are not merely individual identifiers; rather, they are **semantically and culturally loaded units**, reflecting a community's **worldview, values, social organization, and historical memory**. As such, anthroponyms operate as **linguacultural signs** – a concept rooted in semiotics, where language and culture intersect to construct meaning.

In each linguistic tradition, names carry **symbolic weight**, often embedding cultural ideologies, spiritual beliefs, and social expectations. For instance, English occupational surnames such as *Smith* or *Baker* serve as historical records of one's ancestral profession – a phenomenon that aligns with the **Anglo-Saxon pragmatism** and class-oriented structure of society. In contrast, Uzbek names like *Sherzod* or *Dilbar* reflect poetic and emotional worldviews, where names are often metaphors for desired personal traits or physical beauty, revealing the **Turkic tradition of symbolic naming**. French and Russian anthroponyms particularly illustrate the role of naming in preserving **collective and historical memory**. French surnames tied to nobility or regional dialects demonstrate a **strong link between identity and geography**, whereas Russian names, especially those reformed or created during the Soviet period (e.g., *Vladlen*), highlight how state ideologies can reshape naming systems to produce and reinforce **cultural myths or political loyalty**. As Superanskaya (2005) notes, "Имя – это не просто слово, это – формула памяти, культурный код, образ жизни." ("A name

is not just a word; it is a formula of memory, a cultural code, a way of life.") Religious influence is another strong cultural constant visible in all four naming systems, though manifested differently. English and French names show **Christian biblical traditions**, with names like *Mary* and *Thérèse* signaling not only religious devotion but also historical continuity. Uzbek names often incorporate **Islamic or Arabic roots** (e.g., *Zaynab*, *Abdulloh*), reflecting the close relationship between **naming and Islamic identity**. This religiously bound tradition persists despite modernity and globalization. In Russian, while Orthodox Christian names are traditional, the Soviet era ushered in a distinct secular and even anti-religious ideology, demonstrating how political forces can **displace or reshape religiously rooted anthroponymy**. Across all cultures studied, anthroponyms serve as powerful tools for **group identity formation**. The French use of noble prefixes (*de*, *du*) or compound surnames marks class and lineage, while the Russian patronymic (*-ovich*, *-ovna*) linguistically encodes family hierarchy and paternal respect. Uzbek suffixes (*-jon*, *-bek*, *-xon*) often add cultural nuance, warmth, and honorific status to names – an example of how **morphology becomes a medium of respect and relational meaning**. These linguistic devices are culturally encoded, making names simultaneously **grammatical** and **cultural signs**. They create what Roland Barthes might call a **“second-order semiological system”** – where the signified (a name) becomes a signifier of deeper cultural meaning. While traditional naming systems remain influential, **modernization and globalization** are also shaping anthroponymic trends. For instance, the rise of unisex names in English-speaking countries (*Taylor*, *Jordan*) and Western-style baby naming in urban Uzbek families (*Diana*, *Ali*) show how global cultural flows impact local naming choices. Yet, the **core symbolic functions** of names as linguacultural signs – identity, memory, hierarchy, emotion – remain constant. This tension between **tradition and innovation** underscores the **dynamic nature of anthroponyms**: they evolve linguistically but remain culturally anchored. The comparative analysis of anthroponyms across English, French, Russian, and Uzbek traditions shows that names serve not only linguistic but **cultural, historical, and ideological functions**. They are **symbols of social belonging, cultural continuity, and linguistic creativity** – functioning as “living fossils” of human civilization. As linguacultural signs, anthroponyms open a unique window into how different peoples conceptualize identity, value systems, and interpersonal relationships.

Conclusion

The comparative study of anthroponyms in English, French, Russian, and Uzbek languages demonstrates that personal names are more than simple linguistic units – they are dynamic, multifunctional signs embedded within a society’s cultural, historical, and ideological frameworks. Each naming system reflects a **unique intersection of language and culture**, shaped by factors such as religion, history, political regimes, and collective memory. This research has shown that anthroponyms operate as **linguacultural signs**, serving not only to identify individuals but also to encode and transmit cultural meanings. In English, names often carry occupational or locational significance, reflecting a utilitarian worldview. French anthroponyms reveal deep connections to regional identities, social status, and Catholic traditions. Russian names, especially those influenced by Soviet-era reforms, display how language can be used as a tool for ideological expression. Uzbek anthroponyms, deeply rooted in poetic, spiritual, and honorific traditions, encapsulate the emotional and symbolic values of Central Asian society. Furthermore, the morphological structures – such as patronymics, suffixes, and compound forms – across all four languages showcase how **grammar and culture intertwine**, reinforcing social roles, familial ties, and community belonging. The presence of religious, mythological, and ideologically motivated names across cultures highlights how naming practices reflect not only personal identity but also **collective belief systems**. Significantly, the study reveals a dual movement in contemporary naming practices: while traditional forms and meanings persist, there is an increasing tendency toward globalization, hybridization, and individualization in anthroponymy. This reflects a broader linguistic and cultural trend where the **local meets the global**, and names become a site of negotiation between heritage and modern identity. In conclusion, anthroponyms are **not static labels** but rather evolving cultural texts. They embody

the historical consciousness, linguistic creativity, and symbolic imagination of communities. A deeper understanding of their linguacultural features allows us to see names as powerful instruments of human expression – **bridging the individual and the collective, the past and the present, the linguistic and the cultural**. This study contributes to the expanding field of onomastics by foregrounding anthroponyms as essential units of linguistic anthropology and cultural semiotics, inviting further interdisciplinary exploration across languages and societies.

References:

1. **Bardsley, C. W.** (1875). *Curiosities of Puritan nomenclature*. Chatto & Windus.
2. **Beaucarnot, J.-L.** (1994). *Le grand livre des noms de famille*. Éditions Jean-Claude Lattès.
3. **Begmatov, E.** (2007). *O‘zbek tilida antroponimik birliklar va ularning semantik-tarixiy tahlili*. Fan.
4. **Billy, P.-H.** (2011). *Dictionnaire des noms de lieux de la France*. Le Robert.
5. **Coates, R.** (2006). Properhood. *Language*, 82(2), 356–382.
<https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2006.0086>
6. **Dauzat, A.** (1980). *Dictionnaire étymologique des noms de famille et prénoms de France* (7th ed.). Larousse.
7. **Hanks, P., & Hodges, F.** (2003). *A dictionary of surnames*. Oxford University Press.
8. **Mills, D.** (2011). *A dictionary of British place-names* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
9. **Morlet, M.-T.** (1997). *Les noms de personne sur le territoire de l'ancienne Gaule du VIe au XIIIe siècle*. Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS).
10. **Nègre, E.** (1990). *Toponymie générale de la France* (Vols. 1–4). Librairie Droz.
11. **Petrovskiy, N. A.** (1966). *Slovar' russkikh lichnykh imen*. Nauka.
12. **Superanskaya, A. V.** (2005). *Obshchaya teoriya imeni sobstvennogo*. Nauka.
13. **Tupikov, N. M.** (1903). *Slavyanskiy antroponimikon*. Tipografiya Imperatorskoy akademii nauk.
14. **Unbegaun, B. O.** (1972). *Russian surnames*. Oxford University Press.
15. **Withycombe, E. G.** (1977). *The Oxford dictionary of English Christian names* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.