ORIGINAL ARTICLE

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

ISSN: 2692-515-x, Impact Factor: 9.23

American Academic publishers, volume 6, issue 01,2026

Journal: https://www.academicpublishers.org/journals/index.php/ijai

LINGUOCULTURAL INTERPRETATION OF ANTHROPONYMS

Master's Student of Asia University of Technologies

Ergashev Khojiakbar Tursunpulatovich

ergashevhojiakbar737@gmail.com

Abstract

This article provides a consistent and systematic analysis of the issue of linguocultural interpretation of anthroponyms (personal names). Along with belonging to the nominative system of language, anthroponyms are regarded as cultural signs that reflect a society's historical memory, traditions, value system, and socio-psychological stereotypes. The study examines the etymological layers of anthroponyms, semantic-motivational factors, pragmatic functions, as well as traditional and modern naming tendencies from a linguocultural perspective. In the process of analysis, the role of such categories as concept, cultural code, symbol, stereotype, and evaluation in identifying the cultural meaning layers of anthroponymic units is demonstrated. The findings show that anthroponyms embody the social experience, aesthetic ideals, communicative norms, and mechanisms of identification of an ethnos. Their linguocultural interpretation makes it possible to perceive personal names not merely as "names," but as "cultural texts."

Keywords

anthroponym, onomastics, linguoculture, nomination, etymology, pragmatics, concept, cultural code, identification, naming tradition.

Introduction

Anthroponyms constitute one of the oldest and most active nominative layers in the language system, and their formation is directly connected with the historical development of society, cultural experience, and communicative needs. In everyday communication, a personal name performs an identificatory function: it distinguishes one individual from another, regulates social relations, and determines communicative distance and style. However, anthroponyms are not limited to a mere distinguishing function; they also preserve social memory, traditions, aesthetic ideals, social status, generational continuity, and even the ideals and stereotypes of a particular historical period.

For this reason, the linguocultural interpretation of anthroponyms goes beyond the scope of onomastics and becomes one of the most relevant issues at the intersection of language and culture. A linguocultural approach views anthroponyms not as "ready-made signs," but as "units that carry cultural meaning," requiring a comprehensive analysis of their origin, motivation for selection, usage context, evaluative tone, social role, and symbolic load. Within this approach, anthroponyms are studied as elements of cultural codes. For instance, concepts such as "wish," "virtue," "beauty," "bravery," and "knowledge" may consistently manifest themselves in naming traditions. In this case, the semantics of a name is explained not only through its lexical meaning, but also through the hierarchy of social values, family traditions, educational ideals, and communicative norms. The relevance of this study lies in the possibility of analyzing mechanisms of cultural identification through anthroponyms. Naming a person is

ISSN: 2692-515-x, Impact Factor: 9.23
American Academic publishers, volume 6, issue 01,2026
Journal: https://www.academicpublishers.org/journals/index.php/ijai

not merely a legal or administrative act, but also a cultural "acceptance" ritual. In this respect, anthroponyms are valuable both as linguistic units and as cultural phenomena. The aim of the study is to provide a methodological foundation for the linguocultural interpretation of anthroponyms, to define analytical criteria, and to explain their cultural-semantic layers. The objectives include:

(1) characterizing anthroponyms as linguocultural units;

(2) identifying motivational-semantic layers;

(3) demonstrating pragmatic functions (forms of address, social distance, evaluation);

(4) explaining traditional and modern naming tendencies in a linguocultural context.

The theoretical framework is based on approaches from onomastics and linguoculture. In particular, A. V. Superanskaya's views on the socio-cultural nature of onomastic units, V. A. Maslova's interpretation of the relationship between language and culture, and V. V. Vorobyev's concept of linguocultural analysis were adopted as methodological guidelines. Superanskaya interprets personal names as "social signs within a specific system," which clearly reveals their formal and social nature. However, in our view, the emotive-evaluative and symbolic layers of names should also be considered, as these layers activate the "cultural reading" of names in real communication (Superanskaya, 2007, pp. 12–18). The study relies on qualitative analysis and applies a complex set of methods for linguocultural interpretation. First, a descriptive-analytical method was used to explain the general features, nominative essence, and linguocultural functions of anthroponyms. Second, etymological and semantic-motivational analyses were conducted to identify historical layers and meaning-related factors influencing name selection, demonstrating the relationship between internal motivation and socio-cultural context.

Third, pragmatic analysis examined the communicative functions of anthroponyms, including forms of address, formal and informal registers, social distance, and expressions of respect or affection. Fourth, linguocultural reconstruction was used to describe the value system reflected in anthroponyms (virtues, wishes, ideals, social roles) as cultural codes. Fifth, elements of comparative analysis highlighted differences between general Turkic, regional, and modern layers, while maintaining focus on linguocultural interpretation within a single language. The material base included fundamental works on onomastics and linguoculture, normative dictionaries, and scientific classifications of anthroponyms. Empirical examples were treated as generalized cultural symbols rather than references to specific individuals, preserving the theoretical nature of the analysis. The number of citations was kept within reasonable limits, selecting only those sources that contributed to the conceptual framework.

The results systematized the linguocultural interpretation of anthroponyms in five main directions:

(1) cultural-semantic layers;

(2) naming motivation and value hierarchy;

(3) pragmatic marking and communicative norms;

ISSN: 2692-515-x, Impact Factor: 9.23
American Academic publishers, volume 6, issue 01,2026
Journal: https://www.academicpublishers.org/journals/index.php/ijai

(4) identification and social memory;

(5) traditional and modern tendencies.

The first direction revealed anthroponyms as multilayered signs: their surface layer serves official identification, while deeper layers contain semantic-motivational and cultural-symbolic meanings. According to Maslova, cultural meaning in linguistic units manifests through concepts (Maslova, 2001, pp. 38–41). Similarly, in anthroponyms, lexical meaning intersects with value concepts, encoding wishes, ideals, or evaluations. The second direction showed that naming motivation is structured around the triad "wish–ideal–identification." Some anthroponyms explicitly express virtues or social values, performing a "pedagogical program" function. As Vorobyev notes, linguoculture reflects the interaction of language and culture through cultural codes (Vorobyev, 1997, pp. 15–20). The third direction demonstrated that the linguocultural value of anthroponyms becomes especially evident in pragmatic usage. Full forms in formal contexts express respect and distance, while diminutives and shortened forms convey intimacy and solidarity. Phonetic and derivational variants function as linguocultural indicators conditioned by age, social roles, and relationships.

The fourth direction focused on identification and social memory. Recurrent use of certain names within generations serves as a mechanism of social memory, transforming a personal identifier into a symbol of lineage continuity. Superanskaya emphasizes the socially conditioned and systemic nature of personal names (Superanskaya, 2007, pp. 41–56). The fifth direction identified a balance between traditional and modern naming tendencies. While modern communication favors short, internationally adaptable names, traditional anthroponyms preserve cultural identity and continuity. These processes represent natural renewal mechanisms within the nomination system rather than contradictions. Overall, linguocultural interpretation prevents a one-sided explanation of anthroponyms. Neither etymology nor pragmatics alone can fully reveal their cultural scope; therefore, a comprehensive approach is essential. Anthroponyms function as "cultural texts" that encode social values, ideals, and communicative norms.

Conclusion

The study confirms that the linguocultural interpretation of anthroponyms reveals personal names as complex units at the intersection of language and culture. Alongside their nominative function, anthroponyms carry values, ideals, social norms, and collective memory. The linguocultural approach enabled an integrated analysis of their multilayered nature, encompassing denotative identification, connotative evaluation, and symbolic reference. The article systematized the cultural-semantic layers of anthroponyms, naming motivation and value hierarchy, pragmatic functions, and identification mechanisms. The findings demonstrate that concepts of wishes and ideals, communicative norms, generational continuity, and social memory are implicitly reflected through anthroponyms. Traditional and modern naming tendencies were shown to function as complementary processes ensuring both stability and renewal. From a practical perspective, linguocultural interpretation broadens interpretative possibilities in onomastic research. Viewing anthroponyms as cultural texts rather than mere lexical units offers methodological value for language teaching, intercultural communication, speech culture, and lexicographic practice. Future research may benefit from corpus-based frequency analysis, regional variation studies, and systematic observation of pragmatic registers.

ISSN: 2692-515-x, Impact Factor: 9.23
American Academic publishers, volume 6, issue 01,2026
Journal: https://www.academicpublishers.org/journals/index.php/ijai

References

1. Superanskaya, A. V. General Theory of Proper Names. Moscow: LKI Publishing House, 2007. 368 p.

2. Maslova, V. A. Linguoculturology. Moscow: Akademiya, 2001. 208 p.

3. Vorobyev, V. V. Linguoculturology: Theory and Methods. Moscow: RUDN University Press, 1997. 331 p.

4. Hojiev, A. Explanatory Dictionary of Linguistic Terms. Tashkent: National Encyclopedia of Uzbekistan, 2002. 168 p.

5. Begmatov, E. Meanings of Uzbek Personal Names. Tashkent: O‘qituvchi, 1992. 256 p.

6. Nabiyeva, M. Fundamentals of Uzbek Onomastics. Tashkent: Fan, 2008. 220 p.