Lexical features of anthroponyms related to the vocabulary of household items

Mashhura Abdujalilova
Namangan State Technical University, Uzbekistan
misskhura@gmail.com

Abstract

Purpose: This study aims to explore the lexical features of anthroponyms, focusing on their relationship with household vocabulary and their significance within the broader linguistic system. By examining how personal names are formed, used, and adapted across cultures, the research highlights their semantic, cultural, and pragmatic roles in society.

Research methodology: The research applies a descriptive linguistic approach, analyzing theoretical perspectives from Uzbek and English onomastic scholarship. Comparative analysis of anthroponymic systems is conducted using linguistic, ethnographic, and pragmatic frameworks to reveal both universal and culturally specific naming practices.

Results: Findings indicate that anthroponyms, beyond their primary naming function, encapsulate historical, cultural, and linguistic information. The study shows that naming customs reflect socio-economic conditions, spiritual beliefs, and cultural integration. Comparative insights reveal similarities in the role of names as markers of identity, while highlighting differences in legal regulation and cultural traditions between Uzbek and English contexts.

Conclusions: The research concludes that anthroponyms are not merely identifiers but integral components of cultural identity and social interaction. Their analysis provides deeper understanding of the dynamics between language, culture, and society.

Limitations: The study is primarily theoretical and descriptive, with limited empirical data. Broader cross-linguistic and ethnographic studies would strengthen the findings.

Contribution: This work contributes to the fields of lexicology, onomastics, and linguopragmatics by emphasizing the role of anthroponyms as cultural and linguistic units that bridge personal identity and collective heritage.

Keywords: *Anthroponym, Household Items, Lexicology, Linguopragmatics, Pragmatics*

How to Cite: Abdujalilova, M. (2025). Lexical features of anthroponyms related to the vocabulary of household items. *Journal of Indigenous Culture, Tourism, and Language,* 1(2), 121-132.

1. Introduction

Nouns occupy a fundamental place in the lexical structure of every language, functioning as the core category through which humans conceptualize and categorize the world around them. Within this lexical layer, proper nouns play a particularly significant role. Unlike common nouns, which can be translated across languages and denote general classes of objects or concepts, proper nouns are inherently unique and retain their form across linguistic boundaries. For instance, while the word person may be rendered differently in English, Uzbek, or Indonesian, the proper name Anna remains phonetically stable across these languages (Ismatov, 2024; Nazarova, 2022). This phenomenon underscores the special role of proper nouns, particularly anthroponyms, in preserving identity and

cultural heritage. The study of proper nouns, and anthroponyms in particular, is both scientifically valuable and practically significant. From the moment a child is born, society bestows a personal name upon them, embedding them within a cultural and linguistic system that shapes their social identity. A name is not simply a label; it is a marker of individuality, a vehicle of cultural memory, and a carrier of historical, geographical, and spiritual information. Consequently, the study of anthroponyms provides insights into the linguistic systems and socio-cultural contexts from which they emerge (Khudayberganova, Mukimova, & Karimova, 2023; Tokhtabaeva, 1984).

The systematic study of personal names belongs to the field of anthroponymy, a sub-discipline of onomastics. Onomastics investigates the origins, structure, and functions of names, encompassing anthroponyms (personal names), toponyms (place names), and zoonyms (animal names), among others. Within this framework, anthroponymy specifically focuses on personal naming systems and examines how names arise, evolve, and function across different societies. The scope of anthroponymy includes not only individual first names but also surnames, nicknames, pseudonyms, and patronymics, as well as culturally specific naming conventions in general. E. Begmatov, a key figure in Uzbek linguistics, emphasized that anthroponymy reflects the dynamic interplay between linguistic forms and social realities. According to him, anthroponymic systems are not static; they are influenced by historical events, cultural exchanges and political changes. For instance, during the Soviet era, Russian-style surnames and patronymics were officially imposed in Uzbekistan, reshaping the traditional anthroponymic landscape (Khaitovna, 2025). This illustrates how names serve as a mirror of sociopolitical contexts and cultural integration (Komiljonovna, 2022; To'xtasinov, 2017; Uralova, 2021).

Similarly, British anthropologist Sir Raymond Firth argued that assigning a name is more than a linguistic act; it is a symbolic process that confers existence and identity on an individual. In his view, names are not arbitrary labels but essential components of personal and social identity, shaping how individuals are perceived by others and how they perceive themselves. The universality of naming is accompanied by profound cultural diversity in the naming practices. In Uzbek society, for example, names often reflect kinship relations, ancestral heritage, and religious beliefs. Traditional naming conventions include suffixes such as qizi ("daughter of") or o'g'li ("son of"), which link individuals to their family lineage. Arabic influences introduced names with religious and spiritual connotations, while Soviet policies in the twentieth century introduced Russian-style surnames. Each layer of naming practice reflects a different historical and cultural influence, collectively forming a rich and complex anthroponymic system (Rofiyevna, 2025; Urubaevna, 2010).

In contrast, English-speaking societies, particularly the United States, have fewer legal restrictions on naming practices. This freedom has fostered a wide variety of personal names, often reflecting creativity, individuality, and cultural hybridization. The cultural diversity of American society has led to the adoption and adaptation of names from numerous linguistic and cultural traditions, reflecting the processes of migration, integration, and identity formation. In this context, names often serve as markers of personal identity and expressions of cultural belonging or differentiation. A comparison between Uzbek and English naming practices highlights both the universality and particularity of anthroponyms. While all societies rely on names to distinguish individuals and structure social relations, the forms and meanings of names are deeply shaped by cultural, historical, and political contexts (Khamraeva, 2021; Nuessel, 2021).

From a linguistic perspective, anthroponyms are distinctive in that they often originate from common lexical items but acquire specialized meanings as personal identifiers. For example, a word meaning "hope," "flower," or "lion" in the lexicon may become a widely used personal name, thereby carrying both lexical meaning and personal significance. Over time, the semantic transparency of names may diminish, yet cultural resonance often remains (Mnaidarova, Sarseke, & Sahin, 2024). Thus, anthroponyms perform a dual function: they serve as unique identifiers of individuals and as carriers of cultural and historical meanings. They may reflect parents' aspirations, commemorate ancestors, express religious devotion, or symbolize specific virtues. As Begmatov observed, the selection of a name often arises from practical necessity—the need to distinguish one person from another—but it

simultaneously embeds the individual within broader cultural narratives (Hlushchenko, Didur, Okulova, & Pylypiuk, 2021; Vaxobovna, 2022; Yang, 2019).

Beyond their lexical and semantic features, anthroponyms also fulfill important pragmatic and social functions in the text. A name is the primary linguistic tool through which individuals are addressed, identified, and integrated into society. It signals membership within a family, community, or culture and can influence social perception and interaction. In some cases, names may even affect an individual's opportunities or life trajectory, reflecting the social power of the naming practice. The pragmatics of naming also extend to the adaptation of names across cultures. When individuals move from one cultural context to another, their names may be modified, translated, or substituted to conform with local linguistic norms. Such adaptations illustrate the intersection of personal identity and cultural integration. Simultaneously, the resistance to changing one's name in a new cultural context can serve as a form of identity preservation and cultural assertion (Ainiala & Östman, 2017; Mensah, Rowan, & Ekpe, 2024).

An intriguing aspect of anthroponymic studies is the connection between naming practices and material culture, including household items. Similar to how objects in the domestic sphere carry names that reflect cultural values and functions, personal names also embody cultural meanings and traditions. For example, household items may be imbued with symbolic associations of hospitality, family continuity, or social status, paralleling the symbolic dimensions of personal names. By examining the interplay between anthroponyms and household vocabulary, researchers can uncover how language encodes cultural values across the personal and material domains of life. Despite extensive discussions on anthroponyms, significant gaps remain in comparative and cross-cultural studies. While much has been written about specific naming practices within particular cultures, systematic analyses comparing anthroponymic systems across diverse linguistic and cultural contexts remain limited. Moreover, the relationship between anthroponyms and other lexical fields, such as household vocabulary, remains unexplored. This gap provides the rationale for the present study, which seeks to highlight the interconnectedness of naming practices and broader lexical and cultural systems (Fernández-Juncal, 2018).

This study aims to explore the lexical features of anthroponyms in relation to household vocabulary and analyze their significance within a wider linguistic and cultural framework. By employing a descriptive and comparative approach, this study examines how anthroponyms function as cultural and linguistic units, reflect socio-economic and spiritual conditions, and contribute to the construction of personal and collective identities. Focusing on both Uzbek and English naming practices allows for the identification of universal patterns as well as culturally specific features, thereby enriching our understanding of the complex dynamics between language, culture, and society. The significance of this study lies in its interdisciplinary relevance. For linguists, it contributes to lexicology, semantics, and pragmatics by analyzing the unique features of anthroponyms as lexical items. For anthropologists and sociologists, it offers insights into how names reflect cultural values, social structures and historical transformations. In cultural studies, the symbolic power of names in shaping identity and belonging is demonstrated. By situating anthroponyms within both linguistic and cultural frameworks, this research underscores the importance of names as more than mere labels; they are carriers of meaning, identity, and heritage.

2. Literature Review
2.1 Basic Concepts of Onomastics and Anthroponyms
Onomastics, a branch of linguistics, focuses on the study of names, whether personal names (anthroponyms), place names (toponyms), or animal names (zoonyms). Anthroponyms, in this context, refer to personal naming systems that function not only as identity labels but also as carriers of cultural heritage, social representation and historical reflection. According to Begmatov, anthroponymic systems are dynamic because they are continuously influenced by social, political and cultural changes. This was evident during the Soviet colonial era, when Russian-style patronymics were imposed in Uzbekistan, reshaping traditional kinship-based naming systems (Aliyevna, 2025). From the perspective of linguistic anthropology, Firth emphasized that naming is a symbolic act that bestows social existence upon an individual. A name is not merely a sound but a meaningful entity that affects

how one is perceived in society. Therefore, the study of anthroponyms is not only valuable in linguistics but also significant in practice, as it is directly related to identity and social structures. In addition, anthroponyms serve as a bridge between individual identities and collective heritage. The selection of a name often involves a variety of motivations, ranging from honoring ancestors and religious figures to expressing parental aspirations or socio-political affiliations. In Uzbek culture, for instance, names such as *Ulugbek* or *Temurbek* may evoke historical pride and a collective memory of national heroes, while names influenced by Arabic traditions can signify spiritual devotion. Similarly, in English-speaking contexts, names drawn from virtues such as *Hope* or *Grace* symbolize moral values, while the adoption of foreign or hybrid names reflects processes of globalization and cultural integration. These examples show that anthroponyms carry multiple layers of meaning that extend far beyond their surface function as identifiers (Aliakbarova, Madiyeva, & Xiao, 2020; Mensah et al., 2024).

Moreover, naming is deeply tied to issues of power, authority, and cultural transmission. Naming regulations imposed by states, such as the Soviet requirement for standardized patronymics, demonstrate how political structures seek to shape social identities through linguistic means. Simultaneously, resistance to such impositions, whether by maintaining traditional suffixes in Uzbek names or preserving indigenous names within diasporic communities, illustrates the resilience of cultural identity in the face of external pressures. This highlights the dual nature of anthroponyms: they can serve as instruments of cultural conformity, but also as tools of resistance and self-assertion. Finally, a comparative study of anthroponyms across societies opens a window into broader questions of intercultural communication and identity negotiation. In multicultural settings, names often become focal points of adaptation, as individuals may alter the pronunciation or even the structure of their names to align with dominant linguistic norms. Such practices reveal both the challenges of assimilation and the enduring significance of names as symbols of personal and cultural identity. Thus, anthroponymy remains a fertile field of research, offering insights into linguistic phenomena and the complex dynamics of history, society, and human identity (Sikandar, Arslan, & Ullah, 2024; Widodo, Suyatno, Mohamad, & Ismail, 2025).

2.2 Linguistic Dimensions of Anthroponyms

From a linguistic standpoint, anthroponyms are unique because they often originate from common lexical items that later undergo specialization in meaning. For instance, words meaning "hope," "flower," or "lion" can be transformed into personal names. Initially, the semantic transparency of such names remains visible, but over time, their lexical meaning tends to fade, while their cultural resonance persists. Thus, anthroponyms serve a dual function: they identify individuals and transmit cultural, historical, and aspirational meanings. Pragmatic perspectives highlight the social functions of names. Names are the primary tool for identifying, addressing, and integrating individuals into society. Names may even influence social perceptions and life opportunities. The adaptation or modification of names in different cultural settings illustrates the intersection of identity with the processes of integration or resistance. In this sense, anthroponyms simultaneously embody linguistic, pragmatic, and sociocultural dimensions (Desai, Tadimeti, & Riccardi, 2023).

From a linguistic standpoint, anthroponyms are unique because they often originate from common lexical items that later undergo specialization in meaning. For instance, words meaning "hope," "flower," or "lion" can be transformed into personal names. Initially, the semantic transparency of such names remains visible, but over time, their lexical meaning tends to fade, while their cultural resonance persists. Thus, anthroponyms serve a dual function: they identify individuals and transmit cultural, historical, and aspirational meanings. Pragmatic perspectives highlight the social functions of names. Names are the primary tool for identifying, addressing, and integrating individuals into society. Names may even influence social perceptions and life opportunities. The adaptation or modification of names in different cultural settings illustrates the intersection of identity with the processes of integration or resistance. In this sense, anthroponyms simultaneously embody linguistic, pragmatic, and sociocultural dimensions. In many societies, anthroponyms function as an archive of cultural memory, preserving historical experiences and transmitting collective values across generations to ensure their continuity. The semantic shift from lexical meaning to symbolic resonance allows names to encapsulate cultural narratives that are both personal and communal in nature. For instance, a name originally derived from

a flower may represent natural beauty and signify resilience, purity, or even political symbolism within a given cultural context. This transformation illustrates the dynamic interaction between language and society, whereby anthroponyms acquire meanings that reflect the evolving values and identities of the community.

Furthermore, the pragmatic force of anthroponyms extends to institutional and professional domains. Studies have shown that the perception of a name can affect educational outcomes, employment opportunities, and social mobility, underscoring the extent to which names shape the human experience. Names associated with prestige or familiarity often elicit positive social evaluations, whereas unusual or ethnically distinct names may lead to stereotyping or bias in multicultural societies. This demonstrates that anthroponyms are not merely passive labels but active agents in structuring social interactions and opportunities. Cross-cultural adaptation also highlights the fluidity of anthroponyms in globalized contexts. Migrants often face the choice between retaining traditional names to affirm their cultural heritage and modifying or simplifying their names to ease their integration into host societies. While name changes can facilitate social acceptance, they may also lead to feelings of cultural loss and identity fragmentation. Conversely, maintaining traditional forms may be a powerful statement of resilience and cultural pride. These dynamics reveal the complex negotiation of identity embedded in anthroponymic practices. Ultimately, anthroponyms embody a unique intersection of language, history, and culture. Their dual role as linguistic signs and cultural symbols makes them invaluable for understanding how societies encode identity, express values, and negotiate belonging. Therefore, continued interdisciplinary inquiry into anthroponyms is essential, bridging linguistics, sociology, anthropology, and cultural studies (Aldrin, 2016).

2.3 Comparative Study of Naming Systems: Uzbek and English Contexts
a)   Naming Traditions in Uzbekistan
In Uzbek society, names are heavily embedded in religious, kinship, and historical meanings. The use of suffixes such as qizi ("daughter of") or o'g'li ("son of") highlights lineage and social belonging. Names often reflect Islamic influences, with many drawn from Arabic and infused with spiritual significance. However, during the Soviet period, Russian-style surnames and patronymics were introduced, altering traditional patterns. This demonstrates that names are not only linguistic products, but also political and cultural instruments.

b)   Naming in the Anglo-Saxon World
In contrast, Anglo-Saxon societies, particularly the United States, grant broad freedom in naming practices. With few legal restrictions, a wide variety of names emerge, reflecting the creativity and individuality of the parents. The ethnic and cultural diversity of American society has contributed to the hybridity of names, as names from various linguistic traditions have been adopted and adapted. In this setting, names serve not only as identity markers but also as expressions of cultural belonging and differentiation.

c)   Points of Convergence and Divergence
The comparison reveals that while naming practices are universal, their forms and meanings are shaped by specific historical, social and political contexts. In Uzbekistan, naming tends to be normative and tied to family structure and religion, whereas in the United States, it reflects individualism and flexibility. Nevertheless, both functions as instruments of identity formation (Omilovna, 2024).

2.4 Anthroponyms and Their Relationship with Material Culture
An intriguing aspect of anthroponymic research is its connection with household vocabulary. Just as domestic objects embody symbolic meanings, such as the tandir in Uzbek culture symbolizing hospitality, personal names also carry symbolic value. Both domains reflect cultural identity, social status and family continuity. This demonstrates how language encodes cultural values across both personal and material spheres of life. Uralova (2021) highlighted how proverbs with family related lexemes reveal links between domestic values and social structures. Hence, the study of anthroponyms can be extended to better understand how language structures meanings across different domains of life.

The symbolic parallels between anthroponyms and household vocabulary underscore the deep interrelationship between language and material culture. Household objects are rarely neutral; rather, they are imbued with meanings that extend beyond their practical functions. A simple item such as a dining table, for instance, may symbolize unity, continuity, and family authority, whereas a traditional stove can serve as a marker of generational heritage and domestic resilience. Similarly, anthroponyms represent not only individuals but also the values, aspirations, and histories carried by their families. Both categories—names and household items—act as semiotic resources through which cultural values are transmitted and reinforced in everyday life. Moreover, the relationship between anthroponyms and the domestic lexicon highlights the importance of metaphor and symbolism in shaping social identity. Just as a family heirloom or handcrafted textile conveys status and tradition, so too does a name signals kinship bonds, lineage, and belonging. This analogy is even more significant in societies where oral traditions and proverbs play a central role in moral instruction. Proverbs involving household items often overlap in meaning with anthroponymic symbolism, jointly reinforcing the cultural ideals of respect, hospitality, and continuity.

In contemporary contexts, the convergence of anthroponyms and household vocabulary reflects the processes of modernization and globalization. While traditional items and names continue to serve as carriers of heritage, both domains are increasingly subject to reinterpretations. Imported household goods may influence local practices, just as foreign names or hybrid naming styles enter domestic repertoires for the same reason. This fluidity suggests that both anthroponyms and household items are dynamic signifiers, constantly reshaped to align with evolving social realities while preserving links to cultural roots.

2.5 Anthroponyms as Social, Political, and Spiritual Markers

Anthroponyms often serve as markers of social, political, and spiritual identities. During the Soviet colonial era, the imposition of Russian names in Uzbekistan was not merely administrative; it was also a form of political hegemony. In Islamic traditions, naming a child is often associated with prayer or spiritual hope, rendering names as sacred cultural expressions of faith. In Western contexts, names can become symbols of resistance or minority identities. For instance, immigrant communities often retain traditional names as a form of cultural resilience. Conversely, some adopt local naming norms to facilitate social and economic integration. This duality illustrates the flexibility and symbolic power of names in globalized contexts such as the Internet. The socio-political dimension of anthroponyms reveals how naming practices can function as instruments of domination and empowerment. In colonial and postcolonial contexts, external authorities frequently imposed naming conventions to exert control over local populations, thereby attempting to erase or homogenize their cultural identities. However, the persistence of indigenous naming practices demonstrates the resilience of local traditions and their role in silent resistance. Similarly, in diasporic settings, the decision to preserve traditional names is a conscious act of cultural preservation, allowing communities to maintain continuity with their ancestral roots while adapting to new environments (Amit & Dolberg, 2023; Muhammad, 2023; Shaik, 2024).

From a spiritual perspective, names often serve as lifelong reminders of moral obligations, religious beliefs or divine blessings. In Islamic cultures, names such as Abdullah ("servant of God") or Muhammad denote identity and reflect devotion and aspirations for piety. In Christian or Jewish contexts, biblical names carry connotations of faith, strength, and hope, embedding religious narratives within personal identities (Belgrade, Kira, Sadaghiyani, & Lee, 2022). Such practices reveal the profound symbolic power of names in linking individuals to transcendent values and collective belief systems. In modern globalized societies, anthroponyms intersect with discourses on multiculturalism and identity politics. For minority groups, the assertion of traditional names in public spaces can function as an act of visibility and recognition, challenging the assimilationist pressures. Simultaneously, hybrid naming practices—combining local and foreign elements—illustrate the creative ways in which individuals negotiate dual or multiple identities. This demonstrates that anthroponyms are not static but rather dynamic markers, continuously reshaped to reflect the changing landscapes of politics, faith, and cultural belonging (Loveday, 2022; Sipavicius Seide & Saparas, 2022).

2.6 Challenges and Research Gaps

Despite the growing body of research on anthroponyms, there remain significant gaps. First, comprehensive cross-cultural comparative studies are limited. Most existing studies focus narrowly on one culture without systematically comparing it across contexts. Second, the relationship between anthroponyms and other lexical domains, such as household vocabulary, remains unexplored. Such connections could reveal how language holistically reflects cultural values. Another limitation is the dominance of descriptive and theoretical approaches with relatively little empirical data. Fieldwork-based studies, such as generational surveys and ethnographic interviews, could enrich our understanding of naming dynamics in the context of globalization and digitalization. Despite the growing body of research on anthroponyms, there remain significant gaps. First, comprehensive cross-cultural comparative studies are limited. Most existing studies focus narrowly on one culture without systematically comparing it across contexts. Second, the relationship between anthroponyms and other lexical domains, such as household vocabulary, remains unexplored. Such connections could reveal how language holistically reflects cultural values. Another limitation is the dominance of descriptive and theoretical approaches with relatively little empirical data. Fieldwork-based studies, such as generational surveys and ethnographic interviews, could enrich our understanding of naming dynamics in the context of globalization and digitalization (Novikova et al., 2019; Sipavicius Seide, 2021).

Future research should therefore prioritize interdisciplinary and empirical approaches that bridge linguistics, anthropology, sociology, and cultural studies. By expanding the scope of analysis, scholars can capture how anthroponyms operate within broader semiotic systems that include objects, rituals and narratives. Furthermore, the increasing relevance of digital identities provides a new frontier for anthroponymic research. Online platforms often mediate how individuals present or modify their names, whether through pseudonyms, abbreviations, or hybrid forms, which in turn shapes perceptions of authenticity, belonging, and authority in virtual spaces. Investigating these practices would shed light on how globalization and technology have transformed traditional naming conventions. Additionally, longitudinal studies across generations could reveal patterns of continuity and change, demonstrating how names adapt to shifting cultural, political, and technological environments while preserving the core elements of identity and heritage (Novikova et al., 2019; Sutrisno, Duwi, Anita, Eksa, & Jenny Yudha, 2024; Z & A, 2025).

2.7 Academic and Practical Significance

The study of anthroponyms contributes to multiple fields. In linguistics, it advances lexicology, semantics, and pragmatics by exploring the unique features of personal names. In anthropology and sociology, it provides insights into how names reflect cultural values, social structures, and historical transformations. In cultural studies, the symbolic power of names in shaping identity and belonging is demonstrated. Practically, understanding anthroponyms is important for law, administration, education, and migration. Differences in naming systems often create challenges in civil registration across national borders. Hence, anthroponymic research has broad implications for both academic and practical domains (Kasmahidayat & Hasanuddin, 2022; Kristiyani, Marlissa, & Urip, 2025; Meilani, Urip, & Mollet, 2025).

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Research Design

This study employed a descriptive linguistic design combined with a comparative approach. The descriptive method was applied to analyze the lexical, semantic, and pragmatic features of anthroponyms within the Uzbek and English contexts. The comparative dimension seeks to highlight universal patterns of naming practices and culturally specific characteristics shaped by historical, political, and religious factors. The choice of design is grounded in the recognition that anthroponymy is both a linguistic phenomenon and a sociocultural construct.

3.2 Data Sources

This research is primarily based on secondary data derived from published linguistic and onomastic scholarship in Uzbek and English. Core references include theoretical works in lexicology, pragmatics, and cultural linguistics, as well as dissertations and academic studies on naming systems and the

household vocabulary. Additional insights are drawn from ethnographic records and cultural histories that document the symbolic roles of names and domestic objects in both societies.

3.3 Data Collection Procedures

Given the theoretical nature of this study, data collection was conducted through document analysis. Academic literature, historical texts, and linguistic treatises were systematically reviewed to identify anthroponyms, their origins and functions. Particular attention was paid to the following:

a) Morphological structures of Uzbek names (e.g., *qizi*, *o'g'li*) and English surnames/patronymics.
b) Semantic fields of names derived from common vocabulary items (e.g., nature, virtues, and animals).
c) Cultural references are embedded in both personal names and household vocabulary.

The comparative analysis was strengthened by selecting representative examples from both linguistic traditions, ensuring that the study captured both micro-level linguistic features and macro-level cultural patterns.

3.4 Analytical Framework

This study integrates linguistic, ethnographic, and pragmatic frameworks to interpret the data.

a) Linguistic analysis focuses on the etymology, structure, and semantic evolution of anthroponyms.
b) Ethnographic analysis examined naming practices as cultural markers associated with kinship, religion, and social identity.
c) Pragmatic analysis explores the use of names in communication, identity negotiation, and cross-cultural adaptation.

Through this triangulated framework, anthroponyms are understood not only as lexical items but also as cultural symbols that connect personal identity and collective heritage.

3.5 Comparative Procedure

To highlight similarities and differences, this study compared the Uzbek and English anthroponymic systems along the following dimensions:

a. Historical influence (e.g., Soviet policies vs. Anglo-American liberal naming traditions).
b. Religious and cultural impact (Islamic and Arabic influences vs. Christian or multicultural traditions).
c. Social function (kinship ties in Uzbek names vs. individualism in American names).
d. Household vocabulary as cultural markers of identity and domestic life.

This comparative procedure allowed us to identify universal tendencies (e.g., names as identity markers) and culture-specific features (e.g., obligatory patronymics in Uzbek versus flexible naming in Anglo-Saxon contexts).

3.6 Limitations

This study is primarily theoretical and descriptive, with limited empirical evidence. No surveys or field interviews were conducted, which restricted the scope of quantitative validation. Moreover, the cross-cultural comparison is limited to Uzbek and English contexts, leaving out other linguistic traditions that may provide further insights into the topic. Despite these limitations, this study establishes a strong conceptual foundation and opens opportunities for future research employing empirical, ethnographic, and cross-linguistic approaches.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Results

4.1.1 Lexical and Semantic Characteristics of Anthroponyms

The findings reveal that anthroponyms extend beyond their primary role as personal identifiers. They encapsulate lexical and semantic information that reflects cultural values, historical influences and societal aspirations. Many Uzbek names are derived from common nouns such as natural elements, virtues, or religious expressions, while English names show a high degree of hybridity due to immigration and cultural blending. Over time, the original meanings of these names may fade, but their symbolic resonance remains.

4.1.2 Cultural and Historical Embeddedness

Uzbek naming conventions demonstrate a strong connection with lineage and kinship, often expressed through suffixes such as *qizi* and *o'g'li*. Additionally, Islamic traditions contributed religious connotations, while the Soviet era imposed Russian-style patronymics, which reshaped the anthroponymic systems. In contrast, English-speaking societies, particularly in the United States, allow for greater freedom in naming, resulting in a diversity that mirrors multicultural integration and creativity. These findings highlight how anthroponyms mirror historical, political, and religious dynamics.

4.1.3 Pragmatic and Social Functions

Names function as powerful pragmatic tools in communication, shaping social interactions and identity negotiation. For instance, retaining traditional names within migrant communities acts as a marker of cultural resilience, whereas adopting localized names facilitates social integration. The findings suggest that anthroponyms are deeply tied to the processes of inclusion, exclusion, and identity preservation across cultural contexts.

4.1.4 Connection with Household Vocabulary

One of the innovative outcomes of this research is the identification of the parallels between anthroponyms and household vocabulary. Household items, like personal names, carry symbolic associations such as hospitality, family continuity, and social prestige. This connection underscores how language encodes cultural meaning across both the personal and material domains of life.

4.2 Discussion
4.2.1 Universal and Culture-Specific Features

This study confirms that anthroponyms are universal linguistic phenomena, yet their forms and meanings are shaped by specific cultural contexts. Names function as identity markers and social tools. However, culture-specific variations—such as mandatory patronymics in Uzbek traditions versus liberal naming in Anglo-American contexts—illustrate how different societies encode values and norms into their naming systems differently.

4.2.2 Anthroponyms as Carriers of Collective Memory

These findings align with Firth's view that naming is not merely linguistic but symbolic, conferring social existence upon individuals. Names act as carriers of collective memory, embedding historical shifts, colonial policies, and religious legacies into the identities of individuals. For example, Soviet-era impositions on Uzbek names reflected political hegemony, while the adoption of diverse names in the U.S. demonstrated cultural hybridity shaped by migration.

4.2.3 Interplay Between Language and Material Culture

The association between personal names and household vocabulary reflects a broader semiotic system in which language encodes material culture. Just as a tandir oven in Uzbek homes symbolizes hospitality and tradition, names signal lineage, faith, and social belonging in Uzbek culture. This interplay highlights the need for interdisciplinary approaches that link linguistics, anthropology, and cultural studies.

4.2.4 Implications for Cross-Cultural Understanding

The comparative analysis reveals that names are sites of negotiation in multicultural societies. Migrants often face the dilemma of preserving traditional names or adapting to local conventions. This has implications for social integration, policies, and intercultural communication. Understanding anthroponyms as cultural and pragmatic tools can foster greater sensitivity in education, governance, and social interaction across diverse societies.

4.2.5 Research Gaps and Future Directions

Despite providing valuable insights, this study acknowledges its limitations as a primarily theoretical and descriptive work. Future research should include empirical data, such as interviews and surveys, to capture how individuals perceive and negotiate their names in their everyday lives. Expanding the scope

beyond the Uzbek and English contexts will also provide a more comprehensive understanding of global naming systems.

5. Conclusion
5.1 Conclusion
This study demonstrates that anthroponyms are more than simple identifiers; they are complex linguistic and cultural constructs that carry lexical, semantic, historical, and symbolic significance. The findings reveal several key insights.

a) Lexical and semantic richness: Anthroponyms often derive from common nouns and virtues, transforming into personal names that retain cultural resonance even when their original meanings fade.

b) Cultural and historical embeddedness: Uzbek anthroponyms are deeply tied to kinship, religion, and socio-political history, including Islamic influences and Soviet-era patronymics. In contrast, Anglo-American naming practices are shaped by liberal traditions, migration and multiculturalism.

c) Pragmatic and social functions – Names act as powerful tools in identity negotiation, influencing social perception, integration, and resilience, particularly in migrant and multicultural contexts.

d) Interconnection with household vocabulary: Both personal names and domestic objects serve as cultural markers of family continuity, hospitality, and social prestige, reflecting the symbolic role of language in both personal and material domains.

e) Universality and cultural specificity: While anthroponyms universally mark identity, their forms and meanings vary according to cultural, historical, and political settings.

Overall, anthroponyms are integral to cultural identity, collective memory, and social interaction, bridging personal individuality with collective heritage.

5.2 Suggestions
Based on the results and limitations of this study, several recommendations are proposed.

a) Empirical Enrichment: Future studies should incorporate qualitative and quantitative fieldwork, including interviews, surveys, and ethnographic observations, to capture how individuals experience and negotiate their names in everyday contexts.

b) Cross-Cultural Expansion: Comparative analyses should be extended beyond the Uzbek and English contexts to include other linguistic and cultural traditions, enabling a broader understanding of global naming systems.

c) Interdisciplinary Integration: Research should combine perspectives from linguistics, anthropology, sociology, and cultural studies to capture the full symbolic and pragmatic dimensions of anthroponyms.

d) Practical Applications: Policymakers, educators, and administrators should recognize the sociocultural significance of names in civil registration, education, migration policy, and multicultural governance. Greater awareness can prevent misinterpretations and foster inclusivity.

e) Digital and Global Contexts: With the rise of globalization and digital identities, future studies should investigate how anthroponyms evolve in online spaces and transnational communities, where issues of cultural adaptation and identity preservation are increasingly salient.

References
Ainiala, T., & Östman, J.-O. (2017). Chapter 1. Introduction: The pragmatics of names (pp. 2-18).

Aldrin, E. (2016). Assessing Names? Effects of Name-Based Stereotypes on Teachers' Evaluations of Pupils' Texts. *Names, 65*, 1-12. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00277738.2016.1223116

Aliakbarova, A., Madiyeva, G., & Xiao, C. (2020). Evolution Of Anthroponyms: Transformation In The Naming Of Newborn Babies And Its Role For Society In The Period Of Linguistic Transition. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews, 8*, 1522-1534. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2020.84140

Aliyevna, B. S. (2025). The formation of spiritual values: Changes and evolutions. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Academic and Practice Studies, 3*(3), 943-953. doi:https://doi.org/10.35912/jomaps.v3i3.3498

Amit, K., & Dolberg, P. (2023). Who do you think I am? Immigrant's first name and their perceived identity. *Comparative Migration Studies, 11*(1), 6. doi:https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-023-00328-1

Belgrade, A., Kira, M., Sadaghiyani, S., & Lee, F. (2022). What makes us complete: Hybrid multicultural identity and its social contextual origins. *J Community Psychol, 50*(5), 2290-2313. doi:https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.22776

Desai, R. H., Tadimeti, U., & Riccardi, N. (2023). Proper and common names in the semantic system. *Brain Struct Funct, 228*(1), 239-254. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s00429-022-02593-9

Fernández-Juncal, C. (2018). Evolution of Anthroponyms in an Area of Linguistic Transition: A Socio-Onomastic Study. *Names, 66*, 1-11. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00277738.2018.1453275

Hlushchenko, O., Didur, Y., Okulova, L., & Pylypiuk, K. (2021). Exploring Functional Nature of English Anthroponyms in Literary Texts for Children. *Arab World English Journal, 12*(3), 400-410. doi:https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol12no3.28

Ismatov, J. (2024). Anthroponym As An Object Of Linguistic Research. *Science and innovation, 3*(C10), 11-14.

Kasmahidayat, Y., & Hasanuddin, H. (2022). Collaboration strategy in the development and inheritance of Archipelago's Arts. *Journal of Indigenous Culture, Tourism, and Language, 1*(1), 25-44. doi:https://doi.org/10.35912/jictl.v1i1.1065

Khaitovna, B. G. (2025). The socio-philosophical interpretation of economic destructions. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Academic and Practice Studies, 3*(3), 955-965. doi:https://doi.org/10.35912/jomaps.v3i3.3499

Khamraeva, K. K. (2021). *Study of Terminology in the Art of Uzbek National Items.* Bukhara. (238)

Khudayberganova, D., Mukimova, Z., & Karimova, F. (2023). The Role of Linguistic Anthropocentrism Theories in Uzbek National Linguistics. *Journal of Law and Sustainable Development, 11*(12), e2524-e2524. doi:https://doi.org/10.55908/sdgs.v11i12.2524

Komiljonovna, K. (2022). Changes in the system of anthroponyms in the Uzbek language at the end of the 20th century-the beginning of the 21st century. *Zien Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, 10*, 65-67. doi:https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.93808

Kristiyani, S. T., Marlissa, E. R., & Urip, T. P. (2025). The influence of village fund capital participation in Village-Owned Enterprises on the development of Village-Owned Enterprises and the economy of the Wania District community. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Academic and Practice Studies, 3*(3), 455-469. doi:https://doi.org/10.35912/jomaps.v3i3.3087

Loveday, L. (2022). An Onomastic Banquet of Intercultural Relations. Review of the book: Felecan, O., & Bugheşiu, A. (Eds.). Names and Naming: Multicultural Aspects. Cham: Palgrave, 2021. xxx + 490 p. *Вопросы Ономастики, 19*, 259-263. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.15826/vopr_onom.2022.19.1.014

Meilani, R. R. I., Urip, T. P., & Mollet, A. (2025). Analysis of the potential and effectiveness of local revenue receipts at the livestock and animal health service office in Mimika Regency. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Academic and Practice Studies, 3*(3), 435-453. doi:https://doi.org/10.35912/jomaps.v3i3.3086

Mensah, E., Rowan, K., & Ekpe, M. (2024). The representation of people in the Ibibio anthroponymic system: A socio-onomastic investigation. *Languages, 9*(6), 188. doi:https://doi.org/10.3390/languages9060188

Mnaidarova, M., Sarseke, G., & Sahin, I. (2024). Anthroponyms: the lexico-semantic approach to word formation and its social and cultural implications. *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics, 21*. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/lpp-2024-0025

Muhammad, D. (2023). Child naming and the need for cultural decolonization initiatives Among the Hausa in Northern Nigeria. *Curriculum Perspectives, 43*(1), 23-31. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s41297-023-00185-z

Nazarova, N. (2022). Study of anthroponyms and their places in the lexical system (In Web of Scientist: International Scientific Research Journal, Volume 3, Issue 1, pp. 90-96). *Ahrorovna, NN (2022). STUDY OF ANTHROPONYMS AND THEIR PLACES IN THE LEXICAL SYSTEM. Web of Scientist: International Scientific Research Journal, 3*(1), 90-96.

Novikova, O. N., Muryasov, R. Z., Aznabaeva, A. F., Belyaev, A. N., Kalugina, Y. V., Mustafina, A. R., . . . Khazhieva, Z. (2019). Ethno-linguistic distribution of anthroponyms in the name system

of multinational region. *Space and Culture, India, 7*(1), 104-116. doi:https://doi.org/10.20896/saci.v7i1.418

Nuessel, F. (2021). Multicultural Aspects of Names and Naming in the United States (pp. 9-25).

Omilovna, K. N. (2024). Development of investment activities in the automobile industry of Uzbekistan in the conditions of the digital economy. *Global Academy of Business Studies, 1*(2), 149-159. doi:https://doi.org/10.35912/gabs.v1i2.3469

Rofiyevna, J. S. (2025). The Issues of the English Reflection of Onomastics in the Novel "Night and Day". *Spanish Journal of Innovation and Integrity, 41*, 83-90.

Shaik, N. H. (2024). Politics of personal naming and Islamization: A sociological study of the naming patterns among the Dudekula community. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14216650

Sikandar, N., Arslan, F., & Ullah, F. (2024). An Examination Of Naming Conventions And Linguistic Structures Across Diverse Cultures: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective. *Lingua Nostra, 8*, 2024. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14732710

Sipavicius Seide, M. (2021). Comparative Anthroponomastics. *Revista GTLex, 6*, 554-571. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.14393/Lex12-v6n2a2021-8

Sipavicius Seide, M., & Saparas, M. (2022). Proper Names In Multicultural Contexts. *Alfa: Revista de Linguística (São José do Rio Preto), 66*. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/1981-5794-e15619t

Sutrisno, E., Duwi, S., Anita, R., Eksa, R., & Jenny Yudha, U. (2024). Study on the utilization of village funds to support food security in Glagah Lamongan District, East Java. *Journal of Indigenous Culture, Tourism, and Language, 1*(1), 15-24. doi:https://doi.org/10.35912/jictl.v1i1.1734

To'xtasinov, I. M. (2017). *Developing Professional Competencies in Translator Training Based on the Phenomenon of Equivalence.*

Tokhtabaeva, S. Z. (1984). *Kazakh Women's Traditional Jewelry of the 18th–20th Centuries.*

Uralova, O. P. (2021). *Semantics and Structure of Proverbs with the Core Lexeme "Family" in English and Uzbek.*, Samarkand.

Urubaevna, B. V. (2010). *Jewelry of Kyrgyz Women (Late 19th – Early 20th Century).* Bishkek.

Vaxobovna, A. (2022). About the lexical-semantic features of anthroponyms. *Texas Journal of Philology, Culture and History, 7*, 1-3.

Widodo, S. T., Suyatno, S., Mohamad, B., & Ismail, S. (2025). Exploring the changing of name as a socio-cultural adaptation strategy of the Javanese Diaspora in Sabah Borneo—Malaysia. *Frontiers in Sociology, 10*, 1487934. doi:https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoc.2025.1487934

Yang, X. (2019). Relationships Between Jewellery and Body: Investigating Personal and Interpersonal Body Space with Jewellery. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.25904/1912/661

Z, K., & A, B. A. (2025). The concept of respect in Central Asia: Historical roots, cultural practices and contemporary transformations. *Journal of Indigenous Culture, Tourism, and Language, 1*(1), 1-13. doi:https://doi.org/10.35912/jictl.v1i1.2783