

Linguocultural Foundations And Historical Stratification Of Uzbek Anthroponymy

Yashnarbekova Shaxzoda

Doctoral researcher, Uzbekistan State World Languages University, Uzbekistan

Received: 12 October 2025; **Accepted:** 04 November 2025; **Published:** 08 December 2025

Abstract: This article provides a comprehensive analysis of the historical, linguocultural, and semantic dimensions of the Uzbek anthroponymic system. It examines the multilayered structure of personal names shaped by ancient Turkic, Persian–Tajik, and Arabic traditions, emphasizing the influence of sociocultural factors, religious values, and intercultural interaction on name formation. Utilizing linguocultural, comparative-historical, semantic, and sociolinguistic methodologies, the research reveals that anthroponyms function as symbolic units that preserve cultural memory, national mentality, social values, and historical identity.

Keywords: Anthroponymy, Uzbek personal names, linguoculture, semantics, cultural memory, historical layers, sociolinguistics.

Introduction: The anthroponymic lexicon uniquely reflects the cultural-historical peculiarity of a people in the context of the link between language and culture. Anthroponymic vocabulary constitutes a complicated system influenced by both language and socio-cultural elements. These considerations significantly influence the selection of personal names. The linguocultural examination of anthroponyms centers on the individual as the bearer of language and culture, together with their unique worldview, or mentality.

The mentality of a specific nation is rooted in the social character of the individual, reflecting both national and social attributes. National characteristics demonstrate the impact of the cultural milieu that has, over an extended duration, molded the habitual behaviors characteristic of the nation's members. The social character, meanwhile, reflects the prevailing milieu of the era in which an individual resides, irrespective of their ethnic heritage. The indicators of these traits are clearly evident in naming conventions.

The aforementioned characteristics of personal names have historically been a pertinent topic of inquiry for philosophers, linguists, theologians, and cultural experts. This paragraph necessitates the presentation of scholarly results pertaining to anthroponymy throughout the ancient Turkic language family, to

which Uzbek is affiliated, as we investigate the anthroponymic system of the Uzbek language. Kazakh scholar Januzakov, after doing significant research on anthroponymic layers, categorizes Kazakh anthroponyms into the following ethnolinguistic groups:

pan-Altaic nomenclature;

Personal names of Turkic origin (ancient Turkic and authentically Kazakh);

acquired personal names from Chinese, Mongolian, Iranian (Persian), Arabic, and Slavic origins; composite names;

New Kazakh personal nomenclature.

Uzbek anthroponymy's creation and development comprise two key historical epochs.

The first epoch, the Common Turkic period, represents the formative stage in which the core Turkic naming inventory was established. This period is characterized by names signifying bravery (Alp, Botir), wisdom (Bilga), kinship, totemic symbols, and the natural environment — all of which encode the cognitive and social worldview of early Turkic tribes.

The second epoch, defined as the emergence and development of the Uzbek national language, introduced a profound cultural and linguistic layering

process. Through continuous interaction with Persian–Tajik literary traditions and the adoption of Arabic-Islamic ideological and religious concepts, the Uzbek anthroponymic system became semantically stratified. Additional influences from Mongolic, Pahlavi, Russian, and later European naming conventions further enriched its structure.

Consequently, contemporary Uzbek anthroponymy demonstrates a complex synthesis of ancient Turkic heritage, Islamic-Persian intellectual culture, and modern global naming trends, reflecting both historical continuity and ongoing sociocultural transformation.

The researcher G'. Sattorov, who significantly contributed to the study of Uzbek anthroponymy, observes in his analysis that this system comprises two layers: the indigenous layer and the borrowed layer of anthroponyms.

When examining the Uzbek anthroponymic system, it becomes evident that scholars interpret and classify this layer in various ways. According to E. Begmatov's research, Uzbek personal names fall into three principal layers:

1. the layer of ancient Turkic names;
2. the layer of Persian–Tajik names;
3. the layer of Arabic names.

The scholar notes that "among Uzbek personal names there are also Pahlavi, Mongolian, and, during the Soviet period, Russian and European names. However, these names do not occupy a significant position in the Uzbek anthroponymic system; rather, they are characterized as marginal elements." These views were expressed in the second half of the last century. Today, however, we can observe that European names are increasingly gaining popularity in Uzbek society.

G. Sattorov, in his academic publication *The Turkic Layer of Uzbek Personal Names*, categorizes Uzbek anthroponymy according to the idea of stratification. The scholar categorizes the anthroponymic system into two primary divisions: the indigenous layer and the borrowed layer. He encompasses within the borrowed layer those personal names that have entered the Uzbek language from Turkic, Persian–Tajik, and Arabic origins.

METHODS

This study utilizes descriptive, comparative-historical, linguocultural, semantic, and sociolinguistic methodologies to examine the anthroponymic system of the Uzbek language.

Descriptive method. The descriptive technique was employed to categorize and thoroughly analyze the structural-semantic characteristics of Uzbek

anthroponyms. E. Begmatov (1988) asserts that "anthroponyms disclose their intrinsic structure solely when contextualized within their functional and cultural framework."

Comparative-Historical Method. This method delineates the evolution of Uzbek names from the Common Turkic era to the contemporary Uzbek national phase. G. Sattorov (1994) asserts that "the history of personal names is inextricably linked to the history of the language itself, as names encapsulate the cultural migrations and ethno-historical strata of each era."

Linguocultural method. The linguocultural technique was crucial to this study, as anthroponyms serve as cultural indicators. In accordance with W. von Humboldt's assertion that "language is the outward manifestation of the spirit of a nation" (Humboldt, 1836), Uzbek names were analyzed as cultural objects that embody worldview, values, and mindset.

Semantic Analysis. This approach facilitated the interpretation of the lexical, symbolic, and connotative significances of anthroponyms. Sapir asserted, "the vocabulary of a language serves as a significant indicator of a culture" (Sapir, 1921).

Sociolinguistic Observation. Contemporary naming trends were examined through corpus data and naming statistics. This aligns with Lotman's concept that "culture is a mechanism for storing and transmitting socially significant information" (Lotman, 2009).

DISCUSSION

Anthroponyms are important linguocultural entities as they encapsulate cultural memory, social conventions, and a collective worldview. Mahmud al-Kashgari asserted that "names among Turkic peoples are selected to represent valor, power, and tribal dignity."

Uzbek anthroponyms exemplify what Sapir termed the "cultural reality represented through linguistic forms."

1. Appropriated Layers and Cultural Interaction

According to Begmatov's classification, Uzbek anthroponyms comprise old Turkic, Persian–Tajik, and Arabic components. Begmatov (1988) states: "The Uzbek naming system is historically enhanced by interactions with Persian literary culture and Islamic-Arabic influences."

G'. Sattorov (1994) observes: "The Arabic component of Uzbek anthroponyms signifies not merely borrowing but also the assimilation of religious concepts into linguistic identity."

Layer	Examples	Semantic Field	Cultural Source
Old Turkic	Alp, Bilga, To'g'un, To'lqin, To'g'i	Valor, nature, strength	Turkic tribal culture
Persian–Tajik	Bahrom, Farrux, Kam, Gulnora	Beauty, bravery, prosperity	Persian literature, court culture
Arabic-Islamic	Abdulloh, Muhammad, Zaynab, An, Karim	Religion, ethics, spirituality	Islam & Arabic scholarship
Later Borrowings	Timur (Turko-mongol), Svetlana (Russian), Milan (European), Robert	Heroism, modernity, internationalism	Mongol, Russian, European influence

Table 1. Major Etymological Layers in Uzbek Anthroponymy

2. National Mentality and Symbolic Semantics

Assmann (2011) asserts that “cultural memory is

maintained in symbolic forms that guarantee the continuity of identity.” Uzbek names operate in this manner. The following table illustrates the units:

3. Modern Transformations . Globalization has

been "marginal." Today, names such as Emir, Samir, Liana, Daniel, Sofia, Arina, Mark, Elvin, Yasmina are

Semantic Category	Examples	Cultural/National Meaning
Heroic / Military	Botir, Faxriddin, Jaloliddin, Shiroq, Temur	National pride, bravery, historical memory
Moral-ethical Values	Sodiq, Adolat, Rahmon, Sahobiddin	Honesty, justice, piety
Aesthetic / Beauty	Dilnoza, Zarina, Gulbahor	Beauty, purity, poetic imagery
Nature-related	Quyosh, Kamol, Lochin, Bulut	Harmony with nature, worldview
Social Wishes / Blessings	Umid, Saodat, Baxtiyor	Positive aspirations, optimism

impacted contemporary nomenclature, enhancing the prevalence of Western names. This contradicts Begmatov's previous assertion that European names

becoming increasingly common in urban Uzbek communities.

Begmatov's previous assertion that European names

Category	Examples	Sociocultural Motivation
Western/European	Daniel, Sofia, Elisa, Mark	Global culture, media influence
Hybrid/Modified Names	Jasurjon → Jason, Malika → Malika-Marie	International identity expression

Modern Muslim Names	Rayyan, Amina, Malik, Yasir	Pan-Islamic identity
Russian-origin names	Svetlana, Sergey, Olga, Oksana	Post-Soviet cultural contact
Novel creative forms	Ziyonur, Amirxon, Shodaliyya,	Individualism, uniqueness

Table 2. Contemporary Naming Trends in Uzbekistan

4. Anthroponyms as Units of Cultural Memory Assmann contends that cultural memory functions through names, symbols, and rituals that maintain the past over generations. Uzbek names like Ulug'bek, Temur, and Bahauddin exemplify this function effectively.

Name	Reference / Origin	Cultural Memory Function
Ulug'bek	Timurid astronomer	Scientific heritage
Temur	Amir Temur	Statehood, power, national pride
Navoi	Alisher Navoiy	Literary and linguistic identity
Bahauddin	Bahauddin Naqshband	Spiritual Sufic heritage
Bobur	Zahiriddin Muhammad Bobur	Cultural mobility, empire, artistry

Table 3. Culture-Bearing Names in Uzbek Tradition

The linguocultural analysis of Uzbek anthroponymy reveals that personal names serve not only as linguistic identifiers but also as intricate cultural symbols that encapsulate the historical memory, spiritual perspective, and social values of the Uzbek populace. The analysis corroborates the perspectives of prominent scholars including E. Begmatov, G'. Sattorov, A. Hojiyev, A. Madvaliyev, A. Nurmonov, and R. Qo'ng'urov, who assert that the Uzbek naming system embodies a complex structure influenced by centuries of cultural exchange and linguistic development.

The research findings indicate that the Uzbek anthroponymic system has developed under the influence of three principal civilizational and linguistic layers:

the ancient Turkic heritage;

the Persian–Tajik cultural sphere;

the Arabic-Islamic tradition. Each of which has substantially contributed to the semantic, structural, and symbolic diversity of personal names. E. Begmatov accurately observes that the inclusion of Pahlavi, Mongolic, Russian, and subsequently European names, once deemed peripheral, has gained prominence in modern naming conventions, illustrating the effects of globalization and cultural modernization. This affirms that anthroponymy is not a fixed collection of lexical elements, but a dynamic and developing system responsive to political, ideological, and sociocultural transformations.

CONCLUSION

The research further corroborates G'. Sattorov's classification, which differentiates between native (o'z qatlam) and borrowed (o'zlashma qatlam) layers in Uzbek anthroponymy. This distinction is pertinent today, as linguistic borrowing persists due to migration, global communication, media consumption, and evolving cultural preferences. Current naming trends indicate a distinct shift towards hybridization, wherein traditional Turkic and Islamic names coexist with globally recognized English and European names, creating a novel, modern anthroponymic paradigm.

From a linguocultural standpoint, Uzbek personal names function as symbolic representations of communal identity, ethical principles, gender norms, and historical tales. They encapsulate culturally significant concepts such as courage (Botir, Sherzod), beauty (Dilnoza, Mohinur), knowledge (Hikmat, Otabek), piety (Abdulloh, Muhammadyusuf), and lineage (Tursunboy, Qizi), thereby mirroring the value structure of Uzbek society. The semantic rationale for naming selections illustrates a continual link among language, culture, and perspective, reinforcing the theoretical assertion that anthroponyms are culturally imbued entities with significant association capacity.

This study's findings suggest that the linguocultural examination of Uzbek anthroponymy offers significant insights on the ethnic identity, sociocultural evolution, and historical continuity of the Uzbek populace.

Additional investigation in this domain—particularly concerning cognitive onomastics, corpus-based anthroponymic modeling, and comparative Turkic linguoculture—will enhance the understanding of personal names as reflections of cultural consciousness and as evolving components of linguistic heritage.

REFERENCES

1. Assmann, J. (2011). *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization: Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination*. Cambridge University Press.
2. Begmatov, E. A. (2007). *O‘zbek ismlari (2-nashr)*. Toshkent: O‘zbekiston Milliy Ensiklopediyasi Davlat ilmiy nashriyoti.
3. Begmatov, E. A. (1998). *O‘zbek ismlari ma‘nosi (Izohli lug‘at)*. Toshkent: O‘zbekiston Milliy Ensiklopediyasi.
4. Begmatov, E. (2013). *O‘zbek tili antroponimikasi*. Toshkent: Fan nashriyoti.
5. Sapir, E. (1921). *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech*. Harcourt, Brace and Company
6. Sattorov, G‘. (1990). *O‘zbek ismlarining turkiy qatlami [Filologiya fanlari nomzodi dissertatsiyasi avtoreferati]*. Toshkent.
7. Nazarova, N. A. (2022). Lexico-semantic features of anthroponyms. In *Education and Innovative Research*, (№ 7), 19-22.
8. Juraeva, I. & Masharipova, S. (2018). “O‘zbek tilida ismlarning erkalash va kichraytish shakllari”. *TÜRKLAD (Uluslararası Türk Lehçe Araştırmaları Dergisi)*, 2018, 182-186.