



LEXICO-SEMANTIC FEATURES OF ANTHROPONYMS IN LITERARY TEXTS: ENGLISH AND UZBEK LITERATURE

Ergashev Ulugbek Akbarali ugli

Independent researcher of Fergana State University

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18059323>

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 23rd December 2025

Accepted: 24th December 2025

Online: 25th December 2025

KEYWORDS

Anthroponyms, lexico-semantic features, literary texts, English literature, Uzbek literature, cultural semantics, character analysis

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the lexico-semantic properties of anthroponyms in English and Uzbek literary texts. By analyzing personal names in novels, short stories, and historical narratives, the research demonstrates how authors use names to convey character traits, cultural values, and social roles. English literature often employs names with historical or symbolic resonance, while Uzbek literature integrates moral, religious, and evaluative meanings into personal names. The findings highlight the importance of anthroponyms as carriers of semantic richness and cultural information, offering insights into the interplay between language, literature, and culture.

Introduction

Anthroponyms in literature serve as more than mere identifiers; they are powerful lexico-semantic tools that reveal cultural codes, character traits, and social relationships. In English and Uzbek literary traditions, names carry distinct semantic loads reflecting the respective cultural, historical, and moral frameworks. English literary anthroponyms, such as *Elizabeth Bennet* in *Pride and Prejudice* or *Hamlet*, often evoke historical, symbolic, or classical associations that guide the reader's interpretation of characters. In contrast, Uzbek literary works frequently use names like *Baxtiyor*, *Umid*, *Shodmon*, or *Sabriddin*, embedding moral values, social expectations, and religious significance. Studying these lexico-semantic features enables a deeper understanding of cultural representation and character construction in literature.

Materials and Methods

The research corpus consists of 50 English literary texts, including novels and short stories from canonical authors, and 50 Uzbek literary texts spanning classical and modern works. Each anthroponym was analyzed for its semantic transparency, evaluative load, connotative meaning, and pragmatic function within the narrative. Comparative and descriptive methods were employed to identify patterns and contrasts between the two languages. Semantic-pragmatic analysis focused on how names inform readers about characters' social roles, moral qualities, and cultural positioning, as well as how authors manipulate naming to create symbolic or affective resonance.

Results

Analysis revealed that English literary anthroponyms frequently retain historical, symbolic, or referential connotations. For instance, *Hamlet* evokes both the historical Danish

prince and Shakespeare's thematic explorations of indecision and morality, while *Elizabeth* may connote elegance, social class, and propriety. These names primarily function to guide interpretation and add depth to character construction. Uzbek literary anthroponyms, however, are often semantically transparent and evaluative, conveying moral qualities or social expectations. Names like *Baxtiyor* ("fortunate") or *Shodmon* ("joyful") provide immediate semantic cues about the character's personality and narrative role, integrating moral and cultural codes directly into the text.

Discussion

The analysis of anthroponyms in English and Uzbek literary texts demonstrates that personal names are powerful lexico-semantic and pragmatic tools, deeply embedded in cultural and literary contexts. In English literature, names such as Elizabeth Bennet, Hamlet, or Heathcliff serve primarily symbolic, referential, or historical functions. They often evoke social class, historical continuity, or intertextual associations. For instance, Hamlet does not merely identify a character but signals a set of thematic associations—indecision, moral conflict, and existential questioning—that the reader is expected to recognize. Similarly, Elizabeth may carry connotations of propriety, social expectation, and elegance, helping the reader anticipate the character's behavior and social interactions. In this sense, English anthroponyms function as interpretive cues that guide the reader's understanding of narrative and character dynamics.

In Uzbek literature, personal names perform a more evaluative and culturally transparent role. Names like *Baxtiyor* ("fortunate"), *Shodmon* ("joyful"), or *Sabriddin* ("patience of faith") immediately convey personality traits, moral qualities, and narrative significance. These names encode explicit ethical, social, and sometimes religious values, allowing the author to communicate character attributes efficiently and to reinforce cultural norms. Unlike English literary names, which may require historical or intertextual knowledge to access their connotative meaning, Uzbek literary names are semantically accessible and function as direct conveyors of cultural and moral codes. This difference reflects the collective orientation of Uzbek culture, where literature often aims to educate, guide, and socialize the reader through clearly coded linguistic choices.

Moreover, the study reveals that the pragmatic function of anthroponyms varies between the two literary traditions. In Uzbek texts, names actively shape readers' expectations, guide their moral evaluation, and provide cues for interpreting character behavior. For example, a character named *Umid* ("Hope") is likely to embody optimism or serve as a symbol of resilience within the narrative. In contrast, English anthroponyms are often less prescriptive and more interpretively open, allowing readers to infer meaning from context, historical background, or symbolic associations. This suggests that English literature emphasizes ambiguity, complexity, and interpretive engagement, whereas Uzbek literature emphasizes clarity, moral guidance, and cultural continuity.

Another important aspect is the interplay between literary style and name choice. In English literature, classical or historical names often reinforce genre conventions, social realism, or symbolic resonance. For instance, Gothic novels like *Wuthering Heights* use names such as Heathcliff to evoke a sense of ruggedness, isolation, and Romantic heroism. In Uzbek literature, contemporary and classical works alike embed cultural, religious, and moral significance directly into anthroponyms, aligning narrative function with societal ideals. This

reflects a broader cultural emphasis on ethical instruction, community values, and the integration of personal identity with social and spiritual frameworks.

Finally, cross-linguistic comparison highlights how globalization and literary influence affect naming conventions. Uzbek authors increasingly incorporate foreign or modern names, sometimes blending them with traditional semantic cues, creating hybrid anthroponyms with layered meanings. English literary names, particularly in contemporary fiction, continue to favor flexibility and neutrality, reflecting both cultural pluralism and individualistic values. Despite these dynamics, the underlying lexico-semantic and pragmatic principles—transparency, evaluative load, symbolic resonance—remain culturally contingent, demonstrating that anthroponyms are more than linguistic labels; they are vehicles of literary, social, and cultural knowledge.

In conclusion, the discussion confirms that anthroponyms in English and Uzbek literature differ significantly in lexico-semantic and pragmatic function. English names often rely on symbolic, historical, or referential meaning, engaging readers interpretively, whereas Uzbek names are evaluative, transparent, and culturally coded, actively guiding readers' moral and social interpretation. These findings underscore the importance of anthroponyms as instruments of cultural communication and literary expression, highlighting the inseparable relationship between language, literature, and society.

Conclusion

In conclusion, English and Uzbek literary anthroponyms exhibit significant lexico-semantic differences shaped by cultural and literary traditions. English names often carry historical, symbolic, or referential meanings, engaging the reader interpretively, while Uzbek names are semantically transparent, evaluative, and culturally coded, directly guiding moral and social interpretation. This study demonstrates that anthroponyms are not only linguistic identifiers but also powerful carriers of semantic richness and cultural knowledge, essential for understanding literature, cultural representation, and intercultural communication.

References:

- 1.Algeo, J. (2010). English Names and Cultural Identity. London: Routledge.
- 2.Rahmatullayev, S. (2006). Onomastics in Uzbek Culture. Tashkent: Fan.
- 3.Whaley, L. J. (1997). Language, Culture, and Typology. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- 4.Karimov, S. (2015). Linguistic and Cultural Analysis of Personal Names in Uzbek Literature. Tashkent: University Press.
- 5.Superanskaya, A. V. (2007). General Onomastics. Moscow: URSS.