

LINGUOCULTURAL FEATURES OF PERSONAL NAMES FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE ANTHROPOCENTRIC PARADIGM IN ENGLISH AND KARAKALPAK LANGUAGES

Shamshetova Biybiayim Janibek qizi

Independent researcher of Karakalpak State University

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20726529>

Abstract. The anthropocentric paradigm has become one of the leading approaches in modern linguistics because it places human beings at the center of language research. Within this framework, personal names are viewed not merely as linguistic units identifying individuals but also as cultural signs reflecting national mentality, historical memory, social values, and collective experience. This article examines the linguocultural features of personal names in English and Karakalpak from an anthropocentric perspective. The study reveals that anthroponyms serve as repositories of cultural knowledge and embody the worldview of a particular linguistic community. Through comparative analysis, similarities and differences in the semantic structure, cultural symbolism, and modern development of English and Karakalpak personal names are identified.

Keywords: anthropocentric paradigm, anthroponymy, linguoculturology, personal names, cultural identity, naming traditions.

The anthropocentric paradigm has significantly transformed linguistic research by shifting attention from language as an autonomous system to language as a product of human cognition, culture, and social interaction. Consequently, language units are increasingly analyzed in connection with their users, cultural environment, and communicative functions. Among these units, personal names occupy a special place because they directly relate to human identity and social existence. In this regard, anthroponyms represent a valuable source for understanding the interaction between language, culture, and thought [2, 45-47].

Personal names are not randomly assigned linguistic signs. On the contrary, they emerge from specific historical, cultural, religious, and social circumstances. Therefore, the study of anthroponyms allows researchers to uncover the cultural values and cognitive patterns characteristic of a particular society. From an anthropocentric viewpoint, every name reflects not only the individuality of its bearer but also the collective cultural experience of the community that created and preserved it.

The English anthroponymic system has developed under the influence of various historical processes, including migration, religious transformation, and globalization. As a result, English personal names demonstrate remarkable diversity in their origins and meanings. For instance, the name Alexander originates from Greek and conveys the meaning “defender of mankind,” while Sophia comes from Greek as well and means “wisdom.” Similarly, Henry is of Germanic origin and means “ruler of the home,” and Lily is associated with purity and innocence, derived from the flower symbolism widely used in English-speaking cultures. These examples illustrate how English anthroponyms preserve traces of historical interaction, cultural borrowing, and symbolic interpretation [1, 709-725].

Furthermore, English naming practices increasingly reflect individualism and personal choice, which are important characteristics of contemporary English-speaking societies. Parents often select names based on aesthetic preferences, originality, or media influence. Names such as Ethan, Chloe, and Noah have gained popularity due to global cultural circulation and popular

culture influence. Thus, English anthroponyms demonstrate the dynamic interaction between language, culture, and modern social developments [3].

In contrast, the Karakalpak anthroponymic system is deeply rooted in Turkic traditions, family values, and collective cultural memory. Karakalpak personal names frequently express parental wishes, social expectations, and positive character traits. For example, the male name Arislan signifies “lion,” symbolizing courage, Temir means “iron,” representing strength and resilience, and Nurlıbek conveys “radiant fortune.” Female names such as Gulnara, Zamira, and Sholpan are associated with beauty, inner purity, and celestial symbolism. Consequently, Karakalpak anthroponyms often embody meaningful cultural images reflecting ideals and aspirations [4, 127-130].

Moreover, religious influence plays a significant role in the formation of Karakalpak personal names. Names of Arabic and Persian origin entered the anthroponymic system through Islamic tradition. Names such as Yusuf, Ibrahim, Zuhra, and Maryam remain widely used because they symbolize spiritual continuity and moral values. Therefore, Karakalpak anthroponyms reveal the close relationship between language, faith, and cultural identity [5].

From a linguocultural perspective, both English and Karakalpak anthroponyms perform important cultural functions. First, they preserve historical memory by transmitting information about past generations and cultural traditions. Second, they reflect social values that communities consider desirable and worthy of preservation. Third, they contribute to the construction of personal and collective identity. Nevertheless, the specific cultural content encoded in names differs considerably between the two linguistic communities.

A comparative analysis demonstrates that English anthroponyms tend to emphasize individuality, personal achievement, and cultural hybridity. Conversely, Karakalpak names often highlight collective values, symbolic meanings, and social harmony. For example, while modern English names are frequently chosen for stylistic uniqueness and global compatibility, Karakalpak naming practices still strongly preserve semantic transparency and culturally embedded meanings. This distinction reflects broader differences between individual-centered and community-centered cultural orientations.

Another notable difference concerns the semantic transparency of names. Many Karakalpak names preserve meanings that remain easily interpretable for native speakers. The meanings of names such as Arislan, Temir, or Nurlıbek are directly accessible through lexical understanding. In contrast, many English names have undergone historical transformations that obscure their original meanings, making them function primarily as identifiers rather than transparent semantic units.

At the same time, globalization has influenced both anthroponymic systems. International communication, migration, and digital media have contributed to the spread of foreign names across linguistic boundaries. English names increasingly appear in Karakalpak-speaking communities, while certain traditional naming patterns are being reinterpreted in modern contexts. Nevertheless, anthroponyms continue to function as essential markers of cultural identity and linguistic heritage.

In conclusion, the anthropocentric paradigm provides an effective framework for investigating personal names as reflections of human experience, cultural values, and social consciousness. The comparative analysis of English and Karakalpak anthroponyms demonstrates that personal names are much more than identification markers. They represent complex linguocultural phenomena that encode historical memory, religious beliefs, social ideals, and

national worldviews. While English anthroponyms predominantly reflect individualism and cultural diversity, Karakalpak names emphasize symbolic meaning, tradition, and collective identity. Consequently, the study of anthroponyms contributes significantly to understanding the relationship between language, culture, and human identity in different linguistic communities.

Adabiyotlar, References, Литературы:

1. Finch, J. (2008). Naming names: Kinship, individuality and personal names. *Sociology*, 42(4), 709-725.
2. Teñelbaevna, N. B. (2025). ANTROPONIMNÍŇ IZERTLENIW MÁSELESI. *Central Asian Journal of Education and Innovation*, 4(7), 45-47.
3. Windt-Val, B. G. (2012). Personal names and identity in literary contexts. *Oslo Studies in Language*.
4. Yusupova, Ú. (2026, February). FOLKLORLÍQ SHÍĜARMALARDA ANTROPONIMLERDÍŇ QOLLANÍLÍWÍ (Qırq qız dástanı misalında). In *Conferences* (Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 127-130).
5. Сайымбетов, О. Т. (2000). Қарақалпақ тилиндеги меншикли адам атлары. *Нөкис: Билим*, 72.