



Linguistic Interpretation Of The Concept Of Ergonym

Omonkulova Mokhinur Zokir kizi

Master's Student, Termez State University

omonqulovamohinur1@gmail.com

Abstract: Ergonyms are interpreted as the names of institutions or associations established and operated by people. This area of onomastics serves as the foundation for a number of promising studies in linguistics. This article discusses the linguistic analysis and lexical-semantic structure of ergonyms.

Keywords: Ergonym, onomastics, descriptive motivation, anthroponymic motivation, toponymic motivation, intertextual motivation, symbolic motivation, chrematonym, ideonym, indexation, concept.

Introduction

In modern linguistics, the process of naming and the socio-communicative functions of names are regarded as one of the most important directions for understanding the relationship between language and society. In particular, under conditions of urbanization, the development of a market economy, the expansion of the service sector, and the intensification of advertising and branding practices, the names of various institutions — such as enterprises, organizations, retail outlets, workshops, service centers, educational institutions, catering establishments, pharmacies, hotels, private clinics, and similar entities — have become an active layer of linguistic study [1].

In linguistics, such names are commonly explained by the term *ergonym*, within the system of onomastics, they represent a relevant object of research, especially at the intersection with pragmatic onomastics and sociolinguistics. Ergonyms are significant not only as nominative units but also as forms of linguistic expression of specific social groups, regional mentality, economic objectives, advertising strategies, and cultural values. Therefore, the linguistic interpretation of the concept of ergonym, its place in the onomastic system, the factors determining its lexical-semantic nature, as well as its discursive-pragmatic functions, require a consistent theoretical approach [2].

The term *ergonym*, from an etymological and conceptual perspective, is associated with the Greek component *ergon*, meaning “activity,” “work,” or “labor”. This indicates that this type of naming serves to denote objects directly related to human activity. In onomastics, ergonyms are interpreted as “names of institutions or associations established and operated by people,” encompassing legal entities, trade brands, public organizations, private enterprises, cultural and educational institutions, healthcare facilities, production units, and small-scale service sector entities [3].

In linguistics, the classification of ergonyms as a distinct category is associated with the expansion of onomastic research in the second half of the twentieth century. In urban environments, ergonyms become highly visible through street signage, advertising banners, shop windows, outdoor announcements, digital maps, and location tags on social media. This demonstrates that ergonyms are multidimensional units intersecting with graphics, phonetics, lexicon, semantics, pragmatics, discourse, and even psycholinguistics [4].

Although ergonyms fall within the category of proper names in the language system, unlike ordinary proper nouns, they also perform a function of “influence” under conditions of marketing,

image-building, and competition. Therefore, it is insufficient to consider ergonyms solely as nominative units; they also fulfill functions such as identification, differentiation, evaluation, persuasion, and memorability in social communication [5].

Several key issues emerge in the linguistic interpretation of ergonyms: first, their place within onomastic classification; second, their mechanisms of nomination; third, their lexical-semantic structure; and fourth, their socio-pragmatic motivation. According to onomastic theory, proper nouns differ semantically from common nouns in that they primarily indicate an individual referent and tend toward denotative rather than descriptive meaning [6]. However, ergonyms partially deviate from this general rule: they often possess internal semantic motivation, generating meaning through the activity of the object, type of service, quality indicators, geographical or cultural codes, personal names, historical or religious symbols, and culturally specific concepts. For example, names such as “*Baraka*,” “*Saxovat*,” “*Zarafshon*,” “*Navbahor*,” “*Mehribon*,” “*Istiqlol*,” and “*Oltin vodi*” retain evaluative or symbolic semantics. Such ergonyms provide consumers not only with identification but also with positive associations [7].

Methodology

The concept of “*naming motivation*” occupies a central place in the linguistic interpretation of ergonyms. Naming motivation refers to the basis on which a name is chosen and the semantic or pragmatic purpose it serves. General onomastic principles apply in this regard, including:

1. descriptive motivation (type of activity, location, product),
2. anthroponymic motivation (name of the owner or a famous person),
3. toponymic motivation (region, city, or village name),
4. symbolic motivation (symbolic, religious, historical, national codes),
5. intertextual motivation (literary works, films, myths, proverbs),
6. prestige motivation through foreign language elements (English, Russian, Turkish, Arabic units)[8].

Result and discussion

In ergonyms, these motivations often merge, producing hybrid names. For instance, a national concept combined with an English component (“*Baraka Market*”), a toponym combined with a service type (“*Jarqo ‘rg‘on Service*”), or an anthroponym combined with a symbolic epithet (“*Xumoyun Med*”).

From a linguistic perspective, it is also necessary to examine the lexical-semantic structure of ergonyms. In terms of lexical composition, ergonyms may be single-component (“*Baraka*”), two-component (“*Oltin Asr*”), or multi-component (“*Navro ‘z Shopping Center*”). Semantically, they can be classified as descriptive (denoting activity), metaphorical (symbolic), metonymic (naming the whole through a feature), toponymic (derived from place names), or mixed types [9]. For example, “*Sut olami*” (“*World of Milk*”) relies on metaphorical conceptualization, while “*Jarqo ‘rg‘on Non*” combines metonymic and toponymic motivation [10]. A clinic named “*Ibn Sino*” reflects ergonymic motivation that evokes scientific prestige and trust. These examples demonstrate that meaning in ergonyms is constructed not only through direct description but also through cultural memory and values [11].

In Uzbek linguistics, although proper names—particularly toponyms and anthroponyms—have been extensively studied, the study of ergonyms remains a relatively new direction. Nevertheless, general onomastic theory and sources within Uzbek lexicology provide a methodological basis for analyzing ergonyms [12].

Another important issue in defining the concept of ergonym is its distinction from related terms such as *chrematonym* and *ideonym*. In some onomastic traditions, “*chrematonym*” refers to the

names of material objects, products, and trademarks, while “ergonym” refers specifically to the names of institutions and organizations; in others, these boundaries are interpreted more broadly or narrowly [13]. In practical analysis, the “*brand name*” and the “*organization name*” often overlap.

For example, a shop name may simultaneously function as both a legal entity and a brand. In the case of the Jarqo‘rg‘on district, this phenomenon is particularly likely: small businesses often use their names as advertising headlines, and these names become fixed both in official documents and in everyday speech. Thus, the linguistic interpretation of ergonyms involves not only terminological classification but also the actual functioning of names in discourse and their acquisition of social status [14].

The semantic layer of ergonyms often has an evaluative and image-forming character. For instance, ergonyms based on abstract nouns such as “*Saxovat*” (*generosity*), “*Fayz*” (*blessing*), “*Zafar*” (*victory*), “*Yuksalish*” (*growth*), “*Umid*” (*hope*), and “*Ishonch*” (*trust*) tend to name not the object itself but the expected positive outcome. Such names have a “prospective” semantic character: they evoke an ideal state in the consumer’s perception rather than describing the current reality.

From the perspective of cognitive semantics, this can be explained through conceptual metaphors and symbolic concepts: “*baraka*” represents abundance and prosperity, “*fayz*” conveys blessedness and harmony, “*zafar*” denotes victory, and “*iqbol*” signifies success and advancement. Therefore, accounting for the conceptual layer and revealing the cultural code of a name is essential in the linguistic interpretation of ergonyms.

On the other hand, ergonyms often function as a means of reinforcing local identity. Names with toponymic components (“*Surxon*,” “*Jarqo‘rg‘on*,” “*Termiz*,” “*Boysun*”) evoke a sense of regional pride and familiarity, providing the consumer with a social signal of belonging. In sociolinguistic terms, this can be explained as “indexation”: through its name, an object associates itself with a particular region, ethnocultural environment, or social group [15].

In the case of the Jarqo‘rg‘on district, ergonyms may be enriched with lexical units specific to the Surxondaryo region, variants close to local pronunciation, or names related to regional history. This demonstrates that ergonyms are not merely “company names” but also manifestations of local culture through linguistic means.

In Uzbek onomastic traditions, cultural and religious components play a significant role in naming practices. Accordingly, it is natural for ergonyms to reflect religious and cultural values. Components such as “*Halol*,” “*Bismillah*,” “*Madina*,” “*Ka‘ba*,” and “*Zamzam*,” as well as words of Arabic or Persian origin, may reinforce concepts of trust, purity, and blessing. Pragmatically, such names target specific audiences and convey a sense of moral assurance.

At the same time, ergonyms associated with national holidays and historical figures (“*Navro‘z*,” “*Istiqlol*,” “*Amir Temur*,” “*Jaloliddin Manguberdi*”) activate social memory and confer prestige upon the entity. These phenomena can be effectively interpreted at the intersection of conceptual semantics and cultural studies.

Conclusion

In conclusion, ergonyms serve as a “living indicator” of lexical-semantic processes in language, reflecting a society’s economic model, value system, prestige criteria, and communicative strategies. Therefore, the linguistic interpretation of the concept of ergonym should not be limited to defining the term; it should be based on a comprehensive approach that encompasses naming motivation, semantic connotations, orthographic variation, multilingualism, and discursive functions.

Expanding this field in Uzbek linguistics, systematically documenting ergonyms on a corpus basis, classifying them by semantic fields, standardizing their normative spelling, and scientifically analyzing their regional features represent important directions for future research (Karimov, 2018).

Foydalanilgan adabiyotlar ro‘yxati

- [1] D. Crystal, *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*, 2nd ed. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- [2] C. Hough, Ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Names and Naming*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- [3] N. Karimov, *O‘zbek tilida onomastik birliklar va ularning tadqiqi masalalari*. Toshkent: Muharrir, 2018.
- [4] R. Keller, *On Language Change: The Invisible Hand in Language*. London, U.K.: Routledge, 1993.
- [5] F. B. Kultayeva, “Fanda ergonimlarning o‘rganilishi xususida,” *Filologik tadqiqotlar: til, adabiyot, ta’lim*, pp. 45–48, 2024.
- [6] F. B. Kultayeva, “Ergonimlar hosil bo‘lishining leksik-semantik usuli (metonimik onimizatsiya),” *So‘z san’ati xalqaro jurnali, special issue 1*, pp. 173–177, 2024.
- [7] F. B. Kultayeva, “Linguistic characteristics of ergonyms (based on the example of Surkhandarya),” *Journal of Advanced Linguistic Studies*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 199–209, Jan.–Jun. 2025.
- [8] G. Lakoff, *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago, IL, USA: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- [9] R. Landry and R. Y. Bourhis, “Linguistic landscape and ethnolinguistic vitality: An empirical study,” *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 23–49, 1997.
- [10] J. Lyons, *Semantics*, vols. 1–2. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- [11] N. V. Podolskaya, *Slovar russkoy onomasticheskoy terminologii*. Moscow, Russia: Nauka, 1988.
- [12] A. V. Superanskaya, *Obshchaya teoriya imeni sobstvennogo*. Moscow, Russia: Nauka, 1973.
- [13] S. Ullmann, *Semantics: An Introduction to the Science of Meaning*. Oxford, U.K.: Basil Blackwell, 1962.
- [14] E. Hansack, “On the classification of proper names,” *Names: A Journal of Onomastics*, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 1–15, 2000.
- [15] P. H. Matthews, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics*, 2nd ed. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press, 2007.