

## LINGUISTIC STUDY OF ANTHROPONYMS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Dilshoda Tursunboyeva

2<sup>nd</sup> course of Master's degree of Foreign Languages Department of Jizzakh State  
Pedagogical University

Prof. Mamatov Abdug'afur Eshonqulovich  
Scientific supervisor

### Abstract:

Anthroponyms in English and Uzbek will be analyzed in our article. Linguistics of modern Uzbekistan is characterized by an in-depth study of foreign languages both in theoretical and practical terms, as well as the development of new directions aimed at the study of language about the study of thought processes, place and role of a person always a world that is becoming more complex, the peculiarities of human language behavior within different social groups (linguistic pragmatics).

**Keywords:** Anthroponyms, semantically, proper nouns, Uzbek – English, lexical meaning, human activities

Linguists repeatedly turn to the phenomenon of the nominative value of a word as one of the means of forming linguistic worldviews in a given language. In connection with the expansion of the areas of application of the English language in our republic, binary comparisons of the Uzbek language with English, as well as typologically extremely important triple comparisons (Uzbek - English) are gaining importance. The aspect of the study chosen in this article is closely related to the category of certain uncertainty, which is certainly present in every language, but not in every language that receives the status of a grammatical category and about which English and Uzbek are significantly underrepresented Languages.

English is a language with a grammatically formed category of certainty-uncertainty (determinative), and this category is well studied (see the works of L. Bloomfield, O. Espersen, V.D. Arakin, etc.). However, concerning anthroponyms, which we consider to be complex personal names with proper nouns, the category of determinative needs to be refined and detailed. The concept of signals (signs of anthroponyms mainly in the text) was introduced by V.I. Bolotov considering a

word, morpheme, or phrase as signals of anthroponyms in micro text and contributing to the introduction of a personal name into the anthroponymic field. Proper noun signals can be semantically empty (pure) and semantically filled. We call pure anthroponymic signals that fulfill only one function: they indicate the presence of anthroponyms in the micro text [3].

According to W.I. Bolotov, pure signals of anthroponyms do not exist in many Indo-European languages. Such signals exist in some Indic languages in which the articles of generic and proper nouns differ [5]. According to G. Sweet and L. Bloomfield, one might assume that the absence of an article before anthroponyms in the language is their mere signal. However, the analysis of specific language material does not allow us to agree with this opinion [4]. In most theoretical works dealing with the proper noun, it is pointed out that the proper noun is not used with the article. However, various authors cite numerous exceptions to the above provision, namely cases of using an article with a personal proper noun.

Among the signs of anthroponyms that have retained their lexical meaning is V.I. Bolotov refers to common nouns denoting a person or collective nouns denoting a group of people, as well as verbs characterizing human activities. All of these words and the adjectives and adverbs derived from them that identify the anthroponym within the micro text retain their meaning, and most of them can be used independently. We consider such signals to be semantically filled. However, this group includes several signals from anthroponyms, some of which have lost their lexical meaning and cannot be used independently (without anthroponyms). We call them **Ms.**, **Mrs.**, **Dr.** (Doctor), and partly **Miss**.

But we cannot regard them as mere signals of anthroponotic, since the change from **Mr. Brown** to **Brown** by the same speaker in the same social field undoubtedly implies a change in the label's evaluative features on the speaker's part [3]. Anthroponymous signals can change in that the proper noun is not always linguistically limited and does not always show the name known to the members of the communication situation. When using an anthroponym as a language object, the following situations are possible:

1. If the designation of an anthroponym belongs to the same social field as the members of the communicative situation, then the article is not used before the



anthroponym: the context and the speech situation specify the anthroponym. For example, we meet our old friend **Romey Thompson** in Sydney.

2. If the designation of the anthroponym does not belong to the social field of one of the members of the communication situation, then it is possible to use:

- a) a definite article, if the anthroponym is associated with one of the members of the communication situation multi-person communication situation, then serves the definite article as an additional means of individualization;
- b) an indefinite article, if one of the participants in the communication situation does not know anything about the meaning of the anthroponym, for example, **A Rose Gwinn** *has saved the train* (Some (some) Rose Gwynne saved the train. We only know the person's proper name, but not their designation).

Another situation arises in the conversation of parents, when it is impossible to make a mistake in determining the designation, for example, **John** *came late last night again*. The different semantic load of anthroponyms affects the translation of articles from English into Uzbek. If the bearer of the proper name is **somebody**, **someone** then the indefinite article is usually translated into English by pronouns some, some, into Uzbek - **bir kimsa**, **allakim**, **bir kishi**, **birov**. If the articles indicate that the denominations of anthroponyms do not belong to the same social field as the members of the communicative situation, then they are translated as follows: a) a definite article is the same, the same; b) an indefinite article is a definite, a definite. When the articles indicate the constitutive transition of a proper noun into a common name, the definite article must not be translated at all, and the indefinite article is replaced by the words one of, one of; in the Uzbek language through the corresponding semantic lexemes **bir**, **bitta**.

It should also take into account the possibility and even the use of a certain article with plural surnames.

In the work of Martin Hiving "Advanced English grammar", cases of the use or disuse of the article before proper names are considered. In particular, it is noted that the article is not used before the name and surname of famous, famous people, for example, **The name Nelson Mandela** *is known all over the world*.

At the same time, the following positions on the use of a certain article are given:



1. If more than one bearer of the same proper name is involved in a communication situation and there is a need to single out one of them: That is not **the Stephen Fraser I** went to school with.
2. If necessary, emphasize that everyone knows this person: Do they mean **the Ronald Reagon**, or someone else?
3. With adjectives or nouns denoting the profession: **The Aboriginal writer Sally Morgan. The wonderful actor Harrison Ford** [1].

A different picture is observed in the American version of English, where **Mr.** is often used as an address.

In modern English (in England), there has been a clear distinction between the use of **Mrs., Miss, and Madam**. As a signal of the name of the personal **Mrs.**, it is used if a married woman is meant. The **Mrs.** form. it is never used independently, but only as a signal before a proper name. The nomination of men and women is not completely symmetrical: even if a woman's husband occupies such a low position in society that his surname is not usually preceded by **Mr.** before his wife's surname **Mrs.** it is mandatory. **Madam** is used as a form of polite address instead of a name. Previously, this word was usually used by servants when they addressed the mistress, then the word began to be used in addressing a woman of any social status, like the word sir. To an unmarried young lady, servants, and people of less noble origin address Madame.

The use of **Dr** is adjacent to the above signals of anthroponyms. as an academic degree before anthroponyms.

Semantically filled signals of anthroponyms include the nouns **president, minister, counselor**, etc.

In Uzbek, the degree of kinship is much more significant in communication and precise in detail than in English, for example, **opa**/older sister, **singil**/ younger sister/**aka** older brother, **uka** /younger brother **amaki**/ paternal uncle/**hola** maternal aunt and many others. Kinship terms can even turn into a kind of postpositive affixes, combining with a proper name, and in the extremely "etiquette" Uzbek language they are practically mandatory and can denote not only real kinship, but are often formulas of politeness and addressing seniors by age or duty: Nodira-opa, Tursun-aka, etc. These signals of anthroponyms are quite peculiar to both English and Uzbek.



It should be noted that the category of belonging is grammatical in Uzbek and is primarily applied to kinship terms: **akam** my older brother, **ukang** your little brother, **opasi** her older sister etc.

There is a tendency among English-speaking people to simplify naming formulas and switch to addressing them primarily by their names. The universal naming formula is currently a surname, and the social function of the surname interacts with its intrinsic linguistic nature. Modern onomastic subsystems of language and anthroponymic formulas that have formed over many centuries are part of the linguistic worldview. The same parameters apply to their study as to the appellative vocabulary: semantics, syntactic, and pragmatics.

#### References:

1. Hewings M. Advanced grammar in use. London: Cambridge University Press, 2003. 340 p.
2. Kononov A. N. Grammatika sovremennogo uzbekskogo literaturnogo yazyka. M.: AN, 1960. 446 s.
3. Bolotov V. I. Teoriya imen sobstvennix. Tashkent: NUUz, 2003. 98 s.
4. Blumfeld L. Yazyk. M.: Progress, 1968. 606 s.

