



PECULIARITIES OF UZBEK, GERMAN AND RUSSIAN ANTHROPONYMS

Berdieva Zulfiya

Lecturer, Termez State Pedagogical Institute

Annotation

This article deals with anthroponyms. The article considers a look at the history of the emergence and development of English anthroponyms, the definition of their types and properties, and determines the methods of transferring anthroponyms within the framework of intercultural and interlingual communication.

Keywords: onomastics, proper, language, branch

An anthroponym is a proper name (or a set of names, including all possible variants), officially assigned to an individual as his identification mark. The anthroponym names, but does not attribute any properties. Anthroponyms have a conceptual meaning, which is based on the idea of a category, a class of objects. This value usually has the following features: a) an indication that the bearer of the anthroponym is a person: Peter, Lewis in contrast to London, Thames; b) an indication of belonging to a nationallinguistic community: Robin, Henry, William, in contrast to Renй, Henri, Wilhelm; c) an indication of the person's gender: John, Henry as opposed to Mary, Elizabeth [1:39]. It is clear that each person cannot have a unique, only inherent name for him. Both personal names and surnames, taken by themselves, have many carriers. Outside of a specific situation or sphere of communication, the names John, Elizabeth, Thomas, etc. do not point to any particular person. Such names, which in the linguistic consciousness of the collective are not preferably associated with any one person, we will call multiple anthroponyms. Other anthroponyms also belong to many people, but are primarily associated with one person. These are the names of people who have gained wide popularity (Plato, Shakespeare, Darwin, Einstein, etc.). V.P. Berkov proposed to distinguish between these groups, respectively, as general and individual [2:107]. The term "general", however, does not seem to be entirely successful, as it may suggest that this is something more general, abstract, than single names.

The principle of distinguishing between these two types of anthroponyms is different: in the absence or presence of the object to which the anthroponym points in the first place. For example, the proper name Churchill, used in the text without explanation, will most likely be understood as the surname of the British prime minister of the 40-





50s (Churchill was a heavy smoker). Only when the context or speech situation contradicts this understanding, the name will be perceived as plural: Churchill, my next-door neighbor, has just come from Africa. Thus, multiple anthroponyms are characterized by the fact that the communicative sphere in which they uniquely define one referent is limited. Therefore, when introducing them into a wider sphere of communication, they must necessarily be accompanied by a clarifying context, for example: I heard somebody coming through the shower curtains. Even without looking up, I knew right away who it was. It was Robert Ackley, this guy that roomed next to me...

Not even Herb Gale, his own roommate, ever called him "Bob" or even "Ack". (J. Salinger) clarifying context, since their communicative sphere is the entire language community. This is demonstrated, in particular, by those cases when the anthroponym is introduced into the text without any explanation, and when, on the basis of the text itself, it is impossible to establish who the given name belongs to. For example: That the characteristic romanticism of the Victorian mind the sea represents something mysterious, boundless, reaching out wider and wider into eternal truths and eternal progress. Charlotte Bronte, seeing the sea for the first time, was "quite overpowered so that she could not speak", and Hazzitt's reaction was no less awestruck at the "strange ponderous riddle, that we can neither penetrate nor grasp in our comprehension". (International Herald Tribune)

nnnnThe article from which the cited passage is taken does not specify anywhere that Charlotte Bronte (1816-1855) and Hazllitt (1778-1830) are prominent English writers. It is assumed that they are fairly well known to readers. The extralinguistic factor - the wide popularity of a person in society - finds linguistic expression in the fact that single anthroponyms do not need an accompanying context of a clarifying nature, and their referents do not depend on a narrow communicative sphere. It follows that the known information about the bearer of the name is included in the meaning of a single anthroponym as a unit of the language. It is important for a translator to know how much this information is and whether it can be equated with encyclopedic information about the person to whom the name belongs. As already mentioned, there is an opinion according to which single ISs have an "infinitely rich" content and their meaning includes all encyclopedic information about the object. Rightly objecting to this point of view, A.B. Superanskaya notes: "Speaking of the infinitely rich content of the name Cervantes, we replace the linguistic analysis of this name with biographical information about the author of Don Quixote, forgetting that other people could also be called Cervantes, just as there are many people named Churchill." And yet the





author of Don Quixote occupies a special position among all persons named Cervantes.

This surname does indeed belong to many people, but the additional information that one of these people is a great writer and author of a famous novel seems to be contained in this name not only for the whole language community, but even for many language communities. In this regard, when it comes to this particular person, the name Cervantes does not need further explanation. The minimal idea that Cervantes is “the famous writer, author of the novel Don Quixote” is firmly included in the characterizing component of the meaning of this name. Of course, not every member of the language community has all the information about a particular person, so the meaning of a single anthroponym in the language is a well-known abstraction corresponding to the average level of knowledge about the bearer of the name. Of course, not everyone has read Aesop's fables, the works of Albert Einstein or Lincoln's biography, but everyone (or almost everyone) has a certain amount of information about these people, having drawn this information from other people, from books, periodicals, radio and television programs. Such an average sum of information is consistently correlated with a single name.

This amount of information, this well-known minimum of information about the bearer of the anthroponym, can apparently be considered the value of single anthroponyms in the primary nomination. Thus, the meaning of IS Homer is almost completely exhausted by the following definition; Ancient Greek poet, author of the epics Iliad and Odyssey. Firstly, this is the amount of information that is associated with this name in the minds of most native speakers, and secondly, this is almost everything that is known about this person in historical and literary science. That is why the playful maxim sounds so comical: "It is established that the Iliad was not written by Homer at all, but by another Greek of the same name." The status of the primary nominative meaning in intercultural communication is different for different anthroponyms. The fame of many people has gone beyond the boundaries of their country and linguistic community, respectively, their names are single anthroponyms in other languages. On the other hand, the fame of other figures who are widely known in their countries does not reach the international level. If the anthroponyms Einstein, Aesop, Newton, Lincoln are single in both English and English, then the names of William Hazlitt or Willa Cather do not have such a status in English.

If the translator makes such a conclusion regarding the text he is translating and the audience for which the translation is intended, he has reason to apply clarifying, descriptive or transformative correspondences. In addition, contextual analysis can show that a single IP realizes its meaning in a figurative nomination [1:39-43]. Thus,





it is necessary to differentiate the concepts of "single anthroponym" and "multiple anthroponym". For single anthroponyms, in addition to the features characteristic of both types, information about the bearer of the name is important. In addition, in a situation where the text does not contain an object indicated by an anthroponym, and the text itself is intended, among other things, for an international audience, additional information about this object may be necessary. The concept of a personal name, i.e. the attitude of the members of the language community to their names is gradually changing, and this leads to the restructuring of anthroponymic systems. For a modern English person, the most natural two-component naming. It can be: name + patronymic (Ivan Petrovich, Maria Ivanovna); name + surname (Vasily Kudryavtsev or Vasya Kudryavtsev, Tatyana Smirnova or Tanya Smirnova); name + nickname: Olga Ryzhaya, Zhora Khomyak. Since the 1990s, two-component naming has begun to spread in Russia in business and political circles, consisting of the full form of the name and surname: Galina Starovoitova, Sergey Kovalev. In previous eras, this method of naming was used only in the artistic environment: Isabella Yuryeva, Arkady Raikin [1:1]. For anthroponymy, the categories of diminutiveness and endearment are of particular importance (in English grammars they are sometimes combined). Words expressing diminutives are called deminutives, and hypocoristics express petting - when naming a person or any other animate or inanimate objects. For example, a mountain (large) is a hill (small), and a hill, a gorushka are affectionate words; bear (big), bear, bear cub (small), Medvedushka, Medvedko - affectionate names of a bear or appeal to a bear. As a result of deminutivation, the names of other objects can be created: a hand - a handle (doors), a leg - a leg (beds), an eagle - an eagle (a bird of another detachment). In English anthroponymy, since ancient times, deminutivation has been used to name children: they were given the name of the parent in a diminutive form (vertical structural co-naming). For example, father: Yuri Grigoryevich Volk Kamensky (first half of the 15th century) - son: Ivan Yuryevich Blind Wolf Volkov son Kamensky. Affection is a special category that reflects the attitude of the speaker to the named, regardless of family and other relationships. Numerous affectionate suffixes can be added to both full and truncated stems: Ivan - Ivanushka, Ivanochek; Vanya - Vanyushka, Vanechek. In addition to affectionate ones, there may be other suffixes of subjective assessment, for example, magnifying and frightening: Ivanishche, Varvarishcha; scornful: Ivashka, Maryashka. But there is no direct relationship between the suffix and the emotional characteristics of the name. In different parts of Russia, forms like Vanka, Manka can be regarded differently: in cities they are perceived rather as dismissive, in rural areas - as a normal designation of young hardworking people. With the development of documentation,





the reflection of kinship in names became optional, and diminutive forms joined pets. Anthroponyms include all types of personal and family names. In different countries, the set of names that make up the official naming of a person is not the same.

Literature

1. Sh F. F. TECHNOLOGY OF TEACHING LANGUAGES //Экономика и социум. – 2022. – №. 12-2 (103). – С. 39-42.
2. Sh F. F. TECHNOLOGY OF TEACHING LANGUAGES //Экономика и социум. – 2022. – №. 12-2 (103). – С. 39-42.
3. Sh F. F. TECHNOLOGY OF TEACHING LANGUAGES //Экономика и социум. – 2022. – №. 12-2 (103). – С. 39-42.
4. Tadjievna X. O. USE OF INTERACTIVE METHODS IN RUSSIAN //European International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Management Studies. – 2022. – Т. 2. – №. 12. – С. 86-88.
5. Усманова Г. М., Хужанова О. Т. LANGUAGE LEARNING GAMES IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE LESSONS //Актуальные научные исследования в современном мире. – 2020. – №. 6-7. – С. 144-148.
6. Alaudinova D. R. New methods of teaching languages //International Journal EPRA. – 2020.
7. Alaudinova D. R. New methods of teaching languages //International Journal EPRA. – 2020.
8. Alaudinova D. R. New methods of teaching languages //International Journal EPRA. – 2020.
9. Berdieva Z. TRAINING THE CONTENT AND FORM OF THE PROJECT ACTIVITIES //Science and innovation. – 2023. – Т. 2. – №. B2. – С. 287-290.
10. Бердиева З. С. FEATURES OF THE" GERMAN MODEL" OF HIGHER EDUCATION //Актуальные научные исследования в современном мире. – 2020. – №. 6-8. – С. 33-37.
11. Бердиева З. С. О языковых контактах в немецких языковых анклавах в России //Актуальные научные исследования в современном мире. – 2016. – №. 5-1. – С. 5-8.
12. Бердиева З. С. FEATURES OF THE" GERMAN MODEL" OF HIGHER EDUCATION //Актуальные научные исследования в современном мире. – 2020. – №. 6-8. – С. 33-37.

