The Role Of Anthroponyms In The Language System

Khudaynazarov I.I., Elmatov Sh.N.

Karshi branch of the Tashkent University of Information Technologies named after Muhammad al-Khwarizmi. Uzbekistan

Abstract

The following article deals with the role of anthroponyms in the lexical system of language, and the literature on the topic was analyzed as well. The vocabulary system of the language has a hierarchical structure. Each of its syllables consists of a center and a circle, and the center of the syllable usually consists of one word. It will have its first, second, third syllables: synonymous, graduonymic, and so on; all of which are open, and can be filled with a new lexemes that can be used, as in the socio-linguistic stage it forms an anthroponymic edge and the most necessary linguistic empty circle. This siege exists only at the linguistic stage as an opportunity. For each person, this siege is personal and private.

Key words: anthroponym, dictionary, system, linguistics, Uzbek linguistics, linguistic stage, animal.

Introduction

The study of the issues of systemic rule in the process of systematic construction, survival and expansion of the language dictionary system in the field of Uzbek linguistics began in the 60s and 70s of the twentieth century.[1] It is not exaggeration to say that in the 80s and 90s this issue was completely resolved. In particular, the course " The system of lexicology" in Uzbek linguistics, rewritten by Professor Sh. Rakhmatullaev,[2] generalized textbooks of H. Nematov, R. Rasulov[3] the Uzbek language has fully proved the formation of Lexicology system; the systemic nature of the lexicon has become self-evident without debate. Such generalizations became a guide for further lexicological research. Conducting research based on the systemic nature of lexicon provides an opportunity to fully reveal the specific features of lexical units.

The complete proof of the systematic structure of the lexicon also posed many new problems for lexicological research. Some of these problems and tasks are listed in the textbook on systematic lexicology.[4] However, a large proportion of them have not yet been identified in the scientific literature. One such unresolved problem is the systemic nature of the lexicon and its place in the lexical system of onomocysts.

Literature review

This issue was frequently addressed by linguists in the 50s and 60s. Under the influence of I.V. Stalin's work on linguistics in our linguistics at that time, two concepts:

1. The basic vocabulary of the language.
2. Linguistic structure was differentiated.

In the research of this period, for example. In the works of A.I.Vizgalov, A.A. Reformatsky and others, famous names were not included in the main dictionary of the language. Their place in these studies would be determined by the composition of the dictionary. But these studies were done long before the systematic study of lexicon was formed as a separate method. Nevertheless, as K.A. Levkovskaya points out, even in the linguistic vocabulary, famous horses were distinguished as distinctive words. One of the scholars who initiated the systematic study of lexicon in linguistics is A.A. Ufimtseva. It shows that famous horses are recognized as one of the microsystems that complement the lexical system of language. In Uzbek

linguistics, the work done in this area is analyzed in detail in the research of E.A. Begmatov.[5] The main work of the researchers was not to determine the place of famous horses in the lexical system, but to prove that they are a unique system in the lexical system. In the subsequent period in Uzbek linguistics, with the efforts of a large group of scholars (including E.A.Begmatov, T. Nafasov, N. Ahunov, G. Sattorov), it was fully proved that famous horses are a separate part of the linguistic system. As professor E. Begmatov writes: "After the cognate horse and other words in the language become the famous horse, it undergoes various formal and functional changes. For example, can the names Azizjon, Azizbibi and Butabek, Butayor, Butakul, Butaboy be semantically and formally equivalent to the words "aziz" and "buta"?

The word used in the function of the noun assumes various suffixes, auxiliary forms, various elements at the disposal of onomastics. The functional capabilities of the word as a noun also expand. . . For example: Buriboy, Burigul, Buriniso, Burikhan. . . Such names cannot be said to be the exact word for wolf in the language. Although the wolf used as a name originally originated from "a wolf", which is a cognate horse, it now has its own semantic, nominative, and functional characteristics as a nickname horse. Similarly, common names such as Bobonor, Bozorgul, Jumamurod, Murodali are lexemes formed in the framework of grief anthroponymy and characteristic of famous horses.[6] Indeed, anthroponyms, as an integral part of the lexical system (system) itself, consist of certain subsystems. In particular, anthroponyms themselves are divided into separate groups, such as name, patronymic, surname, nickname, nickname. Similarly, the group of personal names is subdivided into a group of names given to men and women, respectively. The anthroponymic units mentioned above have their own semantic, structural, structural, and methodological features. The Russian linguists K.A. Levkovskaya and A.A. Ufimtseva "Words of a separate group in the language dictionary[7] or "An integral part of the language lexical system"[8] they have noted. Linguist E. Begmatov suggested calling them as "anthropolexes or nouns". [9]

Research Methodology

From the above it is clear that anthroponyms have their own semantic and methodological features, and in the language system, which is not grammatically plural, these linguistic units consist of separate systems and subsystems. still remains open.

We are far from assuming that the relation of onomastic lexicon to appellate lexicon has not been studied at all. More than a hundred scientific papers have been published in Uzbek linguistics alone on the relation of isolated onomosymonyms (onomastic lexicon) to isolated applied lexicon,[10] but all this work is devoted to the historical-etymological relations of onomastic lexicon with the appellate lexicon taken separately. However, in such cases, the concepts of onomasiological-etymological meaning and historical-etymological meaning are often confused.[11] It is known that in a number of works the systematic relations within the onomastic lexicon are considered in detail,[12] semantic functional classification of onomastic lexicon in Uzbek language (anthroponyms, toponyms, theonyms, astronyms, zoonyms, cosonyms, oikonyms, hydronyms, etc.), specific lexical-semantic, structural features, indicators of each group were interpreted and explained in more detail. But if we ask from Uzbek linguists, such as Abdukarim or Abdujalil, will the Uzbek language be included in the system of vocabulary, he can't definitely answer and suggests do learn it more,or says " that's not a word, it is a name".

Does the name fit into the vocabulary of the language or not? In which link of the dictionary system is the apple located, and how is the apple connected to the dictionary system? Without addressing these two issues, engaging in onomastic research at the current stage of development of Uzbek language lexicology

is nothing more than acknowledging the development of science. Therefore, we raised the issue of the relationship of names to the system of vocabulary of the Uzbek language.

Analysis and results

Systematic lexicological research has shown that the lexical system of a language has a hierarchical structure. Each of its syllables consists of a center and a circle, and the center of the syllable usually consists of one word. It will have its first, second, third circles: synonymous, graduonymic, and other lines, all of which are open, and can be filled with new and new lexemes. The amount of Kursh lexemes depends on the cultural level of the speaker and the level of knowledge of the field (see 76). Therefore, there are more than six hundred types of horses in the Uzbek language,[13] knowing the names of about 500 species of fish, an ordinary Uzbek can easily know the names of 10–12 horse species and the names of 4–5 fish species. It is enough that he knows only two words, "horse" and "fish" instead of 18-20 words. A young child does not distinguish between a "horse" and a "donkey" in his speech. Ordinary Uzbeks can easily meet the needs of their speech if they know the words horse and fish, as mentioned instead of more than 500 species of fish and horses. From this, lexicologists conclude that the most necessary tool for the speech need in any part of the lexical system is the central lexeme, which is at the center of this link [Safarov R., Saidova H., Narzieva M., Orifjonova Sh., Kilichev B., Nematova G. And others]. The rest of Kurshov's lexemes perform secondary functions - beautifying speech, expressing ideas clearly, and avoiding repetitions.

As already mentioned, the systematic structure of the language lexicon is hierarchical, hierarchical in nature and generalizes from the bottom up.[14] In this process, from the lower stage to the higher stage, which is desired, not all the words of this stage are included, but only the central lexeme. For example, if the circle of the lexeme "horse" contains about 500 words for the critic, then only one word "horse" belongs to the group of lexical meanings of "animal", which is higher than about 500 words, and forms the following hypo-hyperonomic

LMG.(Figure1)

Though, a word "trailer" the lexemes horse, donkey, mule, stallion, and camel, which stand in the first circle of the word, each appear as a central lexeme for the next stage of the animal, and combine hundreds of surrounding words around themselves, and it is not necessary for every Uzbek to know these words.

In particular, not all Uzbeks know the difference between "biya" and "baytal". On this basis, we can ask the question we originally asked in a different way. For example, whether "snakehead"[15] or "kakra"[16] can

.

be found in Uzbek language dictionary? Both words are unfamiliar to most Uzbek speakers. Of course, these words are not among the most common words in the Uzbek language.

Both words serve to describe the third and fourth tier of the words "fish" and "grass", which are widely used in the Uzbek language, ie a certain type of "fish" and "grass", and 90% of Uzbeks really need to know it. When necessary, they use the words "kakra" and "ilonbosh" to describe their needs, figuratively expressing "grass" and "fish" as "so-and-so grass" or "so-and-so fish." Only a narrow circle of experts can master the words "snakehead" and "kakra" and use them as a word of common use in mutual professional speech.

Names also have the nature of the most peripheral lexemes of the central lexeme, but their function is completely different from the surrounding lexemes mentioned above. Further we clarify this phenomenon and present the following example based on hypo-hyperionymic relations between words.

For example, if the second circle lexemes of the central lexeme "melon" refer to gender (for example, chillaki, early type), the third circle lexemes refer to the variety of the species (handalak), the fourth circle lexemes refer to the variety (kukcha), the fifth circle lexemes refer to the variety (kokani). Names serve as a separate name for a person, place, object and others are separated as a cognate noun in an entity named by the language. Names perform a high personal social function. At the same time, the names are completely different from the central lexeme, which performs a general social function, and the lexemes of its first, second, third, and so on. Therefore, while appellate lexemes and appellate words have a general social value, names have a special, socio-personal significance. For example, we call a person a woman by the word "woman" in our language, and this word can be applied equally to billions of people of the same sex. For example, in the phrase "This woman spoke well," this woman can be easily applied to any of the nearly two billion women who are now Russian, French, middle-aged, old, masculine, or unmarried. But a certain person enters into a social relationship in his daily life with a small number of women, not with all the women in the world. That is why she has to differentiate each of the specific women she is related to from other women in the world, and keep it in her memory. Because a person's relationship with each of the women he or she enters into is different. So he has to name each of them separately. Another necessity of the individual identity of names is evident, especially in anthroponyms. Each person is a separate world for himself. Therefore, each person should name himself in isolation from other members of society, names including anthroponyms serve for this purpose.

Now, let's answer the question posed at the beginning of this section. Names are not among the most widely used words of Uzbek lexicon of general social significance, but they have a great place and importance in the private lexicon of an individual. Such a statement of the issue confronts the linguistic and speech conflict, which is one of the most pressing problems in our linguistics today and has methodological significance, because language has a general social nature, and speech has a personal social value.

There is a specific law of linguistic discord. The law is that in order for something to live and occur in speech, it must have its place as an opportunity in the linguistic system. What is the possibility of nouns in the linguistic system of Uzbek lexemes, they form a group of the most active words in the vocabulary of each particular person. This feature is unique for each field name in Uzbek. Since the subject of our study is anthroponyms, we will focus only on the expression of the concept of "man" in our language and the surroundings of the lexeme "human".

In the Uzbek language, the ways and means of describing a person (person) have been studied in great detail.[17] We count only a few of the ways of naming a person in Uzbek.

     1. By gender: male-female, grandfather-grandmother, daughter-son.

     2. According to relatives: parents, uncles[18].

     3. By age: lullaby, baby, infant, child, boy.

4. By nationality: Uzbek, Tajik, Kyrgyz, Russian.

5. By place of residence: Bukhara, Samarkand.

6. By profession: hunter, fisherman, tractor driver.

7. According to the structure of the body: fat, small, small.

8. According to the character: cunning, bad-tempered, kind.

9. According to some feature: turtle.

10. According to the shortcomings in some parts: lame, blind, dumb, dumb.

11. According to his behavior: rude, stubborn, polite, bad-tempered.

It is impossible to list all such possibilities. All of these possibilities are linguistic means of naming a person. These are used in anthroponymy.

Names, including anthroponyms, form a separate circle of the lexeme "man" in the Uzbek linguistic system. This can be illustrated as follows.

1. Synonymous

2. Graduonymic

3. Hyponymic

4. Partonimic

5. Anthroponymic

It can be seen from this diagram that the anthroponymic siege is located at the very edge of the "human" lexeme. So there is such a siege in the linguistic system. Such a circle exists both in the word "male" and in the word "female", and in the linguistic system neither the circle of nouns "male" nor the circle of nouns "woman" is empty, not filled with specific words. Therefore, each person fills this circle on the basis of their own social practice and turns it into their own active words. Therefore, the anthroponyms that form the outermost circle of the lexemes "man", "man", "woman" can not enter the linguistic-lexical system, because they are not in the circle, but this circle is at the farthest point from the center of the linguistic system. In this sense, this circle can be compared with the role of the lexeme "Ilonbosh" - fish, "kakra" - grass in the hypo-hyperonymic circle. If the Uzbek language is conditionally included as a special word in the vocabulary, which is unknown to 99% of Uzbeks due to the fact that the "snakehead" is in the fifth or sixth circle of the fish, anthroponyms are also at the edge of all the lines of the lexeme "man". Therefore, the Uzbek language is one of the latest, most specialized words in the vocabulary. Because anthroponyms are the most marginal circle of the "human" lexeme, they are not of general social significance, but are of particular importance in the speech of each individual. Therefore, each person's system of anthroponyms and anthroponymic richness is unique to him. This peculiarity is so special that Tahir in one person's lexicon and Tahir in another person's lexicon may have a completely different meaning and essence.

Conclusion

Although anthroponyms exist as the most marginal circle in the lexical system of a language, they have a special place in the structural system of a language. That is why anthroponyms appear in almost all dictionaries. Anthroponyms are included in many dictionaries, from the first work of Turkic linguistics, Mahmud Kashgari's Devoni lug'atit turk, to the multi-volume Annotated Dictionary of the Uzbek Language. Thus, we can conclude that names have a place in the system of vocabulary of the Uzbek language, but it has a personal social nature, not a general social nature. Although anthroponyms are at the very edge of the general, ie linguistic, lexical richness, they can be used as an active lexical richness in the speech of an individual, because at the socio-linguistic stage they form an anthroponymic edge and the most necessary linguistic circle; this siege exists only at the linguistic stage as an opportunity. For each person, this siege is personal and private.

References

1.   Akramova Surayo Renatovna. Interpretation of lexical and semantic features of uzbek-tajik words in jamal kamal's poem "Uzbek language. ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal Year: 2020, Volume: 10, Issue: 5 First page: (1434) Last page : (1440) Online ISSN : 2249-7137. Article DOI : 10.5958/2249-7137.2020.00342.0

2.   Amonov Sultonovich Ulugmurod. Abdurauf fitrat is one of the earliest researchers of Uzbek folklore. ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal. Year : 2020, Volume : 10, Issue : 6. First page : (669) Last page : (673). Online ISSN : 2249-7137. Article DOI : 10.5958/2249-7137.2020.00616.3

3.   Jamilova B. S. Safarova N. O. Basics of Uzbek Children's Reading. http://www.testmagzine.biz/index.php/testmagzine/article/view/573/513.

4.   Kasimova Zebo Khamidovna. Application of interactive methods in teaching psychology. Academicia: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal https://saarj.com. Year : 2020, Volume : 10, Issue: 9 P. 197-205. Article DOI : 10.5958/2249-7137.2020.01046.0

5.   Makhmudova Darmonjon Bozorboevna. DESIGN AS A MEANS OF AESTHETIC EDUCATION. ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal Year: 2020, Vol. 10 Issue 9. First page: (176) Last page : (182)   Online ISSN : 2249-7137.   DOI: 10.5958/2249-7137.2020.01040.

6.   Mirzayeva Sayyora Rustamovna. Psychological features of attitudes of students to their own health in conflict situations. journal of critical reviews. ISSN- 2394-5125 VOL 7, ISSUE 17,   2020. http://www.jcreview.com/?sec=cissue.

7.   Ruziyeva Mohichehra Yokubovna. About color symbols in folklore. JCR. 2020; 7(17): 461-466 » Abstract » PDF» doi: 10.31838/jcr.07.17.64;

8.   Safarov Firuz Sulaymonovich, Istamova Shohida Maqsudovna. TYPES OF LEXICAL MEANINGS. *Journal of Critical Reviews.* 2020; 7(6): 481-484.

9.   Samarova Shoxista Rabidjanovna, Rakhmonova Muqaddas Qahramanovna, Mirzarahimova Gulnora, Ikromovna, Maratov Temur Gayrat ugli, Kamilov Bobir Sultanovich. Psychological aspects of developing creative personality and the concept of reduction of creativity to intellect. JCR. 2020; 7(17): 498-505. doi: 10.31838/jcr.07.17.69

10.   Tukhsanov K. R. The unity of form and content in translation. JOURNAL OF CRITICAL REVIEWS. ISSN- 2394-5125 VOL 7, ISSUE 17, 2020. http://www.jcreview.com/?sec=cissue.

11.   Касимова З.Х. РАЗВИТИЕ ВАЖНЫХ ПСИХОЛОГИЧЕСКИХ КАЧЕСТВ В ЛИЧНОСТИ РУКОВОДИТЕЛЯ [DEVELOPMENT OF IMPORTANT PSYCHOLOGICAL QUALITIES IN THE PERSONALITY OF THE LEADER] // LXXIV International Scientific Review of the Problems and Prospects of Modern Science and Education Свободное цитирование при указании авторства:https://scientific-conference.com/grafik/grafik-2020-pervoe-polugodie.html (Boston. USA. - 27 October, 2020). с. {см. сборник}

12.   Касимова З.Х. ОСОБЕННОСТИ НАЦИОНАЛЬНЫХ ЦЕННОСТЕЙ И МЕЖКУЛЬТУРНЫХ КОММУНИКАЦИЙ В СОДЕРЖАНИИ ГУМАНИТАРНОГО ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ // Вестник науки и образования №22(76), 2019. [Электронныйресурс].
URL: http://scientificjournal.ru/images/PDF/2019/VNO-76/osobennosti-natsionalnykh_1.pdf

13.   Tosheva Nurzoda Toshtemirovna. Methods and techniques of developing cognitive activities of primary school pupils //ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal. – 2020. – Т. 10. – №. 10. – С. 80-87.