

## SEMANTIC ANALYSIS OF ANTHROPONYMS IN ENGLISH LANGUAGES

NARMURODOVA DILFUZA ABDUHALIKOVNA

Master student of Termez State University, Faculty of Foreign languages  
E-mail: dilfuzaqurbonova91@gmail.com, Contact number: +998944660087  
Uzbekistan

### ABSTRACT:

**The linguistics of modern Uzbekistan is characterized by an in-depth study of foreign languages, both in theoretical and practical aspects, as well as the development of new directions aimed at studying the language in terms of studying the processes of thinking, the place and role of man in an increasingly complex world, the specifics of a person's speech behavior within different social groups (language pragmatics).**

**KEY WORDS: terms, semantics, antroponyms, names, morpheme, phrase**

### INTRODUCTION:

Language researchers repeatedly turn to the phenomenon of the nominative value of the word as one of the means of forming the language pictures of the world. In connection with the expansion of the application of the English language in our country, binary comparisons of the Uzbek language with English, as well as triple comparisons (Uzbek - English - Russian languages) are especially relevant, which is extremely important in typological terms. The research aspect chosen in this article is closely related to the category of definiteness - uncertainty, which is unconditionally present in every language, but not in every language receiving the status of a grammatical category and obviously insufficiently studied with respect to Russian and Uzbek languages.

English is a language with a grammatically defined category of definiteness - uncertainty (determinability), and this category is well studied (see the works of L. Bloomfield, O. Espersen, V.D. Arakin, etc.). However, in

relation to anthroponyms, which we consider as complex names of persons by their own names, the category of determinacy needs to be refined and detailed.

The concept of signals (signs of anthroponyms primarily in the text) was developed by V.I. Bolotov, who uses the signals of anthroponyms to consider a word, morpheme or phrase, within the context of a microcontext, contributing to the introduction of the person's name into an anthroponymic field. "Signals of proper names can be semantically devastated (clean) and semantically filled. By pure signals of anthroponyms we call such signals, which perform only one function: they indicate the presence of anthroponyms within the microcontext "[88, 116].

According to V.I. Bolotov, in many Indo-European languages there are no pure signals of anthroponyms. Such signals are in some Native American languages, in which the articles of nominal and proper nouns differ [88, 517]. "One might suppose, following G. Suit and L. Bloomfield, that the absence of the article in front of anthroponyms in speech is their pure signal. However, the analysis of specific linguistic material does not allow us to agree with this opinion "[88, 48].

In most theoretical works devoted to the proper name, it is indicated that the proper name is not used with the article. However, different authors give numerous exceptions to the above provision, i.e. cases of using the article with a name of its own.

To the signals of anthroponyms that retained their lexical meaning, V.I. Bolotov refers to "nominal nouns denoting a person, or

collective nouns denoting a group of persons, as well as verbs that characterize human activity. All these words and adjectives and adverbs derived from them, identifying an anthroponym within the microcontext, retain their significance, and most of them can be used independently. We consider these signals to be semantically filled. However, this group includes a number of signals of anthroponyms, which have partially lost their lexical meaning and can not be used alone (without an anthroponym). To them in English we refer Mg., Mrs., Dr. (doctor) and partly Miss. But we can not consider them as pure signals of anthroponyms, since the change in Mg. Brown to Brown by the same speaker in the same social field, undoubtedly implies a change in the estimated character of the denoter on the part of the speaker "[Ibid., P. 56].

Signals of anthroponyms can change due to the fact that the proper name in speech is not always definite, i.e. not always calls a denoter, known to members of the situation of communication. When anthroponym is used as a subject of speech, the following situations are possible:

1. If the denotator of the anthroponym belongs to the same social field with members of the communicative situation, then the article in front of the anthroponym is not used: the context and the speech situation are fully concretized by the anthroponym. For example: We meet our old friend Romey Thompson in Sydney.
2. If the denotator of the anthroponym does not belong to the social field of one of the members of the communicative situation, then it is possible to use:
  - a) a definite article, if anthroponym is associated with one of the members of the situation of communication with a several

individuals, then the definite article serves as an additional means of individualization;

- b) an indefinite article, if one of the members of the situation of communication knows nothing about the denotator of the anthroponym, for example: A Rose Gwinn has saved the train (Some (some) Rose Gwynn saved the train. We only know the name of the person, but not his/her denotator ).

A different situation arises in the parents' conversation, when there can be no error regarding the identification of the denoter, for example: John came late last night again.

Different semantic loads of anthroponyms affect the translation of articles from English into Russian and Uzbek. If the bearer of the personal name is unknown, then in Russian the indefinite article is usually translated by pronouns as "some", in Uzbek - **bir kimsa, allakim, bir kishi, bir**. If articles indicate that the anthroponyms' denotators do not belong to the same social field as the members of the communicative situation, they are translated as follows: a) the definite article in the combination with **тотсамый, тасамая**; b) an indefinite article - **а некий, некая**. If articles indicate a consecutive transition of a name in a common name, then the definite article in general can not be translated, and the indefinite article is transmitted by words **одиниз, однаиз**; to the Uzbek language corresponding to the semantics of the tokens of the **bir, bitta**. One should also take into account the possibility and even the use of a definite article with names in the plural.

In Mapin Higing's work "Advanced English grammar", cases of the use or non-use of an article before persons' names are considered. In particular, it is noted that the article is not used before the name and surname of

celebrities, famous people, for example: The name of Nelson Mandela is known all over the world.

At the same time, the following positions of the definite article usage are given:

1. If more than one bearer of the same name is involved in the communicative situation and there is a need to select one of them: That is not the Stephen Fraser I went to school with.
2. If necessary, emphasize that this person is known to everyone: Do they mean the Ronald Reagan, or someone else?
3. With the adjectives or nouns denoting the profession: The Aboriginal writer Sally Morgan. The wonderful actor Harrison Ford [79, 122-123].

Thus, the absence of an article in front of a noun is not a formal indicator, a signal of anthroponym in English.

"The language material of modern English shows that now **Mr.** retained only one meaning - an anthroponym of the masculine gender. The absence of examples of independent use of **M.** in literary English (in England) its fixed position in front of the anthroponym, the impossibility of separating **Mr.** with the anthroponym of some other word, speaks in favor of the fact that we are currently observing the process of desemantisation of **Mr.**" [72, 57].

A different picture is observed in the American version of the English language, where **Mr.** is often used as a treatment.

In modern English (in England) there was a clear distinction between the use of **Mrs.**, **Miss**, **Madam**. As a signal of a person's name **Mrs.** is used, if you mean a married woman. Form **Mrs.** is never used on its own, but only as a signal before the proper name. Nomination of men and women is not quite symmetrical: even if the husband of a woman

occupies such a low position in society that his name is not usually put before **Mr.**, before the name of his wife **Mrs.** is put necessarily. **Madam** is used as a form of polite treatment instead of a name. Earlier this word was mainly used by servants when they addressed the hostess, then the word began to be used in addressing a woman of any social status, as the word **Sir**. To an unmarried young lady, servants and people of less noble origin are referred to as **Madam**.

To the aforementioned signals of anthroponyms adjoins the use of **Dr.** as a scientific degree before anthroponyms. Semantically filled signals of anthroponyms include nouns president, minister, counsellor, etc.

Thus, although the English language has a complex, branched, almost completely regulated system of signals of anthroponyms, at the same time it is developing, variable. This system is extremely relevant in the formation of social fields of the family, administration and requires further detailed study.

Signals (signs) of anthroponyms are the embodiment of the category of certainty - uncertainty in the sphere of naming a person (individual). Some of the signals of anthroponyms are common to all languages: in Russian, these are adjectives that can characterize only a person (**добрый, трудолюбивый, застенчивый, улыбчивый, предприимчивый**, etc.) and verbs related only to human activity (**трудиться, читать, писать, сочинять**, etc.).

Due to the absence of a grammatically expressed category of definiteness - uncertainty and, consequently, of certain and indefinite articles, in the Russian language, when pronouncing different degrees of

individualization of persons, the role of pronouns of different ranks increases.

This is primarily indefinite pronouns, including the pronominal adjective **one** (not in the counting function). In sentences like One person asks you; There came one woman etc. the role of this pronoun is close to an indefinite article, since it is a question of a person who is unfamiliar to the speaker. However, with this widespread way of expressing uncertainty in the Russian language, no binding way of expressing definiteness correlates. Although certainty is often expressed by demonstrative pronouns such as **тот, такой, этот**, the semantics of these pronouns makes it possible to distinguish the degree of familiarity with the anthroponym object (e.g. **The writer** we listened to last week - **This writer** is familiar to us - Here you need **awriter** who knows the village well. **Тот писатель**, которого мы слушали на прошлой неделе - **Этот писатель** хорошо нам знаком - Здесь нужен **такой писатель**, который хорошо знает деревню).

In relation to proper names, these pronouns are used only in the situation of choice: That Sasha, and not this one. One of the Ivanovs resigned.

A special role in the identification of individuals is played by a pronoun (referring to the person), opposed to the pronoun of something (semantics of objects) as a kind of anthroponym, i.e., The pronoun is an animate noun, but never a denoting animal. It can be used on its own: Someone lived, a man without roots, lonely. **Жил некто**, человек безродный, одинокий (I.A. Krylov), and in combination with personal names: Some Ivanov announced himself in the morning. **Некто Иванов** заявился с утра.

The pronoun **himself (сам)** plays a certain role in expressing the degree of individualization, which also expresses a good acquaintance with the denoter, and emphasizes its importance in this situation of communication: Petrov himself could not cope with this task. **Сам** Петров не смог бы справиться с этой задачей.

In our opinion, these pronouns can be regarded as partially desemantised signals of anthroponyms, since they do not have sufficient nominative accuracy for full identification of a person, but still have a great differentiating potential within different social fields and in different communicative situations.

The terms of kinship as signals of anthroponyms in Russian are used much less often than in Uzbek, since designs like **sister Olya (сестра Оля)**, brother **Sasha (брат Саша)**, husband **Seryozha (муж Сережа)** are obsolete, but can be used to convey emotionally colored situations: Dear husband Serezha went to another woman.

**Родной муж Сережа** ушел к другой женщине (V.Tokarev).

Even in the situation of choice, a person is more likely to be called simply by name, i.e. "Katya and Valya came," and not "My sisters Katya and Valya came" (with the presence of another sister or other sisters). Exceptions are the lexemes uncle, aunt, grandmother, grandfather (**дядя, тётя, бабушка, дедушка**) (in the children's speech - a granny, grandad (**баба, дед**)), which usually precede a personal name.

A significant role in the individualization of individuals in the Russian language is played by the category of numbers, primarily in the designation of the members of one family as an aggregate (Romanovs, Ivanovs,

Yakimchuk, etc.), and also in the designation of the namesake: All Catherines of this group were present today in the class. In the second situation, the name can not be considered a fully desemantised formal sign of any woman, as it is about people of the same generation and status.

The Uzbek language also distinguishes the adjectives that characterize only the person (**қорамағиз / смуглый, новча / рослый, ориқ / истощенный**), verbs that refer only to human activity (**кулмоқ / смеяться, ўйламоқ / думать, размышлять, тингламоқ / слушать, внимать, қўймоқ / ставить, класть, ёзмоқ / писать**).

As is known, N.A. Kononov and other Turkologists consider the prepositive token **bir** and the postpositive affix **(-s)i** and as analogies of the articles, definite and indefinite [82, 89]. However, finally the question of the presence or absence in the Uzbek language of a grammatically defined category of definiteness - uncertainty can be solved only after a complete and systemic survey of the conditions of compulsion - the non-applicability of their use and a detailed analysis of their semantics in certain situations. Nevertheless, it is more obligatory, than in Russian, means of expressing determinativeness. This applies to the appellative vocabulary related to the expression of persons, and partly to anthroponyms.

Indicators and determinative pronouns and particles play a certain role in expressing the degree of individualization of persons in the Uzbek language: *bu, shu, ushbu / mana bu /, u / o'sha /, ana u /, huddi o'zi/ u / / (men) o'zim /, har bir / each /, hamma / all/ etc.*

The original signals of anthroponyms in the Uzbek language are postpositive affixes -

**jon** and **-xon**, which connect only with the names of a person and mean both courtesy and a certain degree of proximity of the speaker to the named (Azizjon, Sayyoraxon). However, sometimes these affixes are included in the passport name.

In the Uzbek language, the notation of the degree of kinship is much more significant in communication and precise in detail than in Russian, for example, *opa / older sister /, singil / younger sister / aka / older brother /, uka / younger brother /, amaki / uncle by father /, hola / mother's sister / and many others*. The terms of kinship can even turn into peculiar postpositive affixes, connecting with the proper name, and in the extremely "etiquette" Uzbek language they are practically obligatory and can signify not only real kinship, but quite often they are formulas of courtesy and appeals to older ones or posts: *Nodira-opa, Tursun-aka, etc.* These signals of anthroponyms are completely original in relation to both English and Russian.

It should be emphasized that the category of belonging is grammatical in the Uzbek language and is used primarily in relation to the terms of kinship: *akam / my elder brother /, ukang / your younger brother /, opasi / his older sister / etc.* This category, of course, is one of the systemic signs of anthroponyms of the Uzbek language.

Signals of anthroponyms in each of the languages in question closely interact with anthroponymic formulas that have developed over the centuries and reflect the historical, cultural and religious traditions of these ethnoses.

The English anthroponymic formula is basically a two-membered (name +

surname), despite the possible existence of a second name or more personal names.

The Russian anthroponymic formula is essentially a three-member formula (name + patronymic + surname); for the Uzbek language, the three-membered anthroponymic formula is strictly official, and within the limits of different social fields the historically imposed element of this formula - the patronymic, is used to a much lesser extent than in the Russian language[76, 216]. It is necessary to note a certain tendency to reject the patronymic or second initial, as well as from the Russian surname-forming affixes: for example, along with Ibrahim Salimovich Salimov-Ibrahim Salim.

In an English-speaking environment, there is a tendency to simplify the naming formulas and the transition to treatment mainly on a personal name.

The universal naming formula is currently a surname, and the social function of the surname interacts with its own linguistic nature.

Modern onomastic language subsystems and anthroponymic formulas, which have

been formed over many centuries, are part of the linguistic pictures of the world. In their study, the same parameters that to the appeal vocabulary apply: semantics, syntactics and pragmatics.

#### REFERENCE:

- 1) Arnold I.V. Lexicology of modern English. - M.: Education, 1966.-- 364 p.
- 2) Barkhudarov L.S. Language and translation. - M., 1975
- 3) Larina T.I. Onomastic trails: semantics and functioning. Minsk: RIVSH, 2011.-- 164 p.
- 4) Ashurova D.U. Interpretation of a literary text in the light of cognitive semantics // Humanistic Role of Language and Literature in the Development of Spirituality and Enlightenment: Materials rep. scientific conf. May 17-18, 2001.-- Bukhara, 2001.S. 165 - 167. (autoreferat)
- 5) Ashurova D.U. Lexicon as a reflection of the national-cultural specificity of the language // Language and Culture: Abstracts. II International scientific conf. - M., 2003. S. 231 - 232. (autoreferat)