



English Anthroponyms as Language Phenomenon

Alieva Iroda Abdusattorovna

English language department of Applied disciplines 3
Uzbekistan state world languages university

ABSTRACT

The study studied the linguistic features of anthroponyms as units of language and units of intercultural communication. 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:

Features Of Anthroponyms, Intercultural Communication, English Anthroponyms, Methods Of Transferring, Interlingual Communication.

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 national-linguistic community: Robin, Henry, William, in contrast to Renñ, 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)

The article from which the cited passage is taken does not specify anywhere that Charlotte Bronte (1816-1855) and Hazlitt (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 deminutivization, 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, deminutivization 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, Ivanochech; Vanya - Vanyushka, Vanechech. 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 hard-working 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. In

English-speaking countries, the naming system is not simple: everyone has a personal name (firstname, given name) and a surname (last name, family name, surname); but there are also double personal names, double surnames, the so-called middle name. By contrast, English patronymics have no counterpart in European languages. When transcribing English addresses by name and patronymic into English, patronymics are often perceived as surnames. However, with all the differences, it turned out that every person in any country has a personal name and surname. The earlier common term "Christian name" as a designation of the concept of "personal name" has now been abandoned in English-speaking countries, since the percentage of non-Christian population has sharply increased there in recent decades [1:11].

Thus, there is a definite difference between the categories of diminutiveness and flattery. In both cases, suffixes are used to form these forms, however, there is no direct relationship between the suffix and the emotional characteristics of the name, therefore, with the disappearance of the need to reflect family relations in the documentation, the diminutive forms joined the affectionate ones.

Based on the studied material, the following conclusions can be drawn:

The ethics of intercultural communication determines the use of anthroponyms. Name forms can be influenced by a person's position in society, his age, types of social formations (army, professional circles), size and type of society (city, village, country), adopted passport rules and life situations. Different modes of address serve as ways of positioning a person at different levels of society: in the family, community, work or service, even internationally. Thus, a certain system of names is being formed, in which one can distinguish: respectful, dismissive, affectionate, official, neutral and other appeals and naming.

The speakers of the English-speaking culture are quite aware of the naming system in the English language. This allows the translation to do without additional explanations (often the lack of special explanations is compensated by

the linguistic context, which expands to several sentences). On the other hand, such a bold use of various diminutive forms noted by us raises doubts, since it significantly complicates the perception of the text, and, consequently, the very process of intercultural communication, in which the English-speaking reader is involved. It seems that addressing and naming with explanations of a different nature are more effective in the process of intercultural communication.

Reference

1. R.H. Robins. General Linguistics. An Introductory Survey. London, 1971.
2. Anthroponymy. Ed. V.A. Nikonov and A.V. Superanskaya. - M.: Nauka, 1970.
3. Бакирова Х. Инглиз тилини ESP сифатида ўқитишнинг инновацион усуллари. Ўзбекистонда хорижий тиллар. Илмий методик электрон журнал. №1. 2017. 141б.
4. Бакирова Х.Б. Сохавий луғат минимум яратишнинг долзарб масалалари. Наманган давлат университети илмий ахборотномаси. 11сон. 2020й. 296б.
5. Бакирова Х. Лексик компетенцияни шакллантиришда методик ва лингвистик қийинчиликлар типологияси ЎЗМУ хабарлари. 1/б. 2021. 44б. <http://science.nuu.uz/uzmu.php>
6. Bakirova H. Typology of methodological and linguistic difficulties in the formation of lexical competence. ACTA NUUZ. 1/5/1 2021. 44p. <http://science.nuu.uz/uzmu.php>
7. Bakirova H.B. "Development of lexical competence based on content -based approach in ESP teaching, "Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal: Vol. 2021: Iss. 5, Article 19. Available at: <https://uzjournals.edu.uz/tziuj/vol2021/iss5/19>.
8. Bakirova H.B. Teaching ESP in non-philological universities. Хоразм маъмун академияси ахборотномаси. - Хива.: 2021. 15б.

9. Bakirova H.B. The role of foreign language of specialty in the development of professional competence of the future ESP specialist. *Til va adabiyot ta'limi. Ozbekiston respublikasi xalq ta'limi vazirligining ilmiy-metodik jurnali*. 6-son 2021. 616. www.tilvaadabiyot.uz
10. Бакирова Х.Б. Нофилологик олий ўқув юртлари талабаларида лексик компетенцияни шакллантиришнинг назарий асослари // Ўзбекистонда хорижий тиллар. — 2021. — № 6 (41). — Б. 160-179. <https://doi.org/10.36078/1644415029>
11. Bakirova H.B. (2017). Нофилологик йўналишларда чет тилларни илмий ўқитиш. Innovative methods in teaching english as an ESP. Ўзбекистонда хорижий тиллар илмий методик электрон журнал. №1 2017. 141 p. <https://doi.org/10.36078/1644415029>
12. Bakirova H.B. Formation of lexical skills in learning foreign language terminology in a non-language university/ Emergent: journal of educational discoveries and lifelong learning (EJEDL) ISSN 2776-0995 Vol. 2, Issue 5, 2021, Indonesia.
13. Bakirova H.B. Formation of terminological competence in ESP education. Novateur publications. Journal NX- A Multidisciplinary Peer Reviewed Journal, ISSN No: 2581 – 4230 VOLUME 6, ISSUE 11, India. -2020. P 63.
14. Bakirova H.B. Teaching foreign language terminology at non-language universities. International journal of discourse on innovation. Integration and education. Volume: 01 Issue: 01. 2020 <http://summusjournals.uz/index.php/ijdiie>
15. Bakirova H.B. Terminological competence of the specialist in training vocabulary of specialty/ Web of scientist: International scientific research journal. ISSN 2776-0979 Vol. 2, Issue 5, 2021, Indonesia.
16. Bakirova H.B. The role of terms of specialty in professionally oriented education. Journal of Hunan university (Natural sciences) Vol 48. No.11.2021. 1430p.
17. Bakirova H.B. The content of teaching foreign languages. Eurasian Journal of Learning and Academic Teaching. Vol.2 www.geniusjournals.org. ISSN: 2795-739X. Belgium. 10-14p.
18. Bakirova H.B. (2021). Some techniques of working on professional vocabulary. "online – conferences & Quot; PLATFORM, 91–94. Retrieved from <http://papers.online-conferences.com/index.php/titfl/article/view/101>
19. Bakirova H.B. (2021). Selection of lexic material for terminological dictionary minimum of energy specialty. "online – conferences & Quot; platform, 108–109. Retrieved from <http://papers.online-conferences.com/index.php/titfl/article/view/156>
20. Bakirova H.B. Difficulties in working with technical terms in ESP education International Conference on Scientific, Educational & Humanitarian Advancements Hosted online from, Samsun, Turkey www.econferenceglobe.com July 15th, 2021. 65-67. Retrieved from <https://papers.econferenceglobe.com/index.php/ecg/article/view/605>
21. Bakirova H.B. Some features of learning terminology in foreign language lessons. Chet tillarini o'rgatishning turlicha yondashuvlari: muammo va yechimlar xalqaro ilmiy-amaliy konferensiya materiallari. -Jizzax. 2021. 270b.
22. Bakirova H.B. Terminological competence as the basis of professional readiness of a future specialist. Analytical journal of education and development. Science box. Vol. 02 Issue 01. 2022. 265p.
23. Bakirova H.B. (2022). Terminology Is A Tool In Development Of Lexical Competence. Eurasian Scientific Herald 4, 69-73.