

**CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF PROPER NAMES IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK
LANGUAGES (IN THE MATERIALS OF HYDRONYMS, TOPONIMS AND
ANTROPONYMS)**

G'aniyeva Dinara Panji qizi

Termiz state university Master's student

N.X.Mamataliyeva

f.f.f.d(PhD)

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10536007>

Abstract. *The article deals with linguistic realization of proper names in English and Uzbek. Proper nouns constitute a class of linguistic items sharing features with both noun and deictic. Besides that it has been analyzed the semantic peculiarities of proper names, their importance in speech and context.*

Keywords: *declaratives, commercial products, approaches, linguistic items.*

**КОНТРАСТНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ ИМЕН СОБСТВЕННЫХ В АНГЛИЙСКОМ И
УЗБЕКСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ (НА МАТЕРИАЛАХ ГИДРОНИМОВ, ТОПОНИМОВ И
АНТРОПОНИМОВ)**

Аннотация. *В статье рассматривается лингвистическая реализация имен собственных в английском и узбекском языках. Имена собственные представляют собой класс лингвистических единиц, имеющих общие черты как с существительным, так и с дейктикой. Кроме того, проанализированы семантические особенности имен собственных, их значение в речи и контексте.*

Ключевые слова: *декларативы, коммерческие продукты, подходы, лингвистические объекты.*

Naming a single entity is one of the basic speed, acts, included by the class of declaratives, alongside declaring war, dismissing and be questring. People and peaces, pets and hurricanes, and festivities, institution and commercial products, works of art and shops are given a name. Naming serves to highlight entities that play a role in people's daily life, and to establish and maintain an individually in a society. Objects of analysis of onomastic people's names, proper nouns have been investigated by philosophers, logicians, anthropologists and psychologists, but only sporadically by linguists: e.g. with different approaches and concerns, Sloat[1,26-30], Gary – Prieur[2, 47-53]. It is generally agreed among linguists that proper nouns are a universal linguists category [3, 88-95]. Their status and function is theoretical issue debated by many scholars, whose views are discussed in Van Langendock [4, 112-132]. The topic is complex and controversial and the account given will be brief and schematic; this means that some aspects will be consideredoper Nouns (PNs) constitute a system organized according to criteria varying across cultures, and provide an interpretation of the society of which they are the expression. They are linguistic items fulfilling a referential function, they refer to single entities existing in the real world. Like deictic, they are not dependent on the immediate situational context.

Like nouns, PNs, constitute an open class of words and, hence, are lexical rather than grammatical; but, unlike nouns, they lack lexical meaning. Proper nouns (also called proper nouns) are the words which name specific people, organizations or places. They always start with a capital letter. 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 anthroponymics in the micro text [3]. According to W.I. Bolotov, pure signals of anthroponymics 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 anthroponymes 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 anthroponymics, 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. 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. Blumfild L. Yazyk. M.: Progress, 1968. 606 s.