

The Structure of Anthroponyms and Its Functioning in English and Russian Languages

Ruxsorxon Akbarova Farxodjon qizi¹, Fayzimatova Nodiraxon Adxamjon qizi²

^{1,2}KSPI lecturer.

Email: mokhinurlazizbekovna@gmail.com¹, nodirafayzimatova56569598@gmail.com²

*Corresponding author's E-mail: mokhinurlazizbekovna@gmail.com

Article History	Abstract
Received: 08 June 2023 Revised: 21 Sept 2023 Accepted: 08 Dec 2023 CC License CC-BY-NC-SA 4.0	<i>Some aspects of the functioning of anthroponyms and the conditions for the realization of their cognitive potential in Russian and English-speaking linguistic cultures. Based on the conducted research using survey and interview methods, an attempt is made to demonstrate how the mobility of the anthroponymic model allows us to reflect the idea and perception of personality in different cultures and how a person regulates relationships with the environment when assistance in choosing name forms in communication. The article deals with the functioning of anthroponyms and the conditions for the realization of their cognitive potential in the Russian and English cultural contexts.</i> Keywords: Anthroponym, Personal Name, Culture, Patronymic, Functioning, Communication

1. Introduction

Learning language in close connection with the versatility of human existence sky personality, its consciousness, mental activity allows discover new facets in those already explored in sufficient detail areas.

Literature Review

An invaluable contribution was made to the theory and practice of onomastic research by V.D. Bondaletov, Yu.A. Rylov, J. Serlem, A.V. Superanskaya, V.I. Suprun and many others, as well as DI. Ermolovich in considering the problems of translating onomastic units. However, if we take a person's personality as a starting point as a bearer and user of a name, you can see well-known language units from a different angle. This is one of the reasons why interest in such a subclass of vocabulary as anthroponyms not only does not weaken, but also expands. In this article I would like to focus on comparing structures and the functioning of a person's name in English and Russian. In this case, it is not intended to compile an inventory of the functions of the onomastic units under consideration, but the goal is to demonstrate how a person, based on his decisive role in the formation anthroponymic picture of the world, regulates in the course of communication their relationship with the environment through the choice of those available in it disposal of name forms.

2. Materials And Methods

Using methods of descriptive-analytical description and reflective induction, traditionally used in onomastic research, both individual aspects of the functioning of anthroponyms and the conditions for the realization of their cognitive potential in the context of specific cultures will be considered. The article presents selected data from questionnaires and interviews involving more than 400 people.

3. Results and Discussion

It is important to emphasize the fundamental position from which the anthro-po-concept will be considered further: we will proceed from the fact that The name of a person is recognized as a cognitive essence. We are completely We share the point of view of the authors who see in onymization method of personal identification, and accept the statement that internal separation of oneself from the surrounding world can be considered as a cognitive act [1].

An anthroponym, acting as an “eti-cat” - that is, having a denotation, but not having a signifier, acquires meaning and connotations in use, acquiring signs concept [2]. Moreover, the conceptual nature of a name is manifested in how ideas about the possibility of its use are formed in a culture [3]. It is extremely important to take into account the fact that the main cognitive perspective of perceiving a person’s name is opposition “friend or foe” [4]. Onyms form part of the ethnocultural space and are considered as ethnocultural markers of linguistic consciousness. Modern research has turned its attention on onomastics from the point of view of linguistic consciousness, taking into account the peculiarities of perception, identification and interpretation of language units [5]. S.I. Garagulya [6] highlights the concept of anthroponymic personality, which is understood as the psychological correlation of the individual with your name and the perception of the name by others. No matter how similar or different cultures are, mechanisms of onymization and laws of using a name, it is recognized as a cultural universal, and a universal of such significance that naming is usually accompanied by ritual. Since the social role of an anthroponym is to identify a person as a member of society, accordingly, a name requires recognition of it others. This is one of the reasons why each cultural community develops its own laws of naming and naming. One of the curious aspects of anthroponymy is the component composition of a person’s name. Differences in anthroponym structure reflect the characteristics of the representation and perception of personality in different cultures.

Well-known models of anthroponyms in European linguistic cultures include from two to n components. They usually represent a personal name and surname, with the presence of an (optional, often formal) middle name in most Western European societies. At the same time, cultures independently regulate the “formulas” of the anthroponym. For example, in Icelandic culture historically it so happens that the patronymic takes the place of the surname; in Spanish language, when registering, a person receives two surnames - father and mother; in East Slavic languages such an important role has not lost its role additional personal identifier, like a patronymic. The two-part name system historically developed back in the pre-Christian period [5; 15; 20] in order to clarify the identification of a person, and along with patronyms, matronyms were also used. The anthroponymic model developed in a similar way in many European cultures - from a personal name to the addition of a patronymic, which at first became an additional identifier, but in later it could transform into a surname or disappear. Yes, on stage when surnames already existed in England, the inhabitants of Wales to the names of the parents, both mother and father, were also added to the person’s name. It is well known from history that the royal dynasty of the Tudors received its name due to the fact that the Welsh personal name of the father of its founder Tudur (from Theodore) as part of the anthroponym Owain ap Marededd ap Tudur, where ar means “son”, and Marededd - mother's name in English language was accepted as a surname. The need not only for personal identification, but also for establishing kinship to resolve issues of inheritance played an important role in the ramification of the anthroponymic model. It's obvious that It was the socio-economic development of society that led to the need to introduce a surname, which only relatively recently became part of the onomasticon [7]. The nature of an anthroponym as one of the species of a wider class the vocabulary of onyms determines the specifics of its functioning.

The structures of anthroponyms that have developed to date are “living” complexes, not indifferent to the pragmatic side their use. The interpretation and perception of the anthroponym reflects its cognitive essence and the opposition “friend - foe” is revealed. Let us consider how the features of the functioning of an anthroponym are largely determined by the order of the components of the name (for the functions of anthroponyms, see also [8]). The officially accepted structure of an individual's name in its full form is suitable for use exclusively in formal situations. A characteristic difference between the functioning of an expanded anthroponym as a nominative in the Russian and English languages lies in the order of the components of the name: in English, the personal name (first name) precedes the surname (John Smith), while in Russian the reverse is preferred order (Popov Petr Ivanovich), and placing the name and patronymic before the surname in official documents is perceived as a violation of the norms of the Russian language. In official written discourse, it is possible to preserve the initials, while in oral discourse (for example, when announcing a list of people), the proper name in its full form appears in the appropriate form for each language is ok [9]. The order of the components of a given name in formal discourse accepted in the Russian language (surname, first name, patronymic) is probably due to the fact that the surname is considered the main element of the anthroponymic complex. An analogy with a description, for example, of goods in a store involuntarily suggests itself, where the characteristics of the product occupy second position: waffle cake, ground coffee, black tea. It's interesting that we eat waffle cake and drink black tea. So it is with the anthroponym: nomenclature - Ivanov Ivan Ivanovich, and in life - Ivan Ivanovich Ivanov.

Thus, the cognitive model of an anthroponym contains elements whose order of use is a conscious and purposeful act for the bearers of a specific culture. When using the expanded form of the Russian anthroponym (first name, patronymic, last name) in the nominative function in the formal context, the pragmatic aspect changes dramatically: while remaining within official style, the author of the message demonstrates his special respect for the named person. So, if in a scientific publication or lectures, Yuri Mikhailovich Lotman is mentioned - that is, by his full name and in the specified sequence, the closeness is easily read in this positions of the author and famous scientist, special respect, and maybe personal acquaintance. In oral discourse it is always more polite to when mentioning the name of a person present, stick to it this formula. Without a surname, a precedent can work perfectly personal name: "There is such a guy, the same Fyodor Mikhailovich called them "Stryutskiy" ("Kommersant". 2013. February 11). Such a reference of the author of the article to Dostoevsky performs the function of including the addresser, addressee and the mentioned person in the general linguistic and cultural context [10]. Thus, in the Russian language, "changing the places of the terms" and expanding or collapsing the name decisively change the pragmatic coloring of the discourse. In English, such a change in attitude is not visible, because the conventional formula the proper name remains the same: the personal name precedes the surname.

Using only the surname in both languages in all forms discourses is equally perceived as formal and defamiliarized. The differences are especially noticeable in the perception of a name that performs a vocative function [11]. The surveys confirmed a fairly predictable result regarding addressing by last name: 98.7% of informants believe that such addressing indicates distancing from the communicant and even "sounds rude" (quote from the questionnaire). In the survey, Russian-speaking informants noted that they are well aware of the way to indicate a break in relations with a person by refusing to mention the person's name and switching to the surname. On the face a clear contrast between first and last names on the principle of "friend and foe" in their functioning. Cases of one of the spouses addressing the other by their last name only confirm this rule: obviously being a way to emphasize the closeness of the relationship ("I can, while others can't"), this method of intimateization perfectly demonstrates the work of the cognitive mechanism of enantiosemia [12]. Separately, it should be noted that in intercultural communication there are differences in the traditional order of first and last names in Russian and English languages often lead to failures in communication (see about this: [13]). Since in European cultures patronymics are irrelevant, and Russian patronymics are also difficult to pronounce, in intercultural communication the patronymic is usually omitted, and on business cards cards most often leave only the surname and first name of the owner, thus "adjusting" the Russian anthroponymic model to European. At the same time, they often do not take into account that the surname should be in second place, which leads to an error in address: for example, in the name Nilin Vadim as a surname is perceived as the second component, and one should not be surprised that a foreigner will address this gentleman Mr Vadim instead of Mr Nilin [14]. Thus, if we recognize that the order of the components of a name alone plays a role in establishing the proper mode of communication, thereby revealing the cognitive nature of a proper name, then it becomes obvious that the anthroponym in its general not too overloaded with model components (in a specific pair languages) manifests itself as a subtle communication tool [15]. As a cultural universal in the languages considered here, the name manifests itself in a similar way - in particular, in its dynamics: the name "grows up" with its owner. Indeed, in comparable languages in early childhood a person is mainly called personal name and mostly in its hypocoristic form; as Russian language change in anthroponymic format clearly demonstrates how the form of the name reflects the communicants' awareness of the age parameter: Vanechka in both uses is a child, and Ivan Ivanovich is an adult. Anthroponyms in this dialogue can be completely replaced with common nouns with semantics age (baby - adult, boy - man) [16].

4. Conclusion

As a cultural universal, the personal name occupies a special place in cognitive space of the individual. It is difficult to overestimate the role that an anthroponym plays in communication, both intercultural and within one culture. Sufficient flexibility in the structure of the anthroponym allows one to make a conscious choice of the form of the name, which in turn represents a cognitive act. Not only on what or which of the components is represented by the name, but also what order they follow, determines the success of communication. Awareness of priority surname (and patronymic in Russian) in formal communication and personal name in informal communication allows communicants to build communication within the framework of the "friend - foe" opposition. The asymmetry of anthroponymic models in the Russian and English languages should be taken into account when establishing contacts in intercultural communication. The communicative competence of a linguistic personality is manifested in how an individual knows how to use such a subtle

instrument as anthroponym. Knowing the “rules for using” an anthroponym, a communicator can regulate his relationships with others by choosing the forms of the name when communicating. Fixed anthroponymic models are a kind of verbal “grid” that is thrown over the models of social-status relations in the linguistic and cultural community, clearly reflecting and regulating the mutual relations of communicants in a special way.

References:

1. Berezovich E.L. Russian toponymy in the ethnolinguistic aspect. Ekaterinburg, 2000.
2. Berestnev G.I. Word, language and beyond. Kaliningrad, 2007.
3. Boyko L.B. Anthroponym as an object of hermeneutic interpretation when translation of literary text // Cognitive-pragmatic aspects of linguistic research. Kaliningrad, 1999.
4. Boyko L.B. Cultural aspects of translation, or a guide to reading "glok kuzdra". // Moscow State University: Russia and the West - a dialogue of cultures. 2000.
5. Bondaletov V.D. Russian onomastics: textbook. manual for students of pedagogical institutes. M., 1983.
6. Garagulya S.I. Anthroponymic transformations and individual identity. M., 2008.
7. Golev N.D., Dmitrieva L.M. The unity of the ontological and mental being of the toponymic system (on the issues of cognitive toponymy) // Questions of onomastics. 2008.
8. Golomidova M.V. Artificial nomination in onomastics. Ekaterinburg, 1998.
9. Ermolovich D.I. Proper names at the intersection of languages and cultures. M., 2001.
10. Novikova O.N. Aspects of cognitive learning of proper names - anthroponym // Issues of cognitive linguistics. 2011.
11. Privalova I.V. Interculture and verbal sign (linguocognitive fundamentals of intercultural communication) M., 2005.
12. Rylov Yu.A. Aspects of the linguistic picture of the world: Italian and Russian languages. M., 2006.
13. Systemic and discursive properties of Spanish anthroponyms under ed. prof. Yu.A. Rylova. Voronezh, 2010.
14. Qodirova , Z. . (2023). THE ROLE OF TECHNOLOGY IN LANGUAGE LEARNING. International Bulletin of Applied Science and Technology, 3(7), 64–67. Retrieved from
15. Nazarova, R., & Ulmasova, M. (2023). LINGUOCULTURAL ASPECTS OF THE STUDY OF WORD MEANING. B DEVELOPMENT OF PEDAGOGICAL TECHNOLOGIES IN MODERN SCIENCES (T. 2, Выпуск 11, cc. 114–119). Zenodo.
16. Inomovna, H. I. (2022). Phraseological euphemisms in modern English. Thematics Journal of English Language Teaching.
17. Ismailova, H. I. (2022). LINGO CULTURAL FEATURES OF EUPHEMISMS OF ENGLISH, RUSSIAN AND UZBEK LANGUAGES. Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal, 2022(3), 152-161.
18. Nodiraxon Fayzimatova <https://journals.researchparks.org/index.php/IJIE/article/view/4948/4582>.
19. Otabek, B., Dilshod, T., Sirojiddin, S., Tohirjon, O., & Zebiniso, N. (2022). Defining The Concepts Of Religious Discourse, Religious Sociolect And Religious Style. Journal of Positive School Psychology, 6(11), 1573-1577.
20. Rahimovna, O. M., & Vahobovna, K. V. (2022). Graduonymy Of Activity Verbs In Uzbek And English Languages. Journal of Positive School Psychology, 6(11), 1372-1377.
21. Yakubovna N., Khatamova Z., & Sirojiddin, S. (2022). General Methods of Word Acquisition. Journal of Positive School Psychology <http://journalppw.com>, 6(11), 1605-1609.
22. Xatamova, Z. (2022). Ron Clark's methods for working with students with low academic performance Xatamova Z. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE & INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH ISSN: 2277-3630 Impact factor: 7.429, 11(09), 179-182.
23. Xatamova, Z. (2023). USING CLASSROOM LANGUAGE IN ESL LESSONS. Galaxy International Interdisciplinary Research Journal, 11(5), 510-513.