



LINGUOCULTURAL FEATURES OF SET EXPRESSIONS CONTAINING PERSONAL NAMES IN THE UZBEK LANGUAGE

Muxitdinova Khadicha Sabirovna

Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor,
Uzbekistan State World Languages University

Tel.: 99 512 43 71

E-mail: muxitdinovaxadichas@gmail.com

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21056053>

Abstract. Within the onomastic scope of the lexical system of every language, personal names occupy a distinctive place. Names themselves constitute a specific system – an anthroponymic institution comprising given names, patronymics, full names, surnames, nicknames, and pseudonyms. Each of these units possesses its own structural organization and stylistic functions in the language of a particular ethnos.

When proper names go beyond their initial reference to a particular object or person and begin to be applied to others in a generalized sense, they acquire figurative meaning and imagery. As a result, a certain semantic feature becomes intensified and develops symbolic significance. Personal names assigned to specific individuals may, under particular situational conditions, acquire a generalized meaning and function as set expressions denoting a general concept in a typical context. This process gives rise to set expressions with a personal–name component.

The article examines the classification and functional features of set expressions containing personal names in the modern Uzbek literary language, which have emerged as a result of the use of personal names within phraseological units. It also analyzes how the Uzbek people verbalize their favored images in the phraseological linguistic worldview as distinctive manifestations of national and cultural identity.

Keywords: onomastic scope, personal names, given name, patronymic, personal appellation, surname, nickname, pseudonym, institution of personal naming, ethnolinguistic specificity of personal names, set expressions containing personal–name components, their stylistic functions.

The onomastic scope of the lexical system of every language is extremely broad, and within this stratum, proper nouns denoting personal names occupy a particularly significant place. It should also be noted that personal names themselves constitute a specific system – an institution of personal naming that includes given names, patronymics, personal appellations, surnames, nicknames, and pseudonyms. Each of these elements has its own structural organization and stylistic functions in the language of a particular ethnos.

Distinctive features can be observed across different languages in the ways names are assigned and used, as well as in the manner in which patronymics and surnames are expressed. For instance, in Russian, personal names may be used in both full and shortened forms, such as Anna – Anya, Katerina – Katya, Vladimir – Volodya, Yuriy – Yura; patronymics are formed with the suffixes *-evna* and *-evich*, as in Vladimirovna and Vladimirovich. In Arabic, patronymic or lineage–related names may include the elements *ibn* and *al*, as in Ibn Khattab and al–Mansur.

In Uzbek personal names, female names are often formed through the addition of the letter *a* and the affixoid elements *oy*, *xon*, *bonu*, *bibi*, and *niso*, for example: Ozod – Ozoda, Salim

– Salima, Gulchiroy, Shahzodaxon, Madinabonu, Oyshabibi, Meriniso. Male names, in turn, frequently include the affixoid elements *bek*, *jon*, *xo'ja*, *said*, as well as the elements *-iddin*, *-i(u)llo*, and *mir-*, for example: Asadbek, Zafarjon, Mahmudxo'ja, Saidakrom, Jaloliddin, Habibullo, Mirakbar.

The expression of patronymics in Uzbek is also characterized by the addition of the words *o'g'li* and *qizi*, as in Shahzodaxon Saidakrom qizi and Mahmudxo'ja Mo'minxo'ja o'g'li. Numerous comparable cases can also be found in Korean, Chinese, and Japanese, where personal names often consist of two or three components, as in Kim Yong Ji and Lee Soo Shin.

Names assigned to particular individuals may, depending on the situation, acquire a generalized meaning and function as set expressions denoting a general concept in a typical context. In her research, I.A. Koroleva describes, on the example of the Russian language, the process by which such words become core components within the system of anthroponymic categories comprising given names, patronymics, and surnames, emphasizing that this process has language-specific characteristics in each linguistic system [1, 3].

It should be noted that a person may be designated not only by the given name, surname, and patronymic assigned to him or her, but also by a nickname or a pseudonym. In many cases, nicknames and pseudonyms perform the same functions as given names, surnames, and patronymics. A pseudonym is also regarded as a type of name. The difference between a pseudonym and a nickname lies in the fact that a nickname has a descriptive character: it is assigned to a person by those around him or her as a marker characterizing that individual. Unlike a person's proper name, a nickname contains a considerable amount of information about the person. A pseudonym, by contrast, is a name chosen by the person himself or herself; that is, it is a self-selected designation adopted by the individual's own will. For example, *Polvon* may be used by others to refer to a person of strong or large physique, whereas *Julqunboy* was the pseudonym chosen by Qodiriy for himself. Thus, a nickname reflects the attitude of members of society toward a person and the evaluation assigned to him or her, while a pseudonym actualizes an image through which the individual characterizes himself or herself. As N.A. Zagryadskaya notes, "the main function of pseudonyms is not only the desire to name a person, but also the desire to emphasize and fix his or her individual features in the act of nomination, while at the same time expressing the attitude of the author of the nomination toward that person" [2, 3].

When proper nouns move beyond the sphere of reference to a particular object or individual and begin to be applied to others in a generalized sense, figurative meaning and imagery emerge in these names. In this process, a particular semantic feature becomes intensified and acquires symbolic meaning. As a result, such proper nouns are transformed from units denoting singularity and individuality into anthroponymic components expressing a generalized and symbolic concept. S.N. Smolnikov emphasizes that proper nouns within phraseological units containing anthroponymic components do not denote specific individuals; that is, they do not perform the nominative and identificatory-differentiating functions characteristic of proper names. As evidence, he refers to N.A. Petrovsky's *Dictionary of Russian Personal Names*, which contains more than three thousand anthroponyms belonging to this group, none of which names a concrete individual [3, 3].

Indeed, the formation of symbolic words from proper nouns is a highly widespread phenomenon. In Uzbek, names such as Xizr, Xo'ja, Ali, Bali, Iso, Muso, Odam ato, Daqqiyunus,

Oppoqxo'ja, Nadirmat, and Sattor can be observed as anthroponymic components expressing symbolic meaning within phraseological units. For example: Alixo'ja – Xo'jaali; "Ali" desa, "Bali" demoq; Daqqiyunusdan beri; Odam atodan qolgan; Musoning alamini Isodan olmoq; Oppoqxo'jam ursin; Tata–tat, usta Nadirmat.

In general, the use of personal names in symbolic meanings is a universal feature characteristic of all languages, and it is precisely this feature that gives rise to set expressions containing anthroponymic components. The study of such expressions at the intersection of cognitive linguistics, pragmalinguistics, sociolinguistics, and linguoculturology makes it possible to reveal more deeply the significance of national and cultural features encoded in anthroponyms as social factors that emerge in human consciousness under the influence of communication in the process of interaction. Proceeding from these considerations, B. Yo'ldoshev considers it methodologically appropriate to analyze set expressions with anthroponymic components in the linguocultural aspect on the basis of the following criteria:

- the presence of a person's proper name within the structure of the expression;
- the possession of a generalized meaning by the anthroponym;
- the performance by the personal name of functions other than its primary naming function;
- the close connection of these functions with the planes of expression and content of the phraseological unit;
- the determination of the national–cultural aspect of phraseological units with anthroponymic components by the linguoculturological features embodied in the personal name, and so forth [4, 13–14].

On the basis of these criteria, the researcher proposes dividing proper nouns into two groups: a) embodying proper nouns; b) non–embodying proper nouns. In our view, proceeding from these semantic features, set expressions with personal–name components may be classified according to the plane of expression into the following groups:

1. Set expressions with personal–name components that provide a generalized and embodied representation of a particular person. In such cases, when personal names are used within set expressions, they express a special figurative meaning that is characteristic not only of those particular individuals, but also of other persons. In other words, the semantic boundaries of the name expand, and within the plane of expression a holistic generalized concept is formed that may also apply to others. In Uzbek, such embodying names mainly arise through the use, in generalized meanings, of proper nouns encountered in religious texts, legends, and hadiths, such as Odam ato, Muso, Iso, Xizr, Daqqiyunus, and Almisoq. For example: Musoning alamini Isodan olmoq, meaning not literally to take revenge on Muso or Iso, but to take out one's anger on any person who happens to be in such a situation; Daqqiyunusdan beri or Almisoqdan qolgan, meaning not merely something belonging to the period in which Daqqiyunus or Almisoq lived, but something dating back to very ancient times.

2. Set expressions with personal–name components that evoke an image of one particular individual. Although such set expressions with personal–name components convey figurative meanings, the name itself is not generalized and applied as an embodied designation for others; rather, it remains associated with the person whose name is mentioned. In Uzbek, such set expressions with name components can be observed in the use of proper nouns such as Ali, Bali, Oppoqxo'ja, Nadirmat, and Sattor, which occur in colloquial speech. For example:

“Ali” desa, “Bali” demoq; Oppoqxo‘jam ursin; Tata–tat, usta Nadirmat; O‘laman Sattor; Musoning alamini Isodan olmoq.

The analysis of the examples shows that set expressions with personal–name components are diachronically quite ancient. The names occurring in their structure differ not only in terms of the plane of expression, but also in terms of meaning and usage. In such expressions, the meanings of proper names may be clearly transparent to speakers of the modern literary language, or, conversely, their meanings may have become considerably obscure and less definite over time. Accordingly, set expressions with personal–name components may also be classified as follows:

- names whose meanings are relatively easy to understand: Xizr, Odam ato, Daqqiyunus, Muso, Iso;
- names whose meanings have become obscure: Ali, Bali, Oppoqxo‘ja, Nadirmat, Sattor, Almisoq / Al Muso.

A comparative analysis of set expressions with personal–name components from the functional–semantic point of view shows that the developmental parameters of the functions performed by personal names in languages are also directly related to their sources of origin. In particular, due to the prohibition of the cult of the individual in Islam, the possibilities of representing persons and their names symbolically, that is, through images, and verbally, that is, through words, were restricted. As a result, set expressions with personal–name components in Uzbek became widely disseminated mainly within the colloquial stratum as expressions of the people’s social way of life.

In the context of globalization, the intensification of socio–economic and cultural relations among peoples and the growing priority of universal human values have contributed to the modernization of certain religious views as well. This, in turn, has led to the partial weakening of such restrictions and to the emergence of new functional–semantic interpretations. All these processes are reflected in modern linguistics and require a renewed approach to the study of the sources of formation and functional–semantic usage of set expressions with personal–name components in Uzbek.

The study of the use of Uzbek personal names within set expressions with name components shows that the following groups may be distinguished in the modern Uzbek literary language according to the sources of origin and usage of set expressions with anthroponymic components:

1. Set expressions with personal–name components formed under the influence of social life. It is known that among Turkic ethnoses there existed hierarchical social categories such as khans, beks, sayyids, khojas, and qorachas. The names and full appellations of persons belonging to these categories necessarily included such titles, for example: Xudoyorxon, Ulug‘bek, Saidolimxon, A‘zamxo‘ja. Since qorachas belonged to a lower category, they were not designated by any special title.

The prohibition of the cult of the individual in Islam gave rise to the generalized use, among the people, of the name xo‘ja, which referred to persons belonging to the middle stratum. As a result, it became common to refer to Nasriddin Afandi as Xo‘ja Nasriddin, and similar generalized names emerged. For example: Xo‘jaali – Alixo‘ja, used in the sense of “it makes no difference whether it is this way or that way; either way is acceptable”; Xo‘janing aqli peshindan

keyin kiribdi, used with reference to people of this type in the sense of dull-wittedness or slow comprehension.

2. Set expressions with personal-name components formed under the influence of phrases taken from oral colloquial speech. This is an approach that has existed in Uzbek since ancient times and is still widely observed today, as colloquial usages often acquire generalized meanings. For example: *Mulla Abdujabbor, senda bir gap bor*, used with reference to people who secretly engage in suspicious or hidden activities; *Mamlakat Tursunovna!*, used in situations where a wife occupies the leading position in the family and is addressed formally even within the household.

3. Set expressions with personal-name components formed under the influence of folklore sources: *Seni ham oting Jamilaxon, meni ham otim Jamilaxon*, taken from *lapar* or poetic dialogue, meaning “you and I are the same.”

4. Set expressions with personal-name components formed under the influence of certain lines taken from poetic works: *Karima ko'ylak kiyadi, etagi yerga tegadi*, used in the sense that a particular person's clothing does not suit him or her at all.

5. Set expressions with personal-name components formed under the influence of names and replicas taken from prose works. In contemporary social life, the people's use of the names of beloved literary characters in relation to people around them, in situations corresponding to those characters, has become widespread. For example: *Farhod va Shirin, Layli va Majnun*, used in the sense of lovers; *Kumush, Otabek* from *Abdulla Qodiriy's O'tgan kunlar*; *Farmon bibi, Sotti* from *Said Ahmad's Kelinlar qo'zg'oloni*; *O'tkuriy* from *Said Ahmad's Parvona*; *Bobchinskiy va Dobchinskiylar* from *Gogol's Revizor*.

6. Set expressions with personal-name components formed under the influence of popular replicas taken from various films. This approach has also become increasingly widespread in recent times. Such names and replicas are freely used in communication either as forms of address directed at participants in interaction or as response replicas produced by participants in a speech act. It should be emphasized that these names and replicas, taken from literary works and films, are received positively and affectionately by both older and younger audiences. For example: *Ivan Vasilyevich!*, *Marfa Vasilyevnaman*, from the film *Ivan Vasilyevich o'z kasbini o'zgartiradi*; *Alomat. Qumri dedim-a? Bozorboy akam bozordan kelib bozorga ketdilar*, from *Temir xotin*.

In these examples, we can observe how the Uzbek people verbalize their beloved images within the phraseological linguistic worldview as distinctive manifestations of national and cultural specificity. Since fixed expressions are used in speech activity to name an object or phenomenon figuratively, they necessarily enter into an organic relationship with a particular national culture. In V. Teliya's formulation, every subject of nomination is simultaneously a subject of national culture [5, 13].

It should be noted that in this context, what matters most is not merely the source from which these expressions and names were taken, but rather the sphere in which they were formed. They reflect the expression of national specificity, as well as national standards and stereotypes characteristic of that source. The examples cited above also represent cross-cultural commonality. The fact that names popularized through works belonging to the creative traditions of other peoples have been integrated into the Uzbek way of life further confirms this view.

Thus, personal names are a valuable source of information about a people's culture and mentality. They not only serve to preserve and transmit the great spiritual and cultural heritage of a people from generation to generation, but also contribute to the popularization of shared cross-cultural features.

References:

- 1.Koroleva, I.A. The Formation of the Russian Anthroponymic System: Abstract of the dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philological Sciences. Moscow, 2000, p. 3.
- 2.Zagryadskaya, N.A. Personal Phraseological Units and Their Place in English Phraseology: Dissertation for the degree of Candidate of Philological Sciences. Moscow, 2003, 145 p. // <http://www.dslib.net/germanskie-jazyki/lichnostnye-frazeologizmy-i-ih-mesto-v-anglijskoj-frazeologii.html#4204314>.
- 3.Smolnikov, S.N.
<https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D0%9F%D1%80%D0%BE%D0%B7%D0%B2%D0%B8%D1%89%D0%B56>.
- 4.Yo'ldoshev, B. Issues of Uzbek Onomastics. Samarkand, 2011, pp. 13–14.
- 5.Telia, V.N. Types of Linguistic Meanings: The Bound Meaning of the Word in Language. Moscow: Nauka, 1981, p. 13.

