ВАЖНОСТЬ ИМЕНИ СОБСТВЕННОГО В СОВРЕМЕННОМ ЯЗЫКЕ

Зайниддин Ибодуллаевич Санакулов
Чирчикский государственный педагогический институт
Заведующая кафедрой немецкого языка, доктор философских наук

Аннотация: Данная статья посвящена ономастике, в которой на примере немецкого языка разъясняется место имени собственного в лингвистике, их специфические фонетико-фонологические, морфологические, лексические особенности.

Ключевые слова: ономастика, имя собственное, имя лицо, топонимы.

THE IMPORTANCE OF PROPER NAME IN MODERN LANGUAGE

Zainiddin Sanakulov
Chirchik State Pedagogical Institute, Tashkent Region
PhD., Head of German Language Department

Abstact: The article is devoted to onomastics, in which the place of proper names in linguistics, their specific phonetic-phonological, morphological, lexical features are explained by the example of the German language.

Key words: onomastics, proper name, person's name, toponyms.

Proper names (PNs) have a special place in science from a number of points of view: the first word a person learns to write is his name. Only PNs are constantly studied and mastered by everyone throughout their lives (we encounter hundreds of PNs as soon as a newspaper is published, and the media is no exception). As a person gets older (older), PNs become harder to remember or harder to remember, or even begin to forget. This situation sometimes embarrasses and embarrasses us (this is normal for our grandparents). This means that while mastering PNs and remembering them (as we get older) has become our "daily worry", the "abandonment" of them, the impossibility of living without them, is a sign that PNs are a part of our lives.

We cannot find PNs in dictionaries, which means that they are not considered a basic lexical layer and are not included in the vocabulary. We cannot

accuse someone who does not know an PN (e.g., in a foreign language) of ignorance, he can only suspect that he is not well educated (if everyone knows this PN). If someone in a German class does not know the word *Paris* , we cannot say that his knowledge of German is low, but his worldly knowledge is not enough. We do not find PNs in the basic vocabulary of a language. They are not usually translated, but "copied" as in the original language material, especially now that we often see it. PNs such as *Merkel, Cologne* and *Munich are not necessarily translated (* the French *Cologne* or *Munich forms of the word Munich* are not translated), and even (mainly derived from cognate nouns (TO)) there is an alternative translation of PNs, but they are in their original language. stored, not translated: e.g., the German name Helmut *Kohl (translated cabbage)* into English * *Cabbage* , Uzbek * *Cabbage* , or vice versa, Uzbek *Kochkor aka* German * *Bock* , English *Churchill* German * *Kirchhügel* or *Shakespepe* til * Schütteld does not meet the norms. This raises the question of whether PNs have a place in the language system or not at all.

The fact that PNs do not have the same orthographic form, i.e. that they are written in different forms is also considered correct, is their next characteristic, which means that they are not subject to a certain orthographic norm (but they have their own form in written speech). This is especially the case for names such as <Becker> instead of <Bäcker>, <Schwarz> instead of <Schwarz>, as well as letter combinations that are not found in the usual vocabulary (eg, <Bismarck>). after <r> in <w>, <tt> in <Württemberg> after <r>). In some language notation, PNs are always capitalized and highlighted. This, of course, applies to languages where other names in the word category are written in lower case (e.g., Uzbek, Russian, etc.). Over the centuries, all horses in the German language began to be written in capital letters. PNs, on the other hand, have been written in capital letters since ancient times, and the words of the remaining noun phrases gradually took on this form later (around 1500) [1].

In PNs there are cases of "disobedience" to not only orthographic, but also grammatical rules, deviations from them: in other lexical units sound-combinations

that we do not encounter, ie phonological aspect *(Gm elin , Gstr ein, Mross, Psch orr, Georg, Luise)* , in the plural all PNs *take the suffix -s* (which is typical for other foreign languages, especially English) (*die beiden Ingrids* / *Rudolfs* / *Freiburgs* / *Deutschlands*), i.e. morphologically; other German-specific plural allomorphs (e.g., *-er* , *-e* , *-en* , zero-article, umlaut) are not used. In addition, the addition of the German suffix - *chen* , which adds the content of masculinity and diminutive in German, also deviates from the rules of umlaut: *Hanne ^ Hannchen (* Hännchen), Paul ^ Paulchen (* Päulchen).* At the morphological-syntactic level, however, there is a specificity (deviation from the rule) associated with the use of the article and its functions (*Mainz* always comes without an article, and *der Main* always comes with an article). Individual horses (SHs) are more complicated (*die* simone or without article?). In the syntactic field, too, the SHOs take the precedent in the future tense: *Alexanders Geburtstag-Alexander's birthday,* but other horses are used not in the tense-tense sequence (** des Lehrers Geburtstag),* but in the usual tense (*der Geburtstag des Lehrers)* .

PNs, unlike other independent word types, have no lexical meaning, they have no semantics. This is the most important fact about them. Although words like *Castrop-Rauxel* or *Zoske* are not always thought to search for the meaning of these PNs because they are not similar to other words, there are also PNs that look like "ordinary" words (cognate horses): *Neustadt (* literally: *new city)), Fischer (* literally: *fisherman), Fleischer (* literally: butcher) . When we hear such PNs, we intuitively (in a way) overshadow their lexical meaning, i.e., ignore it. It is clear that no one expects a person named *Fleischer* to go to a butcher shop (meat shop) to find him, thinking that his case is related to "meat" . This means that PNs do not make any sense about their "owner" based on their meaning. For this reason, PNs are seen as "dry" labels, whose function is simply to "label". No one, nothing prevents us from naming any object, any creature as we wish: we can name a dog, a bird or a work "Alpha", of course. So the most important thing is to know the PNs. PNs have etymological meaning because they are mainly derived from TOs (*Becker < Bäcker*) and free word combinations *(Altenburg < zur alten Burg)* .

Onomastics is mainly concerned with revealing the history of the ancient meanings of PNs: how ancient PN is *(the history of the word Hilde* <goes back to the ancient German literary language *hiltia* "Kampf-struggle, war") and other languages (*Cologne* <Latin *Colonia, Koblenz* <Latin *Confluentes).* the German-assimilated form of the words *)* makes the work so difficult . Especially the most ancient, stable and unchanging objects - the origin of the names of mountains and rivers - are considered to be a very difficult task, as they belong to the time and space before the Indogerman period. PNs can have the same connotative meaning as TOs, i.e. an idea (assessment, look), assumption, association, and so on. [2]. There are different views on names, some are beautiful, resonant, old-fashioned, others are modern, religious, and so on. is considered. In particular, the German *Hartz IV* is considered by many to be rude, cold. PN itself has a less connotative meaning than the object represented by PN, e.g., *Hiroshima-* Hiroshima *, der 11. September-* 11 October *, Titanic-* Titanic *, Tschernobyl-* Chernobyl (these ideas also apply to TOLs, e.g., *Krebs-* rak, *Atomkraft-* atom . , *Waldsterben-* deforestation) [3]. This peripheral position in the language system contradicts the fact that PNs belong to minority universals in language [4]. There are languages that do not have words, prepositions, or conjunctions that belong to the adjective category, and even noun and verb phrases that are not clearly distinguished, as well as languages that do not have PNs, are noted in industry sources. Naming a particular object separately is like an anthropological chief necessity. Which object to name or not to give depends on the culture, and this is variable (at a time in history when weapons were named, storm types were left unnamed). From the above, it is clear that PNs are unique in many respects.

PNs are also quantitatively different. Although there are no accurate statistics on their share of vocabulary, Ruoff, who has compiled a vast body of conversational material on our daily lives into a vast body of language, writes that an average of 3% of oral speech consists of PNs and 11% of TOs [5]. This means that PNs make up almost one-fifth of horses (nicknames and cognate horses are included in the horse vocabulary).

Unlike other lexical units, PNs are of interdisciplinary interest. Only by studying PNs as an interdisciplinary science will it be possible to understand them very well. PNs study sociology, psychology, pedagogy, philosophy, cultural anthropology, ethnology, history, law, religion, and even biology and genetics as their subjects. However, PNs are still poorly studied from a linguistic point of view (some see PNs as an ancillary science, part of the above disciplines. This is not a satisfactory situation). By comparison, PNs are well-studied in terms of etymology, i.e., their origin, meaning, structure, language of origin, but they are rarely studied as part of a synchronous language system. In German grammar, it is also noted that PNs (as well as their written form) have been studied in detail since recent times. Sometimes the number of studies conducted within PNs is also not large, which is a misconception that they are considered to be among the topics of uninteresting. That, of course, is bound to change.

List of used literature

1. Nübling D., Fahlbusch F., Heuser R. Namen. An Einführung in the Onomastics. 2., überarbeitete und erweiterte Auflage. - Tübingen: Narr Francke Attempto Verlag. 2015. - S. 13.
2. Thurmair M. Eigennamen als kulturspezifische Symbole oder: Was Sie schon immer über Eigennamen wissen wollten // Anglogermanica Online. 2002. - P. 84-1
3. Nübling D., Fahlbusch F., Heuser R. Namen. An Einführung in the Onomastics. 2., überarbeitete und erweiterte Auflage. - Tübingen: Narr Francke Attempto Verlag. 2015. - S. 14.
4. Seiler H. Namengebung als eine Technik zur sprachlichen Erfassung von Gegenständen // Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft, Sprachtypologie und Textlinguistik. –Tübingen: 1983. - P. 150.
5. Ruoff A. Stylistic Functions of Namen in Mündlichen Erzählungen // Eichler et al. 1995, - S. 552.