

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHLI (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2021 Issue: 11 Volume: 103

Published: 30.11.2021 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



Gawhar Saklapbergenovna Patullaeva

Nukus State Pedagogical Institute named after Azhiniyaz
candidate of philological sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of Karakalpak language
Uzbekistan, Nukus, P.Seytov street. Phone: +998 (91) 3889149
gauxar_patullaeva@mail.ru

Gulnaz Jaksimuratovna Mambetova

Nukus State Pedagogical Institute named after Azhiniyaz
Doctor of Philosophy in Philological Sciences, Senior Lecturer, Karakalpak language department
Uzbekistan, Nukus, P.Seytov street. Phone: +998 (91) 3047799
gulnaz.mambetova.76@mail.ru

Sarbinaz Keunimjaevna Nurimbetova

Nukus State Pedagogical Institute named after Azhiniyaz
researcher

FORMATION OF ANTHROPONYMS OF KARAKALPAK AND TURKISH PEOPLES BY LEXICALIZATION

Abstract: In this article, we have looked at the lexicalization of anthroponyms of the Karakalpak and Turkic peoples. We have compared the lexical-syntactic method given in the scientific literature with other word-formation methods and the lexicalization of the anthroponyms of the Turkic peoples.

Key words: word formation, word formation methods, lexicalization, anthroponymy, anthroponym, anthroponymic lexicalization.

Language: English

Citation: Patullaeva, G. S., Mambetova, G. J., & Nurimbetova, S. K. (2021). Formation of anthroponyms of Karakalpak and Turkish peoples by lexicalization. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 11 (103), 1124-1128.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-11-103-129> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2021.11.103.129>

Scopus ASCC: 1200.

Introduction

In his speech on the further development of our native language and its inclusion in the list of world languages, the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan Sh.M.Mirziyoyev said: “The mirror of every nation's existence in the world is its language and literature. Our native language is an inexhaustible treasure of our national spirituality. Therefore, it is the duty of all of us to show him due respect and dignity. We need to show the richness and respect for our mother tongue by introducing our language to the world”[Mirziyoyev, 1999].

Indeed, the development of our language is largely due to scientific research in linguistics.

Karakalpak names are part of the vocabulary of the language. It is rooted in the vernacular and

continues to evolve in accordance with the internal criteria of the language.

Anthroponymy is a branch of onomastics that studies the structure of related (private) human names, the laws of their origin, language layers, structure, semantic features, and so on on a linguistic basis. “The whole set of personal names that exist in a particular language is called anthroponymy. Anthroponymy or nomenclature is the branch of onomastics that studies the paedo, development, and functional properties of anthroponyms”[Uzbek Onomastics, 2012].

Scientific articles have been published on the fact that words in the Karakalpak language are formed by a certain method of word formation, specific to their laws, and today there are many words formed by

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIIHQ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

the method of lexicalization [Jaqsymuratova, Patullaeva G, 2016].

The field of word formation studies the formation of words with new meanings, which are specific to the internal laws of the language, from the existing words in Karakalpak linguistics.

In Karakalpak linguistics on word-formation methods, first of all, N.A. Baskakov conducts his scientific research and shows that artificial words are formed in the following ways: lexical method, morphological method and syntactic method. A. Kidirbaev emphasizes that words in Karakalpak language are formed by morphological and syntactic methods [Modern Karakalpak language, 1974: 17]. In his scientific works, A. Bekbergenov gives several ways of word formation. For example, in a special article and monograph on word formation, he shows that new artificial words in the Karakalpak language are formed by morphological, lexical-syntactic, morphological-syntactic, lexical-semantic methods [Bekbergenov, 1976: 68 - 73 ; Creation of words in the Karakalpak language, 1979]. In the academic scientific grammar of modern Karakalpak literary language (in this case, too, the ways of word formation were written by A. Bekbergenov), the ways of word formation were previously divided into two major groups: morphemic way and nonmorphemic method. The morphemic line includes affixation, word addition, abbreviation, and the nonmorpheme line includes lexical-semantic and lexical-syntactic methods [Grammar of the modern Karakalpak literary language, 1994: 19-28].

The main character that determines the way words are formed is the word formation form. Indicates that a word is a way of making a word if it is made with the same formant. Considering the word-formation formant, the modern Karakalpak language has the following methods of word-formation: affixation, word addition, lexical-semantic, lexical-syntactic methods.

Lexicalization is the construction of words by the lexical-syntactic method, in which the first component of the word is made up of the desired word group, the last component is made up of the verb phrase, and generally has a meaning. indicates. There are many lexicalized words in Karakalpak language and they are used in different spheres of our society.

In Uzbek literature, lexicalization includes compound words. Such words are formed in Karakalpak language by adding words.

According to a study by our local scholars, "The lexical-syntactic word-formation formant is a compound word. A phrase has a meaning and a meaning. For example: I will die if I don't wrap up, I met in a taxi, swayed on a plane, you can't take (names of materials), Qizketgan (place name), Qazanketgan, Sotiboldi, Ulbosin (human names), etc. It is clear from these words that in this way a meaningful phrase and

an auxiliary word, a phraseological phrase, create artificial words with a new meaning. "

Thus, it is understandable that in the linguistics of the Karakalpak language and other Turkic peoples, in particular, the word-formation methods of the word-formation department are similar or, conversely, lexicalized (depending on all the languages spoken). the word combination acts as a word-forming formant of the words.

Based on the above theoretical ideas, we found that among the Karakalpak anthroponyms there are many words formed in this lexical-syntactic way. In addition, the views on the construction and construction of personal names in Turkic languages in the works of T. Kusimova [Kusimova, 1975: 37-55], AGShaykhulova [Shaykhulov, 1978: 1819], VUMaxpirov [Makhpirov, 1980: 24-28] and others. also occurs.

Although the personal pronouns of the world's languages have the same grammatical structure, the personal name given to each language is governed by the internal laws of that language.

Like other Turkic languages, Karakalpak personal pronouns are grammatically simple and compound.

Most anthroponyms, which are made up of a combination of word-formation methods, consist of a group of words (meaningful) whose first component is desired, and the next component is often a group of verbs: Baybolsin, Kópjasar, Saqlapbergen, Sotiboldi, Kojursin, etc.

Among the Turkic languages, Uzbek word formation is one of the areas of special research.

The Uzbek word-formation method is as follows: "It is said that a new word (lexeme) must be formed in any way in word-formation. It is necessary to distinguish two phenomena:

1) the formation of a completely new word in the language;

2) creation of a new word (formation of a new word) with language materials on the basis of a certain (fixed) method specific to the language "[Hojiev, 1989]. So the Karakalpak language is compatible with this aspect.

It should be noted that the morphological structure of the names of the people who are the object of our research is simple? He studies the divisions of nouns into three groups, such as compound and abbreviated nouns, and proves with convincing examples that Uzbek nouns are formed by morphological, lexical, and syntactic methods.

Comparing Karakalpak language research with word-formation methods, we can see that there are some differences: "Syntactic-lexical word-formation means the transformation of a phrase into a word (lexeme). In the process of language development, a certain type of phrase changes from a syntactic unit to a lexical unit as a result of acquiring a single lexical meaning - a compound word. For example, compound

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHIQ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

words such as milboshi, johoripoya, tokqaychi are considered to be compound words formed in this way. This method of word formation is also called lexicalization "[Hojiev, 1989: 30].

In this theory, the components of words formed by lexicalization in the Uzbek language are made up of a combination of nouns. It is known that such words are formed by adding words in the word formation section of the Karakalpak language (glove, Annaqul, Tolganoy, etc.).

We found that most Karakalpak anthroponyms are lexical-syntactic. If we look at the tradition of naming children, we can see that the names given to children by the people were accepted in the ecological, astronomical, and religious contexts surrounding human beings. For example, Tangirbergen, Khudoibergen, Aitoldi, etc. By naming the child, they believed in the Moon, the Sun, the Star, and God with the best intentions. This is also the case with Uzbek anthroponyms:

1. Courage, heroism, divine views are reflected in the names of people given in ancient times: Oyyorug, Tangriberdi.

2. The names of people like Ulbolsin are given by parents who want their next child to be a boy.

3. In the Turkic layer of Uzbek anthroponymy there are also human names made of celestial bodies: Kuntuǵmish, Oy tóldi, Kuntuǵdi. [Tursunov].

The anthroponyms in the examples are lexicalized based on the noun + verb model.

Naming a child and trying to distinguish it from others is an objective necessity that has existed in all nations since time immemorial. There are different opinions about the name and its naming. Ernst Begmatov says: "The habit of naming and naming is born of the need to distinguish one person from another. Subsequent and formal surnames, nicknames, patronymics, ancestral (pantronic) names and their various forms, and other forms and methods of naming a person are the legitimate products of such a vital need "[Begmatov, 1994: 90].

In general, if we compare the lexical and syntactic construction of anthroponyms in Karakalpak and Uzbek languages, there is no significant difference, they are similar in terms of construction.

Word formation in Azerbaijani, one of the Turkic languages, is one of the issues studied within morphology. If we compare the method of lexicalization with the research work in the Karakalpak language, we can see that there are some differences. In addition, Sadykov studies the structure of Azerbaijani names in simple, artificial and complex forms. He illustrated their morphological, lexical, and semantic construction methods.

In Karakalpak anthroponyms, it is customary to give the names Ulbosyn, Ultuǵan, and Ulbogan to the next-born girls with the intention of having a son if only girls are born in the family. This process is also reflected in the formation of Azerbaijani names: These

are the wishes and desires of the parents who have a legitimate dream or who have several daughters in the family. In Byazyan, these names refer to the shchyasryat or kyadyar of parents living in exile: Gyzbyas, Gulbas, Gyztamam, Gultamam, Gyzgayyt, Gulgayyt, Gyzyetyar ". It turns out that the model of making such names is of the type "horse + verb" (Ul - horse, bosin - verb; Giz (girl) - horse, tamam (meaning to end) - verb). In addition, the components tamom, gayt, yetyar are verbs, which in Karakalpak means "stop or stop, come back or come back, enough".

If we take a closer look at the mysteries of naming children, we will see that the names given to children by the people are related to the ecological, astronomical, and religious conditions that surround them. Allah, God, God, and the ummah of the prophets also have human names associated with the names of their companions, propagating religious concepts, as well as those derived from the worship of celestial bodies: Allambergen, Kudaibergen, Tangirbergen. Such anthroponyms are also found in the Azerbaijani language. For example, "Theonimlyardyan duzyalyan anthroponymlar. "Theonim" is derived from the combination of two Greek words - "theo" (Allah) or "onim" and is used in the sense of "the name of Allah". Green names: Tanryverdi, Allahverdi, Khudaverdi., Imamverdi and so on. "

The words Berdy and Bergan are also widely used as a component of Karakalpak qubun nouns: Kudayberdi, Allaberdi and Bergan are widely used only as a second component: Bekbergen, Qosbergen, Embergen, Dosbergen, Kudaibergen, Allabergen and others.

These components are also used effectively in Azerbaijani anthroponyms:

Qarjawbay (born in the snow) is also associated with some of the names associated with animal husbandry, which are the basis of human existence. For example: Koybaǵar and so on.

Anthroponymic, which is related to natural phenomena and the concept of fire. In ancient Turkish monuments, natural phenomena are more often associated with the names: Ay Toldy, Gun Toldy, Mirbagyr and others.

1. Green names. Many of the green names in Azerbaijani anthroponymy are Turkish Myanmar. This means that from ancient times the appellation lexicon of our language has been the main source of the origin of green names. These appellate and semantic names with Ryanearyan semantics reflect the modern syllables of our language: Garyagdy, etc. [Pashaev, 2015].

In conclusion, in Karakalpak and Azerbaijani languages, the construction of personal names, including through lexicalization, is close to each other, and in most cases is done in the "horse + verb" model.

One of the Turkic languages, Kazakh word formation is one of the areas of study within

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHII (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

morphology. If we compare one of the methods of word formation with the method of lexicalization in the Karakalpak language, we can see that there are some differences.

One of the methods of word formation in the Kazakh language is lexicalization, which is defined as follows: The components of the lexical phrase do not change in terms of sound and structure. The logical-semantic, grammatical connections of the components (senses) of the lexical combination are not obscured (dark-blue), they stand in their place and form a single lexicon. The lexicalization of word combinations is based on the habit of using some simple word combinations in a descriptive way. For this reason, lexicalized complex words and complex nouns are common. Examples: railroad, kosayaq, jukayaq, saptyayaq, shyny ayak, gloves, aqu, sary ala naz, dog ala qaz, aqutan, kokkutan, altybaqan, baspasöz, asqazan, bozbala, aqsaqal, alaökpe, qaraökpe, orarbas boynya atar, atshabar, shanbasar, qapteser, qolkeser” [Ysraqov, 1991].

So, among the other Turkic languages we have compared above, in Uzbek and Kazakh there is almost no difference in the way this word is formed by lexicalization. Consider the use of compound words or compound words in the Azerbaijani and Karakalpak languages. Also, in his dissertation, T. Januzakov studied the personal names of the Kazakh language in terms of simple and complex grammatical structure [Januzakov, 1960: 14-17]. On this basis, if we compare the structure of anthroponyms with the Karakalpak language, the verb component of Kazakh nouns corresponds to the components of the Karakalpak language serunum "berdi, bergen".

In addition, G. Sattarov divided the Tatar singular into verb and noun according to their structure and made a comprehensive linguistic analysis of the phonetic-morphological system and dialectical features of Tatar names [Sattarov, 1975: 20-44].

In fact, when we study the structure of personal names in a particular language, they are divided into simple and artificial groups. A.V. Superanskaya argues that the composition of various singular nouns in Indo-European languages is traditionally complex and appealing [Superanskaya, 1989: 63]. KM Musaev shows that Turkish anthroponyms are structurally simple and complex [Musaev, 1984: 219].

Although no research has been done on the formation of anthroponyms of the Turkic peoples, scientific articles have been published. For example,

one of the methods of word formation we are studying explains the formation of Turkish place names (human names) by lexicalization method: “Born” or prichastie “born”; imya sushchestvitelnoe “rodstvennik”): Baytugan, Irtugan, Biktugan, Yantugan.

Glagol 3 l. ed. ch. prosh. rezultativnogo vr. iz'yav. inclination -berdy (dal): Kuchamberdy, Kutlyberdy, Kutayberdy, Taguberdy, Tanaberdy, Tokberdy” [Alishina, 2001].

Thus, the ways in which anthroponyms are formed in common Turkic languages, especially by lexical-syntactic methods, are similar and serunum way.

The morphological structure of modern Karakalpak anthroponyms is divided into different linguistic layers, the analysis of linguistic and non-linguistic factors, a comprehensive study of the semantics of human names, anthroponymic variants, grammatical structure is of great theoretical and practical importance.

The study of human names in the Karakalpak anthroponymic system, the reasons for their emergence, the methods of making variants, in particular, the method of lexicalization, led to the following conclusions:

1. Materials collected on the names of Karakalpak people and scientific research based on them will serve as the main source for studying the history of language, customs and traditions, culture of our people in the future.

2. The lexical structure of Karakalpak human names is, by origin, layers of Turkic languages, layers of Arabic and Iranian languages, as well as Russian. In Karakalpak linguistics, Karakalpak onomastics, which is a branch of it, work is carried out on the meanings of anthroponyms, their analysis, grammatical construction and construction of names, surnames and patronymics (father's name), the main reasons for naming a child, its ethnographic basis. However, the issue of anthroponymic lexicalization, which is one of the characteristic features of the structure of Karakalpak anthroponymy, has not been specifically studied. The study of Karakalpak human names has not only theoretical but also practical significance. The results of the research serve as a theoretical basis for the transcription and transliteration of Karakalpak human names into other languages in determining the orthographic and orthoepic norms of Karakalpak human names, the creation of orthographic and annotated dictionaries of human names.

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582	PIHII (Russia) = 3.939	PIF (India) = 1.940
GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 9.035	IBI (India) = 4.260
JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

References:

1. Mirziyoev, Sh.M. (2019). *Speech at the solemn ceremony dedicated to the thirtieth anniversary of the status of the Uzbek language as the state language*. October 21, 2019.
2. (2012). *Problems of Uzbek onomastics*. 3rd selection fan, Samarkand.
3. Zhaksymuratova, N., & Patullaeva, G. (2017). *Leksikalizacija - söz zhasay usylynyň biri*. "Ilim çäm zhämijet" zhurnaly.
4. (1974). *Házirgi qaraqalpaq tili*. I, Morfologiya., (p.17). Nókis.
5. Bekbergenov, A. (1976). *Karakalpak tilindegi tijkarý söz zhasay usyllary* — «ӨзIA KB Habarshysy», (pp.68 – 73).
6. (1979). *Karakalpak tilinde sözlerdiň zhasalyýy*. Nókis.
7. (1994). *Házirgi qaraqalpaq ádebiy tiliniň grammatikasy. Sóz jasalıw hám morfologiya*. (pp.19-28). Nókis.
8. Kusimova, T. (1975). *Drevnebashkirskie antroponimy*. AKD. (pp.37-55). Ufa.
9. Shajhulov, A.G. (1978). *Tatarskie i bashkirskie lichnye imena turkskogo proishozhdenija*. AKD. (p.1819). Moscow.
10. Mahpirov, V.U. (1980). *Sobstvennye imena v pamjatnike XI v. «Devonu lugat - it-turk» Mahmuda Kashgarskogo*. AKD. (pp.24-28). Alma-Ata.
11. Xozhiev, A. (1989). *Ўzbek tili sýz jasalishi*. Tashkent.
12. Xozhiev, A. (1989). *Ўzbek tili sýz jasalishi*. (p.30). Tashkent.
13. Tursunov, Sh. (n.d.). *Ўzbek tilidagi bázi antroponimlarning lingvomadaniy tasnifi*. (internet).
14. Begmatov, E. (1994). *Ism chiroyi*. (p.90). Toshkent.
15. Pashaev, A. (2015). *Azerbajzhan antroponimikasy*. «Elim və təhsil», Baki.
16. Yskakov, A. (1991). *Kəzirgi kazak tili (Morfologija)*. «Almaty».
17. Zhanuzakov, T. (1960). *Lichno-sobstvennye imena v kazahskom jazyke*. AKD. (pp.14-17). Alma-Ata.
18. Satarov, G.F. (1975). *Antroponimija Tatarskoj ASSR*. ADD. (pp.20-44). Kazan.
19. Superanskaja, V.A. (n.d.). *Struktura imeni sobstvennogo*. (p.63).
20. Musaev, K.M. (1984). *Leksikologii turkskih jazykov*. (p.219). Moscow.
21. Alishina, H.Ch. (2001). *Strukturnyj analiz muzhskih antroponimov sibirskih (tumenskih) tatarov XVIII veka*. Tumenskij gosudarstvennyj universitet, Rossija.