

**SECTION 29. Literature. Folklore. Translation Studies****Atajanova Anorgul Jumaniyazovna,**

PhD,

The docent of the Department of “Theory and Methodology of Primary Education” of Urganch State University, Uzbekistan

**ABOUT THE ROLE OF ETHNONYMS IN THE ONOMASTIC LANGUAGE SYSTEM**

*The article deals with the role of ethnonyms in the onomastic language system.*

*The ethnonyms are analyzed by anthroponomically. And also the peculiarities of ethnonyms are studied, which ethnonyms used to be the proper nouns and it is tradition to investigate it as the proper one.*

*Keywords: ethnonyms, genetic roots, onomastics, toponyms, antroponyms.*

Surrounding events, things, natural object or person and someone or some events are very old nominative circumstance. The creations of proper nouns, their meanings, the sociolinguistics peculiarities, Stylistic-Connotative meanings are studied by linguistics.

The Uzbek onomastics is very progressive branch. Especially, in investigating the toponyms, antroponyms, many great things are done, such as, to create the essential dictionary, to collect very fruitful materials about them. There are a lot of monographs, scientific collections, and reports in Uzbek onomastics. They are more than 300 [4]. So, More than 10 conferences are dedicated to the problems of Uzbek onomastics are held there. It is clear, that ethnonyms is the lexical unit what is included to the onomastic system, and is the proper noun. Ethnonyms used to be the proper nouns and it is tradition to investigate it as the proper one.

The famous scientist V.A.Nikonov knows the ethnonyms as the proper noun [8]. A.V.Superanskoeya considers that it is common noun, because, the ethnonyms doesn't name a person, but it names the whole group of person [10, p. 59-61]. Such kind of views depends on the setting the role and place of ethnonyms in the onomastics language system. Because, unknown status of ethnonyms in the onomastic system came up to confuse in the investigation of them. In orthography, the ethnonyms is written with the proper letter or small letter [14, p. 13-14]. In the rules of “Writing the proper letters” there is a discussion about the writing the name of tribes and race. The great investigator of Uzbek ethnonyms professor X.Doniyorov writes them with small letters [5, p. 85, 87, 93] but sometimes he accounts them with proper one [5, p. 74-77].

The Turkic, especially Uzbek etnonyms are considered in the works of historians and ethnographers. And we can see that the names of tribe, race and nations are written with proper or small letters [6, p. 77-80]. For example: qipchoq, kimak, uz, kun, qay, pecheneg, chigil, yag'mo, qarluq, halach, org'u, tuhsi, turkesh, az, o'z kabi [12, p. 57, 87]. The ethnic groups are written with small letters [1, p. 82].

We pay attention to the peculiarities of writing the etnonyms because if we write them with proper letters it is considered like the proper nouns and it is graphical, orthographical sign. From one side it is unimportant. But there is a rule of writing the proper nouns with proper letter in the language system. It would be weak if we don't pay attention to it.

Ethnonyms is a very attentive problem for investigation. The humanity is the social ethnic category of the historical period of developing. The unit of humans creates the ethnic groups.

Professor K.Shoniyozov thinks that there are some peculiarities which came from the thought of general thinking of the persons. K.Shoniyozov writes: Every component of Uzbek nations is the relatives to each other and they have the thought "one nation" [12, p. 99].

Akademic A.Askarov considers this sign and while he's speaking about ethno genetic process of Uzbek people, he considered that ethnics should have such peculiarities: "Ethnoterritorial unit, ethno economical, language, ethnonym, social units and so on" [1, p. 240-241].

As it was considered above, ethnic groups consist of small groups. So, ethnonyms are the name of the groups. That's why ethnic names aren't represented like the category of nouns.

So, if the anthroponym is the name of one thing or person, the ethnonym is the name of the group.

From this point of view the ethnonyms is not considered as the proper nouns. So, anthroponym is used to distinguish the thing or person by the name, the ethnonyms serves to distinguish the groups from each other. Why we differ the ethnos from the others? Because, one group of person from one ethnic group differ by its culture, social, ethnic signs. For example, old time one tribe has different peculiarities:

- every race and tribe have own religion, believe, they have totem and fetish;
- every race and tribe thinks about their genetic roots;
- every tribe has it's own symbol;
- every tribe has it's industry like, (agriculture, hunting, handicraft);
- every ethnos has its own meals, clothes and accessories;
- every race and tribe has its traditions;
- every tribe has its place for living.

These peculiarities are belonged also to one person or the representatives of ethnic group.

The name which has not the Status in the onomastic system has another meaning. We can consider the phitonyms like this one. For example, the name or term of the agriculture sometimes is written with small letter, sometimes with proper one. And it is the reason to argue whether it is common or proper noun.

M.Safarov represents the terms of agriculture like these: asati, qoraqand, oqqovun, oqgurvak, qoragurvak, oqurug', qoraurug'. These are the names of melon. Sometimes we can observe that they are written with proper letters. He thinks what it is not correct to write with proper noun. –Because, there are two lexical units create one sort of melon, it would be better to write it with small letter and add it: oqgurvak” [9, p. 25].

These events are represented among the names of flour, corn, rice, pototoe, carrot, rape, cucumber and others. For example: –In the beginning of 90 th, these sort of melon: Handalak, Cho'pori, Qizilurug', Qo'ybosh, Umarboqi, Gulobi, Asati, Oqurug'; These sort of water melon: Chinni, Qo'zivoy, Marvarid, O'zbekiston, Hayitqora; These sort of pototoe: Darband, Toshkent, O'zbekiston – 133, Aqrab, Umid, Zarafshon, To'yimli, Kardinal, Sedov; these sort of carrot: Mushak, Qizil, Mirzoyi, Sariq, Shantane; these sort of onion: Qatortol, Kaba, Andijon oq piyozi, Ispan 313, Sunbula; these sort of the tomato: Sovg', O'zbekiston, Yusupov, Surhon tingi, Bahodir and others painted” [11, p. 791].

In this example one can see that these are the names of products. In this case the name doesn't differ the things from each other but it is generalized lexeme. Shortly it is used to differ the sort of the plant. In this moment they are close to the ethnonyms.

To consider the name as the proper noun, it should have these criteria's:

1. Lexeme should be the name of one things.
2. Lexeme should name the things of group.
3. It should house the strong nominative side.
4. Is the name has lexical or encyclopedically meaning?
5. Is the name added to the essential vocabulary?
6. Is it possible to translate the name?
7. Is the lexeme written with the small or proper letter.

In investigation of onomastic system the ethnonyms is not marked.

This problem are solved by the investigator E.Begmatov at the 1<sup>st</sup> time antrophonyms [3, p. 56-57]. He compared the ethnonyms by 24 of criteri. Because, the antrophonym and ethnonym relates the meaning of person and they are very close to each other.

When E.Begmatov compared the functions of antrophonyms, the names of race, tribe and nation, don't correspond the demand of the proper nouns. He came to conclusion what the ethnonyms stay between the common and proper nouns. The result of this conclusion was what the etnonyms understood not lexical units. In his book he doesn't consider the ethnonym in onomastic system [2, p. 31-48]. This problem was the reason to come that opinion like the

proper nouns has the meaning; the meaning of it is very rich. To understand these we should insist on the lexicographic resources.

In –The Explanatory dictionary of Uzbek language” there are some ethnic names.

**Qipchoqlar** 1. The Turkic nation tribe, which were lived in the shore of Ural and Volga near the central and eastern part of Kazakhstan. 2. One of the ethnic tribe of Uzbek nations. (O’zTIL, 1-jild, B.297).

**Qorluqlar**– consists of three tribes which are included to Uzbeks (O’zTIL, 1-jild, B.250).

**O’g’uz.** One of tribes of Uzbek genetic system. The dialect of Uzbek language. (O’zTIL, 5-jild, 195-bet).

As you see ethnonyms are differ from the common noun. In the comment there are given history, the place the territory of ethnonyms. These comments are differing from the philological dictionaries by the clear and wide information about ethnos. Some investigators consider the ethnonyms like –the encyclopedic meaning”.

In –The Explanatory dictionary of Uzbek language there are 8 meanings of the word race is given.

And the 7<sup>th</sup> of 8<sup>th</sup> comment are:

**Urug’.** (race) 7. The group of person who came from one father, one ancestor. 8. The group of the person who were the relatives in the tribe in the old of the history (O’zTIL, 4-jild, B.297).

As you see, the ethnonyms is not the lexic unit, it is the name of ethnic units, it informs us about the tribe’s, symbols and peculiarities. This information is the encyclopedic meaning of the ethnonyms. In Conclusion, we can say the ethnonyms doesn’t correspond the demand of the proper nouns. It is not the onomastic unit. Ethnonyms stays between the proper and common nouns and serves to differ one ethnic group from another one.

## REFERENCE:

1. Асқаров Аҳмадали. Ўзбек халқининг этногенезиси ва этник тарихи. – Тошент: –Университет”, 2007, 82-бет.
2. Бегматов Э. Ўзбек тили антропонимикаси. –Тошкент: –Фан”, 2013.
3. Бегматов Э. Этнонимларнинг тил ономастик тизимига муносабати // Хоразм Маъмун академиясининг ахборотномаси. – Урганч, 2007, 2(3). Б.56-57.
4. Бегматов Э.А., Улуқов Н.М. Ўзбек ономастикаси (библиографик кўрсаткич). – Наманган, 2008.
5. Дониёров Х. Ўзбек халқининг шажара ва шевалари. – Тошкент: Фан, 1968.
6. Кармышева Б.Х. Очерки этнической истории Южных районов Таджикистана и Узбекистана. –Москва: «Наука», 1976.

7. Никонов В.А. Введение в топонимику. – М., 1965.
8. Никонов В.А. Этнонимия // Этнонимы. – М.: «Наука», 1970.
9. Сафаров М. Ўзбек тили полизчилик терминологиясидаги ҳар хилликлар // Ўзбек тили терминологияси. -Тошкент: «Фан», 1987.
10. Суперанская А.В., Суперанская А.В. Групповые обозначение людей в лексической системе языка // Имя нарицательное и собственное. – М.: Наука, С.59-61.
11. Ўзбекистон Миллий энциклопедияси, Тошкент, 8-жилд, 2004.
12. Шониёзов К. Ўзбек халқининг шаклланиш жараёни. – Т., Шарқ, 2001.
13. Этническая ономастика. –Москва: «Наука», 1984.
14. Этнонимы. –Москва: «Наука», 1970.