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The Attitude to words and lexemes: One of the most important social functions of inter-verbal language is to name things, events, happenings, signs that have social significance for members of society. Therefore, which language, what kind of being, the distinction of realities depends on the lifestyle of the members of society. For example, Uzbeks have only one lexeme for "snow", distinguishing about a hundred types of "noun" with separate lexemes. In the Eskimo language, "horse" and "donkey" are called by the same word, but there are more than forty lexemes that distinguish the types "snow". Naming according to social demand is a common feature for all the languages of the world. But in everyday life, every person is not with a human being in general, with a man in general, with a woman in general, with a lake in general, with a street in general, with a city in general,
with a village in general, rather, it deals with specifics that are separated from the species, such as a particular man, a particular woman, a particular city, a particular institution, a particular lake. Names, nicknames, onomosynonyms perform the task of naming certain of the relatives in this reality separately for each person. Therefore, there is a great need for each person to distinguish certain units from related commonalities, while there is no universal, universal need to separate certain definitions in existence. Such a dialectical approach justifies the existence of proper nouns in the language, which serve to distinguish some of the related noun and related nouns. No matter what language is in the world, in each of them you can find many names that are called proper nouns in science. According to researchers, the number of pronouns in any language is several times greater than the number of ordinary words in that language. Before examining the problem posed in the first chapter, we must first dwell on the relation of nouns, including anthroponyms, to words and lexemes, the basic unit of the linguistic dictionary system.

Are the anthroponyms words? In a way, the question seems inappropriate. Proper nouns become a specific part of speech in the speech system, like any independent meaningful lexeme of language. Takes possession, agreement, cut suffixes. Living and naming in speech is almost indistinguishable from other words in terms of the function of naming as well. "Ahmadjan is an active participant,". He will succeed in whatever task you give him. ” In this short passage, the meaning of "Ahmadjan" and "this young man" are the same as in the speech. If we continue the passage of speech, the following three types of sentences have the same value in the text. 1. A person who works with Ahmadjan enjoys. 2. The person who worked with him is happy. 3. A man who has worked with such a young man enjoys. In this part of the speech, also, "Ahmadjan", "such a young man", the functional-nominative equivalence of the words "he" is obvious. So "Are the anthroponyms words?" such a question seems nonsensical. In the speech process, anthroponyms and appellate vocabulary are equally valuable spoken words. (We'll think about this elsewhere). But the other side of the issue, are
anthroponyms linguistic lexemes with social value or not linguistic lexemes? The question must be answered. In answering, linguists are divided into two groups.

1) Proper nouns have no meaning (Mill, Brendal, Morozova);

2) Proper nouns have meaning (Espersen, Brand, Nikonov, Superanskaya) [63, 63, 80]. To answer this question, we give a definition of a linguistic lexeme in recent research: “Ready, general, uniting for members of society, consisting of a stable combination of form and content, forming a thing, sign, feature, and relationship in reality, incorporating grammatical morphemes in speech and vocabulary The type of morpheme it acquires is a lexeme”[57, 37].

We measure anthroponyms with the above foundation criterias given to the lexeme:

1. The readiness of the lexeme. Proper nouns are ready for community members. They are also ready for each person, and the person takes it from society. Hence, in anthroponyms the factor of readiness is reflected.

2. Its general sign. Anthroponyms do not have this feature, as Proper nouns name individual things separately from common ones. The common denominator in anthroponyms, therefore, is the naming of a particular person and gender. In this respect, all male and female names are of equal value to each other. Hence, anthroponyms do not have a universal linguistic, universal social character. Therefore, for 10 persons, "Ahmadjon" can serve to separate different people.

3. Obligation factor. It can be said that there is a factor of obligation in anthroponyms, and it can be said that there is not. The existence of this factor is that when anthroponyms single out a particular person (e.g., when someone is named Sanobar), that name is obligatory for that person (for Sanobar), for the society to which he or she belongs. This is not obligatory for people who are not related to this person.

4. Stable linking factor of form and content. This factor cannot be said to exist in anthroponyms either. Because anthroponyms have the function of distinguishing a person. Nearly a thousand male names, as many female names, are the same in Uzbek society in terms of informational ability "person + man", 
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"person + woman". In addition, there are additional meanings, such as belonging to the Uzbek language or national ethnographic character. Everyone unlike other lexemes in anthroponymic language, it does not have a balance of form and content.

5. Something in reality, a character, a feature, and a factor in shaping relationships. In other words, do anthroponyms reflect a concept or not? Proper nouns do not have a conceptual expression, but, like an adjective, a modal, an imitation, represent something. In particular, anthroponyms are given to people and serve to distinguish them from each other.

6. The factor of grammatical morphemes in speech. In this respect, as we have seen above, proper nouns not only have equal rights with other lexemes, but they have the ability to accept all the grammatical morphemes specific to horses and to perform syntactic functions. Thus, if we measure the Proper nouns with the initial steps given to the above lexemes, we can see that they correspond halfway to one feature of the lexeme, from six character factors to two factors. But anthroponyms cannot meet the remaining three requirements of lexeme. This means that in Proper nouns the linguistic lexemal feature is only forty percent. So, nicknames are full-blooded words, and only forty percent have universal lexemal features. A lexeme is distinguished by its specific lexical meaning. In terms of the plan of expression, if a word is called by the term lexeme, its expression according to the plan of meaning is referred to by the term semema. Semema consists of a specific structure of sema. Some of the semaphores in the semaphore take the lead, some take the subordinate. Leading semaphores are more general, more abstract than subordinate semaphores. In addition, there are differential semaphores and unifying semaphores of a particular lexeme, the role of certain semaphores in the lexical-semantic system is mainly determined by the nature of the unifying and differentiating semaphores in this semema.

If we apply to the above ideas to anthroponyms, anthroponyms are also a lexeme with the name of something, as mentioned above. For example, it names individual objects. So, generalization is the naming of sema-individuals. And this
is the head, the leading sema. There are also differentiating semas. In particular, names differ according to the naming of male and female individuals, and there is also a semaphore of national identity.

So, as noted above, the presence of a differentiator and a conjunction allows anthroponyms to be included in the vocabulary. Now, with all the above-mentioned features, we will focus in detail on the question of which part of the system lexemes of Proper nouns can take place, that is, what place anthroponyms can take in the systematic interpretation of the dictionary system.

**Occurrence of inter-verbal systemic relations:** Approaching language as a system (system) helps to clearly define the characteristics of onomastic units. When a language analyzes lexical units as a whole system, anthroponyms are grouped together in a lexical-semantic sequence. Anthroponyms have their own characteristics of generality and specificity. Such features are determined within the context of their verbal spiritual relationships.

Inter-word systematic relations are understood as paradigmatic, hierarchical and syntactic relations of words. For example: similarity (paradigmatic) relations: cattle, cow, bull; hierarchical relationship: plant, tree, willow; neighborhood (syntagmatic) attitude: He read a book and so on.

When approached from this perspective, anthroponyms do not show stereotypes and neighborliness. After all, one group of names is another groups, not part of the names. Each name serves to name a particular person. Also, in anthroponyms, more precisely in an anthroponym, there is no syntagmatic circle. The syntagmatic relationship of anthroponyms is limited to the syntagmatic relationship of human, male, and female lexemes. But it is known among anthroponyms and this relationship is reflected in the division of anthroponyms into three groups as male names, female names, neutral names. But the relationship between the two paradigms of anthroponyms - the group of male nouns and the group of female nouns - is completely different from the paradigmatic relationship of other lexemes. From lexical paradigms, there is an interrelationship of form and content between the members of the paradigm, i.e., each of them has its own form.
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and content. In anthroponymic paradigms, on the other hand, there are formal differences between members of the paradigm and there is no general semantic difference. The common informational value is the same in all male names and in all female names: person + male, person + female. In particular, anthroponyms form two groups, two internal paradigms, such as male names and female names. The words of each group contradict the common names of the third group, which do not differ in gender and form the most marginal circle of the human lexeme.

Figure 1

![Diagram](common names to male names and female names)

These three groups constitute the internal paradigm of the anthroponym system. Each member of the paradigm has its own distinct syntagmatic relationship. Including anthropoindicators of each group the combination with. For example: Like; Pulatoj, Davlatbek, Mardonqul, Mehriniso.

All three members of the anthroponyms paradigm are open, and they can be filled with every new word, nickname, psygdonium. Neither male names, nor female names, nor common names form separate paradigms within themselves. Perhaps it stands in a relationship of mutual variability; the name of the woman we see, but do not know, may be what she wants from the female names. All three members of the anthroponym paradigm unite around the concepts of female names, male names, and common names.

At this point, we also found it necessary to think about the specificity of anthroponyms.

Synonymous relationships are defined primarily by their meaning. Meaning is directly related to perception. Anthroponyms differ from other common nouns in that they express the concept of denotation. While common nouns can directly
express the concept of subjectivity, anthroponyms do not have such a feature. They are often formed on the basis of common nouns, the parents' dream, a wish of nation is the name of a different person. Their main task is to distinguish individuals from people. Compare: Individuals with the names Bakhtiyor, Botir may not fit their denotation. In life, one can be unhappy and the other can be a very cowardly person. Or: The anthroponym of Oybek in the phrase “this is Oybek” can mean both the writer Oybek and the picture with his picture, or the neighbor's son Oybek.

So is it possible to talk about synonymy in anthroponyms in such cases? Yes, it is possible. The synonymy of human names, unlike the synonymy of common nouns, is not mutually exclusive in that it expresses the concept of a denotation, but rather in the expression of a denotation by means of two or more words. That is why such synonymy is conditional. This is the Russian linguist A.V. Superanskayathinking that it is preferable to use synonymy in anthroponymy with the term polyonymy (pluralism) [71, 300]. Just like synonyms, plurality has social, methodological, pure (onomastic) meanings specific to different areas of language. The use of one person instead of a noun can only take place in a certain period, under certain conditions, in the process of speech, which depends on human character. Compare: Like; Hamid Gulomovich, comrade Nematov, Hamidjon. Apparently, naming a person with words of three different forms was done with both social and methodological requirements. In other words, the addition of the father's name is a product of the next period in Uzbek speech, but at the same time it is typical of the official style. The form "Hamidjon" differs from the form "Comrade Nematov" informally, as well as the meaning of intimacy. As G. Nasrullaeva noted, "the personal qualities of communicators act as a catalyst in the selection of linguistic units, assigning them certain communicative, emotional and expressive tasks."  

---
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Professor V.D. Bodaletov also noted that the synonymy between human names differs according to the methodological color: “In Russian, Ivan, Vanya, Vanyusha; There are more than a dozen synonymous variants of the names Maria, Masha, Marusya, Mulya, Manasha. It is impossible to talk about the mutual semantic difference between them. The difference between them is emotional expressiveness. In this case, we can see a paradigm inherent in the diversity of meanings ”[9, 13].

Hence, it is important to define synonymy in anthroponymy as they can express a concept, rather than to call a denotation by different names. In defining synonyms, the neutral word in the synonymous row is taken as the dominant basis. In related horses, the word colored is defined in comparison to this dominant: "Speaking" (neutral), whispering, murmuring, shouting (painted). These words are any speech does not lose its additional stylistic color even in the conditions. In anthroponym synonymy, the landscape has a slightly different character. That is, the stylistic color in the names changes under different speech conditions. In other words, a methodically painted name becomes a neutral name. Compare: Yakhshieva Gulnora Toshpulatovna (at work), Gulnora (in a family), Guli, Gulichka (among friends), Guljon (in her mother's speech), etc. These nouns lose their stylistic color rather than apply, approaching neutrality. This change in neutrality in anthroponyms distinguishes them from synonyms of common nouns.

Summarizing the above points, the following manifestations of synonymy (polionymics) in anthroponyms in language are known:

1. Names in the sense that arise in connection with a particular period, conditions, features of the national language: Tamarakhonim= Tamara Artyomovna Petrosyan.

2. Synonyms formed as a result of different naming of a person by different nationalities: Abu Ali ibn Sina - Avttsena; Aristotle - like Aristotle. Navoi's epic "Saddi Alexandria" contains more than a dozen similar historical and mythological figures: Plato - the ancient Greek philosopher Plato; Alexander (Alexander) -
3. Anthroponyms are formed in a language as a result of naming a certain person by different forms, often at the request of style: Oybek: Musa Tashmuhammad oglu, Musa Tashmuhammadovich: Muso Tashmuhammadov.

4. Meaningful names woven by the writer in the works of art, describing the hero in one way or another, in accordance with the content of the image; Like Saida - Sinchalak; Hakimbek - Alpomish.

Thus, naming a person by names of different forms forms a synonym or polynomial in anthroponyms. Anthroponymic variants are names that refer to the same person, not distinguished by their additional emotional-methodological aspects (color), but by functional-methodological color. Therefore, as noted above, masculine, feminine, and common names are in a relationship of mutual variability, without forming separate paradigms within themselves.
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