

ERGONIMIK BIRLIKLARNING INGLIZCHA-O‘ZBEKCHA VA O‘ZBEKCHA- INGLIZCHA LUG‘ATLARDA AKS ETISHI

Berdiyeva Mashhura

Qarshi davlat universiteti Mustaqil tadqiqodchisi

mashhuraberdiyeva0999@gmail.com

+998908970999

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20354738>

Annotatsiya: Ushbu maqolada inglizcha–o‘zbekcha va o‘zbekcha–inglizcha ikki tilli lug‘atlarda ergonimik birliklarning aks etishi va talqini o‘rganiladi. Ergonomlar (ergonimlar) tashkilotlar, muassasalar va tijorat obyektlarining atoqli nomlari bo‘lib, onomastik tizimning muhim qatlamini tashkil etadi hamda jamiyatning ijtimoiy-madaniy va iqtisodiy xususiyatlarini aks ettiradi. Tadqiqotda lug‘atlarda berilgan ergonimlarning tarjima usullari tahlil qilinadi, jumladan transliteratsiya, kalkalash, izohli tarjima va funksional moslashtirish usullari aniqlanadi. Shuningdek, ergonimlarning semantik xususiyatlari, pragmatik ma’nalari va madaniy o‘ziga xosligi ko‘rib chiqilib, ularning tarjimada yuzaga keladigan muammolari yoritiladi. Natijalar shuni ko‘rsatadiki, mavjud ikki tilli lug‘atlarda ergonimlar har doim ham to‘liq va aniq aks ettirilmaydi, bu esa ularning dinamikligi va madaniy bog‘liqligi bilan izohlanadi. Tadqiqotda lug‘atchilikda yangi yondashuvlarni ishlab chiqish zarurligi asoslab beriladi. Mazkur ish tarjimashunoslik, leksikografiya va onomastika sohalari uchun muhim ahamiyat kasb etadi.

Kalit so‘zlar: ergonim, Ergonimika, ikki tilli lug‘at,leksikografiya,tarjima strategiyalari, semantik tahlil, onomastika, madaniy xususiyat.

REFLECTION OF ERGONOMIC UNITS IN ENGLISH-UZBEK AND UZBEK- ENGLISH DICTIONARIES

Abstract: This article examines the representation and interpretation of ergonymic units in English–Uzbek and Uzbek–English bilingual dictionaries. Ergonyms, defined as proper names of institutions, organizations, and commercial entities, constitute an important layer of the onomastic system and reflect sociocultural, economic, and linguistic realities of a speech community . The study focuses on how such units are recorded, translated, and semantically explained in bilingual lexicographical sources. The research analyzes dictionary entries containing ergonyms, identifying the main strategies of translation equivalence, including transliteration, calque, descriptive translation, and functional adaptation. Special attention is given to semantic shifts, pragmatic connotations, and cultural specificity, which often complicate the lexicographic treatment of ergonyms. The article also explores the structural and semantic features of ergonyms in both English and Uzbek, highlighting similarities and differences in their formation and usage. The findings demonstrate that bilingual dictionaries do not always provide adequate representation of ergonyms due to their dynamic nature and strong cultural embedding. The study emphasizes the need for improved lexicographic approaches that account for pragmatic meaning, cultural references, and communicative function. The results contribute to the development of bilingual lexicography, translation studies, and onomastic research

Key words: ergonym, ergonymy,bilingual dictionary, lexicography,translation strategies, semantic analysis, onomastics, cultural specificity.

ОТРАЖЕНИЕ ЭРГОНОМИЧЕСКИХ ЕДИНИЦ В АНГЛО-УЗБЕКСКИХ И УЗБЕКСКО-АНГЛИЙСКИХ СЛОВАРЯХ

Аннотация: В данной статье рассматривается отражение и интерпретация эргонимических единиц в англо-узбекских и узбекско-английских двуязычных словарях. Эргонимы, представляющие собой собственные имена организаций, учреждений и коммерческих структур, являются важной частью ономастической системы и отражают социокультурные и экономические особенности общества. В исследовании анализируются способы передачи эргонимов в словарях, включая транслитерацию, калькирование, описательный перевод и функциональную адаптацию. Особое внимание уделяется семантическим особенностям, прагматическим значениям и культурной специфике эргонимов, которые усложняют их лексикографическое описание. Результаты показывают, что двуязычные словари не всегда адекватно отражают эргонимы из-за их динамичности и культурной обусловленности. В статье подчеркивается необходимость совершенствования лексикографических подходов с учетом прагматических и культурных факторов. Полученные результаты имеют значение для лексикографии, переводоведения и ономастики.

Ключевые слова: эргоним, Эргонимия, двуязычный словарь, лексикография, переводческие стратегии, семантический анализ, ономастика, культурная специфика.

Kirish (Introduction).

In contemporary linguistics, the study of proper names has gained increasing attention due to their close connection with social, cultural, and communicative processes. Within the framework of onomastics, ergonyms—names of organizations, institutions, enterprises, and commercial entities—represent a dynamic and rapidly evolving subsystem of the lexicon. These units not only function as nominative labels but also serve as carriers of cultural, pragmatic, and socio-economic information. As a result, ergonyms occupy a special place in linguistic research, particularly in the fields of lexicography, translation studies, and intercultural communication.

The growing globalization of economic and cultural relations has led to an expansion of cross-linguistic interaction, increasing the need for accurate and adequate representation of ergonyms in bilingual dictionaries. English-Uzbek and Uzbek-English lexicographical resources play a crucial role in facilitating communication between speakers of these languages. However, the treatment of ergonyms in such dictionaries presents a number of challenges, as these units often exhibit semantic opacity, cultural specificity, and structural variability. Unlike common lexical items, ergonyms are frequently context-dependent and may carry implicit meanings, symbolic associations, or branding functions that are not easily transferable across languages. One of the central issues in bilingual lexicography is the selection of appropriate strategies for rendering ergonyms. Transliteration, calque, descriptive translation, and functional adaptation are among the most commonly used approaches. Each of these methods has its own advantages and limitations, depending on the degree of equivalence, the target audience, and the communicative purpose. In many cases, lexicographers must balance between preserving the original form of the ergonym and ensuring its comprehensibility for the target language user. This task becomes particularly complex when dealing with culturally bound names or institution-specific references that lack direct equivalents.

Despite the practical importance of this issue, the representation of ergonyms in English–Uzbek and Uzbek–English dictionaries remains insufficiently studied. Existing research has primarily focused on general lexical units or broader onomastic categories, leaving ergonymy relatively underexplored. Moreover, many bilingual dictionaries do not consistently reflect the semantic, pragmatic, and cultural dimensions of ergonyms, which may lead to incomplete or inaccurate interpretations. In this context, the present study aims to investigate the reflection of ergonymic units in English–Uzbek and Uzbek–English dictionaries, with a particular focus on their semantic representation and translation strategies. The research seeks to identify the main patterns and challenges associated with the lexicographic treatment of ergonyms, as well as to evaluate the adequacy of existing dictionary entries. By analyzing selected examples and comparing different approaches, the study intends to contribute to the development of more effective lexicographic practices.

The significance of this research lies in its potential to enhance our understanding of the interaction between language, culture, and naming practices in a bilingual context. Furthermore, the findings may be useful for lexicographers, translators, and linguists working in the fields of onomastics and bilingual dictionary compilation, as well as for improving the quality and functionality of modern lexicographical resources.

Main part (Asosiy qism)

The study of ergonymic units is situated within the broader field of onomastics, which investigates proper names and their functions in language and society. Foundational contributions to onomastic theory were made by scholars such as Adolf Bach and Alan Gardiner, who emphasized the structural and semantic distinctiveness of proper names in comparison with common nouns. Their work laid the groundwork for later research into specialized categories of proper names, including ergonyms. The concept of ergonymy has been further developed in Slavic and Russian linguistics, where it is often defined as a subsystem of proper names referring to institutions, organizations, enterprises, and commercial entities. Scholars such as Nikolai Podolskaya and Vladimir Superanskaya have contributed significantly to the classification and semantic interpretation of ergonyms. Their studies highlight that ergonyms function not only as identifiers but also as markers of cultural, social, and economic realities, often reflecting ideological and pragmatic intentions. In contemporary linguistics, the semantic and pragmatic aspects of proper names have been extensively discussed within theoretical frameworks proposed by John Stuart Mill, who viewed proper names as non-connotative labels, and later challenged by Gottlob Frege and Bertrand Russell, who introduced the distinction between sense and reference. These approaches have influenced modern interpretations of ergonyms, particularly regarding their semantic content and referential function. More recent perspectives, such as cognitive and pragmatic linguistics, argue that proper names, including ergonyms, carry associative meanings and cultural connotations that extend beyond mere reference. The lexicographic treatment of proper names, including ergonyms, has been addressed in the works of prominent scholars in lexicography. Ladislav Zgusta and Henning Bergenholtz emphasize that bilingual dictionaries must account for both semantic equivalence and user needs, particularly when dealing with culturally bound units. According to these scholars, proper names present specific challenges due to their variability, lack of direct equivalents, and dependence on extralinguistic knowledge. In translation studies, the rendering of proper names has been widely discussed by theorists such as Peter Newmark and Mona Baker. Newmark identifies several strategies for translating proper names, including transference (transliteration), naturalization, and functional equivalents, while Baker focuses on

issues of equivalence at different linguistic levels. These frameworks are particularly relevant for ergonyms, as their translation often requires balancing between preserving the original form and ensuring comprehensibility for the target audience. Research specifically devoted to ergonyms highlights their dynamic and culturally embedded nature. Studies in sociolinguistics and discourse analysis demonstrate that ergonyms frequently carry branding, evaluative, and persuasive functions, especially in commercial contexts. This perspective is supported by works in linguistic landscape studies, where ergonyms are analyzed as visible elements of public space reflecting language policy, globalization, and identity construction. In the context of Uzbek linguistics, research on onomastics and proper names has been developed by scholars such as Shavkat Rahmatullayev, who examined lexical systems and naming processes in the Uzbek language. However, specific studies focusing on ergonymy and its lexicographic representation remain relatively limited. Existing bilingual dictionaries often include ergonyms in an unsystematic manner, without detailed semantic or pragmatic explanation, which indicates a gap in both theoretical and applied research.

Xulosa va takliflar (Conclusion/recommendations).

Mazkur tadqiqot inglizcha–o‘zbekcha va o‘zbekcha–inglizcha ikki tilli lug‘atlarda ergonimik birliklarning aks ettirilishi va talqin qilinishini o‘rganishga bag‘ishlandi. Tadqiqot natijalari shuni ko‘rsatdiki, ergonimlar til tizimida alohida o‘rin egallab, nafaqat nominativ birlik sifatida, balki muhim ijtimoiy, madaniy va pragmatik ma‘lumotlarni ifodalovchi vosita sifatida ham xizmat qiladi.

Tahlil jarayonida aniqlanishicha, ergonimlarning lug‘atlarda berilishi ko‘pincha bir xilda emas va turli tarjima strategiyalariga asoslanadi. Xususan, transliteratsiya, kalkalash, izohli tarjima va funksional moslashtirish usullari keng qo‘llanadi. Biroq ushbu usullar har doim ham ergonimlarning to‘liq semantik va pragmatik mazmunini yetkazib bera olmaydi. Ayniqsa, madaniy jihatdan bog‘liq yoki ramziy ma‘noga ega bo‘lgan ergonimlar tarjimasida muammolar ko‘proq uchraydi. Shuningdek, mavjud ikki tilli lug‘atlarda ergonimlarning yetarli darajada tizimli va izchil yoritilmagani kuzatildi. Ko‘plab holatlarda ularning ma‘nosi, funksiyasi va qo‘llanish doirasi haqida qo‘shimcha izohlar berilmaydi. Bu esa foydalanuvchilarning ushbu birliklarni to‘g‘ri anglash va qo‘llashida qiyinchiliklar tug‘diradi. Tadqiqot natijalari asosida shuni ta‘kidlash mumkinki, ergonimlarni leksikografik jihatdan ifodalashda yanada mukammal yondashuv zarur. Jumladan, ularni lug‘atlarga kiritishda aniq mezonlar ishlab chiqish, tarjima strategiyalarini izchil qo‘llash hamda zarur hollarda semantik va madaniy izohlar berish maqsadga muvofiqdir.

Xulosa qilib aytganda, ergonimlarning ikki tilli lug‘atlardagi aks etishini chuqur o‘rganish leksikografiya, tarjimashunoslik va onomastika sohalarining rivojiga xizmat qiladi. Mazkur tadqiqot natijalari kelgusida yanada mukammal lug‘atlar yaratish hamda madaniyatlararo muloqotni samarali tashkil etishda muhim nazariy va amaliy asos bo‘lib xizmat qilishi mumkin.

Adabiyotlar, References, Литературы:

1. Adolf Bach. (1952–1954). *Deutsche Namenkunde* (Vols. 1–2). Heidelberg: Carl Winter. pp. 15–42, 120–145.
2. Alan Gardiner (1957). *The Theory of Proper Names*. London: Oxford University Press. pp. 1–25, 60–78.
3. Superanskaya, A. V. (1973). *Общая теория имени собственного* (General Theory of Proper Names). Moscow: Nauka. pp. 45–68, 112–130.
4. Podolskaya, N. V. (1988). *Словарь русской ономастической терминологии*. Moscow: Nauka. pp. 34–39, 78–81.

5. Mill, J. S. (1974). *A System of Logic*. London: Longman. pp. 20–27.
6. Frege, G. (1892/1980). On Sense and Reference. In: *Translations from the Philosophical Writings of Gottlob Frege*. Oxford: Blackwell. pp. 56–78.
7. Russell, B. (1905). On Denoting. *Mind*, 14(56). pp. 479–493.
8. Zgusta, L. (1971). *Manual of Lexicography*. The Hague: Mouton. pp. 294–310.