

DISCURSIVE-PRAGMATIC NATURE OF ANTHROPONYMS

Bakhtiyorova Maftuna Bakhtiyorovna*

*Student,
National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek,
Tashkent city, Republic of UZBEKISTAN
Email id: maftunabakhtiyorovaphd@gmail.com

DOI: 10.5958/2278-4853.2022.00222.1

ABSTRACT

*The article deals with the problems of anthroponyms in literary works. The actuality of the theme is that the onomastic concepts are analyzed as components of cognitive structures, i.e., cognitive units in the article. The object of the article is the theory of anthroponyms. The aim of the article is also providing general information about the origin of proper names, the peculiarities of the linguistic verbalization of anthroponyms, the definition of known carriers of proper names and the semantics of onyms in the language. **Methods:** such methods as descriptive method, method of componential analyses were used to prove the informativeness of the topic relied on the studies of well-known scientists in the field of linguistics. **Results (Findings):** The analysis of the examples presented in the article shows that onym reveals one of the most ancient mysteries and enigmas of mankind, because in the field of proper names the laws of language are interpreted separately. In addition, the proper noun serves as a distinctive cultural, time, ethnic symbol that can respond to changes in the interests of society and appropriately reflect the ideas and views that exist in society. **Conclusion:** Summing up the results, it can be concluded that the set of proper names in one language or another will vary at different stages of the historical development of a particular society, the representatives of which may be repeated in onyms of different societies or different languages that live far from each other in space and time.*

KEYWORDS: Concept, Linguistic, Verbal, Conceptosphere, Semiotics, Onym, Semantics, Function, Symbol, Anthropocentrism, Theory, Ethnic Character.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Воробьёв В.В. Лингвокультурология: теория и методы. – Москва: Изд-во Рос. ун-та дружбы народов. 1997. – 331 с.
 2. Гришаева Л.И., Цурикова Л.В. Введение в теорию межкультурную коммуникацию. – Москва: Академия, 2007. – 336 с.
 3. Есперсен О. Философия грамматики. – Москва: Изд-во иностранной литературы, 1958. – 404 с.
 4. Маматов А. Э. Лингвомаданиятшуносик: лингвокультурема ва логоепистема// Хорижий филология. – Самарқанд: СамДЧТИ, 2015. – №1. 9-16 б.
-

5. Махмудов Н.М. Тилнинг мукамал тадқиқи йўллари излаб//Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти. – Тошкент: 2012. № 5. 50-55 б.
6. Руденко Д. И. Собственные имена в контексте современных теорий референции // Вопросы языкознания. –Москва, 1988. - №3. - С. 55–68.
7. Сафаров Ш. Лингвистика дискурса. – Челябинск, 2018. – 315 с.
8. Суперанская А В. Общая теория имени собственного. - Москва: Логос, 2004. - С. 141.
9. Суперанская А. В. Общая теория имени собственного / отв. ред. А.А. Реформатский. - Москва: Книжный дом «ЛИБРОКОМ», 2009. –365 с.
10. Топоров В.Н. Миф. Ритуал. Символ. Образ: Исслед. в области мифопоэтического. - Москва: Прогресс, 1995. 624 с.
11. Уфимцева А.А. Лексическая номинация (Первичная номинация) // Языковая номинация. Виды наименований. –Москва.1977. – 359 с.
12. Юсупов У.Қ. Теоретические основы сопоставительной лингвистики. – Ташкент: Фан, 2007. – 125с.
13. Wilmet, M. Nom propre et ambiguïté /M.Wilmet //Langue française. – 1991. -№ 92. – P. 113-127;