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

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 in formativeness 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.*

INTRODUCTION

The concepts of linguistic and conceptual view of the world are distinguished in cognitive linguistics research, and their inconsistencies are recognized in all research, while emphasizing the generality and breadth of the concept in the conceptual view of the world. The conceptual view of the world is broader and richer than the linguistic view of the world as a specific set of images composed of concepts, because information about the world is encoded in the human mind not only verbally but also nonverbally. Therefore, the conceptual view of the world is more complex than the linguistic view of the world, because the national language "lives" within the conceptosphere [2:101].

Addressing different aspects of people's interactions with specific names provides a basis for adopting a cognitive-semiotic approach to their study. According to this approach, onyms are understood as aninstrument. Onomastic concepts are understood as components of knowledge structures, containing the most general information about the origin of names, identify the specific features of their use in language, the specific carriers of nouns, and the semantics of onyms in language.

As language units, onyms perform the following important functions: nominative, identifying, and differentiating. In addition to the basic functions above mentioned, scientists highlight the following secondhierarchical functions too: social, emotional, cumulative, "rank" function, expressive, aesthetic, stylistic. As a material idea, onym always has an inner meaning that cannot be explained and cannot be read explicitly. Researchers have noted the symbolism and enigma of the proper nouns, the people's belief in the legendary power of the proper nouns, its ability to predict the fate of its owner. This is explained by the not only declining but also re-emerging interest in onomasics and onomasiology in the modern anthropocentric-oriented linguistic format, since the anthropocentric approach specific to the modern stage of linguistic development opens up new perspectives for the study of onyms.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Defining the beginning of a person in language as a priority of linguistic research led to the formation of human theoryas a linguistic entity in the 80s and 90s of the XX century, which manifests itself in texts that was created and being created in common space and related to the concepts of the world landscape, the linguistic landscape of the world, the linguistic-authorial landscape of the world. Special mention should be made of the research of the Russian scientists Yu.S.Stepanov, V.I.Karasik, V.V.Krasnykh, S.G.Ter-Minasova, V.V.Maslova, N.F.Alefirenko and Uzbek scientists D.U.Ashurova, Sh.S.Safarov, N.M.Mahmudov, A.M.Mamatov, U.K.Yusupov, D.Khudaybergenova and others who have conducted research in this area.

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.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. For example, Marat is the name of a famous historical figure during the Great French Revolution and the name of a Kazakh man, Barak is the name of an American president and the name of a Kazakh sultan. Such similarities (coincidences) can be explained by a variety of reasons – from random coincidences to the fact that the name or honor of a person or event is intentional.

One of the main problems encountered in the process of studying anthroponyms is their lexical meaning. The more debates there are to date, the more ideas remain. Opinions expressed by foreign researchers on the problem of the meaning of anthroponymic units are divided into three main groups – asemantics, the idea that onyms have no meaning, semantics, the idea that onyms have a broad meaning, and the idea that combines the features of both, as if "reconciling" the

first and second views.According to the first concept, onyms are in no way connected with the expression of significant of constant concepts, and onym means nothing, because it does not say anything about the characteristics of an object with a proper name, only distinguishes it from other corresponding onyms. Onyms are not associated with the expression of constant concepts and are unable to carry information about the objects they represent. Currently, this approach is being critically evaluated, for example, D.I. Rudenko states in one of his works that the logical category called "nonsense nouns" cannot be used in language because "nonsense noun" does not have the status of a natural language.[6: 55–68.].

The second direction is based on the fact that onymcan only have full meaning when used in speech, in a specially selected speech environment, and in a particular speech environment. According to some foreign linguists, onomastic semantics is a completely special type of semantics, which includes both subjective and socially conditioned factors, as well as the emotions that arise in the referent's speech.[12: 365].

Proponents of the third direction claim that names have meaning in both language and speech.(Kleiber. 1992; Ducrot. 1989; Damourette.1970). French linguists P.Siblot and S.Leroy, based on empirical observations on the creation of nouns or neologisms from proper nouns, conclude that proper nouns have the ability to form meaning in speech and when used outside the main meaning:"In the absence of a semantic field, it is impossible to describe the expression of a proper noun by means of fixed schemas(Siblot, Leroy 2000: 91). According to V.V.Vorobyov, proper nouns have a semantic content consisting of denotative, signifiable and structural components of meaning [1: 197].

LITERATURE REVIEW

In the last few decades, this view of the problem of onym meaning has developed due to the use of component analysis methods in onym semantics and the use of a dialectical approach to general and specific, abstract and explicit, social and individual ratios.

The process of investigating the discursive-pragmatic nature of anthroponyms is, of course, based on the existence of meaning in anthroponyms. We consider the anthroponym semantics to be broader than the appellate meaning. The proper noun has a complex structure consisting of linguistic and extralinguistic components. Besides that, the linguistic component includes both stylistic value and features of use in language and speech, as well as other elements. The extralinguistic component includes the complex associations of the name, the degree of popularity of the name holder, the encyclopedic information about the name and its owner, the ideological orientation of the name, and so on. In the semantics of anthroponyms we distinguish three main parts: denotativeis interrelated with denotat, that is the object that determines the nature of the naming; signifier is indirectly interrelated withsignifat, i.e. the concept embodied in the anthroponym; pragmaticconsists of an infinite number of subjective complementary meanings and associations that arise on the basis of objective information. For example, the name *Alfred*: denotative component of semantics - subject, male; signifiable component – live creature, human being; pragmatic component – *AlfredJohnson*, or just any person known to the addressee and all information that anyone may know about him.

Such a horizontal section of the continuum of names of one or another language can be recognized by an objective indicator of the cultural, ethnic language connection of this or that

period. When taken in a vertical section, the onomastics of this or that language reflects the history of its development, as well as the history of the people who created this language. There are also cases of recurrence of obsolete names over time.

RESULTS

Thus, the onomastic environment of a given language isinextricably linked to, firstly, language as a means of communication for invids who speak that language; secondly, the culture and history of the people who created it. It follows that the proper noun consists, firstly, of a linguistic content, secondly, of an ethnocultural content, and thirdly, of an aesthetic component which embodies in itself a sign of noble sound.

They all are inextricably linked, acting as a specific subject name of a particular onym, and it exhibits a specific feature that gives rise to this or that association. It is this association (linking with a concept) that influences the choice of name when a child is born, when choosing a firm, product name, and so on. This is especially important when choosing names for fictional heroes, historical figures, public figures, and other individuals who can be conditionally called "celebrities," that is, individuals who are known to a wide range of personalities. The concept created as a result of this relationship has been introduced into linguistics through the term "precedent name".

DISCUSSIONS

As a linguistic unit, the proper name is primarily a sign with a twofold nature: meaningful and comprehensible, and debates continue to this day as to whether the last sign is present in lexical-sense onyms and what character it has. It is well known that in the theory of proper nouns the presence or absence of meaning in onym is one of the most complex issues, and as a result, there are concepts within them that exclude the meaning of proper nouns. According to one of them, proper nouns are deprived of their independent meaning. Scientists like O.F.Yespersen, A.V.Superanskaya, A.A. Ufimtseva are proponents of this approach. Continuing this tradition, A.V.Suslova noted that "they are semantically limited, have no special meaning and do not express a concept"; according to another view, the meaning of onyms is considered incomplete or lying within the framework of other information, and according to the third, their semantic meaning is more than that of common nouns [3, 8, 9, 11]. In our view, proper nouns have a lexical meaning and, in general, perform an identifying function, i.e., indicate that the name holder belongs to a particular group of objects present in the environment and at the same time distinguish it in this line (a differentiating function as noted above).

CONCLUSIONS

As we can see, the proper nouns as a linguistic unit contains certain fragments that define the national landscape of the world:

1. Propernounmeans cultural-historical, axiological, religious and fragments;at the same time, the amount of linguocultural information is determined by the breadth of worldview for each individual onym, the level of language training of the recipient, the degree of development of "language perception".

2. Allthe features of onym are very important and are becoming more and more relevant in the field of artistic naming.

3. The peculiarity of artistic communication is that each word has a separate, context-dependent meaning and the functional load of the anthroponym in the literary text is increasing because it is one of the most important means of creating an literary image.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Воробьёв В.В.Лингвокультурология: теория и методы. – Москва: Изд-во Рос. ун-та дружбы народов. 1997. – 331с

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. Лингвомаданиятшунослик: лингвокультурема ва логоэпистема// Хорижий филология. – Самарқанд: СамДЧТИ, 2015. – №1. 9-16 б.

5. Махмудов Н.М. Тилнинг мукаммал тадқиқи йўлларини 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. - No3. - 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. СуперанскаяА. В. Общаятеорияименисобственного / 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. Видынаименований. –Москва.1977. – 359 с.

12. Юсупов У.Қ. Теоретические основы сопоставительной лингвистики.   – Ташкент: Фан, 2007. – 125с.

13. Wilmet, M. Nompropreetambiguïté /M.Wilmet //Languefrançaise. – 1991. -№ 92. – P. 113-127;