SEMASIOLOGICAL AND SEMANTIC CHARACTERISTICS OF PROPER NOUNS

Olimova Khurshida Vaydillayevna*

*English Teacher,
Karshi State University
Karshi City, Republic of UZBEKISTAN
Email id: khurshida_olimova@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The article deals with the study of Proper Nouns, whichserve to express such meanings as action, state, process, quality of things andsign.It is known that the wealth of the dictionary is in its composition. The dictionary consists of different groups; it forms a complex of units that are very different from each other. In this complex, Proper Nouns also have a special place and position. The ***actuality*** *of the theme is that the Proper Nouns form a less studied group than other types of dictionary units. The* ***object*** *of the article is the semasiological and semantic characteristics of Proper Nouns. Many questions arising from the fact that linguistics did not fully develop the principles of analyzing individual spheres of study of Proper Nouns still need a specific answer. In particular, the current problems of linguistics include semasiological indicators of Proper Nouns, their grammatical categories, and description of meaning and definition of tasks when creating a text. The* ***aim*** *of the article is providing general information about the Proper Nouns, these masiological peculiarities of their verbalization, the definition of the place of Proper Nounsin the dictionary ofthe 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 grammar of linguistics.*

Results (Findings): *The analysis of the examples presented in the article shows that a large-scale study of groups of nouns with Proper Nouns determines the prospect of a detailed study of the vocabulary system, the semantics of vocabulary units, and their communicative-pragmatic capabilities. The study of linguistic units from the point of view of an anthropocentric approach based on the dialectic of "possibility and reality" plays a theoretical role in clarifying certain abstract states in linguistic structures. The results obtained will help to consistently study important issues of general and private linguistics and find their solutions.*

Conclusion: *Summing up the results, it can be concluded that in the language system, it is required that all vocabulary units have semantic, syntactic and morphological characters. Therefore, as long as the role, essence of words in the system is determined, it will be necessary to pay attention to their same three signs. In addition, in the classification regarding the categorization of words, these signs are summarized.*

INTRODUCTION

When dividing nouns into a separate category, scientists recommend taking into account the semiological sign and semantic properties of words. Most of the scientists are in favor of choosing "subjectivity" or "substantiality" as the general meaning of nouns.

But nouns also serve to express other meanings such as action (play, run, study), state (sickness, sleep, depression), process (asking, talking, drawing), quality of things, sign (beauty, length, darkness).

It is difficult to determine the grammatical meaning of word groups due to the fact that they are interchangeable. Among other things, the meaning of "subjectivity" is interpreted by some as a lexical meaning, while others prefer to assign it to grammatical or logical categories [2; 12 etc.].Some do interpret "subjectivity" as both lexical and grammatical meanings [3].

LITERATURE REVIEW

It is known that lexemes such as *love, beauty, freedom, greatness*refer to abstract concepts. Similarly, nouns such as *breakage, removal, acceptance, rapine* express action, not independent objects.The fact that nouns, in addition to being the owner of a sign, i.e., substance, can also designate an abstracted action, sign, or relationship is a common, universal phenomenon for all languages, and nouns with such a meaning acquire the characteristic of grammatical object.Nouns in this group participate in the sentence as a unit expressing the meaning of the subject.

According to the American linguist W. Chafe, these features of nouns ensure the possibility of forming syntagmatic lines of "subject-action" (subject, object, means of action) and "subject-sign" (such as the quality, dependence of the subject) [1: 63.]

The meaning of the nouns in this group is formed not only by naming concepts, but also by logical adaptation, which creates the basis for various derivational changes. As an example, the following series of derivational transformations can be given:

a) Morphological derivation: to kill - killer, to intend – intention, to desire – a desire (object noun); to mix – mixer, to cut – cutter (instrumental noun);

b) Lexical derivation: to read a document – the document reads – a reading of the document;

c) Syntactic derivation: children are happy - happy children - happy people.

The given examples testify that nouns have the ability to perform two different semiological functions, they are not only naming things, but also describing them.

 The assumption of these tasks by a single unit causes the formation of unique predicative and attributive combinations. Linguist A.Rakhimov, relying on the opinions of Russian scientists Yu.S.Stepanov, L.N.Murzin, believes that the occurrence of intercategory migration or paradigmatic changes is not related to the phenomenon of linguistic derivation [11: 146; 14: 142; 7: 47].

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Despite the fact that linguists have long been busy with the issue of defining the semantic signs of nouns and their semantic grouping, the opinions expressed in this regard are different, and the standards for separating meaning fragments often do not match each other.

While differentiating word groups traditionally relies on three main criteria - the semantic nature of the word, the function it performs and the place it occupies in the structure of the sentence, linguists work on the basis of an incompatible principle in the internal division of noun groups:

1) Determination of the objective nature of objects-phenomena in the world;

2) The type of meaning of the linguistic unit.

Using these principles, the first semantic classification of nouns takes the form of "concrete" and "abstract" nouns. At the moment, the distinguishing factor between the names of these groups is not clear, the boundary between them is relative.

Some propose to choose their nominative meaning, which occurs in the process of naming reality, as a criterion for the distribution of nouns into one or another group.

Researchers from another group argue that the study of word semantics based on the separation of denotative meaning is not enough for their linguistic analysis and that denotative meaning is more related to the logical content of linguistic units [10: 199-159; 4].

Of course, it is a very difficult task to uniformly describe the semantic features of the thousands of nouns that exist in the language system, as no reliable standard and method has been created. The difficulty of this task is also explained by the fact that the relations of the represented objects in reality have a multifaceted and perfect nature.

When talking about the semantic properties of nouns, first of all, it is necessary to distinguish between their place among nominative units and the denotative meanings activated by their participation in speech structures.

In the first case, denotation is a generalized concept of an object (or a class of objects) in reality as an object of naming, and in the second case, denotation is the relationship of a linguistic sign with an object in the speech process, that is, its connection with its referent [9; 6].

The signifier, which is another organizational part of the semantic structure of linguistic units, appears in different forms:

1. Signification - in contrast to denotation, appears as the complete content of a certain concept. For example, in the naming of singular or concrete things, such as *city, wind, book, village, rain, book*.

2. In the naming of concepts that are highly abstracted, generalized and do not contradict the concept of objectivity: *coldness, calmness, darkness, activity, maturity*, etc.

3. In the linguistic realization of generalized, abstract concepts representing categories of thinking: *event, quality, quantity, etc*.

4. Terms related to various fields, metalinguistic concepts [5: 34-40].

In lexical units with a narrow conceptual content, the concept of objectivity, that is, the denotation, is of course more important than the signifier. Such lexical units have a denotative meaning as they fulfill the nominative function. If the signifier that occurs in the conceptual relationship prevails over the denotation, the linguistic sign has a purely significant meaning and serves to name abstract concepts.

At the same time, since the language system and reality do not distinguish strictly limited subject areas, the classification of words into one or another type creates great difficulties. Nevertheless, it is necessary to divide the nouns into semiological-semantic groups.

Usually, words with a denotative meaning are included in the group of concrete nouns, while words expressing a significant and significant-denotative meaning are included in the group of abstract nouns [15; 13]. Among the nouns in the first group are words that perform two different functions, that is, nominative and significant. The meaning of the nouns in this group is based on the concept of the object, which is the object of expression, and the concept of the signifier, which expresses the different characteristics of the objects.

The main part of the vocabulary of the language system is nouns that can be perceived by the sense organ. Concrete or other nouns of this type, which have received the term "certain", can be divided into a number of thematic groups in relation to the differences in their categorical features:

1. Name of the substance: *water, gold, sand, silver*, etc.

2. Personal name: *girl, teen-ager, mother, father,* etc.

3. Item name: *pencil, book, spoon, carpet, key*, etc.

4. Plant name: *tree, tulip, plant, root*, etc.

5. Place name: *village, city, desert, mountain, valley*, etc.

6. Quantity name: *tone, kilo, couple*, etc.

7. Organization and institution name: *school, office, shop, market*, etc.

8. Name of time: *day, season, morning, evening, night*, etc.

These thematic groups are divided into smaller groups. For example, personal descriptive nouns are divided into lexical-semantic groups:

a) A group of nouns describing a person in terms of age: *girl, boy, teenager, teen, baby,* etc.;

b) Lexical-semantic group describing a person in terms of kinship: *mother, father, grandmother, sister, brother, father, sister*, etc.;

c) A group of words describing a person in terms of profession: *worker, reader, teacher, waitress, farmer, broker, reaper*, etc.;

d) Words describing a person in terms of place of residence: *British, westerner, muscovite, Japanese, Pakistani,* etc.;

e) Words describing a person in terms of appearance: *hump, blind, fat,*etc.;

f) Words that describe a person in terms of his mental state: *foolish, stupid, chatter,* etc.;

g) A lexical-spiritual group describing a person socially: *rich, poor, greedy, stingy*.

RESULTS

Abstract nouns express the same or similar quality that exists in different things in the form of an allegory. For example, if the abstract quality sign of *apple, melon, sugar, honey* is "sweetness", then the general sign contained in a certain object in the abstract noun *sweetness* is given as an allegory.

 Therefore, the difference between specific and abstract nouns is not only in their representation of a real (book, apple, door) or imaginary (love, romance, dessert) general single event, but also in the way in which the meaning of the sign and adjective is interpreted.

When the expressed field of subjectivity, i.e., denotation, fully forms the lexical meaning of the word, the grouping of nouns in relation to categorical symbols would be sufficient to describe their semiological properties.

But the set of categorical semantic signs, rather than determining the nominative value of the word, forms its syntagmatic possibilities. For this reason, semantic grouping is important for determining whether nouns are combined with units belonging to other word groups (eg, adjectives and verbs).

In addition, the lexical meanings of nouns never lose their denotative-significant properties, and the difference between denotations is manifested as semantic synonyms, forming paradigmatic relations. Synonymous relationships are often expressed in the use of different linguistic means in different languages. For example: *tree: willow, maple, birch-tree, pine-tree, fir-tree, etc.*

Also, not all concrete, countable, inanimate object nouns are equally "concrete" or "certain". The analysis of subject and logical connection of nouns is necessary to determine only their direct nominative meaning. The semantic derivation possibilities of nouns are not the same in different groups [8: 116; 11: 100]. For example, the names of plants, structures, and tools, on the one hand, are close to terms, and on the other hand, they resemble proper nouns (compare: nuclear physics – nuclear physics laboratory; oil and gas institute, design center, and etc.).

Since nouns naming parts of the body, clothes, and food are widely used, their semantic content also expands. For example, lexical units such as *eye, head, hand, month, heart* refer to concrete, specific things in relation to nominative meanings, participate in various metaphorical and metonic processes, and they start to express abstract artificial meaning.

DISCUSSIONS

In the group of nouns under analysis, the words naming natural phenomena and separate, single objects in reality (such as the sun, moon, sky, universe, wind, rain) and the words expressing the physical actions of objects (such as sound, whistle, light, noise) are worthy to be described separately.

The difference of these nouns from other groups is seen in the uniqueness of the denotation. The denotation arising on the basis of the perception of single things-events corresponds to the significative part of the meaning structure, because in such nominative activity the denotation repeats the concept of separate, single events. For this reason, the meaning of these types of

nouns has a significant-denotative nature and they can be conditionally called "concrete-abstract nouns".

The scope of use of words such as *thing, way, fact, point, line, base, article, side, object, matter* is wide.

Words having wide meaning represent some common sign characteristic of a number of objects and are on the verge of losing their semantic essence. These nouns, approaching other semiological groups, sometimes perform the function of a pronoun. But we have to admit that the nouns in this group are kept in a significative-denotative form to their referent in the process of speech activity [16; 17].

As an example, we can compare the combinations, which contain nouns with a wide meaning of this type:

To arrange things

To hare things straight out "to fix the situation";

To sell things

Things are what they are.

Although the use of the noun *thing* in the cited compounds gives an idea of their active meaning (compare: personal things, memorable *things), but the referent of this linguistic unit is clear only in the context. For example: Those are things we cannot alter* means "This is something we cannot change (situation)"; *Take the thing away!*With the meaning, "Lose it!"

CONCLUSIONS

1. Nouns denoting inanimate objects and substances are few in number and have the same meaning. The denotative basis of nouns in this group is the imagination and understanding of indivisible substances and materials.

2. Most of the nouns in this series are close to the term series, but some words such as *water, iron, steel, gold, silver* have the opportunity to be used on a wide scale as a result of meeting various metaphorical and metonymic movements.

3. It is known that nouns are divided into groups of singular nouns and collective nouns according to whether they represent one type of object or a group of objects in the form of singular number.

4. Collective nouns, in turn, are divided into two classes according to the characteristics of the denotations: 1) the denotation consists of an image of a group of individuals distinguished by some common characteristics such as: *family, party, brigade*; 2) denotation - a general concept that does not describe expression: *poverty, freedom*, etc.

USED LITERATURE:

1.   Chafe W. Meaning and the structure of language. –Chicago, 1970. –P. 63.

2.   Есперсен О. Философия грамматики. –М., 1958.

3.   Huddleston R. Introduction the Grammar of English. –Cambridge: CUP, 1995.

4. Keller R. A Linguistic Theory of Sign. –Oxford: OUP, 1998.

5. Бегматов Э., Неъматов Ҳ., Расулов Р. Лексик микросистема ва унинг тадқиқи муаммоси // Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти, 1989, 6-сон. –Б.34-40.

6. Миртожиев М. Ўзбек тили семасиологияси. –Т.: Мумтоз сўз, 2010.

7. Мурзин Л.Н. Основы дериватологии. –Пермь, 1984. –С.47.

8. Никитевич В.М. Основы номинативной деривации. Минск, 1985. –С. 116.

9. Никитин В.М. Основы лингвистической теории значения. –М., 1988.

10. Нурмонов А. Лексеманинг мазмуний мундарижаси // А.Нурмонов. Танланган асарлар. –Т.: Академнашр, 2012. –Б. 199-159.

11. Раҳимов А. Лексик ва семантик деривация муаммолари. –Т., 2011. Б. 146.

12. Слюсарева Н.А. Проблемы функциональной морфологии. –М., 1986.

13. СобировА. Ўзбек тили лексик қатламини системалар системаси тамойили асосида тадқиқ қилиш. –Т., 2004.

14. Степанов Ю.С. Основы общего языкознания. М.: Наука, 1975. –С. 142;

15. Уфимцева А.А. Лексическое значение. –М.: Наука, 1986.

16. Ҳакимова М. Семасиология. –Тошкент, 2008.

17. Palmer F.R. Semantics. A new outline. - М., 1982.