THEORETICAL BACKGROUND OF PROPER NAMES

Yashnarbekova Shahzoda

PhD student, Uzbekistan World Languages University

shahzoda.yashnarbekova.96@mail.ru

Abstract. The proper names play the main role in onomastics. In linguistics, and especially in the field of onomastics there has been a serious lack of reflection on the theoretical problems associated with proper names. A major difference between philosophers and linguists, centres on the understanding of the designative relation holding between proper names and single definite objects. The following article illustrates the different ideas and theories of different scholars.

Key words: onomastics, proper names, scholars, theories, logic, linguistics, nouns, connotative, denotative.

INTRODUCTION

Throughout the past century, proper nouns and anthroponyms were considered not only a linguistic topic but also related to logic and philosophy. In the past, logicians and philosophers also conducted scientific research on anthroponyms. According to logicians, nouns consist of proper nouns and common nouns. We can see the initial thoughts on this subject in the works of ancient scholars and philosophers.

The existence of proper nouns and their various types is considered a linguistic universal. No other class of nouns has been studied as thoroughly and deeply as proper nouns by various branches of linguistics and logic. In the 1930s, a specialized branch of linguistics that studies only proper nouns - onomastics - was also formed.

Currently, various studies in the field of onomastics are being conducted worldwide. There are international and national centers for the study of proper nouns, among which the International Centre of Onomastic Sciences regularly holds international onomastic congresses. The first of these was held in Paris in 1938, and the latest, the 23rd, took place in Toronto (Canada) in 2008. In Great Britain, the Society for Name

Studies in Britain and Ireland has been operating since 1962. This society has been publishing the "Nomina" journal annually since 1977. Similarly, the American Name Society was established in the USA in 1951 and has been publishing the "Names" journal since 1953. In Canada, the Canadian Society for the Study of Names has existed since 1967 and publishes the "Onomastica Canadiana" journal [Namenforschung, 1995]. As a result of the international activities of onomastologists, it became possible to publish comprehensive works such as "Namenforschung. Name Studies. Les noms propres" (1995). This work involved 250 authors from 45 countries.

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

Also, in Uzbekistan, in the last quarter of the last century, scientific and theoretical conferences on onomastics held in our republic played an important role in the development of the field. The conference materials were published in the form of several scientific collections under the title "Issues of Onomastics."

It is known that onomastics is a branch that studies any proper nouns, the history of their emergence and change, and Uzbek onomastics has become one of the most developed areas of linguistics since the second half of the last century. The field of onomastics summarizes any proper nouns and divides them into the following groups according to categories. In particular, anthroponymy is the proper names of people (names, surnames, patronymics, nicknames and pseudonyms), toponymy is the proper names of geographical objects, hydronymy is the proper names of water bodies and structures, theonymy is the names of gods, deities, religious and mythical figures and beings that arose on the basis of religious beliefs, mythonyms are the proper names of imaginary fictional images, zoonyms are the names given to animals, phytonymy is the proper names of

As a result of a number of large-scale scientific studies in the field of onomastics in Uzbek linguistics, various monographs, brochures, explanatory dictionaries, scientific articles, candidate and doctoral dissertations were written as a result of a number of large-scale scientific studies related to the field.

It is known that in linguistics, the issue of proper nouns is less studied than related nouns. The formation of such an attitude towards proper nouns is related to the following views on onomastic units in linguistics:

a) To consider proper nouns not a full-fledged word, but a symbolic sign, to understand them as having no lexical meaning, like related nouns, and not expressing a concept;

b) Failure to adequately assess the role of onomastic units as a linguistic unit and their functional aspects in speech;

c) The fact that the existing onomastic units in the language have not been fully studied and are not sufficiently scientifically evaluated;

d) The study of proper nouns is a complex process related to a number of fields, such as history, geography, ethnography, archaeology, and others;

e) The insufficient definition of the theoretical foundations of the study of proper nouns in linguistics.

One of the well-known English philosophers who conducted the first research on proper nouns is John Stuart Mill (1806-1874). John Stuart Mill's research theories are one of the most common theories in English linguistics. Although Mill was not known as a linguist, scientists were able to form the concept of a proper noun using his work on proper nouns. In his opinion, each name signifies some object. Proper nouns do not have any meaning, but they have a sign and feature that distinguishes the object (nouns) from each other. He believes that there is no connection between the signs and properties of proper nouns and their meaning, that is, they do not have a connotative meaning, but only have a denotative meaning. "Nouns have no connotative meaning, in short, they do not give any meaning."

The scientist divides nouns into two classes: connotative and non-connotative classes. Unlike connotative nouns, nouns that do not have a connotative meaning "do not express any attribute (uniqueness) about their designated objects and function as a denotative linguistic unit" (a theory that contradicts the scientist's opinion), "Nouns

that do not have a connotative meaning, in short, do not have any meaning" [J. Mill 1874, 32].

He does not agree with J. Mill's opinion that personal names do not have denotation and significance, and emphasizes that this opinion is "completely false." "Personal names are a sign that guides our thoughts towards a specific person. This sign, of course, means meaning."" 151]. According to the scientist, a proper noun has more meaning than a related noun, because even if a proper noun does not fully reflect all the characteristics of a person, it indicates a characteristic that characterizes a person from its meaning. In particular, personal names can provide partial information about a person's nationality, nature, profession, sometimes even if this information is not accurate.

Some of the theories of proper nouns by another English linguist, Nicolaisen, do not agree with John Stuart Mill. In his scientific work "Are there connotative meaning," in contrast to J. Mill's theory, he also emphasizes that proper nouns have connotative meanings. In his treatise, he quotes excerpts: "When we speak of a proper name, the names of Brown or Smith, or the name of a city, or York, in addition to these names, we certainly convey to the listener some meaning associated with these names." The author also emphasizes that extralinguistic factors in proper nouns also influence onomastic meaning. ("connotative proper names do exist, as a part of a socially, culturally, historically, and individually fashioned onomasticon") [Nicolaisen, 1978: 45, 47].

Another English linguist, Sir Alan Gardiner's book "The theory of proper names" also plays an important role in the research. He gives the following definition of proper nouns: proper name is a word or group of words recognized as indicating or tending to indicate the object or objects to which it refers by virtue of its distinctive sound alone, with out regard to any meaning possessed by that sound from the start, or acquired by it through association with the said object or objects.

The study of personal names from a social perspective is becoming increasingly popular. English scholar S. Liberson examines the factors and causes influencing the

choice of personal names, as well as issues related to the fashion of names. The linguist identifies several reasons related to this phenomenon. In particular, the image associated with the name; parents' ideas about what their children will be like in the future as the owner of a certain name; the acceptance of the name by others; popular names by the media; the opinion of parents about what a name is that corresponds to their social status; existing anthroponymic norms and standards [Lieberson, 2000: 24]. Here, we will cite the opinion of the Russian linguist A.V. Superanskaya on this topic: "It is generally recognized that in every language there is a special class of proper nouns that oppose related nouns." Another opinion concerning the proper noun is that "Professional nouns are a vivid mirror of every nation, their individual or general meanings are directly related to the history and culture of that nation."

DISCUSSION

According to the Belgian linguist Et Beussens, proper nouns are substitutes for other language units and do not have a specific meaning {Buyssens, 1938, 112}. Danish scientist Paul Kristofersen equates proper nouns to the number given to convicts. No matter how similar they are, the same number is not given. Identified by numbers, but not described. Also, the English name smith (smith) can be applied not only to people in this profession, but also to women. This is the unit that defines Mr. Smith, which consists of a sequence of sounds {Christophersen, 1939, 64}.

To determine the linguistic features of proper nouns, American scholar Russell compares proper nouns to specific descriptions (descriptions). Each name refers to a corresponding object, and if an object exists, it is defined by some specific description. Therefore, if the name gives the meaning of this object, a specific description will appear that defines this object. Therefore, a noun is always a hidden or abbreviated characteristic. A proper noun and description have not only a general referent, but also a general meaning. The meaning of a proper noun is formed together with the description and is expressed by the description itself. Therefore, proper nouns can also be replaced with descriptions that correspond to the extensive or modal context [Russell 1957, 92-103].

Some scholars support the theory of linguist K. Marx: "Names have nothing to do with the nature of the name associated with that name." "I may know a man's name, but it is natural that I have no knowledge of that man" [Marx, 1955, 107] quoted [Zvigentiev 1965, 483]

In his article "General Experience in the Theory of Lexicography," Russian linguist Sherba compares proper and related nouns to articles in French and defines proper nouns as a special name of a specific object with a certain semantic meaning [Sherba, 1974, 79].

In addition to the opinions and judgments that proper nouns are common nouns, some scientists have also put forward theories that proper nouns are not part of common nouns [Sharandin, 2001; Matveev, 2004; Coastes, 2005]. Proper nouns do not have lexical grammatical properties and do not belong to the general category of nouns, they most likely support the opinion of a special independent group of words with a specific categorical meaning [Sharandin, 2001, 122]. Another English scholar, Coates, believes that the theoretical word "name" can be completely separated from a noun. Referring to E.Hamp, he writes that the relationship between nouns and names is the result of Eurocentrism, based on morphological features. In most languages, nouns do not resemble proper nouns, as they have characteristics of verbs and adverbs [Hamp, 1956,348].

CONCLUSION

According to researchers, the logical approach to the study of proper nouns has become one of the most effective methods. According to this approach, the essence of proper nouns is revealed through comparison with common nouns and is often realized through contrast. As a result of their comparison in contrast, it became clear that the main distinguishing feature of proper nouns and related nouns is their content and specific lexical meaning.

Theories arising within the framework of the logical direction in language, in general, are distinguished by the fact that they emphasize the uniqueness of proper nouns, their difference from related nouns, and therefore their shortcomings.

REFERENCE:

1. Buyssens E. Du nom propre et du nom commun [Text] / Ren Yuen Chao. – Berkeley - Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1968. 847 p.

2. Christophersen P. The articles. A study of Their Theory and Use in English {Text} / P.Chistophersen. Copenhagen – London, 1939. – 245p.

3. Coates, R. A New Theory of Proper Hood [Text]/ R.Coates// Proceedings of the 21st International Congress of Onomastic sciences. Uppsala 19-24 August 2002/ - Uppsala: Sprak – och folkminnesinstitutet, 2005. Vol.1. – P.127-137.

4. Gardiner. The theory of proper names. London, 1954

5. Hamp E.P. Review of Ernst Pulgram Theory of names. [Text] . -H.W.B. Joseph. -Ed.2. -Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1946. -410 p.

6. John Mill. System of Logic 1874, p30

7. Joseph, H. W. B. An Introduction to Logic [Text] / H. W. B. Joseph. Ed. 2. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1946. – 410 p.

8. Lieberson S. A Matter of Taste: How names, Fashions and Culture Change. – New Haven, L.: Yale University Press, 2000. – 334p .

9. Nicolaisen W.F.H. Are there connotative Names? // Names. Vol.26, 1978. – P 47

10. Верещагин Е.М., Костомаров В.Г. Язык и Культура. Три лингвострановедческих концепции:лексического фона, речеповеденческих тактик и сапиентемы. – М.: Индрик, 2005. – 1040 с.

11. Звегинцев. В.А. История языкознания веков в очерках и извлечениях [Текст] в 2 ч. – М. Просвещение 1965.-Ч.2 -469с

Матвеев А.К. Апология имени [Текст] /А.К.Матвеев// Вопросы ономастики. - Екатеринбург: Изд-во Уральского университета, 2004. -№1. - С.7-13.

12. Суперанская А.В. Общая теория имени собственного. М., 1973, с.56

13. Шарандин, А.Л. Курс лекций по лексической ономастике. Об отношении русских имен к греческим в русском языке XV-XVII вв. [Текст] / В/К/Чичагов. // Вопросы языкознания. - 1957. - №6. С. 64-80

14. Щерба, Л.В. Языковая система и речевая деятельность: Опит общий теории лексикографии [Текст] / Л.В.Щерба. - Л:Наука, 1974. - С. 265-304.

15. UMAROVA, F. (2024). USING ART PEDAGOGY METHODS IN TEACHING ENGLISH TO PRESCHOOLERS. News of the NUUz, 1(1.6.1), 225-227. https://doi.org/10.69617/nuuz.v1i1.6.1.3791

16. Yaqubov, O. (2024). IMPLEMENTING INTERACTIVE LEARNING METHODS REQUIREMENTS OF TIME. *SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL JOURNAL "SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE"*, *22*(2), 95-97.

17. qizi Teacher, B. E. M. (2024). THE TERMINOLOGICAL DIVERSITY OF AMERICAN ENGLISH VARIETIES. *International journal of advanced research in education, technology and management*, *3*(6), 66-77.