



## SEMANTIC PECULIARITIES OF PROPER NAMES IN MODERN RUSSIAN GRAMMAR

**Khusanova Salomat Khushbakovna<sup>1</sup>,**  
**Dzhumaeva Zaytuna Khazratkulovna<sup>2</sup>**

teacher of the Denau Institute of Pedagogy and Entrepreneurship,  
4<sup>th</sup> year student of the Denau Institute of Pedagogy and  
Entrepreneurship

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6558858>

### ARTICLE INFO

Received: 01<sup>st</sup> April 2022

Accepted: 10<sup>th</sup> April 2022

Online: 14<sup>th</sup> April 2022

### KEY WORDS

Language, system, word  
classes, proper names,  
modern Russian  
grammar, functioning,  
society, theories,  
sociological components.

### ABSTRACT

*This article discusses the issues and semantic meanings of onyms and proper names in modern Russian grammar. These types are considered by the great scholars of modern Russian grammar. Names, proper as the main motive in speech.*

In recent years, interest in the problems of anthroponymy has noticeably grown. This is due to the fact that it is proper names, due to the peculiarities of their development and functioning, that reflect the public consciousness in different periods of the life of society more fully and specialized than any other classes of words in the language. Attention to the system of proper names is also determined by the special position of homonyms as words that develop according to the laws of the language, but in addition to the linguistic component, they also include ethnographic, historical, sociological components.

Study of the specific meaning of a proper name correlate with the “word-concept in proper names” problem, which until has not been unambiguously resolved so far. This problem has a long history history and causes undying interest in it among modern linguists. There are several points of view on the “word-

concept in proper names” relationship, the authors of which represent diametrically opposed concepts: the assertion of some linguists that proper names do not express a concept raises objections from others, who prove the presence of the category “concept” in onyms. Arguing the position that ISs have the ability to express a concept, F. I. Buslaev wrote: “... proper names, by which we mean an indivisible representation, are the same general concepts as common nouns” [1, p. 6-7]. This point of view was shared by A. A. Potebnya, L. V. Shcherba and others. The opinion of K. S. Aksakov that “the proper name ceases to matter and becomes only a designation of the subject” [2, p. 58], supported by V. V. Vinogradov, L. A. Bulakhovsky, A. A. Reformatsky, modern Soviet linguists O. S. Akhmanova, O. D. Mitrofanova, V. N. Mikhailova, V. I. Chernyshev and others The discussion between O. Jespersen and J. S. Mill can



serve as an example of the argumentation of diametrically opposed opinions on the issue. O. Jespersen in "Philosophy of Grammar" [3, p. 76-77].

In the work "The Theory of Proper Names", the English scientist A. Gardiner clarifies and develops the interpretation of J. S. Mill: "The proper asserts that from a linguistic point of view there is no clear difference between onyms and appellatives, "since the difference between them is quantitative, not qualitative" . Arguing with J.S. Mill, who believes that "proper names are devoid of concomitant meanings", that "the only names of objects that are devoid of connotation are proper names; ...these names have no meaning" [3, p. 70]. O. Jespersen writes that Mill and his followers paid too much attention to the dictionary meaning of the name and "very little attention to its contextual meaning in the specific situation in which it is pronounced or written." O. Jespersen concludes that the word "in each individual sentence has one specific meaning, which is clear from the context and situation." [3, p. 71] .

A name is a word or group of words whose specific name is recognized as an identification, and which fulfills, or tends to fulfill, this purpose by means of a distinctive sound, regardless of any meaning inherent in this sound..." [5, p. 73].

The presence of such different points of view, as noted by A. V. Superanskaya, "is largely due to the difference in the starting points and methods of their creators, as well as the fact that the search was carried out in diametrically opposite directions" [6, p. 88]. E.F. Danilina, analyzing the concepts of theorists of onomastics, indicates that linguists, when determining the meaning of

the onym, did not take into account the duality of the significative function of names in the spectrum of language and speech: "they considered names at different levels: linguistic (Mill) and speech, or contextual (Jespersen ), - and, naturally, came to different conclusions" [7, p. eight].

Considering the "appellative-onym" ratio, many linguists argue that there is a "line of demarcation" between these categories [8, p. thirteen]. E. Kurilovich writes: "Instead of simply designating, as all common nouns, he calls his own name" [9, p. 252]. The same opinion is shared by V. A. Nikonov, pointing out that a proper name, when naming, individualizes an object, and a common noun, when naming, does not individualize, but singles it out as a species from a genus [10, p. 89].

V. Tashitsky, on the other hand, claims that "there is no significant difference there is no difference between onomastic and common words" [11, p. 7]. His supports I. V. Muromtsev, pointing out that "proper names express concepts, but to a different extent and somewhat peculiarly: to a certain extent, their expression of concepts can be correlated with the manifestation similar quality in pronouns and some other nominal parts speech with a non-derivative and etymologically opaque basis", and further:

"Following O. Jespersen, we believe that the phenomenon of the transition of appellatives into proper nouns and, conversely, can serve as evidence of the absence of sharp differences between these two groups of vocabulary language" [12, p. 147]. He does not see a sharp difference between onyms and



appellatives in the semantic sense and N. P. Butenko [13, p. 34-35].

Scientists who delimit onyms from appellatives, fundamentally the difference between them is determined in the fact that the common noun means class of homogeneous objects, and a proper name indicates a specific an object. So, B. Russell notes: "Proper names refer to all objects of a certain kind" [4, p. 107]. B. Russell's logical concept is shared by E. Kurilovich, only specifying that both the common noun and proper name denote classes, but the appellative denotes a class of many objects, and the onym denotes "a class that consists of one object" [9, p. 252]. N. A. Yanko-Trinitinskaya adds that a proper name is a verbal linguistic sign (the second name of a certain object), which distinguishes it from a multitude of homogeneous (similar), but "does not give any indication of the features or properties of this object, and therefore does not uniting similar objects" [14, p. 237].

N.I. Tolstoy most accurately defined the relationship between proper names and common nouns, who points out that "the opposition of IP and IN on the basis of the principle - relation to one object ...: relation to a variety of objects (My italics - Z.K.) We understand it as some extra-linguistic individual and occasional information, IS is not opposed to IN, since the latter can also have it. But IS has only this "content", without having semantics - the sum of semantic features that generalize and selectively reflect a number of properties inherent in many homogeneous objects. Such a sum of semantic features can only be possessed by an IN, which, according to this principle, is opposed to other INs, which on this basis form a certain system" [15, p. 201].

Characterizing a proper name from the point of view of its semantics, R.Z. Muryasov argues that they should be considered "in connection with the theory of the sign in a specific theoretical and linguistic context" [16, p.70]. V. Z. Panfilov also speaks out in support of this concept [17, p.

58]. Highlighting proper names within the framework of nominative signs along with common nouns and quantitative signs as one from the main semiological classes, scientists at the same time draw attention to the fact that, as A. A. Ufimtseva notes, "by the nature of the sign meaning, by the scope of functioning and the function of individualization proper names can be called "lexically defective, defective" [18, p. 42]. Yu.A. Karpenko: "Proper names have their own semantics, but it is very specific, original ... and does not contain elements of generalization and thus is not associated with any concept. Proper names have a poor, narrow semantics, which, moreover, unlike the semantics of common nouns, does not have flexibility, the ability to change" [19, p. 89]. This idea is continued by B. F. Lyubchenko, paying attention to the fact that "anthroponyms are filled with lexical content, mainly in individual speech, and only a few pass into the national language with a certain stable concept" [20, p.108]. He notes that in a particular speech situation, proper names are signs of "a great semantic potential of ideas, a whole set of features that characterize the bearer of the name," and V. N. Mikhailov.

Summing up, we note that the majority of Russian linguists recognize the right of the onym to have meaning. The ability of a proper name to undergo rethinking in the minds of speakers of a particular language



and culture is just one of the arguments in favor of the semantic value of a name.

## References:

1. *Buslaev F.I. Historical grammar of the Russian language. M., 1959.*
2. *Aksakov K.S. Experience of Russian grammar. M., 1861. Issue. I.Ch.I.*
3. *Jespersen O. Philosophy of Grammar. M., 1958.*
4. *Russell B. Human knowledge. Its spheres and boundaries. M., 1957.*
5. *Gardiner A.H. The theory of proper names. 2nd ed. Oxford, 1954.*
6. *Superanskaya A.V. General theory of proper name. M., 1973.*
7. *Danilina E.F. Nicknames in modern Russian // East Slavic onomastics: Materials and research. M., 1979.*