MODERN TRENDS IN DETERMINING THE MEANING OF ANTHROPONYMS

Baymirzaeva Madina Radjapovna

Teachers of Department of Foreign Language and Literature
Faculty of Foreign Philology
National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek
Tashkent, Uzbekistan
madinabaymirzaeva@yandex.ru
Tel: +998 90 988 28 06
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11608940

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

This article deals with proper names and their meaning, which became the field, where the most heated debates originate and in which specialist on linguistic and logic take place. The world of proper names is enormous. The problem of proper names is complicated and unsolved yet, linguists are interested in entity of proper names, its status, history, origin, their life in society and connection between a name and a human. Anthroponymy is investigated not only by linguists, but also other specialists, for instance by ethnographers, who study folks as communities with a distinctive culture. The issue of existence or absence of lexical meaning and three concepts of proper names are considered in this article. Additionally, four components in the meaning of proper names are analyzed.

English anthroponomical system, as English language, was influenced by different cultures and languages from early periods of its formation. Scientists point out to three features of this lexical group, which can explain the erasing interest: 1) proper names exist only in the human community, what is more, there are not any human community without proper names; 2) proper name is involved into constructing of a formalized language of logic; 3) the methods which the rest of the language can be described with sometimes do not work to describe proper names, thus the other methods of description are developed.

This feature explains the significance of further investigation of proper name peculiarities comparing with common names. Proper name refers to comprehensive functional and semantic group of nouns, the main features of which are to highlight and define distinct objects, expressing a single concept and entire representation about these objects in a

language, speech and so on. In other words, the proper names can be characterized as words and word combinations, the main task of which is to indicate the concrete object or phenomenon and to allocate it from a number of similar objects.

The meaning of proper name, developing in a spiral, goes through several turns, which symbolize the expansion of its interpretive potential. All names, originally appearing in the language, were at the same level. Some of them enriched their extralinguistic meaning thanks to the referent's (a holder of the name) life and activities and moved to the next level. Certain characteristics and features formed in their meaning and enabled the recipient (communicator) use them in the indirect function of naming and made it recognizable.

One of the main difficulties in investigation of proper names is the issue of existence or absence of its lexical meaning. The meaning is the relationship between name and its value, which can produce each-other in person's consciousness. Thus, modern linguists formulated three conception on this occasion.

The first concept considers the proper names as asemantic ones. Linguists refuse any meaning of proper names. They, J. St. Mill, B. Russell, A.A. Reformatsky, K.D. Levkovskaya, claimed that each object must be named, however, this name can not tell anything about the object. Some of the linguists approve that proper names identify individuals or individual items bearing these names, but do not indicate any features peculiar to them.

The second concept claims that the proper names receive their meaning in a concrete situation. What is more, the context is quite important here. Proper name must indicate one concrete person. Supporters of this concept are V.I.Bolotov, S.I.Zinn, A.V. Superanskaya, M.Breal.

According to the third concept proper names have a linguistic meaning with a specific type and refer to a separate subsystem of the language. Researches supporting this idea indicate that proper names have social meaning and identify actual and potential anthroponyms. The supporters of this theory point out that proper names are used in a speech for naming, identifying and distinguishing similar objects, and in language proper names as a linguistic sign exist regardless of the direct connection with the object. The usage of proper names in a specific speech condition gives meaning about the attitude towards a person, equally, characterize the speaker. Scientist indicate that proper names possess a complicated meaningful structure, unique forms and etymology, numerous connections with other language units and categories.

However, at the present stage many scientists consider a proper name as a full-fledged sign which has denotation and signification both at the level of speech and the level of language. According to some linguists, three form s of meaning should be distinguished in proper name:
1.   etymological (pre-anthropocentric)
2.   anthroponymic
3.   anthropocentric

According to I.A. Vorobyova proper names have a semantic composition consisting of three components of meaning: denotative, significative and structural. The linguist F.Danilina

supports I.A. Vorobyova's opinion, drawing attention to such a feature of proper names as the binarity. In language a name reveals a general concept, in speech – a specific concept.

Additionally, there are 4 components in the meaning of proper names. The first component is the existential component, which points out that the object is existed. The second is the classifying component which classifies the object to a certain class, which can be called a denotation of a name. The third component is the individualizing one, a special purpose of the name for naming one of the objects within the framework of denotation, this object is called a referent of a name, this component can be called as a detailed message. In the individualizing component scientists state the presence of additional meaning due to background knowledge about a specific person or object among the participants of this communication and appearing in the relevant contexts and situations. Additional meaning serves as a descriptive addition to the individualizing component in speech, contributing to its clarification and enrichment. And the fourth component is the characterizing component, which includes a set of characteristics of the referent, according to which this referent is identified.

Knowledge about a certain referent can vary from person to person. To adequately perceive information participants of communication, introduce background knowledge about a specific subject into their speech. A question about the meaning of a proper name has not only theoretical interest. This question becomes extremely actual in intercultural and interlingual contacts. It seems that proper names easily cross interlingual barriers, since they strive preserve their external form even when they are used outside of their native language. However, sometimes essential elements of their content is much difficult to overcome such language barriers. And without preserving their meaning proper names cannot function in a different language environment. Hence, there are the possible problems of misunderstanding and inaccurate perception of texts which contain names. Here is a huge field of knowledge for mastering by everyone who studies or teaches a foreign language in comparison with native one.

References:

1. Jespersen O. "Language: Its nature, development and origin". London: Allen & Unwin. 1922
2. Ermolovich D.I. 2005. Proper names: theory and practice of interlingual transmission. Moscow, R. Valent. (In Russ.)
3. Gudkov D.B. 2003. Theory and practice of intercultural communication. Moscow, Gnosis. (In Russ.)
4. Jespersen O. 1958. Philosophy of Grammar. Moscow, Ed. foreign Literature. (In Russ.)
5. Лахно А.В. Дихотомия смысла и значения имени собственного в теософии. - М., 2004.
6. Денисова Н. В. К вопросу о значении имени собственного в современной лингвистике // Молодой учёный. – 2015. – №8. – С. 1116-1118.
7. Лахно А.В. Имя собственное как объект сопоставительного исследования. Системообразующие свойства имени литературного персонажа в художественном

тексте и его переводе: Диссертация ... кандидата филологических наук. – Москва, 2006. – 219 с.

8.   Керова Л.В. Личные имена в английском и немецком языках: Лингво-культурологический асрект. Донецк. 2019

9.   Чичагов В.К. Из истории русских имен отчеств и фамилий. Москва. Учпедгиз, 1959.

10.   Виноградов В.В. О языке художественной литературы. М.: Гослитиздат, 1959.