

THE HISTORY OF LEARNING PROPER NAMES

Qutliyeva Gulhayo Bobirovna

Jondor District No. 1 vocational school teachers

Ibatova Hadicha Ogabek kizi

Jondor District No. 1 vocational school teachers

ibodovaxadicha@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The article focuses on the special position of proper names in the language and their difference from common nouns. The article argues that the term όνομα among the Greeks could mean both common names (Plato and Aristotle) and proper names (Xenophon). The Greeks contrasted the categories of όνομα κύριον with προσηγορία – common or common names.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 7 Sep 2024

Received in revised form 3 Nov 2024

Accepted 25 Nov 2024

Keywords: anthroponym, Russian anthroponymy, onomastics, name, proper names, common names, onym

Hosting by Innovatus Publishing Co. All rights reserved. © 2024

INTRODUCTION

The special position of proper names in the language and their difference from common names has been noted by researchers since ancient times. Attempts to theoretically substantiate these differences are just as old, but the task is still far from being solved. The contradictions begin with the term "proper name" – Russian tracing paper from Latin. nomen proprium (cf. Eigenname, French nom propre, English proper name). In Latin, this term is translated from the Greek. όνομα κύριον.

The term όνομα among the Greeks could mean both common names (Plato and Aristotle) and proper names (Xenophon). The Greeks contrasted the categories of όνομα κύριον with προσηγορία – common or common names. However, Aristotle and Plutarch used this term in the meaning of "nickname", equal to Latin cognomen. The Stoic Chrysippus, emphasizing the difference between proper names and common nouns, called the former simply όνομα, and later grammarians – όνομα κύριον, implying that the category προσηγορία is also included in the class of όνομα on the rights of names that are not so true.

The instability of Greek terminology and the concepts attached to the listed terms penetrated into later European grammars, obscuring the essence of the phenomena denoted by these terms. The most difficult task turned out to be to determine the originality of the meaning of a proper name. In the 19th century, this problem was perceived not so much as a linguistic one, but as a logical one, so its researchers were mainly

logicians and philosophers.

Along with common names (Latin *nomina appellativa*), there are proper names in any language (Latin. *nomina propria*, English, proper name, French. *nom propre*, German. *Eigennamen*). The linguistic science that deals with their comprehensive study is called onomastics (from the Greek *onomastike* — "the art of naming")¹. Proper names are used to denote a wide range of a bright and diverse range of objects, phenomena, concepts.

A person has a first name, patronymic, surname, may have a nickname, a pseudonym. - This is anthroponyms (Greek. *anthropos* — "person" and *onyma* — "name, title"). The word is a combination of anthroponyms — anthroponym and I of a particular language. The science that studies anthroponymy is anthroponymika.

Geographical objects (rivers, seas, mountains, lowlands, cities, villages, regions, countries, streets, avenues, roads, etc.) also have proper names — toponyms (Greek. *topos* — "place" and *onyma* "name, title"). The totality of toponyms forms toponim and y. The science that studies toponymy is called that understand.

The names of objects in outer space (stars, constellations, planets, comets, asteroids) — kosmonims (Greek. *kosmos* — "universe", "world", "firmament" and *onyma* — "name, title"). They form cosmochemistry, which is studied in a special section of onomastics — cosmonymy.

Proper names (nicknames) of animals, most often domestic ones — dogs, horses, cows, etc., make up a number of zoon and mov (Greek. *zoon* "animal" and *onyma* "name, title"); their totality — zoonym and I — is studied in zoonymy.

Anthroponymy, toponymy, cosmonymy, zoonymy, cinematonymy, etc. they are part of onomastics as its sections

Proper names have already attracted the attention of ancient Egyptian, ancient Greek and ancient Roman scientists

As a special class of words, they were distinguished by the Stoics (in particular, by Chrysippus), however, even later — in the Renaissance, in modern times (T. Hobbes, J. Locke, G. Leibniz), throughout the XIX century (J. St. Mill, X. Joseph, etc.), the discussion about them continued, during which many unambiguous (accepted by many scientists) and completely opposite judgments were expressed.

The most difficult task turned out to be to determine the originality of the meaning of a proper name. In the last century, this problem was perceived not so much as a linguistic one, but as a logical one, so its researchers were mainly logicians and philosophers.

The great English logician John Stuart Mill (1806-1873) devoted much effort to its resolution. He came to the conclusion that proper names have no meaning, they are kind of labels, or marks (like a cross) that help to recognize objects and distinguish them from each other. The characteristic of the named thing is not associated with the name-label, they do not "connote" (do not designate, do not describe it), but only "denote", or name it. Mill suggested that "connoting names appeared after proper ones"

Another English logician X. Joseph, disagreeing with Mill, who denied proper names in semantics, expressed the opposite opinion: he not only allowed the proper name to have a meaning, but found that "a proper name has even more meaning than a common name," for example, in the phrase "Palicourt overboard" (Aeneas's companion) compared to the expression "The man is overboard!".

In the twentieth century, the logical concept of proper names was developed by the famous English logician and philosopher Bertrand Russell (1872-1970). In his opinion, everything that is designated in the space of time by its proper names may well be designated using a coordinate system, and it is designated more precisely, more scientifically. But for everyday, to a certain extent "primitive" communication, proper names are more convenient, and this justifies their existence in the language. B. Russell noticed a certain similarity of his own name with demonstrative pronouns (this, that, this, etc.).

In the 20th century, the logical concept of proper names was developed by the famous English logician and philosopher Bertrand Racel (1872-1970). In his opinion, everything that begins in space-time with its own names can well be designated using a coordinate system, and it is designated more precisely, more

scientifically. But for everyday, to a certain extent "primitive" communication, proper names are convenient for her, and this justifies their existence in the language. B. Russell noticed a certain similarity of his own name with the demonstrative pronouns this, that, this and under

The fact that the problem under discussion is of interest to linguists and especially dentists around the world is evidenced by its nomination as the main topic of the XIII International Onomastic Congress — "Common Names and proper names", held in Krakow in 1978.

The Danish linguist Paul Kristoffersen saw the difference between common and proper names in the fact that the former are abstract, the latter are concrete. A proper name is a direct name of an individual, a common name is an indirect one. The common noun first names the class that the individual belongs to, and only then – the individual. An important milestone in the study of proper names was the work of the English linguist Alan Gardiner "The Theory of proper names" (1954).

Accepting Mill's main thesis about the absence of proper names, A. Gardiner clarifies and develops his interpretation. "A proper name is a word or group of words whose specific purpose is recognized as identification and which fulfill, or tend to fulfill, this purpose solely through a distinctive sound (the sound appearance of the word), regardless of any meaning inherent in this sound from the very beginning or acquired by it as a result of association with an object or objects, identified through this sound"

Gardiner's idea of "embodied" and "disembodied" proper names is interesting. Embodied, or "corporeal", are names attached to certain persons, localities, etc. (such as William Shakespeare, the River Thames). Disembodied, or "disembodied", are the same words—names, but considered out of connection with specific persons or topoobjects (William as a personal name in general, for example, in the dictionary of English anthroponyms).

J. Mill's thesis that "a proper name has absolutely no meaning", which was supported by linguists V. Brendal, E. Boissens, L. Elmslev and a number of other scientists, led the modern Danish linguist Knud Togeby to the conclusion that proper names (as well as pronouns), being devoid of semantic content (with "zero root"), are synonyms. This circumstance, in his opinion, is the reason that one individual can have several different names, and several can have the same name (namesakes, namesakes).

The opposite view of proper names as words with more meaning than common names, expressed by ancient Greek Stoic philosophers and supported in the 19th century by H. Joseph, a contemporary of J. S. Mill, was defended in the twentieth century by O. Jespersen, M. Breal, etc. Jespersen wrote: "Mill and his followers paid too much attention to what can be called the dictionary meaning of a name, and very little attention to its contextual meaning in the particular situation in which it is pronounced or written."

Summing up this far incomplete list of points of view in the proper name, let's pay attention to the fact that most theories belong to logicians. But the logicians did not have sufficient linguistic material. The examples they used were quite random. Linguists who operated with specific linguistic material often did not have the opportunity to abstract from the particulars of the studied language, from the specifics of its forms, which greatly devalued their theoretical conclusions. For example, definitions of a proper name as a category that does not have an article in the singular (Bertelsen), or as some kind of "x" for which a formula is created that includes the article (Sorensen), show that languages that do not have an article category were ignored by their authors

The expansion of the front of special onomastic works in the twentieth century, the attraction of new scientific material has as its direct consequence the need for updated general onomastic theories.

REFERENCE

1. Begmatov E. A. O'zbekiston nomlari ma'lumotiislari ma'nosi (izoxlilug'at). 14 600 ismlar izoxi.2-nashri. — Toshkent: O'zbekiston milliy ensiklopediyasi (lug'at), 2007. — 608 r.
2. Ivan shmelyov va Olga Brednus-Subbotina bilan yozishuvi.- Murmansk, Murmanskoye knijnoye

izdatelstvo, 1990.

3. Nafasov T. Markayev O'tish: Saytda Harakatlanish, Qidiruv O'zbek etnoantroponimlari // Onomastika O'zbekiston onomastikasi. Sat. tez.II rep. ilmiy-amaliy.conf. - Qarshi, 1989. — P. 136-140.
4. Nikonov V. A. *Ism va jamiyat*. –M.: Ilmiy. 1974. — 278 p.
5. Superenskaya A.V. *Atoqli otlar struktrasi fonologiya va morfonologiya*.-M.: Nauka, 1969.
6. Ikbol K. Aesthetic onomastics and its functions in artistic and intertext //International Journal on Integrated Education. – 2021. – T. 4. – №. 4. – C. 132-136.
7. Komiljonovna K. I. ANTHROPONYMY AS A BRANCH OF ONOMASTICS //Open Access Repository. – 2023. – T. 9. – №. 9. – C. 84-87.
8. Komiljonovna K. I. Changes in the system of anthroponyms in the Uzbek language at the end of the 20th century-the beginning of the 21st century //Zien Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities. – 2022. – T. 10. – C. 65-67.
9. Koziyeva I. K. THE HISTORY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF RUSSIAN ANTHROPONYMY //МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ ЯЗЫКА, ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ, ПЕРЕВОДА. – 2022. – Т. 3. – №. 3
10. Komiljonovna, K.I. 2021. Lexical-Semantic and Etymological Research of Anthroponyms in Uzbek, Russian and English Languages. International Journal on Integrated Education. 4, 12 (Dec. 2021), 246-250. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31149/ijie.v4i12.2548>.