

## LEARNING PROPER NAMES

Koziyeva Iqbol Komiljonovna

Lecturer of the Department of Russian Language and Literature

at the Faculty of Philology of Bukhara State University

ikbolkoziyeva0105@gmail.com

ABSTRACT	KEY WORDS
This article examines the position of proper names in the language and their difference from common names since ancient times. Attempts at theoretically grounded problems and their solutions are considered.	Proper name, calculus, common names, nickname, term.

### 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. *Eigennamen*, fr. *nom propre*, eng. *proper name*). In Latin, this term is translated from Greek. *ὄνομα κύριον*.

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

The instability of Greek terminology and the concepts attached to these 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 peculiarity of the meaning of a proper name. In the nineteenth 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 peculiar 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 names". Another English logician is H. Joseph, disagreeing with Mill, who rejected 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 "Palicurus overboard" (companion of Aeneas) compared to the expression "Man 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 space and time by proper 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 more convenient, and this justifies their existence. in the language. B. Russell noticed a certain similarity of his own name with the demonstrative pronouns (that, this, this, etc.).

The Danish linguist Paul Christophersen 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 name. The common noun first names the class to which the individual belongs, and only then – the individual. An important milestone in the study of proper names was the work of the English linguist Alan Gardiner "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 by means of a distinctive sound (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, places, etc. (such as William Shakespeare, the River Thames). Disembodied, or "disembodied", are the same name words, but considered outside 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 have the same name (namesakes, namesakes).

The opposite view of proper names as words with a greater meaning than common ones, expressed by the ancient Greek Stoic philosophers and supported in the nineteenth century by H. Joseph, a contemporary of J. St. Mill, was defended in the twentieth century by O. Jespersen, M. Breal, and others. Jespersen wrote: "Mill and his followers paid too much attention to what could 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 from complete list of points of view on the proper name, let's pay attention to the fact that most theories belong to logicians. But the logicians did not have enough language material. The examples they used were quite random. Linguists who worked 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 without an article in the singular (Bertelsen), or as some kind of "x" for

which a formula including the article is created (Sorensen), show that languages without 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.

## References

- [1] Begmatov E. A. The meaning of the names of Uzbekistan references (dictionary). 14 600 names isoxi. 2nd edition. - Tashkent: National Encyclopedia of Uzbekistan (dictionary), 2007. — 608 r.
- [2] Nafasov T. Markayev transition: moving on the Site, Search Uzbek ethnoanthroponyms //onomastics Uzbekistan onomastics. Sat. fast.Rep II. scientific-practical.conf. - Against, 1989. — P.136-140.
- [3] Nikonov V. A. Name and society. —M.: Nauka. 1974. — 278 pages.
- [4] Superanskaya A.V. Phonological and morphological structure of proper names.-M.: Nauka, 1969.
- [5] Petrovsky N.A. Dictionary of Russian personal names.-M.: Publishing House Soviet Encyclopedia, 1966.
- [6] Ermolich D.I. Proper names between languages and cultures.-M.: R.Valent, 2001.
- [7] 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.
- [8] Koziyeva I. K. THE HISTORY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF RUSSIAN ANTHROPONYMY //МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ ЯЗЫКА, ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ, ПЕРЕВОДА. — 2022. — Т. 3. — №. 3.
- [9] Koziyeva I. ANTHROPONYMY STUDIES //Science and innovation. — 2023. — Т. 2. — №. C10. — C. 63-65.
- [10] Koziyeva I. ISSUES OF ANTHROPONYMY IN UZBEK AND RUSSIAN LINGUISTICS //Science and innovation. — 2023. — Т. 2. — №. B1. — C. 121-123.
- [11] Komiljonovna K. I. THE ORIGIN OF PERSONAL NAMES IN RUSSIAN ANTHROPONYMY //Open Access Repository. — 2023. — Т. 9. — №. 3. — C. 277-281.