Linguoculturological Properties of Proper Names

Kamola Kholmamatova,

MA Student, Uzbek State World Languages University

Abstract: The article deals with comparative semantic and linguoculturological analysis of proper names in English and Uzbek languages and revealing semantic and linguoculturological properties of human names in English and Uzbek languages the in order to identify the best strategies, methods and techniques of translating proper names in English and Uzbek languages.

Keywords: proper names, linguoculturological analysis, best strategies, methods and techniques of translating proper names, anthroponymic formulas, etymological meaning of the name.

I. INTRODUCTION

Analysis of semantic and linguoculturological properties of proper names is not possible without defining the very concepts of semasiology and linguocultulogy. What we tried here in this and following paragraphs are to identify the definition of semasilogy and lingucluturology and conclude main approaches in semasiology and linguoculturology and define the angle of analysis of proper nouns and later proper names from perspective of semantic and linguoculturological aspects.

The branch of the study of language concerned with the meaning of words and word equivalents is called semasiology. The name comes from the Greek word "semasia" meaning signification. As semasiology deals not with every kind of meaning but with the lexical meaning only, it may be regarded as a branch of Lexicology.

If treated diachronically, semasiology studies the change in meaning which words undergo. Descriptive synchronic approach demands a study not of individual words but of semantic structures typical of the language studied and of its general semantic system. Sometimes the words semasiology and semantics are used indiscriminately. They are really synonyms but the word semasiology has one meaning, the word semantics has several meanings.

2. MAIN PART

Despite the different processes that have formed modern anthroponymic formulas among different peoples of the world, the following components are generally accepted: personal name, the name given to a person at birth and by which he is known in society, the surname is a hereditary name that passes from generation to generation, a nickname - a name given to a person in different periods of life and, as a rule, motivated by some personal qualities of the bearer, a pseudonym is a name given by the bearer to himself for various reasons (political, religious, creative), and sometimes the surname can be combined with a pseudonym.

Less common is such a component of the anthroponymic formula as patronymic (name by father's personal name).

For most of the peoples of the modern world, a fundamentally two-term formula is characteristic - a personal name (or several personal names) and a surname (or more than one surname).

This means that, in addition to the etymological meaning of the name, which is often guided when naming a child, the name is overgrown with positive or negative connotations, which also often plays a role in choosing a name. For example, the Russian male name Alexander (Greek alexo to defend and ander (genus andros) - husband, man), popular in the 19th-20th centuries, is often chosen both because of its high etymological semantics and because of its focus on its popular carriers (Alexander Makendonsky, Alexander Nevsky, possibly - three kings of the XIX century, who bore this name). In addition, the Christian peoples have a stable tradition of naming in honor of one or another saint, who is considered the patron saint of a person throughout his life.

As already mentioned, AF "name + patronymic + surname" was imposed on all the peoples of the CIS, despite the primordially established naming system. Only in rare cases did the peoples manage to defend the originality of the national naming, for example, the Uzbeks: for a man - Huseyn Israil oglu Aliyev, for a woman - Zeynab Kurbanali kyzy Mamedova, etc. In this case, although the official anthroponymic model has been preserved, it realizes the national identity.

Anthroponymic models of the modern peoples of Europe and America, and indeed of many peoples of Asia, are twofold, i.e. consist of a personal name and surname. Obviously, it is this model that ensures the proper measure of individualization of the person, together with the questionnaire data (information about the field, age, marital status, last name, etc.). At the same time, the structure of both personal name and surname may not be uniform. For example, Germans do not officially have a limited number of names. Usually, a newborn is given one or two (rarely three or more) names, one of which is the main one and which a person is usually called when addressing. Double surnames are also considered a single surname.

In the 20th century the progress of semasiology was uneven. The 1930's were said to be the most crucial time in its whole history. After the work of F. de Saussure the structural orientation came to the forefront of semasiology when Jost Trier, a German philologist, offered his theory of semantic fields, treating semantic phenomena historically and within a definite language system at a definite period of its development.

There are broadly speaking two schools of thought in present-day linguistics representing the main lines of contemporary thinking on the problem: the referential approach which seeks to formulate the essence of meaning by establishing the interdependence between words and things or concepts they denote, and the functional approach, which studies the functions of a word in speech and is less concerned with what meaning is than with how it works.

All major works on semantic theory have so far been based on referential concepts of meaning. The essential feature of this approach is that it distinguishes between the three components closely connected with meaning: the sound form of the linguistic sign, the concept underlying this sound form and the referent, i.e. that part or that aspect of reality to which the linguistic sign refers. The best-known referential model of meaning is the so-called "basic triangle".

CONCEPT

SOUND FORM ————— REFERENT

As can be seen from the diagram the sound form of the linguistic sign, e.g. [teibl] , is connected with our concept of the piece of furniture which it denotes and through it with the referent, i.e. the actual table. The common feature of any referential approach is the implication that meaning is in some form or other connected with the referent.

The sound-form of the linguistic sign [d/\v] is connected with our concept of a bird which it denotes and through it with the referent, i.e. the actual bird. The diagram implies that the meaning is a correlation between the sound-form of a word, the underlying concept and the concrete object it denotes. The question arise: in what way does the meaning correlate with each element of the triangle and in what relation does meaning stand to each of them?1.It is easily observed that the sound form of the word is not identical with its meaning. There is no inherent connection between the sound cluster [d/\v] and the meaning of the word dove. The connection is conventional and arbitrary. It can be easily proved by comparing the sound forms of different languages conveying one and the same meaning: dove, голубь, ... The words have different sound forms but express the same meaning. 2.The meaning and concept. The meaning of the word though closely connected with the underlying concept is not identical. Concept is a category of human cognition. Concept is the thought of an object that singles out its essential features. Concepts are the result of abstraction and generalization. Thus they are almost the same for the whole of humanity in one and the same period of its historical development. The meanings of words, however, are different in different languages. Compare: "a building for human habituation" –HOUSE, ДОМ; "fixed residence of family or household" –HOME, ДОМ. These examples show that the concepts expressed by one and the same word in one language can be expressed by two different words in the other language. Distinguishing meaning from the referent is of the utmost importance. Firstly, meaning is linguistic, whereas the referent is beyond the scope of language. One and the same object can be denoted by more than one word of a different meaning, e.g., the referent "CAT" be denoted by the words "cat", "animal", "Tom", "this", "pet", etc. All these words have the same referent but different meanings. Besides, there are words that have distinct meaning but do not refer to any existing thing, e.g., mermaid –an imagery sea creature that has the upper body of a woman and a fish tail. The conclusion is obvious –meaning is not to be identical with any of the three points of the triangle, but closely connected with them. In recent years a new and entirely different approach to meaning, known as the functional approach, has begun to take shape in linguistics and especially in structural linguistics. The functional approach maintains that the meaning of a linguistic unit can be studied only through its relation to other linguistic units. In a very simplified form this view may be illustrated by the following: we know, for instance, that the meaning of the two words move and movement is different because they function in speech differently. Comparing the contexts in which we find these words we cannot fail to observe that they occupy different positions in relation to other words. (To) move, e.g., can be followed by a noun (move the chair), preceded by a pronoun (we move), etc. The position occupied by the word movement is different: it may be followed by a preposition (movement of smth), preceded by an adjective (slow movement), and so on. As the distribution of the two words is different, we are entitled to the conclusion that not only they do belong to different classes of words, but that their meanings are different, too. The same is true of different meanings of one and the same word. Analyzing the function of a word in linguistic contexts and comparing these contexts, we conclude that meanings are different (or the same) and this fact can be proved by an objective investigation of linguistic data. For example, we can observe the difference of the meanings of the word take if we examine its functions in different linguistic contexts, take the tram (the taxi, the cab, etc.) As opposed to take to somebody. The functional approach is sometimes described as contextual as it is based on the analysis of various contexts. That is the context that determines which of the possible meanings of a polysemantic word is used. Word-meaning is not homogeneous. It is made up of various components. These components are described as types of meaning. The two main types of meaning are the grammatical (categorical) meaning and the lexical (material) meaning. The grammatical meaning is defined as an expression in speech of relationship between words. GM is the component of meaning recurrent in identical sets of individual forms of different words: the tense meaning (asked, thought, walked); the case meaning(girl's, boy's, night's);the meaning of plurality(joys, tables, places). Grammatical meaning is generalized in the most abstract part of the meaning of the word; it is common to all the words belonging to this part of speech. It is that part of meaning which recurs in the identical forms of different words of the same class, e.g., big, bigger, the biggest. The lexical meaning is the meaning proper to the given linguistic

unit in all its forms and distributions. The word-forms go, goes, went, going, gone possess different grammatical meanings of tense, person, number, but in each form they have one and the same semantic component denoting 'the process of movement'. Lexical meaning is not indivisible, it may be analyzed in threecomponents: denotational, connotational, and pragmatic. One part of meaning expressing a notion is called denotation. Denotational meaning establishes correlation between the name and the object, process or characteristic feature of concrete reality (or thought) which is denoted by the given word. Denotation expresses a notion. Denotation is objective, it reflects objective reality through notions. The other part of meaning may express a personal attitude of the speaker to the object of speech, or it may characterize the role of the speaker in the process of communication. The subjective part of meaning is the connotation of the word.

Many Western peoples have different forms of the name, but not the surname.

A peculiar semantisation of names - female and male - according to different semantic models is typical for many peoples of the world. The role of men and women, father and mother, husband and wife in naming is unequal. Most often, the role of a man in the naming processes is immeasurably more important, this is already evidenced by the patronymic of those peoples where the patronymic naming system is adopted. Usually a woman gets a surname either from her father or from her husband. The converse, although permitted by law, is much less common.

The naming system adopted in England in the past and the centuries before last led to situations of almost complete absorption of a woman's name by the name of her husband, as, for example, in J. Golsworthy's novel "The Forsyth Saga": the main character, Irene, is often called "Mrs. Soams Forsyte».

Another parameter of the individualization of the face is the age-related differences in the names of a person, which manifest themselves in a very peculiar way in the systems of names of different peoples. Common to many peoples is the presence of children's names, nicknames, variants of the main name for young children within the family. These can be affectionate nicknames such as English baby, kiddy, little, sole (mylittle, heartkin, honey), Turkic bo'taloq, qo'zichoq, polopon, do'mboq, asaltoy. Often in a family circle, such a nickname functions in parallel with the main name for a long time. V.A. Nikonov with reference to L. Gumilev reports that the ancient Turks had only age names, and did not carry them from birth to death, like Europeans, and the name always indicated the position of a person in society [48, p. 21].

The role of nicknames in the individualization of persons is extremely large, because sometimes it is by the nickname that a person becomes famous throughout the world, such as, for example, the Cuban revolutionary of Argentinean descent Che Guevara (real name Ernesto Guevara, che is an interjection of the type "hey," reflecting a friendly attitude to what is called).

A special means of individualizing persons are pseudonyms (Greek pseudonimus "bearing a fictional name") - a fictional name or surname used to replace one's own by politicians, writers, actors, etc. This, so to speak, is self-sounding, which is given to the person called himself from a variety of motives, with different goals, often opposite: to hide your identity under a foreign name (a very frequent motive for journalists, etc.), or, on the contrary, to become famous under a loud, catchy name. A pseudonym can be a semantic tracing paper of a surname: for example, the surname of the famous linguist A.Kh. Vostokova is a redesign of his true surname Ostenek.

The pseudonym can be taken by place of birth, political beliefs, when changing religion (this is how boxer Cassius Clay turned into Muhammad Ali), by symbolic fairy-tale characters (Sirin - V. Nabokov, Humayun - one of the Afghan revolutionaries), by the names of religious characters (Madonna) ; pseudonyms can represent the real name in a "refined" sound (Brigitte Bardot), etc. Pseudonyms are extremely common in the East: Foniy, Maknuna, Oybek, Zhulunboy.

Thus, different components of the anthroponymic model are aimed at different linguoculturological fields, the most universal component is the personal name, which passes through most of the fields, and for many people in different countries, whose society is essentially limited to the family, the personal name will be the main one throughout life.

In functional terms, especially in relation to the family, the designations of kinship, or the terms of kinship, come close to proper names. Within the family, the nominations Seryozha, Valya, etc., and mom, dad, grandfather, grandmother, aunt and uncle, etc. are functionally equal.

Comparison in English: an old man, an old woman, a father, a mother, an uncle, an aunt, Aunt Ann, Uncle James;

- Well, *Aunt Ann*?-said a voice behind (Galsworthy, 1974, 40).

- Tell me what you think of my new star, *Uncle Swithin*, said Irene softly. (Galsworthy, 1974,65).

3. DISCUSSION

In the Uzbek language, along with proper names, the following words are used: old man - chol, old woman - kampir, father - ota, mother -ona, aya, aunt - hola, uncle – tog'a, older brother - aka, older sister - opa.

Another means of individualizing the face and at the same time expressing the formulas of politeness in different languages are the following words: sir, mam, miss, missis, mister, madame; honim, janob; monsieur, madame, mister, pan, etc.

Their use is regulated by etiquette norms within a given language. For example, in French, when officially addressing a woman (by last name), the use of the words madame or mademoiselle is mandatory, depending on whether she is married or not. The use of only one surname in a communication situation serves as a sign of special, possibly negative, relations between the interlocutors. These words, like the English Miss, Mrs., are used both when addressing and when identifying a person.

These words differentiate persons by sex, age, social status. For example, an appeal is accepted only in relation to a man, the eldest in age, rank or social status (for example, in a situation, the servant is the owner), but also if the son turns to the father in a certain situation.

In real communication, all components of the anthroponymic model, kinship terms and words like Madam, Mrs. etc. closely interact, creating in each language specific variable formulas for individualization of the face and replenishing with such means of individualization of faces as direct indication of age and gender (for example, English-an old man, an old woman, Uzbek-kampir, Chol) , appearance, origin, etc.

In many linguistic traditions, the designation of a person by profession, education, academic degree, etc. extremely widely used both when naming a person in case of his absence, and when addressing (for example, an English counselor- an advisor, postgraduate - an adjunct, a lawyer, professor, major, colonel, president, master, etc.). In an official setting in modern English-speaking countries, an appeal is made according to the position: counselor, judge, lawyer.

To a much lesser extent, this form of individualization is used in modern Uzbek.

Currently, the most common is the double AF: first name + last name; less common is the three-member model: first name + middle name + last name. At the same time, the anthroponymic formulas of many peoples are extremely diverse and variously combine such model components as name, or names (permanent or temporary), middle names (formant or syntactic), surnames (which often represent a generic or caste name), nicknames, and pseudonyms.

The surname, which connects different social fields, has the maximum name in the modern world. The social nature of the surname interacts with its own linguocultrological nature.

4. CONCLUSION

Anthroponymic formulas in the English and Uzbek languages have developed over the centuries and reflect the historical, cultural and religious traditions of these ethnic groups.

The degree of individualization through anthroponymic models of men and women is asymmetrical in all three nations (as well as in other nations of the world), however, there is currently a tendency for a woman to retain her surname in marriage.

The English anthroponymic model is fundamentally two-term (first name + last name), despite the presence of a second name or a larger number of personal names, since it does not include an intermediate component - a patronymic. Modern English anthroponymic formulas were formed primarily on the basis of the ancient Germanic onomasticon, which included layers that personified the ideas of the ancient Germans about the beautiful and significant, as well as the zoophoric group of names. The motive for naming was also the preservation of the name of the closest relative or its variation. Modern variations of the ancient onomasticons lead to giving new meaning to old concepts.

With the strengthening of the role of Christianity, biblical names, the names of Catholic saints have spread, and only the name given at baptism becomes legal.

The naming trends associated with the Christian religion persisted in modern English-speaking countries.

The English onomasticon was also influenced by fiction, through which, in particular, ancient names were assimilated.

Currently, in England, a fundamentally two-term anthroponymic formula is used: first name + last name, despite the fact that often (especially in the USA) two personal names are used (one of them is often replaced by an initial).

The maximum nominative value in the Uzbek language is possessed by a personal name, which unites all social fields, as well as a surname. The inclusion of a middle name in the anthroponymic formula of a person is mandatory only for the official style of communication.

The personal names of Uzbeks are distinguished by their originality among other Turkic-speaking peoples, and among other peoples of Islamic culture.

The formation of personal names was significantly influenced by the names of the Arabs, and through it, many pre-Islamic ones. Ancient Turkic and Iranian vocabulary played an important role in the formation of the modern names of Uzbeks.

As a universal, individualization of a person can be distinguished in all languages of the world using common nouns (appellatives) according to the following parameters: gender, age, marital status, social status, features of appearance, physical condition, character, intelligence.

The use of any component of AF is associated with social fields in which the name is used.

5. References

1. Аракин В.Д. Сравнительная типология английского и русского языков. М.: Просвещение, 1979. – 260 с.
2. Аракин В.Д. История английского языка. – М.: Иностранная литература, 2001. – 296 с.
3. Баскаков Н.А. Русские фамилии тюркского происхождения // Ономастика. – Т. I. – М.: Наука, 1969. – С. 5-26.
4. Бегматов Э. А. Ўзбек исмлари маъноси (изохли луғат). 14 600 исмлар изохи. 2-нашри. – Тошкент: Ўзбекистон миллий энциклопедияси (луғат), 2007. – 608 с.
5. Бегматов Э., Жумаев А., Сатторов Ғ. Ўзбек ономастик терминологияси ва уни нормалаш проблемалар // Ўзбек тили терминологияси ва унинг тараққиёт переспективалари.–Тошкент: Фан, 1986. – б. 8-11.
6. Болотов В.И. Имя собственное. Имя нарицательное.

Эмоциональность текста. Лингвистические и методические заметки. – Ташкент: ФАН, 2001. –360 с.

7.   Болотов В.И. Теория имен собственных. –Т.: НУУз, 2003. – 98 с.

8.   Бондалетов В.Г. Динамика личных имен в XX в. // Личные имена в прошлом, настоящем и будущем. – М.:Наука, 1970. – С. 91-105.

9.   Бондалетов В.Г. Русская ономастика. – М.: Наука. 1985. – 186 с. 17. Буранов Ж. Сравнительная типология английского и тюркского языков. – М.: Высшая школа, 1983. – 267 с.

10.   Верещагин Е.М., Костомаров В.Г. Лингвострановедческая теория слова. – М.: Русский язык, 1980. – 320 с.

11.   Воробьев   В.В.   Лингвокультурология   (теория и методы):

12.   Монография. – М.: Изд-во РУДН, 1997. – 331 с.

13.   Воробьев В.В. Теоретические   и   прикладные аспекты лингвокультурологии: Автореф.   Дисс... д-ра. культурол. наук. – М., 1996. – 395 с.

14.   Галиуллина Г.Р.   Татарская   антропонимия   в   лингво-

15.   культурологическом аспекте: Автореф. дисс. докт. филол. наук. – Казань, 2007. –55 с.