



## THEORETICAL BASIS OF CLASSIFICATION OF FRENCH ANTHROPNYMS

**Kamalova Sanobar Jabborovna**

Associate Professor of the Department of Foreign Languages,  
Bukhara engineering - technological Institute, Bukhara, Uzbekistan

Article history:	Abstract:
<b>Received:</b> December 26 <sup>th</sup> 2020 <b>Accepted:</b> January 11 <sup>th</sup> 2021 <b>Published:</b> January 27 <sup>th</sup> 2021	The article considers the theoretical identification of national features of the use of anthroponyms in the French language, their denotative and connotative meanings in the linguo-pragmatic aspect.
<b>Keywords:</b> Anthroponym, theoretical identification, national characteristics, ontological character.	

In the development of world linguistics of the XXI century, special attention is paid to the study of anthroponymic units, their role and peculiarities of use in everyday communication. At the same time, their interpretation depending on national, cultural, historical and social characteristics is becoming more and more relevant. The communicative capabilities of the anthroponym have become the main objects of research in such areas as cognitive linguistics, discursive linguistics, cultural linguistics, pragmalinguistics and stylistics. In particular, the study of the pragmatic aspects of connotations arising from the interconnection of anthroponyms with their referent in language, speech and in the process of speech realization is of great theoretical and practical importance. Research in this area allows us to identify the ontological nature and linguo-cognitive mechanism of human relations within the framework of linguistic communication.

Today, one of the main directions in the leading scientific centers of the world is the problem of studying the linguistic, speech, cultural and national mentality of linguistic units, expressing sensual and aesthetic assessments of the personality associated with linguistic culture. At the present stage of development of society, issues related to the study of pragmalinguistic factors that affect the denotative and conative realization of anthroponymic meaning, which are activated in intercultural communication, are associated with the process of globalization, affect the functioning of international organizations, the holding of multilingual conferences and congresses, as well as the release of international periodicals. In addition, it becomes necessary to study the discursive and pragmatic features of anthroponyms and notify the world community about it. During the years of independence, the Uzbek national linguistics has gained experience in studying language and speech systems using modern principles and creative development of advanced ideas of world science. In linguistics, the phenomenon of anthroponymy, problems of etymological, national-cultural characteristics and meanings of anthroponyms have always been in the center of attention of scientists. In particular, a number of scientific studies are devoted to the study of the linguistic and extralinguistic nature of French names and surnames [3]

General information about French proper names is presented in the works on French grammar. To date, modern French nouns - anthroponyms have become the object of special dissertation research. A number of studies have paid attention to the comparative study of the corpus of French proper names. However, a comprehensive study of the connotations arising in connection with the use of a certain anthroponym in the linguistic system or within a certain discourse has not been carried out.

Anthroponymic units were also studied on the material of the English, German, Russian and Uzbek languages as objects of special research using various approaches. For example, in English anthroponomics, such topics as identity and pragmatics of personality, nominative aspects of the compilation of anthroponyms and the national-cultural identity of English nicknames, the use of allusive and precedent anthroponyms were analyzed. In the German artistic discourse, the development of the cognitive meaning of proper names is characterized. In Russian linguistics, extensive research has also been carried out on the linguistic nature of proper names. In particular, the connotative semantics and pragmatic content of Russian names are theoretically interpreted in a communicative aspect, Russian female names are described in a cultural and genetic aspect, a structural, semantic and functional analysis of Russian anthroponyms used in a work of fiction is provided, a dictionary of Russian names was created [2].

Linguistic, historical, ethnosemantic, sociolinguistic research of the Uzbek anthroponym provides valuable information about the nominal function of names, the concept of the meaning of a name, the conditions and traditions of naming, the reasons for the religious naming of children, totemistic and animistic beliefs used in naming. There is also an opinion that Uzbek names, surnames and patronymics are not a simple label, but have a certain meaning. The content and grammatical structure and regional features of the names, which make up the vocabulary of Uzbek anthroponymy, also did not remain out of sight of researchers. Anthroponyms are one of nineteen types of proper names studied by onomastics. In many studies devoted to onomastics, the problem of anthroponyms was

raised. Only since the second half of the twentieth century, anthroponyms in the French language have become useful observation material, with the subsequent clarification of their main goals and objectives. In addition, there have been attempts to expand the range of objects expressing this term.

As part of the study of French anthroponymic units, the researchers focused on a number of issues related to the linguistic nature of the anthroponym, including the separation of anthroponymic classes from onomastic units, the interpretation of the anthroponym in terms of the opposition "noun / common noun", the study of anthroponyms in the diachronic aspect, coverage of their national, regional and social-class affiliation, interlanguage typology, translation features, their place in expressing the idea of a literary text and functions, in terms of attitude to reality, the relationship between national and foreign elements in the formation of a system of anthroponyms.

One of the main problems arising in the study of anthroponyms is the problem of their lexical meaning. Until now, the opinions of researchers on this issue differ. The views expressed by French and foreign researchers regarding the meaning of anthroponymic units are subdivided into three main groups - asematic, that is, onyms do not make sense; sematic, that is, onyms have a broad meaning. There is also a third point of view, which unites the peculiarities of both of the above and, as it were, "reconciles" them. According to the first concept, onyms are in no way connected with the expression of permanent concepts - significations, onyms do not express anything, because they do not give any information regarding the properties of an object with a proper name, they only distinguish it from the rest of the corresponding onyms. Onyms are not associated with the expression of permanent concepts and are not able to convey information about the objects they represent. This approach is currently being critically assessed.

For example, according to D.I. Rudenko in one of his works that the logical category of the so-called "meaningless nouns" cannot be applied in the language, since the "meaningless noun" does not have the status of a natural language [1]. The second direction is based on the fact that an onym can only have full meaning when it is used in speech, in a specially selected speech context and in a specific speech environment. According to some French and Russian linguists, onomastic semantics is a very special form of semantics, subjective, socially conditioned factors, as well as feelings that form the speaker in the reference are included in the semantics of the name [4].

Proponents of the third direction argue that there is a meaning of names in language and speech. French linguists, based on empirical observations of the creation of names or neologisms from proper names, came to the conclusion that proper names have the ability to form meaning when used in speech and deviate from the basic meaning. According to A. Vorobyova, proper names have a semantic content, consisting of denotative, significative and structural components. In the past few decades, this view of the meaning of onyms has evolved through the use of component analysis methods in semantics and a dialectical approach to general and specific, abstract and precise, social and individual relations. The process of illuminating the discursive-pragmatic nature of anthroponyms is, of course, based on the existence of meaning in anthroponyms.

We believe that the semantics of anthroponyms is much broader than the appellative meaning. A proper name has a complex structure, consisting of linguistic and extralinguistic components. At the same time, the linguistic component includes stylistic value, features of use in language, speech and other elements. The extra-linguistic component includes complex associations of a name, the degree of fame of the bearer of the name, encyclopedic information about the name and its bearer, the ideological orientation of the name, and much more. In the semantics of the anthroponym, we distinguish three main components: denotative - denotatum, that is, the object that determines the nature of naming is associated with the type; significative - a significat that is, indirectly related to a concept that is embodied in an anthroponym; pragmatic - consisting of endless multiple subjective meanings and associations arising from objective information about the denotation.

For example, the name *François*: denotative component of semantics - subject, man; the significative component - a living being, a person; pragmatic component - *François Mitterand or Mauriac*, or any person known only to the addressee and everything that others may know about him. The study of the process of formation and expansion of the meaning of an anthroponym forced to turn to the theory of reference and consider the use of an anthroponym in contradiction with the tradition of the language system, with cases of use together with determinants.

Therefore, the structure of an anthroponym as a linguistic feature consists of four components: from the material side - exponential and referential, in the ideal (mental) plan - designator and meaning. The exponent and the designator represent the expression plan. Meaning and referent, on the contrary, do not have a permanent character and appear in speech in different ways. The meaning of the anthroponym is distinguished from denotative, significative and connotative semes. The signifying anthroponym is defined as a component of meaning that reflects the common features of all potential referents. These characters consist of ingredients, that is, generic and species (type) semes, and generic semes with reflect the most general characteristics inherent in all anthroponymic referents; in type semes, for the most part, private characters are shown. Denotational characteristics of a certain referent, given objective characteristics, with the exception of inherent semes, consist of afferently denotative semes introduced into the meaning of the word. The connotation is formed by additional associations and afferent connotative semes, which represent the speaker's relationship to the name referent.

**REFERENCE**

1. Rudenko D.I. Proper names in the context of modern theories of reference // Questions of linguistics. - 1988. - №3. - P. 55–68.
2. Superanskaya A.V. Dictionary of Russian personal names. –M.: Eksmo, 2004. – 544 p.
3. Velde V. de, Flaux N. Les noms propres: nature et détermination // Lexique, 15. éds, 2000.- 128 p.
4. Wilmet M. Nom propre et ambiguïté // Langue française. – 1991. -№ 92. – P. 113-127.