

Appellativation Of Proper Nouns In Phraseological Units From The Typological Perspective

Obrueva Gulchekhra Khamrokulovna¹

*Candidate of Philological sciences, Associate professor of Samarkand State Institute of
Foreign Languages, Samarkand, Uzbekistan*

Abstract. *In linguistics (general, comparative typological, Romanic, Germanic, Slavonic, Turkic, etc.), the recent period is characterized by the rapid development of the linguistics of the text and vocabulary, as a result of which the “intra-linguistic typology of the text” is gaining more and more effective study along with the development of such a theoretical direction as a system-level analysis of the language.*

Key words: *proper name, onomastics, phraseological unit, typology semantics, cultural specific, extra-linguistic, intra-linguistic.*

1. INTRODUCTION

PUs (phraseological units) with PN (proper noun) component in modern English make up a large group of over 1000 units. The disclosure of the functional and semantic originality of the onomastic component in phraseological use predetermines the need for:

- 1) studying the mechanism of qualitative transformation of PN as a part of PU;
- 2) identifying factors contributing to this process, and
- 3) systematization of the ways of rethinking [21, p.24].

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

As you know, there is no single and generally accepted interpretation of the essence of PN. The most contradictory judgments have been and are being expressed on this issue [22, p.216].

The most adequate interpretation of the content side of PN is, in our opinion, the concept according to which its semantics is a unity of general (categorical) and single (individual) meanings [9, p.257-258].

Material for the study was phraseological units with proper names and their derivatives, extracted from English phraseological, explanatory and synonymy dictionaries and reference books, as well as from modern English literature and journalism.

The following methods were used in the present work:

Descriptive and component methods were used in the present work mainly. In separate sections, comparative - comparative, applicative, etymological, and statistical methods were also used, as well as structural - semantic modeling and dictionary commentary methods.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

It should be noted that phraseological units of the investigated type have been studied extremely insufficiently. In a few works [14, 145] they are described mainly in etymological terms. Before establishing what qualitatively different features are endowed with a component of a phraseological unit, it is necessary to determine the currently established point of view on the nature of component as such, for the most contradictory judgments are

expressed on this issue. The inconsistency of conclusions in solving this problem seems to be due to a different approach to the proper name. Researchers who deny its ability to matter approach it purely functionally. Such an approach, indeed, makes it possible to objectively distinguish between a common noun and a proper name - the semantic "lack of quality" of the latter from a functional point of view is indisputable. Proponents of the "semantics" of a proper name usually approach it diachronically, referring to its genetic "common noun", the ability to develop figurative meanings, acquire expressive connotations in speech, become common nouns, etc.

If the meaning of AN (appellative name) is subject to division from the general category to the specific and from the specific to the lexical, According to Yu.D. Apresyan, it is also not "an elementary semantic unit," but breaks down into elementary meanings [2, p.254], then the PN functions only on the basis of the general onomastic, i.e. categorical value, the division limit of which is the specific value associated with the specialization of the function of the secondary designation of the object, on the basis of it PNs are combined into such subclasses as personal female and male names; surnames; names of countries, cities, rivers, planets, etc. The specific meaning of PN is not subject to further division, the members of the subclass allocated on its basis do not lend themselves, in contrast to AN, to further opposition, which indicates the absence of lexical meaning in these words.

This position is confirmed in the course of the lexical analysis of the text, including PN, in which all words require interlanguage translation, i.e. interpretation of the meaning, while a simple indication of its categorical (specific) meaning, that the encountered word is PN, will be sufficient in this case.

Any additional information about the bearer of this name goes beyond the scope of the linguistic analysis of the text (therefore, it should be interpreted not as the lexical meaning of PN, but as its encyclopedic meaning). This term was introduced by V.I. Bolotov, who defines the meaning acquired by a proper name when correlating it with a specific denotation in the process of communication [10, p.9]. If PN [in addition to the species] also had a lexical meaning, then the naming process would be devoid of the arbitrariness inherent in it in reality [15, p.54-55].

Thus, being a word of a language, PN, nevertheless, occupies a somewhat special position in its lexical-semantic system, and therefore there is a natural interest in how PN manifests itself in interaction with other words, in particular, what are the features of its functioning on phraseological language level.

It is generally acknowledged that any phraseological unit is characterized by the semantic transformation of its components. Consequently, the word - PN, marked by the indicated semantic originality, can become a component of phraseological units only after undergoing a qualitative shift in its structure.

The latter is due to the propensity of the onoma to appellativation, i.e. to functioning "as a common noun without changing the form" [21, p.40]. Changes in the function lead to semantic modifications [16, p.84-85].

Under the influence of external (extra-linguistic) factors, among which the dominant role belongs to various transfers of the name, a part of the encyclopedic meaning of PN is transformed into the lexical meaning of the appellative. (At the phraseological level, this transformation results in the formation of the phraseological meaning of the onomastic component).

The appellativation can be full or partial.

With full, the name of an object that has not yet had its name appears (ampere, raglan, volcano), and with partial appellativation, a symbolic-characterizing name appears for an object that already has its own name (Othello' jealous', Orpheus' mellifluous singer', Napoleon' power-hungry'), i.e. the name retains its "secondary nature" and thus does not

completely turn into a common noun. The combination of AN and PN signs in a word produces expressivity [17, p.144].

Therefore, phraseological units containing an onomastic component, which is a partially appellative name, are always expressive. PU of this type recorded in languages most diverse families, which suggests partial appellative of PN in phraseological context of linguistic universals and gives the basis for cross-language benchmarking mentioned PU, one aspect of which may be comparing units of different languages, comprising onomastic component derived from IS, correlated with the same denotation [18, p.12].

The phraseological meanings of the specified component should be compared, and the discrepancies and convergence registered during such an analysis give an idea of the selective reflection in the phraseology of the compared languages [in our case, these are English, German, Russian and French] of the same extra linguistic facts (the case is the encyclopedic meaning of PN) [26, p.190-191].

It seems possible to postulate the following analysis conditions:

- 1) The entire set of quality, condition and the likea denotation could potentially be represented in a partially appellative PN.
- 2) Representing various qualities of the carrier, PN develops polysemy.
- 3) Since the development of phraseological meanings of the onomastic component of phraseological units occurs on the basis of the same encyclopedic meaning of PN, then theoretically the phraseological meanings of this PN should be numerically equal and identical in the compared languages [23, p.10], even if they are realized in phraseological units with different structures and global values.
- 4) Practically unfulfilled condition (3) gives grounds to speak about the selectivity shown by the compared languages in the phraseological "mastering" of the encyclopedic meaning of the given PN [24, p.117-119].

It also examines phraseological units with ethnonyms-names, the place of which in the language system is not finally determined. Ethnic names are traditionally not included in research on onomastics, although in English linguistics ethnonyms are increasingly referred to PN [27, p.14-15]. According to ethnonymic phraseological units, ethnonyms occupy an intermediate place between PN and common nouns, although they have a large number of features inherent in appellatives.

When analyzing PU with PN, special attention should be paid to the correct identification of the source of PN.

Onomastic phraseology, distinguished by its special national specificity, is the most distinctive part of the phraseological fund of any language [3, p.665-667]. Here phraseological units with PN of biblical and ancient origin should be taken into account. Most of the scientists studying the phraseological fund of any language limit themselves to listing the phraseological units of this group, indicating that they belong to the category of internationalisms [19, p.95].

This approach is due to the still existing belief about the complete identity of international phraseological units in European languages, their immutability and isolation from other units of the language, which is far from the case.

For many centuries European languages have drawn vivid and expressive images from the treasury of biblical and ancient myths [5, p.220-221]. PU, which have become international, function in close unity with other categories of language and obey the laws of its development [6, p.190-192]. In the process of evolution, semantic discrepancies often arise in phraseological units with initially identical semantics.

Thus, the myth of the construction of the Tower of Babel was reflected in the phraseology of the English and Russian languages. Wed: the tower of Babel. Or, the partially appellative PN of the biblical primitive man Adam became an onomastic component of 12 phraseological

units of Russian, 14 - English, 12 - German and 14 phraseological units of the French language. Partial appellativation of PN in phraseological contexts occurs on the basis of its well-known encyclopedic meaning, i.e. information about Adam, stated in the Old Testament, as well as in legends and traditions of apocryphal [early Christian] and biblical literature.

Thus, theoretically, all phraseological meanings of the PN "Adam" must be identical to those of comparable language. In reality, along with the coincidences, there are differences.

So, in phraseological units of other compared languages, the same meaning of the PN does not occur as in the Russian proverb "The master is in the house like Adam is in paradise".

The meaning acquired by this PN in phraseological units "in the costume of Adam" is revealed in German in a phrase with a different structure and imagery: Adam und Eva spielen, and the English language does not master the phraseologically the same component of the encyclopedic meaning of PN, on the basis of which the named phraseological units arose Russian and German languages.

Another component of the encyclopedic meaning of this name is converted into the phraseological meaning of PN in all compared languages (however, phraseological units can differ structurally), except for German: Russian- "прожить Адамовы лета", English - "as old as Adam", French "vieux comme Adam" ["very old"].

On the other hand, at the phraseological levels [7, p.434] of other compared languages, the meaning acquired by the PN in the PU of the French language is not presented 'voyager parla diligencé' Adam = ("to travel on foot").

The national identity of each of the compared languages is manifested not only in the selective phraseological "mastering" of individual components of the encyclopedic meaning of PN, but also in the very form of its phraseological comprehension, which is reflected in the differences in the structural design, imagery, and often in the different global meanings of phraseological units. containing PN with identical phraseological meanings.

For example, the phraseological meaning, which arose on the basis of the same component of the encyclopedic meaning of the PN "Adam", in the Russian language is revealed in phraseological units "это при Адаме было", in English since Adam was a boy, [= 'long ago'], and in German in phraseological units with a different global meaning: er war mit Adam jung (lit. "he is the same age as Adam") "he is very old".

In total, it was possible to identify 87 PNs that have a specific denotative correlation, which are part of the phraseological units of the compared languages. The analysis of these phraseological units allows us to state some features of isomorphism, which is manifested:

- 1) in the coincidence of phraseological meanings of the onomastic component in different phraseological contexts;
- 2) in the interlingual borrowing of phraseological units with PN: the proportion of phraseological units that go back to one source is significant.

However, in spite of the fact that the information (the encyclopedic meaning of PN), which the carriers of the compared languages have in absolutely equal volume, is subjected to phraseological "mastering", each language shows its originality here [8, p.110-111], the principle of selectivity operates, which can be quantified and reflected:

- 1) in the "individual search" of the components of the encyclopedic meaning of the name for their phraseological "development";
- 2) in the lexical, structural and figurative differences in phraseological units of the compared languages with complete coincidence of the phraseological meanings of their PN;
- 3) in phraseology based on borrowed phraseological units. For example, emerging from the tragedy of W. Shakespeare "Hamlet", which became the phraseological unit in the compared languages, the expression that he is Hecube, what is she to him? (personal pronouns vary here) in the meaning of "indifferent attitude to anything, only in German became the basis for further phrase-making. There is a phraseological unit "it does not matter to anyone";

4) finally, the principle of selectivity is also manifested in the fact that in one of the languages being compared, a partial appellativation of this PN in a phraseological context does not occur at all, although there are objective prerequisites for it: the name is frequent, its encyclopedic meaning is well known to native speakers, and the latter contacts with languages in which phraseological unit functions with this PN, but does not borrow them.

Thus, comparing individual fragments of phraseological systems of several languages connected by a single feature, one can get a clear idea of how, under the influence of the same factors external to the phraseological systems, the nodal points of their convergence appear and, at the same time, retains a deep national originality of phraseological systems [20, p.88-89].

Recently, a comparative analysis carried out at various (including phraseological) levels of languages has gained great importance. This circumstance can be easily understood if we mention J. Vandries' opinion: "... whatever the differences in the mental skills of different peoples, the existence of some basic features cannot be denied. There is a common human logic..." [11, p.112]. It is a very important and scientifically significant task to reveal the features of the manifestation of this "common human logic" in different languages, which are distinguished by "deep formal and semantic originality" [25, p.700].

S.D.Katznelson said: "to compare ... languages ... not by isolated features, but by individual microsystems, by separate fragments of the structure of the language" [12, p.75], we will try to present here one of the possible options for solving this problem on the material of one group of stable verbal components (SVC), the phraseological basis of which is formed by proper names. Thus, phraseological units of any structural organization containing PN in Modern English (ME) and in Modern German (MG) were subjected to a continuous survey. (Here in after, these phraseological units are referred to as phraseological units with PN).

Changes in the semantic properties of PN during phraseologization lead to its deep qualitative transformation. Losing its normative individualizing-identifying function as part of PU, PN loses its original purely onomastic meaning.

Having acquired the property of generalization in terms of correlating with a whole class of homogeneous objects, the PN approaches the AN.

4. CONCLUSION

The study of phraseological units in modern English with a proper name (PN) shows that:

a) PN are qualitatively transformed into phraseological units along the line of their rapprochement with common nouns and their acquisition of the ability to express a general concept when abstracted from a single, concrete, particular, in contrast to free use, in which PN has a semantic structure, which is a unity of the general and single meaning and serving as an exponent of both a general and a single concept;

b) the method of rethinking the PN as part of the phraseological unit is of great importance in the phraseological formation of PN.

These data are of interest for clarifying the role of PN as a component of phraseological units in the determination of its stylistic essence, expressive and emotional phraseological units. At the same time, the genesis of phraseological units, the semantics of PN, determined by the properties of a single denotation, and the ability of PN to qualitatively transform play an important role in the formation of a new phraseological unit and in determining its expressive and emotional properties, since many PNs, enshrined traditionally in the phraseological unit, go back to a certain denotatum-anthroponym (we may say, personal PN or family PN) of biblical, mythological, literary, historical or just folk origin. Or, here we are talking about a toponym and anethnonym, which bring associations with the properties of their original denotation into the meaning of phraseological units.

REFERENCES:

- [1]. Алеева Г. У. Сопоставительный анализ фразеологических единиц, характеризующих внешность человека в английском и турецком языках. Автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук. - Казань: КГУ, 1999. – 26 с.
- [2]. Апресян Ю. Д. Идеи и методы современной структурной лингвистики. – М.: Просвещение, 1966. –302 с.
- [3]. Арутюнова Н. Д. Язык и мир человека. -2 - е изд., испр. - М.: Языки русской культуры, 1999. – 896 с.
- [4]. Ахманова О. С. Словарь лингвистических терминов.- М.: СЭ, 1966. -608 с.
- [5]. Балли Ш. Общая лингвистика и вопросы французского языка. – М.: ИИЛ, 1955. – 416 с.
- [6]. Балли Ш. Французская стилистика. – М.: ИИЛ, 1961. – 394 с.
- [7]. Бенвенист Э. Уровни лингвистического анализа // Новое в лингвистике. – М., 1964. – Вып. 4. – С. 434 - 449.
- [8]. Бенвенист Э. Общая лингвистика. – М.: Прогресс, 1974. – 447 с.
- [9]. Богуславский В. М. Слово и понятие // Мышление и язык. – М.: Academia, 1997. – С. 256 - 276.
- [10]. Болотов В. И. Проблемы теории эмоционального воздействия текста: Автореф. дис. ... д-ра филол. наук. – М.: АН ИЯ, 1986.- 37 с.
- [11]. Вандриес Ж. Язык: Лингвистическое введение в историю. – М.: Соцэкгиз, 1937. - 410 с.
- [12]. Кацнельсон С. Д. Содержание слова, значение и обозначение. – М.-Л.: Наука, 1965. – 110 с.
- [13]. Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь // Под ред. Ярцевой В. Н. –М.: Большая Российская Энциклопедия, 2002. –709 с.
- [14]. Лиховидова Т. В. Фразеологические единицы с именами собственными в современном английском языке // Иностранные языки в школе. – М., 1971.- №6.- С. 22-26.
- [15]. Лыкова Н. А. Континуальное и дискретное в языке // Филологические науки. – М., 1999. - №6.- С. 54 - 62.
- [16]. Маслова В. А. Лингвокультурология. – М. : Изд. Центр Академия, 2001. – 208 с.
- [17]. Маслова Ю. С. Когнитивная лингвистика: Учебное пособие. – М., 2004. – 281 с.
- [18]. Михайлова О. А. Фразео-семантическое поле «прекращение жизни человека» в русском и английском языках: Автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук. – Санкт-Петербург: СПбГУ, 1995. – 15 с.
- [19]. Мониц Ю. В. Амбивалентные функции ритуала в эволюции языковых систем // Вопросы языкознания. – М., 2000. - №6.- С. 69 - 97.
- [20]. Новиков А.Л. Значение эстетического знака // Филологические науки. – М., 1999.- №5.- С. 83 - 90.
- [21]. Солнцев В. М. Язык как системно-структурное образование. – М.: Наука, 1977. – 344 с.
- [22]. Ступин Л. П. О лексическом значении имён собственных //Вопросы теории и истории языка (Сборник памяти Ларина Б. А.). –Л.: ЛГУ, 1969. – С. 216 - 224.
- [23]. Тарасова Ф. Х. Сопоставительный анализ фразеологических единиц английского и татарского языков с компонентами, относящимися к фразеосемантическому полю «Пища»: Автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук. –Казань: КГУ, 1999. – 24 с.
- [24]. Espy W. R. O thou improper, thou uncommon noun: A bobtailed, generally chronological listing of proper names that have become improper and uncommonly common. – New York: Potter, 2008. – [10], 366 p.

- [25]. Jakobson R. Selected Writings: Word and Language. – The Hague, Paris: Mouton, 2007. - 752 p.
- [26]. Leech, Geoffrey Neil. Principles of pragmatics / Geoffrey N. Leech. –London; New York: Humanities Press, 2008. – XII, 250 p.
- [27]. Sorensen H. St. The Meaning of Proper Names. – Copenhagen, 1993. -349 p.