


## THE ROLE OF LINGUISTIC ONOMASTICS IN LEARNING PROCESS.

 <https://doi.org/10.24412/2181-1784-2022-20-252-257>

**Mamatkulova Bakhtijon Ravshanovna**

Chirchik higher tank commanding Engineering school

Teacher of the department of languages Phd researcher of Uzbek State World  
Language University

e-mail: [shodiyonichkailhomova@gmail.com](mailto:shodiyonichkailhomova@gmail.com) tel: [+998975989090](tel:+998975989090)

### ABSTRACT

*This article is about semantically speaking, proper names have an identifying function, as they denote a single individual rather than classes of entities. They are often considered to be devoid of lexical meaning, even though they can regularly be traced back to descriptive lexical items (Oxford < originally “passage for oxen”). These etymological meanings, however, are synchronically irrelevant as far as the description of a referent is concerned; and, in many cases, they are no longer transparent.*

**Keywords:** *determiner phrases, corpus linguistics, grammar, methodology, homonymous.*

### АННОТАЦИЯ

*Эта статья о том, что с семантической точки зрения имена собственные выполняют идентифицирующую функцию, поскольку они обозначают отдельного человека, а не классы сущностей. Их часто считают лишеными лексического значения, хотя их регулярно можно проследить до описательных лексических единиц (Оксфорд < первоначально «проход для волов»). Эти этимологические значения, однако, синхронически нерелевантны по отношению к описанию референта; и во многих случаях они уже не прозрачны.*

**Ключевые слова:** *словосочетания-детерминанты, корпусная лингвистика, грамматика, методология, омонимы.*

### INTRODUCTION

Corpus linguistics is, to date, still an underexplored methodology in onomastics. This article seeks to advance the field through a theoretical discussion of onomastic issues from a corpus linguistic point of view. It presents an overview of the linguistic status, meaning and grammar of proper names in order to highlight aspects that lend

themselves to corpus linguistic inquiry. Earlier onomastic research is adduced, to highlight how corpus linguistic methods have substantially improved our understanding of names in language use. While previous onomastic work has often concentrated on the description of names in their own right, without necessarily taking the usage context into account, it is argued that the investigation of the semantics and the grammar of names needs to be complemented by work that draws on usage-based, corpus linguistic evidence. A stronger integration of four types of corpus linguistic analysis (frequency analysis, concordance analysis, collocation analysis, keyword analysis) is suggested for future research.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

The function of direct referential identification is a characteristic that proper names share with pronouns and noun phrases [or determiner phrases] [Colman 2014, 50; Ghomeshi and Massam 2009; Lyons 1977, 179]. This similarity suggests that proper names are more similar to noun phrases than to nouns. This can also be seen in coordinative structures, where names can be combined with noun phrases (Tom and the dog) but not with bare nouns (\*Tom and dog) [Ghomeshi and Massam 2005, 1]. The referential function of proper names is independent of context [for example, Greece always refers to the same entity], whereas noun phrases and pronouns can only identify entities contextually [it depends on the context whether the noun phrase the country or the pronoun it refers to Greece or another country, for example]. Personal names, and in particular given names like Mary or John, are generally considered to be the most prototypical name categories, as they exhibit all of the criteria outlined above [Tse 2000, 494]. Place names like London, Austria, or Europe are also prototypical proper names. Among place names, however, the incidence of less prototypical cases – that is, cases which do not show some of the features discussed above – is much higher than it is among personal names.

## DISCUSSION AND RESULTS

The semantic status of proper names has been extensively discussed in linguistics and language philosophy [for detailed overviews of these debates, see Anderson 2007; van Langendonck 2007]. Most linguists agree that proper names are mainly used to refer to certain entities, not to describe them. A central issue in this respect is the question of whether proper names carry a meaning or not – a question that crucially hinges on the notion of “meaning” employed. On the one hand, there are proponents of the view that proper names do not possess a lexical meaning but

directly refer to a certain entity. This perspective is sometimes called “the Millian approach”, in honor of its first prominent proponent in the 19th century, John Stuart Mill. In line with this view, names are frequently described as “rigid designators” [Kripke 1980] without any lexical meaning that would restrict the number of potential referents [as is typical of common nouns].

On the other hand, there are theorists who argue that proper names do carry certain meanings [e.g. Colman 2014; van Langendonck 2004, 2005]. Various types of meaning are potentially relevant here: denotational vs. connotational meanings; lexical vs. proprial meanings; and presuppositional meaning [Nyström 2016]. Denotation refers to the relation between a certain form and the class of entities to which it can be attributed [the so-called “denotata”]. Denotational meaning stays constant across usage contexts and, therefore, largely corresponds to the dictionary definition of a lexical item. Proper nouns are special in this respect, as they denote only one particular entity (and are not normally listed as entries in dictionaries). Of course, there may be several entities in the world that carry the same name (Cambridge in Massachusetts and in the UK; personal given names in general). However, this fact does not mean that the name denotes these referents as a class. For example, a noun like boy denotes all young male human beings, but a name like George does not create a similar, semantically based class of entities [Ghomeshi and Massam 2009, 74].

Besides their unique denotation, proper nouns may possess connotative meanings. Language users may have various associations with names depending on their personal knowledge and experience. Take the name Oxford, for instance: for some, it may be a place associated with an academic elite; for others, it may be the place where their grandmother lives. Such connotations can be quite individual (the grandmother association), but often they are shared by many people (the academic elite association). With regard to personal names, they frequently involve connotations concerning the social group to which the name bearer is thought to belong. For example, in German society, some English-based male names (Justin, Kevin) and French-based female names (Chantal, Jacqueline) are stereotypically connected to a lower social-class milieu, while other names like Ronny, Maik, Mandy, Nancy, Dorit or Doreen are stereotypically connected to Eastern Germany or the former GDR [Hayn 2016, 99–101].

Another meaning distinction that has a bearing on proper names is between lexical and proprial meanings. Names that are etymologically nontransparent possess

a proprial meaning (e.g. London, Prague), as they are exclusively used to identify a certain entity. However, names may contain elements that are homonymous with parts of the lexicon of a language and thus carry a lexical meaning [e.g. New York, Long Island]. Even though these elements [new, long, island] may be thought to have no lexical meaning when they form parts of names, their descriptive meaning may in fact be contextually activated. For example, people may be startled if they find that Long Island is not literally a long island. This surprise bears witness to the fact that people treat the lexical meaning as potentially relevant. Finally, names may carry presuppositional meanings.

One such meaning type that is highly common in names is categorical meaning: the perception that a name is connected to a certain kind of basic-level concept category [Nyström 2016, 48; van Langendonck 2007, 86]. For example, even if someone does not know who the referent of a name like Stephanie or Christopher is, that person will still most likely assume that these names refer to a person and that that person may be female or male, respectively. Likewise, Smith is commonly perceived as a personal surname, Birmingham as a place name, Thames as a river name, Lassie as the name of a dog, etc. These categorical name meanings are presupposed, even though they may be contextually incorrect (sometimes Stephanie may be the name of a dog, or Birmingham may be a personal surname). The categorical meaning of names can often be made explicit through extension to a complex phrase [the city of Birmingham, the river Thames, Lassie the dog etc.] or an obligatory name part [e.g. the Czech Republic].<sup>1</sup>

One recent development in the onomastic discussion of name meaning is the “pragmatic approach”. This approach was developed by Coates [2005, 2006a, 2006b, 2009], who distinguishes between two types of referential modes: onymic reference and semantic reference. Both modes can, in principle, be expressed by both proper names and descriptive noun phrases, even though there is a strong tendency for onymic reference to be performed by means of the former and for semantic reference to be associated with the latter. In other words, “properhood” does not inherently reside in certain forms, but in the onymic use to which forms are put in a communication context. This usage mode is in principle applicable to all kinds of nouns, not just proper names [Coates 2006a]. Thus, language change processes that involve proper nouns turning into common nouns (Kleenex > kleenex, Band-Aid > band-aid), and vice versa (long island > Long Island) are associated with shifts in the dominant usage patterns of forms.

Using country names as an example, etymologically nontransparent, morphologically simple names like Greece or Norway are commonly used as proper names, that is, for purposes of onymic reference. They tend to denote a unique entity, namely the country in question. In certain contexts, however, these names may be used as common nouns that denote a certain type of the entity denoted by the name (the Greece I used to know, today’s Greece). Conversely, the noun phrase the old vicarage can be used either by exploiting its descriptive semantic content (“an old house where a vicar lives”), or by onymically referring to a specific house (The Old Vicarage), which may not be old or a vicarage but rather a newly established pub [Coates 2005, 130].

## CONCLUSIONS

Van Langendonck [2005, 316] postulates an abstract lexematic category, the “proprial lemma”, which unites the various onymic and semantic referential uses of a certain form [see also Vandelanotte and Willemse 2002; van Langendonck 2007, 7–8; van Langendonck and van de Velde 2016, 19–20]. Proper names are defined as forms that are onymically used, while proprial lemmas include a number of other usage types, including appellative [a different Oxford] and metalinguistic uses (This city is called Oxford) [van Langendonck 2005, 318–321]. Figure 1 illustrates the (prototypical) onymic and the (less prototypical) semantic mode with a country name example. In the semantic mode, the name potentially allows for grammatical constructions that would normally be reserved for common nouns [pluralization, restrictive modification; Vandelanotte and Willemse 2002, 10].

## REFERENCES

1. Berezowski, Leszek. 1999a. “English Proper Name Modification and the Article Usage.” *Anglica Wratislaviensia* 35: 125–135. [Google Scholar]
2. Berezowski, Leszek. 1999b. “Practical Tools to Master Definite Article Usages with English Geographical Names.” In *On Language Theory and Practice. Volume 1: Language Theory and Language Use*, edited by Maria Wysocka, 59–71. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego. [Google Scholar]
3. Berger, Dieter. 1996. “Morphologie und Wortbildung der Ländernamen.” [Morphology and word formation of country names]. In *Name Studies: An International Handbook of Onomastics*, edited by Ernst Eichler, Gerold Hilty, Heinrich Löffler, Hugo Steger, and Ladislav Zgusta, vol. 2, 1356–1360. Berlin: de Gruyter. [Google Scholar]



4. Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad, and Edward Finegan. 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Longman. [Google Scholar]
5. Biber, Douglas, and Randi Reppen, eds. 2015. *The Cambridge Handbook of English Corpus Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [Crossref]
6. Butler, James O., Christopher E. Donaldson, Joanna E. Taylor, and Ian N. Gregory. 2017. “Alts, abbreviations, and AKAs: Historical Onomastic Variation and Automated Named Entity Recognition.” *Journal of Map & Geography Libraries* 13, no. 1: 58–81. [Taylor & Francis Online]
7. Coates, Richard. 2005. “A New Theory of Properhood.” In *Proceedings of the 21st International Congress of Onomastic Sciences [Uppsala, 19–24 August 2002]*, edited by Eva Brylla and Mats Wahlberg, vol. 1, 125–137. Uppsala: Språk- och Folkminnesinstitutet. [Google Scholar]
8. Coates, Richard. 2006a. “Properhood.” *Language* 82, no. 2: 356–382.
9. Coates, Richard. 2006b. “Some Consequences and Critiques of the Pragmatic Theory of Properhood.” *Onoma* 41: 27–44.
10. Coates, Richard. 2009. “A Strictly Millian Approach to the Definition of the Proper Name.
11. Khasanova G. K. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION SYSTEMS OF UZBEKISTAN AND JAPAN //Central Asian Problems of Modern Science and Education. – 2019. – Т. 4. – №. 2. – С. 771-781.
12. Khasanova, G. K. (2021). MAIN TRENDS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL TRAINING IN THE WORLD. *Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences, 1*(Special Issue 1), 257-262.
13. Хашимова, С. А. (2021). ТЕОРЕТИЧЕСКИЕ ВОПРОСЫ СЛОВООБРАЗОВАНИЯ В СОВРЕМЕННОМ КИТАЙСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ. *Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences, 1*(Special Issue 1), 268-285.
14. Насирова, С. А. (2019). Языковая политика в Китае: идентификация общественно-политической терминологии. In *Китайская лингвистика и синология* (pp. 384-387).
15. Hashimova, S. A., & Nasirova, S. A. (2021). FEATURES OF FORMING OF ANIMATED NOUNS WITH THE AFFIXES IN MODERN CHINESE LANGUAGE. *Journal of Central Asian Social Studies, 2*(04), 1-10