

Functional - Pragmatic Variability Of Anthroponyms In French Discourse

¹Kamolova Sanobar Jabborovna , ²Yakubov Jamoliddin Abduvalievich , ³Sharipova Guljahon Bolikulovna , ⁴Rakhimova Gulsanam Ashirbekovna

¹*Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Philology, Head of the Department of Theoretical Sciences of French, Uzbek State University of World Languages, Uzbekistan.*

²*Doctor of Philology, Professor of the Uzbek State University of World Languages, Uzbekistan.*

³*Lecturer, Uzbek State University of World Languages, Uzbekistan.*

⁴*Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), Associate Professor, Uzbek State University of World Languages, Uzbekistan.*

Abstract

In the article there is considered about the national specificity of the use of anthroponyms in French discourse is to determine their denotative and connotative content in a lingvopragmatic aspect. Names, surnames, nicknames used in the French written text, in particular in political, sports, social discourses, were selected as the object of research. Also, to analyze the discursive-pragmatic peculiarities of the names and surnames of French persons, from the dictionaries of M.T. Morle and A. Doza, published annually by the National Institute of Statistics and the Institute of Economics (INSEE) from data (2013-2019), Liberation (1996-2018), Le Figaro (1998-2017), Le Monde (2003-2018), L'Humanité (1999-2018), L'Evade newspapers, this and Internet source articles from other newspapers were used.

Keywords: national specificity, denotative and connotative content, lingvopragmatic aspect, social discourse, written text, discursive-pragmatic peculiarity, political discourse.

INTRODUCTION

The role of anthroponymic units in daily communication in world linguistics in the XXI century, the importance of studying their national, cultural, historical and social features is growing. Anthroponyms communicative capabilities have become the main object of study in such areas as cognitive linguistics, discourse linguistics, linguocultural studies, pragmalinguistics, stylistics. In particular, the study of the pragmatic aspects of connotations, which occur on the basis of the interaction of the anthroponym with its referent in language, during the event and in speech, is of great theoretical and practical importance. Research in this area is people in the context of linguistic communication allows us to determine the ontological nature of the relationship between and the lingvocognitive mechanism.

In world linguistics today, the problem of studying linguistic units that express the emotional, aesthetic values of man in terms of

linguistic-cultural, national and national mentality, which are associated with the field of linguoculture, is gaining urgency as one of the priorities. At the present stage of development of society intercultural processes related to the process of globalization, including the creation of international organizations, the holding of multilingual conferences and congresses, the publication of international periodicals the problem of studying pragmalinguistic factors influencing the denotative and connotative occurrence of anthroponymic meaning activated in communication is becoming increasingly relevant anthroponyms

It is necessary to study the discursive-pragmatic features based on new scientific-theoretical views and methods, and to inform the world scientific community about it. During the years of independence, the Uzbek national linguistics has gained experience in the study of language and speech systems in the application of modern principles, the creative assimilation of

advanced ideas in world science. Including pragmalinguistic principles that are important for the effectiveness of the use of anthroponyms in communication activities, national an attempt is being made to harmonize with the rules of etiquette that have long been propagated in our culture. Therefore, "Uzbekistan must be globally competitive in the field of science, intellectual potential, modern personnel, high technology" further theoretical and practical research in the field of linguistics.

In linguistics, the phenomenon of anthroponymy, the problems of etymological, national-cultural features and meaning of anthroponyms are always in the focus of scholars standing. In particular, a number of scientific studies have been devoted to the study of the linguistic and extralinguistic nature of the names and surnames of French persons. General information about French famous horses is provided in works on the grammar of the French language. To date, modern French anthroponyms have been the subject of special dissertation research. A number of issues in the comparative study of a set of French famous horses focused on the work. However, a complete study of the connotations that arise in connection with the use of this or that anthroponym within the linguistic system or within a particular discourse has not been carried out.

Anthroponymic units are English, German, Russian, Uzbek material has also been studied on the basis of different approaches as an object of special research. For example, in English anthroponymy, topics such as personality identity and pragmatics, nominative aspects of anthroponym formation and the national cultural specificity of English nicknames, and the use of allusive and precedent anthroponyms are analyzed. The German artistic discourse describes the development of the cognitive meaning of famous horses.

In Russian linguistics, too, extensive research has been conducted to describe the linguistic nature of onomastic horses. In particular, the connotative semantics and pragmatic content of Russian personal names are theoretically interpreted in communicative terms, Russian female names are described in cultural genetic aspect, structural semantic and functional analysis of Russian anthroponyms used in the work of art is given, dictionaries of Russian personal names are created.

Sociolinguistic research provides valuable information on the nominative function of names, the concept of name meaning, customs and

traditions of naming, the reasons for giving religious names to children, totemistic and animistic beliefs in naming. Uzbek it has also been suggested that names, surnames and patronymics, nicknames and nicknames have a definite meaning without a dry label.

The issues of semantic classification and grammatical structure, as well as regional specificity of the names that make up the lexical richness of Uzbek anthroponymy have not escaped the attention of researchers.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The main approaches to the study of the properties of anthroponyms at the level of language and speech, as well as research on the interpretation of anthroponyms from the point of view of reference theory are described as well as the theoretical foundations of the research to be conducted.

Anthroponyms are famous for nineteen species that study onomastics is one of the horses. Over the years, all research on onomastics has also referred to anthroponyms. It was only from the second half of the twentieth century that anthroponyms in French became the subject and object of large-scale research as a separate observation material, clarifying the main goals and objectives of their study and even trying to expand the range of objects that the term meant.

In the course of the research, the researchers focused on a number of issues related to the linguistic nature of anthroponyms, including the separation of the class of anthroponyms from onomastic units, the interpretation of the meaning of anthroponyms in terms of "famous name / cognate name" opposition study of anthroponyms in a diachronic aspect, their national, regional and social stratification, interlingual typology and features of translation, their functions in terms of relation to reality and their role in the realization of the idea of a literary text; focusing on issues such as determining the ratio of foreign elements.

The main one that emerged in the process of studying anthroponyms one of the problems is the problem with their lexical meaning.

The more debates there are to date, the more opinions remain. The views expressed by French and foreign researchers on the problem of the meaning of anthroponomic units are divided into three main groups - asemanticity, i.e. the idea that mothers have no meaning, semantics, the idea that mothers have a broad meaning, and combining the characteristics of both, as if the

first and second the views can be divided into a “reconciling” view.

According to the first concept, onyms are constant concepts it has nothing to do with the representation of the certificates, the mother does not mean anything, because it does not say anything about the properties of the object that has the famous name, it only distinguishes it from other corresponding mothers. Onyms express constant concepts is not related and is not able to carry information about the objects it represents. Nowadays, this approach is being critically evaluated, for example, D.I. Rudenko states in one of his works that the logical category called “nonsense horses” cannot be applied to language because “Stupid name” does not have the status of a natural language.

The second direction is based on the fact that the mother can have full meaning only when used in speech, in a specially selected speech environment, and in a particular speech environment. According to some French and Russian linguists, onomastic semantics is a completely special type of semantics, which includes both subjective, socially conditioned factors and the emotions that arise in the referent's speech.

Proponents of the third line claim that nouns exist in both language and speech [Kleiber 1992; Ducrot 1989; Damourette 1970]. French linguists P. Siblo and S. Leroy, empirical observations on the creation of names or neologisms from famous horses

On the basis of this, they conclude that pronouns have the ability to form meaning in speech and when used outside the main meaning: “In the absence of a semantic field, the expression of a pronoun cannot be described by fixed semantics [Siblot, Leroy 2000: 91]. According to I.A. Vorobyova, famous horses have a semantic structure consisting of denotative, signifiable and structural components of meaning [Vorobyova 1971].

In the last few decades, this view of the problem of onim meaning has been evolving due to the use of component analysis methods in onym semantics and the use of a dialectical approach to general and specific, abstract and explicit, social and individual ratios.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The process of elucidating the discursive-pragmatic nature of anthroponyms is, of course, based on the existence of meaning in anthroponyms.

We consider the anthroponym semantics to be broader than the appellative meaning. The

famous horse has a complex structure consisting of linguistic and extralinguistic components. However, the linguistic component includes both stylistic value, usage features in language and speech, and other elements. Extralinguistic component includes the complex associations of the name, the degree of popularity of the name holder, encyclopedic information about the name and its owner, the ideological orientation of the name, and so on. In the semantics of anthroponyms we distinguish three main parts: denotative - denotative, that is, the object that determines the nature of the naming is interrelated with the species;

significative - significate, i.e. indirectly interrelated with the concept embodied in the anthroponym;

pragmatic - consists of an infinite number of subjective additional meanings and associations that arise on the basis of objective information about the denotation. For example, the name François: of semantics denotative component - subject, male;

signifiable component - a living being, a human being; pragmatic component - François Mitterrand or Mauriac, or any person known only to the addressee and all possible information about him.

When associating an anthroponym with its referent, the semantics that reflect characters recognized by French speakers differ in language, for example: ‘named by this name’, ‘alive’ (compare: Jules and Paris), ‘man’ (compare: Jules and Loulou (nickname of the horse)), ‘male / female’ (compare: Jules and Julienne), ‘nationality’ (compare: Jules and Ivan),

‘regional affiliation’ (compare: Julien and Juluan (Breton variant of the name) and belonging to a particular historical period (compare: Jean and Guy (included in the list of obsolete names)), ‘live’ and ‘man’) and as species semantics (‘male / female’,

‘Nationality’, ‘territorial affiliation’, ‘belonging to a particular historical period’). Such semantics without semantics that differ in meaning, allows for the internal classification of names and their division into small groups. In French, connotation is not directly distinguishable in all anthroponyms, as connotation is associated with inherent semantics (e.g., “weakness” semantics in feminine nouns) and with afferent connotative semantics associated with additional associations understood by linguists (e.g., Pierrot, Margo, diminutive nouns).

In the dissertation, connotation is understood as a semantic essence that enters the

semantics of anthroponymic units linguistically or verbally (imaginative or purposeful), expressing the emotional, evaluative, expressive, stylistically defined attitude of the speaker to the listener. Name referent for adequate perception of certain connotative saturation of French anthroponyms mastering the logical meaning alone will not be enough. In this process, at the very least, it is necessary to distinguish the semantic essence of these components, which are specific to connotation. In the work, the sensitivity of the anthroponym is interpreted as the ability of the speaker to express his emotional attitude towards the listener. Assessment involves choosing a particular variant of the anthroponym form in order to express a positive, negative, or neutral attitude toward the noun referent.

Expressiveness indicates the norm, the level of manifestation of a certain quality. The stylistic note indicates that the use of anthroponymic unity in this communicative environment in which the speaker's attitude towards the anthroponym referent is implicitly

expressed is inappropriate. In general, the connotation of anthroponymic units is, by its very nature, a very complex macro component of semantics, distinguished by the nature of expressive dyeing.

In this section, in contrast to the various linguistic - phonetic, morphological, syntactic, lexical means that serve to saturate the denotative meaning of anthroponyms with connotative semantics, based on the background knowledge specific to the linguistic and speech system of anthroponymic identification extralinguistic connotations that occur are studied. The results are given in the table below.

A surname is a name that is passed down from generation to generation, attached to the name of a person, and in a broad sense indicates that a person belongs to a genus, in a narrow sense, to a family, beginning with an ancestor. French surnames implicitly combined different ethnocultural connotations within their signification. They are presented in the table below.

Types of connotation specific to the surname referent

Last name referent specifications (in%)	Surnames
That the referent belongs to a particular region, nation, saint indicative connotations - 33%	Arnaud, Arnault (Arn-waldo); Brémont (Berhtomundo); Humbert (Huni-berhto); Roland, Rolland (Hrodo-lando); Thierry (Theodorico) - surname referees Germanic tribes Franks, derived from the Burgundians and the Visigoths; Aubert- Aubertin, Brémont- Brémontier; or Arnaudin, Arnaudeau-Naudin, Naudeau; lotin saints Brice, Frédéric, Hugues, Mathieu names - Brès, Ferry, Hue, Mahieu, Madeuf; on behalf of Marie - Marion, Mariette, Mariotte, Mariéton, Riotteau; then Perrette, Perrotte: Collette; Michotte; Lamartine; Mahaut (famous shape Marguerite; Overnda, Margeride- A product of Margeridon).
Connotations that the color, size and clothing of body parts do not correspond to the spirit of the times, traditions - 23%	Blond, Leblond (white-haired male), Fauvel, Faveau (pink), Roux, Rousseau, Lerouge (brown), Brun, Lebrun, Brunet, Brunot (brunette), Chatin (brown); Poitron (large chest), Dubuc, Dubut, Dubufe (large chest), Talon (large heel), etc. ; Chape, Chappe (mantle, cloak or cap - nickname), Chaperon (old hat).
Reference house, space connotations-21%	Maisonneuve (new house), La Fayette or Lafayette (black birch), Durocher (rock), Dupré, Delprat (lawn), Canal, Chenal (canal), Rivière, Ribière, Rive (river), Durupt, Delrieu, Rieu (soy) , anhor) or Davignon, Besançon, Paris, Langlois, Lallemand (place of immigration).
Connotations on the profession, position, social status of the referent - 14%	Fournier (baker), Sueur (tailor); Bachelin (young senior), Sergent, Prévôt or its variant Provost, Prost (court), Bailly (king, official who presides over a court session on behalf of a senior); Noble or Lenoble (aristocratic) - a mocking nickname; Paisant (farmer).

Connotations of kinship - 7%	Le père (father), Lefils (son), Cadet (younger), Lainé (older), Legendre (son-in-law), Neveu (nephew), his variant Leneveu, Deloncle (uncle, uncle), Bonfils (good son), Maugendre (bad groom, bad pochcha), Malfilâtre (step-son).
The founder of the area or the owner of the property connotations - 02%	Aurelianum> Orleans) and Pauliacum - pomeste Paulius; Romainville - «villa» of Romanus
Connotations on some features of habits or behavior - 1.8%	Cacheleu (wolf hunter), Watebled (rotten wheat), Bercheux (sniper or hunter), Leloup (wolf - «wild»), Renard (fox - cunning), Abeille (bees - industrious).

From a linguopragmatic point of view, discourse is an evolving system, one of the important components of which is a text with socio-situational and cultural-historical descriptions, conditioned by socially oriented and communicative activity; In terms of structure, discourse is a specific topic and general communication texts

presented through a set, in which the meaning of each specific text included in the discourse system is expressed as a broader product complicated by the intention and extralinguistic background of each author, rather than the sum of the meanings of the linguistic units that make it up. Hence, the discourse is considered as a set of texts that are thematically, semantically, chronologically, typologically connected, related to a particular area of communication and included in historical, cultural, social, economic, political and other contexts.

The pragmatic influence of political discourse on political texts depends on the nature of the appeal and the authors' efforts to influence readers. Influence is achieved through the use of certain linguistic and stylistic means, including the use of socio-culturally defined units, the reference to national values.

It is especially important to do and rely on popular events. The socio-culturally defined units and the nature of the popular events used depend on the cognitive base of the linguistic-cultural community and are determined by a pragmatic context. Thus, a pragmatic approach to the analysis of political discourse takes into account the linguistic and extralinguistic components of speech communication allows you to take into account all aspects and have a clear idea of the process and method of formation of views, beliefs and stereotypes of members of one society about others

CONCLUSIONS

As a linguistic sign, the structure of an anthroponym consists of four components: on the material side - the exponent and on the reference

(ideal) side - the designer and the meaning. The exponent and the designer represent the plan of expression, the plan of meaning and referent content. In the secondary nomenclature of the referent, the components of the expression plan do not change, referent and meaning, on the other hand, occur in different ways in language and speech without having a constant character. The semantic structure of the anthroponym differs from denotative, signifiable and connotative semantics.

The sign anthroponym was defined as a semantic component that reflected the common traits of all potential references. These characters consist of ingerent, i.e. rod and vid (species) semaphores, and rod semaphores reflect the most general descriptions of all anthroponym referents, type semaphores show more private characters. Denotative is associated with descriptions of a particular referent expressed by a noun in speech, and these objective descriptions consist not only of ingerent semaphores but also of afferent denotative semantics which are brought into the meaning of the noun. Connotation is formed by additional associations and afferent connotative semantics that signify the speaker's attitude to the noun referent.

Reference is understood as the connection of a noun with a referent in the course of speech. Single-referent and multi-referent anthroponyms are distinguished as specific reference types according to the level of popularity of the anthroponym referent in the mind of the linguistic community and the presence of general ideas about personal qualities. A psychosystematic theory based on a dynamic approach to language and speech phenomena, developed in French linguistics, plays an important role in revealing these peculiarities. Such an approach characterizes the anthroponym reference references to the primary and secondary of the noun in semiosis involves analysis within the framework of a single process of formation and use of language, time of occurrence, and speech.

In the process of primary semiosis, the peculiarities of anthroponym reference are

manifested in such a way that the reference speaker can imagine different levels of abstraction / precision, singularity / plurality, and so on. This situation finds its official expression in the appropriate form of determinants. Traditionally, the anthroponym in French is used without determinative. Research determinants are colorful connotations of the scope of the anthroponym content showed that they serve as basic grammatical tools that enrich with.

Within anthroponyms, formal and informal names and surnames differ. Formal anthroponyms serve as informative linguistic means, highlighting more referent individually in speech. Their inherent connotations implicitly combine extralinguistic information of anthropological, cultural, social, stylistic character about anthroponym denotation in the nomenclature of names. The authority of surnames is mainly a formal field, used in conjunction with names and social descriptors.

Informal or abbreviated verbal forms of anthroponyms serve as socio-evaluative, emotionally-evaluative linguistic means, conveying a variety of connotations in communication acts. The type and degree of such connotations are called subjective attitude towards the referent, communicative situation, interrelationships and social status of the interlocutors, social hierarchy within the community, individual-personal relations within the group, distribution of social roles. It is these forms of anthroponyms that are an indicator that helps to detect shifts in personal relationships.

Anthroponymic landscape of socio-cultural factors participation in the formation, in turn, forms the basis for the collection of national-cultural and pragmatic information in each name actively used in linguistic and speech acts. Anthroponym, subject to the rules of the national language and sensitivity to the dynamics of social development in response to, with distinctive colorful semantics in the context of a particular culture.

Nicknames can describe the appearance of a referent, indicate his appearance, habits and behavioral characteristics, ethnic and racial origin, give a social assessment of his mental abilities. They are the linguistic expression of the expression of feelings, attitudes towards the referent, the achievement of expressive effect in verbal communication is one of the tools. Nicknames represent a category of unregulated names that act as communicative and emotional substitutes for names and surnames and cannot accompany a person for the rest of their lives.

Noun variants serve as one of the most important means of changing distance in verbal communication, i.e. they range from formal communication to neutral communication, then to friendly, sincere, etc. communication helps to transition. It is anthroponyms that are discriminating, insulting, degrading, ameliorative, glorifying, alienating such as linguistic units that provide a variety of linguistic strategies.

In primary semiosis, the characters reflected in the form of denotative afferent semantics in the anthroponymic sense become signifiable during secondary semiosis and become ingerent semantics, that is, they are fixed in language. As a result, the name can be used to define another (secondary) referent with appropriate properties.

REFERENCES

1. Kamolova S. Linguistic and speaking nature of French anthroponymy// *International Journal on Integrated Education*. Volume 2, Issue VI, 2019.№ 6. - P. 216-217. (№23, № SJIF 5.069).
2. Kamolova S.J. The Employment of the Anthroponym in Sports Acronyms (example in French)// *International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering (IJRTE)*. Volume-8 Issue-4, 2019. - P.7665-7666. (№5. Journal indexed by Google Scholar. №3. RIF 2.51.)
3. Kamolova S. Discursive use of modified anthroponyms // *Scientific Bulletin of Namangan State University*. - Namangan, 2019. -№ 9. - B. 119-124. (10.00.00; №19).
4. Kamolova S. The use of French names and surnames in the formation of figurative speech skills//*Philology and cultural studies: Modern problems and development prospects: Proceedings of the VI International Scientific and Practical Conference*. - Makhachkala, 2014. - P.18-19.