A LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF THE ONOMASTIC SCALES THAT COMPRISE FAMOUS NOUNS IN THE EYES OF SCIENTISTS AROUND THE WORLD

Muhiddinova Nilufar Sadriddin kizi
English teacher of the special school,
Navoi, Uzbekistan.

Annotation: The various features of nouns have attracted the attention of scholars from different fields since ancient times. In the Renaissance and the Middle Ages, as well as in the 19th century, there has been a discussion on the place of nouns in linguistic vocabulary. This article examines the linguistic study of the onomastic scales that constitute nouns.
Keywords: noun, related noun, nouns as a distinct linguistic unit, problem of identity of nouns, logical approach to nouns, word symbols, names-representations, names-non-representations, A. Gardiner and his work: "theory of nouns", ideal nouns, misinterpreted nouns, A. Grodzinsky and his essay on the "general theory of nouns".

The diverse characteristics of nouns in language have attracted the interest of scholars from various disciplines since ancient times. For instance, in the writings of ancient Greek scholars such as Aristotle, Democritus, and Heraclitus, views were also expressed regarding the properties of nouns.

Thus, Aristotle, in his work "Poetics", considers the noun to be one of the main parts of speech, and defines it as follows: "A noun is a compound word that does not denote time, and the constituent parts of which are not significant in themselves. Julius Pollux, a scholar from the 1st century BC, compiled an explanatory dictionary of renowned nouns called "Onomastics". The Stoics, led by Chrysippus, recognized eminent nouns as a distinct linguistic category, a group of words that form a specific class. During the Renaissance and Middle Ages, such scholars as T. Gobbs, J. Locke, and G.Leibniz, as well as in the 19th century, prominent scholars such as J. Mill and H. Joseph continued to discuss the significance of nouns within the linguistic lexicon. A key aspect of this discussion was the question of what constitutes the meaning of a noun. During the 18th and 19th centuries, this issue was studied not only by linguists but also by philosophers and logicians. The renowned English logician, John Stuart Mill (1806–1873), significantly contributed to the exploration of this issue.

According to his perspective, prominent nouns are not essential; rather, they, similar to distinctive features, labels, aid in recognizing an object and distinguishing it from other objects.

A noun's name for an entity or individual cannot serve as a comprehensive basis for describing that entity or individual. In furthering his thoughts, Mill divides words into two categories:

a) word-symbols,

b) connotative words.

Connotative words originated after named nouns. Another English, logician, X. Joseph, is a proponent of famous nouns. Mill has conflicting opinions on this topic. He believes that famous horses have a wider and greater significance than ordinary horses. For instance, the statement "Palikur (the male name of the companion of the mythical is ignored" carries more significance than the statement "a man is ignored".

In the 20th century, the logical development of nouns was furthered by the renowned English philosopher and logician, Bertrand Russell (1872-1970). He argued that the meaning conveyed by prominent nouns in a specific space and time is more precise

and scientific than that of related nouns. With regard to this, named nouns bear a close resemblance to demonstrative pronouns, such as "this", "that", and "those"[1].

Danish linguist Paul Kristoffersen distinguishes between nouns and related nouns by noting that the former conveys a specific meaning while the latter conveys an abstract one. Eminent nouns, or direct names, refer to an individual or personality, whereas related nouns, which are more general, refer to a group or category.

The work of the English linguist Alan Gardiner, in his "Theory of Eminent Nouns" (1954), elevated the field of onomastics to new heights. Building on the idea of Dj. Mill that nouns lack inherent meaning, Gardiner proposed that eminent nouns, which he defined as proper names, convey a set of specific and concrete ideas about a particular object or event. In this regard, nouns can be divided into two categories:

1. Embodied nouns, which can become an emblem or symbol. These include famous horses, such as the famous River Thames.

2. Non-embodied nouns that cannot become an emblem, such as William Shakespeare.

Embodied nouns provide a holistic view of a person or place, as in the case of the River Thames, which represents not only the river but also the great playwright who was associated with it. On the other hand, non-embodied nouns simply represent a general idea or concept, like the name "William", which does not necessarily convey any specific characteristics or associations. From a historical perspective, embodied nouns have existed for a longer period of time. For instance, anthroponyms such as Amir Temur, Mirzo Ulugbek, Alisher Navoi, and Zahiriddin Muhammad Babur are considered to be part of a group of prominent individuals who embody glory, as they represent images of significant figures who played a significant role in the history and cultural development of our nation's state. Meanwhile, anthroponyms names such as Temurbek, Ulugbek, Alisher, and Babur, whose parents hope that their children will emulate these remarkable individuals, are also among the most prominent individuals that have not yet been realized.

The renowned linguist M.I.Steblin Kamenskiy, studying onomastic terminology from the perspective of embodiment, based on the data from Old Icelandic literary sources, notes that there was no occurrence of "embodiment" in the onomastic lexicon used in Icelandic literature. He believes that every known noun has a specific meaning[2].

During the time of Thomas Hobbes, Hobbes's doctrine of the noun's ability to "incarnate" was later developed and improved by Gottfried Leibniz. Leibniz, a German philosopher, believed that concrete and abstract elements of thinking would be expressed through prominent nouns. This view of the scholar is relevant in terms of assigning prominent nouns to language (a system of symbolic communication elements) and speech, using these elements in a communication context. Thanks to these ideas, a linguistic approach to nominal nouns has emerged from both an abstract-logical and a concrete-historical perspective.

A timely From a scientific perspective, DJ. Mill's view, which is based on the premise that prominent nouns do not possess an inherent meaning, was later supported by V. Bryondal, E. Boissens, and L. This view was advanced by prominent linguists such as Elmsley. Consequently, some scholars, including the Danish linguist Knut Togeby, argue that named

---

[1] **Суперанская А.В.** Общая теория имени собственного. – М.: Наука, 1973. – С. 58-59.

[2] **Стеблин-Каменский М.И.** Древнеисландская топономастика как материал к истории имени собственного // Стеблин-Каменский М.И. Спорное в языкознании. – Л.: Наука, 1974. – С. 105-106.

nouns (including pronouns) can be substituted for one another due to their lack of semantic significance.

In the 1960s and 1970s, the prominent Russian linguist A.V. Superanskaya was specifically engaged in the historical study of nouns in linguistics, particularly in foreign linguistics. She published a significant work titled "The General Theory of nouns". Following this, she published V.A. Nikonov's "On names and society" (1974), V.A. Karpenko's "Theoretical foundations for distinguishing nouns and related nouns" (1975), and A.D. Zvereva's "Nouns and Related Nouns in Linguistics" (1976). Additionally, I.I. Kovalik's work "Glory and related nouns in the Ukrainian Language" was published in 1977, and a separate collection of articles on "Glory and Nouns" was published in 1978. The renowned scholar A.A. Reformatsky once proposed a distinction between nominative and derived nouns. Nominative nouns primarily serve the function of naming individual objects, things, or phenomena. In contrast, derived nouns perform a semantic, or expressive, function by designating, along with the naming of an object or event, the concept associated with it.[3]

In general, there are numerous issues in linguistics which require further exploration in the area of research on the general theoretical aspects of prominent nouns. This would necessitate a further enhancement of onomastic research in the future.

USED LITERATURE:
1. Суперанская А.В. Общая теория имени собственного. – М.: Наука, 1973. – С. 141.
2. Теория и методика ономастических исследований. – М.: Наука, 1986. – С. 8.

3. 3. Бегматов Э., Авлоқулов Я. Ономастик кўлам тушунчаси // Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти. 2007. № 3. – Б. 20.
4. 4. Гурбанов А. Озарбайжон ономастикаси. – Боку, 1986 (озарбайжон тилида). – Б. 34.
5. 5. Гурбанов А. Ҳозирги озарбайжон адабий тили. – Боку, 1985 (озарбайжон тилида). – Б. 245-272.
6. 6. Бегматов Э., Авлоқулов Я. Ўзбек тили ономастикасининг макрокўлами таркиби // Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти. 2007. № 5. – Б. 35-36.
7. 7. Бегматов Э., Авлоқулов Я. Ўзбек ономастикасининг микрокўлами // Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти. 2008. № 1. – Б. 55-60.

---

[3]**Реформатский А.А.** Введение в языковедение. – М., 1967. – С. 29-30; 57-62.