

ANTHROPONYMS WITH EVALUATIVE MEANING IN THE FRENCH LANGUAGE

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10112860>

Abdulkhapi Latipovich Mamatkulov

PhD., Associate Professor at AGIA

The article investigates the problem of systematic study of anthroponomic nouns with the evaluative meanings in modern French language. In this article, the main features of the textual meaning of evaluative anthroponyms in modern French are being considered. The inclusion of the evaluative category in the semantics of words provides grounds to believe that it is present in the semantic structure of all lexical-grammatical categories of words (nouns, adjectives, verbs, etc.). The evolution of a word as a source of expressing evaluation manifests diversely in its various lexical-grammatical categories. Nouns - anthroponyms possess distinctive characteristics as a special lexical-grammatical category of words. The evaluative category is reflected in the semantics of anthroponyms in two evaluative aspects: positive and negative. In the semantic structure of each evaluative anthroponym, there exists either a positive or a negative component, determining the evaluative functions of the noun - anthroponym. In this regard, it is sufficient to compare the dictionary definitions of the following words:

1. Lascar n.m. Homme brave, décidé . v . Gallard.
2. Pleutre n.m. et adj . Homme sans courage . v . Lache, poltron.

According to dictionary definitions, the anthroponym "lascar" carries a positive connotation in its semantics, unlike the anthroponym "pleutre," which is characterized by a negative connotation.

Texts have a closed nature, defined by their opening and closing markers. In a text, the constituent elements acquire informative significance in a sequentially organized manner. Without a doubt, in the broadest sense, text and speech situations are the arenas where all the semantic potentials of words are revealed. The transition of a word from language to speech is determined by a lawful and specific change observed in the thought process, involving the connection of a general linguistic

concept stored in the memory of speakers to a specific concept corresponding to the given speech situation. In a text, which is a unique product of human creative

thinking, a word gains a natural perspective of linguistic realization, and thus, along with other linguistic techniques, contributes to the formalization of the representation of the real world.

The integration of anthroponyms into a text is associated with evaluative semanticization. This means that when moving from a dictionary to a text, anthroponyms undergo evaluative speech semanticization. It is important to distinguish evaluative speech semanticization from other types of semanticization.

Speech semanticization, in general, involves the realization of the meaning of linguistic elements in a specific speech situation, following the rules of semantic syntagmatics and functional norms developed by the society of speakers of that language. Speech semanticization is built on a series of laws of semantic syntagmatics, one of which is the mandatory presence of a common classeme. According to the views of B. Potier and A. Greimas, for the correct organization of the semantic compatibility of words, they must share a common classeme. Unlike the differential semes of words in a phrase, the classeme represents a connecting semantic element and therefore manifests iteratively.

During the process of evaluative speech semanticization, the lexical sphere of the text aligns with the communicative purpose of the text, thereby creating informative compactness. This implies that evaluative speech monosemanticization of anthroponyms is driven by the communicative goal of the text.

In the process of monosemanticization, variants of meaning for evaluative anthroponyms in the text are formed. Anthroponyms presented with a full range of meaning variants in the dictionary are realized in the text in a single variant, as the presence of a second variant would hinder communication.

The inclusion of each evaluative anthroponym in the qualifying sphere of the text is carried out in the aspect of positive or negative monosemanticization. Both of these aspects of evaluative speech semanticization of anthroponyms are characterized by a specific set of speech conditions and a unique system of supporting factors. The

main supporting factors include speech determinants (speech semanticizers) and the semantic sphere of the text.

In the French language, speech determinants of anthroponyms include demonstrative and possessive adjectives, personal pronouns of the object and subject, and qualitative adjectives. The semantic sphere of the text reflects the semantics of the speech situation. It is necessary to conduct the analysis based on the concept of textual parameters or the speech field of verbal signs.

In the text, the realization of each word is based on specific textual parameters, which can be considered as semantic macro-units of the text. Textual macro-units act as communicative transformers, ensuring the correct coordination of the semantics of verbal signs and, thus, organizing the informative component of the text.

It should be noted that each speech field of the text is characterized by the presence of a specific set of speech semanticizers for evaluative anthroponyms.

Evaluative anthroponyms are realized within the speech field of qualitative assessment. The inclusion of evaluative anthroponyms in the semantic sphere of the text, as our research has shown, covers the following textual parameters or speech fields:

1. Qualitative parameter within the semantic sphere of the text.
2. The conceptual sphere of situational referents.
3. Objective or subjective nature of the assessment.

Consequently, the specificity of these textual parameters serves to differentiate the evaluative speech field of the text from others.

The qualitative sphere, i.e., the affective layer of speech, is evident in most texts.

This is the dual nature of a word in speech: it is the primary means of conveying thoughts and a source of emotional expression.

An evaluative aspect can also be one of the characteristic features of an object, through which a person expresses their attitude toward the object, the surrounding world, or even themselves in a specific act of communication.

The dictionary entry of an anthroponym is based on the language community's modal relation to the denotate associated with the general concept of "human."

The evaluation related to the modal relation and recorded in the dictionary entry of an anthroponym is determined by the fundamental norm of the socio-psychological values of the particular linguistic community within the social formation's framework.

The evaluative category presented in the dictionary entry of an anthroponym determines its primary denotative meaning, upon which its connection to the qualitative parameter of the text is based.

For example:

"On lui accolait le prénom insolite de l'idiot. (F. Mauriac Sagouin).

Il ajoutait, mentalement: "Au fond, ce n'était qu'un crétin: c'est sans doute sa qui me blesse, Je me fâche que Madeleine ait pu épouser un pareil sot." (Guy de Maupassant Bel-Ami).

In the text, the anthroponyms "idiot" and "crétin" undergo negative monosemantic speech, and their semantic structure highlights a negative evaluative theme, constituting the core of their denotative meanings as documented in the corresponding dictionary entries.

Consequently, the formation of evaluative meaning in such anthroponyms occurs within the text itself, specifically in the qualitative sphere of the text.

- Et bien, mon vieux, tu as de la veine de nous trouver. (J. Laffite. Rose France).

- Non, mon vieux, si tu fais métier de me faucher mes sujets nous le pled , ou de reprendre systématiquement ceux que l'ai portes a la scene avec plus ou moins de bonheur , Il faut le dire ! (Colette La seconde).

In this case, the anthroponym "vieux" undergoes evaluative speech semanticization under the influence of the supporting word - the speech semanticizer "mon" and acquires a positive evaluative meaning. This demonstrates the influence of the qualitative parameter of the semantic field of the text on the semantics of evaluative anthroponyms.

The second textual parameter is the situational-referential parameter, which identifies the connection of the semantics of the evaluative anthroponym with a

specific situational referent. A situation is a part of the reality reflected in language, i.e., dynamic matter. The referential level extracted from the utterance, consisting of a set of words, is the situation of a particular, a set of elements present in the speaker's consciousness in objective reality. Each element of the situation extracted from the overall set correlates with a specific element of the utterance and is revealed as its situational referent in a given act of communication. Similarly, from the general set of elements of the situation, an element that acts as the situational referent of the evaluative anthroponym is isolated in a specific act of communication. Therefore, by the term "situational referent," we mean the object denoted by the noun - the evaluative anthroponym in its specific use. In relation to the situational referent, the evaluative anthroponym finds its informative significance in the text.

In the text, the situational referent of the evaluative anthroponym can be concrete or abstract. Depending on this, the specificity of the evaluative semantics of the anthroponym changes. When the situational referent is specific, the anthroponym has specific lexical content, representing intra-situational monosemantication. However, if the situational referent of the anthroponym is

abstract, its meaning acquires abstract lexical content corresponding to supersituational monosemantication. The formalizers of these processes are speech semanticizers. For example:

"Et tu es jaloux de cet imbécile-là. (P. Mérimée Carmen)."

"...nous avons un salaud dans nos rangs. (J. Laffite. Rose France)."

The anthroponym "imbécile" corresponds to a specific situational referent, which gives this noun specific lexical content in the text. In the role of the speech semanticizer, the demonstrative adjective "cet" (this) is used. The anthroponym "salaud" is characterized by an abstract lexical content because it correlates with a generalized, abstract situational referent, as indicated by the speech semanticizer "un" (an).

The differentiation between objective and subjective evaluative meaning is associated with the specificity of functional styles of the text. Objective evaluative meaning is more often manifested in the semantics of anthroponyms in the

monological style of the text, while subjective evaluative meaning is reflected in the semantics of anthroponyms in the dialogical style of the text. For example:

Pendant ce temps, comme un fou, Edouard marchait dans Paris... (F. Sagan. Le lit défait)

-Vous êtes malade, mon ami, dit Amadis (B. Vian L'automne à Pikin)

- Tu n'est qu'un petit malfaiteur (Colette. La seconde).

So, the meaning of evaluative anthroponyms is characterized by the presence of connections: (1) with the qualitative sphere of the text, (2) with the situational referent, (3) with the sphere of communicants.

The connection with the sphere of communicants of evaluative anthroponyms is reflected in the semantic opposition between societal and individual evaluative semanticization. The evaluative orientation of human consciousness, reflected in linguistic signs, can be either objective or subjective. Both objective and subjective evaluations embody the social understanding of the linguistic community in the non-linguistic reality. In societal and individual evaluative semanticization, the social experience of the entire linguistic community or the experience of specific communication participants is reflected, respectively.

LITERATURE :

1. Gak, V.G. (1972). On the Issue of Semantic Syntagmatics. Problems of Structural Semiotics. Moscow.

2. Pottier, B. (1965). Semantic Definition in Dictionaries. Travaux de linguistique et de littérature. ILL Strasbourg.
3. Greimas, A.J. (1966). Structural Semantics. Paris.
5. Ufimtseva, E.S., Kubryakova, A.E., Teliya, V.N. (1977). Linguistic Essence and Aspects of Nomination. Language Nomination (General Issues). Moscow.
6. <http://farspublishers.org/index.php/ijessh/article/view/1806>
7. <https://zienjournals.com>
8. <https://journals.researchparks.org/index.php/IJOT/article/view/1459>