Materiallar to’plami · Conference Proceedings

TIL, TARJIMA VA TA’LIM: GLOBAL KOMMUNIKATSIYA VA RAQAMLI INNOVATSIYALAR DAVRIDA YANGI YONDASHUVLAR

03 October 2026

UDK 81

ZAMONAVIY LINGVISTIKA VA GLOBAL KOMMUNIKATSIYA

FILMONIMLARNING FUNKSIONAL-PRAGMATIK XUSUSIYATLARINI NAZARIY O‘RGANISH

Dilafruz Umarova*

ANNOTATSIYA

Mazkur tezisda filmonimlarning onomastik va semiotik maqomi, ularning funksional-pragmatik xususiyatlari hamda auditoriyaga ko‘rsatadigan kommunikativ ta’siri tahlil qilinadi. Film nomlarining nominativ, informativ, prognostik, integrativ, attraktiv, reklama, emotsional-baholovchi va estetik funksiyalari tizimlashtirilib, ularning ingliz va o‘zbek filmonimlari misolida namoyon bo‘lishi yoritiladi.

Kalit so‘zlar

filmonim, ideonim, onomastika, semiotika, pragmatika, nominativ funksiya, attraktivlik, kino diskursi

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.23277752

Cinema is one of the most influential forms of contemporary mass culture, and the initial communicative contact between a film and its audience is most often established through its title. A filmonym serves as the first communicative signal of a cinematic work by activating associations, shaping expectations about its content and genre, and influencing the viewer's decision to watch the film. Therefore, interpreting a film title merely as a naming device fails to capture its complex communicative and pragmatic nature. From an onomastic perspective, a filmonym belongs to the category of ideonyms, which designate the products of human intellectual, artistic, and cultural activity. It identifies a particular cinematic work, distinguishes it from other films, and individualizes it within the onomastic system. At the same time, a film title functions as a semantic nucleus that concisely conveys the plot, characters, central idea, and emotional atmosphere of the film, thereby establishing the foundation for the audience's interpretation even before the viewing process begins.

The semiotic approach provides an important methodological framework for explaining the functional-pragmatic nature of filmonyms. Charles W.Morris divides the science of signs into three interrelated dimensions: syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. Applied to filmonyms, this model suggests that the grammatical and structural organization of a film title constitutes its syntactic dimension, its relationship to the film's plot and conceptual content represents the semantic dimension, while its influence on the audience's attention, emotions, and viewing choices forms the pragmatic dimension [5]. This perspective demonstrates that a filmonym is not merely an isolated lexical unit but a semiotic sign that is interpreted by the recipient within a specific communicative context. Before a film is viewed, its title is perceived as a formal sign whose meaning has not yet been fully disclosed. As the viewing process unfolds, the relationship between the title and the film's plot, characters, setting, temporal framework, or central concept gradually becomes apparent. Upon completion of the film, the title evolves into a semantically motivated metatextual sign that reconstructs the meaning of the cinematic work in the viewer's memory. Consequently, the meaning of a filmonym is not fixed or predetermined; rather, it is constructed dynamically through the interaction between the film text and the audience's interpretative activity.

Russian scholar E.V.Knish identifies three principal functions of filmonyms: nominative, communica-

tive, and aesthetic. According to the researcher, the nominative function serves to name and individualize a cinematic work, the communicative function establishes the transmission of information and meaning between filmmakers and the audience, and while the aesthetic function reflects the artistic imagery embodied in the title and conveys the author's conceptual intention [1]. Y.N. Podimova, in turn, considers the nominative function to be the primary function of a filmonym and the informative function to be its leading characteristic. She argues that a film title not only provides the audience with an initial impression of the film's content but also arouses their interest in watching it [2, pp. 9–10]. Filmonyms based on the name of a protagonist, the setting, a historical period, a profession, or a particular activity offer direct information about the thematic orientation of the film. By contrast, metaphorical, symbolic, or semantically ambiguous titles do not reveal the content explicitly; instead, they encourage the audience to engage in a deeper process of interpretation.

The pragmatic impact of a filmonym is largely achieved through the use of stylistic, syntactic, and graphic devices. Interrogative and exclamatory punctuation, inversion, incomplete constructions, ellipsis, repetition, oxymoron, antonymic contrast, phraseological units, and precedent expressions all contribute to enhancing the expressive and emotional potential of a film title. Interrogative titles create the illusion of direct communication with the audience, whereas incomplete constructions generate semantic gaps that encourage viewers to reconstruct the missing information. Similarly, oxymorons and paradoxical expressions stimulate interpretative activity through semantic contrast, while lexical and phonetic repetition increases the memorability of the title [2, pp. 17–19]. Among the scholars who have investigated film titles, E.V.Skvortsova distinguishes five principal functions of filmonyms: nominative, advertising, informative, integrative, and communicative She demonstrates that these functions become salient at different stages of the audience's perception of a film [3]. Before the viewing process, the film title primarily performs an advertising function by attracting the audience's attention and stimulating interest. During the viewing, the title establishes semantic connections with the plot and the characters, thereby fulfilling its informative and integrative functions. After the film has been watched, the relationship between the title and the cinematic text becomes fully established, allowing the nominative function to acquire complete semantic motivation. In this way, Skvortsova emphasizes the dynamic and pragmatic nature of filmonyms and their role throughout the audience's interpretative process [3, pp. 135–136].

O.I.Aleksandrova conceptualizes the filmonym as the figurative and semantic core of a polycode cinematic text and identifies its anticipatory, attractive, advertising, and pragmatic functions in addition to the traditional nominative, communicative, informative, and aesthetic ones [4, p. 1194]. The anticipatory function creates initial expectations about the film, whereas the attractive function captures the audience's attention. The advertising function transforms this interest into the intention to choose or watch the film, while the pragmatic function influences the recipient's emotions, evaluative judgments, and behavioural responses.

Based on the synthesis of the theoretical approaches discussed above, the following major functions of filmonyms can be distinguished:

1. The nominative-identifying function names a film and distinguishes it from other cinematic works;
2. The informative-referential function provides information about the protagonist, plot, setting, time, genre, or the central theme of the film;
3. The prognostic-anticipatory function creates preliminary expectations regarding the film's content, genre, and emotional atmosphere;
4. The integrative-conceptual function unifies the plot, characters, and the central idea into a coherent semantic framework;
5. The phatic-attractive function establishes initial contact with the audience and captures their attention;
6. The appellative-advertising function encourages the audience to choose and watch the film;
7. The emotive-evaluative function evokes particular emotional responses and shapes the viewer's evaluative attitude toward the film;
8. The aesthetic-poetic function enhances the artistic expressiveness and formal appeal of the film title;

These functions do not operate in isolation; rather, a single filmonym may simultaneously perform several communicative and pragmatic functions. For instance, *The Godfather* not only individualizes the cin-

ematic work but also refers to its central character and his social status. Within the context of the film, the lexical component *Godfather* evokes associations with patriarchal authority, power, loyalty, and the hierarchical structure of organized crime. Consequently, the title simultaneously realizes the nominative-identifying, informative-referential, and prognostic functions. Similarly, *Eyes Wide Shut* is based on the juxtaposition of semantically contradictory elements. The paradoxical combination of the notions of ”wide open eyes” and ”being shut” creates an oxymoronic expression that does not disclose the film's content directly but instead encourages the audience to search for its implicit meaning. As a result, the title foregrounds its aesthetic-poetic and phatic-attractive functions while simultaneously stimulating the viewer's interpretative engagement.

Among Uzbek filmonyms *O‘tgan kunlar* is constructed around a temporal concept that activates associations with the past, historical memory, and national destiny. Rather than merely indicating the temporal setting of the narrative, the title encourages the audience to reinterpret the past from a contemporary perspective. Accordingly, it performs informative-referential, prognostic-anticipatory, and integrative-conceptual functions. Likewise, *Semurg‘* derived from the mythical bird of Eastern tradition, evokes culturally embedded concepts of virtue, salvation, spiritual elevation, and the pursuit of perfection. In addition to its nominative role, the title conveys linguocultural, axiological, and aesthetic-poetic meanings.

The communicative effectiveness of a filmonym is determined not only by its grammatical or lexical structure but also by the audience's cultural background, prior knowledge, genre expectations, and viewing experience. Furthermore, when presented in posters, trailers, and opening credits, a film title interacts with typography, imagery, colour, movement, and sound, becoming an integral component of polycode communication. Such multimodal presentation reinforces the informative, attractive, and emotional impact of the filmonym on the audience.

In conclusion, a filmonym is not merely an onomastic unit that identifies a cinematic work; it is also a concise textual construct that encodes the film's content, generates expectations and associations in the audience, and influences viewers' communicative decisions. Its nominative, informative, prognostic, integrative, attractive, advertising, emotive-evaluative, and aesthetic functions operate in close interaction rather than independently. The meaning of a film title is initially perceived as a tentative sign before the viewing experience, develops progressively throughout the film, and ultimately evolves into a coherent and semantically motivated semiotic sign upon the completion of the cinematic text.

Foydalanilgan adabiyotlar

[1] Кныш, Е. В. (1992). Лингвистический анализ наименований кинофильмов в русском языке [Автореферат диссертации кандидата филологических наук, специальность 10.02.01].

[2] Подымова, Ю. Н. (2006). Названия фильмов в структурно-семантическом и функционально-прагматическом аспектах [Автореферат диссертации кандидата филологических наук, специальность 10.02.01].

[3] Скворцова, Е. В. (2009). Функциональная парадигма названий американских художественных фильмов. В Феномен границы в языке и литературе: Международный сборник научных статей (с. 135–143). Издательство «Самарский университет».

[4] Александрова, О. И. (2017). Оригинальные и переводные названия кинофильмов как особые функциональные единицы. Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: Теория языка. Семиотика. Семантика, 8(4), 1191–1199. https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2299-2017-8-4-1191-1199

[5] Morris, C. W. (2014). Writings on the general theory of signs (Vol. 16). De Gruyter Mouton.

[6] Hołobut, A., Rapacz, M., & Stelmach, M. (2024). Working titles: Computational analysis of film titling practices: A Polish case study. Kwartalnik Filmowy, (127), 133–162. https://doi.org/10.36744/kf.3047

[7] Noyan, N. E. (2013). The kingdom of lettering: The film titles in the early years of Turkish cinema. Journal of Literature and Art Studies, 3(4), 230–241.