

CATEGORIES OF ONOMASTIC SPACE

Kozieva Iqbol Kamiljonovna

PhD teacher of the Department of Russian linguistics

Bukhara, Uzbekistan, Bukhara State University

ikbolkoziyeva0105@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This article discusses the place of onomastic material in the general language system. It also examines the discrepancies between statements about the structure or organization of onomastic space and its individual categories. Some linguists have expressed the opinion that the basis of language is a system of common words, which represents a classification system that covers the whole world and is available to humans. All sign systems used by humans are based on it, it is the basis of human thinking and behavior. The article analyzes proper names that do not form an integral system and occupy a peripheral place within the language.

Keywords: Anthroponym, onomastics, onomastic space, categories, system connections, system relations, theory.

INTRODUCTION

The question of the place of onomastic material in the general system of language has not received a single solution. Statements about the structure or organization of onomastic space and its individual categories reveal even more discrepancies.

For example, some linguists express the opinion that the basis of language is a system of common words, which represents a classification system that covers the whole world and is available to humans. As a result, according to the scientists who put forward this statement, the meaning of the system in question goes far beyond the purely linguistic phenomenon. In fact, all sign systems used by humans are based on, it is the basis of human thinking and behavior. As for proper names, they do not form an integral system and occupy a peripheral place within the language.

Simultaneously with this theory, there is another one, according to which proper names do not form an independent onomastic system different from the system of a given language, but are "included in it." Thus, V. N. Toporov recognizes the "intermediate position" of proper names between ordinary linguistic and "hieroglyphic" elements of the text (foreign words and expressions, abbreviations, symbols of specialized languages, etc.) and their "relative independence".

Researcher V. N. Toporov, one of the linguists who puts forward this theory, sees the task of determining the degree of autonomy and the degree, or "coefficient", of consistency of onomastic facts, as well as the specific forms of its manifestation. An IM system is understood as "a set of elements organized in such a way that a change, exclusion, or introduction of a new element is naturally (predictably) reflected in the remaining elements."

The dependent use of two or more proper names is considered a manifestation of systemic relations in toponymy, anthroponymy and other categories of onomastic vocabulary, for example: Small — Large, Old — New, White — Black, Zhdan — Nejdán, Alexander —

Alexandra (feminine. name), as well as the presence of onomastic elements related to each other in relation to production, for example: Dnipro - Dneprik, Ivan — Ivanushka, Peter — Petrusha, as well as Beloe (lake), Belaya (river), Belitsa (its tributary), Belsk (a city on the river), Velskoye (village), etc. with: Black, Black, Blueberry, etc

A manifestation of systematicity, moreover, which is peculiarly embodied, are cases of developing an "independent grammar" of onomastic units (cf.: common nouns love, love, but the anthroponym Love, Love; common nouns with the preposition beyond the forest, but the toponym is Zales, Zalesu, Zalesu) and often in languages there are facts of specialization of grammatical categories and means (most often suffixes) in onomastic vocabulary: proper names — these are nouns (or substantive combinations of words) 35, as a rule, not variable in numbers {Kursk, Volga, "Quiet Don", as well as substantive adjectives: Lugovoy, Verkhniye Klyuchi, Novye Vyselki), often decorated, as we have already seen above, with the same type of word-forming and formative means (the cities of Komsomolsk, Novokuibyshevsk, Volzhsk, Surek and under., the villages of Ivanovka, Ternovka, Veselovka and under.). There is a specialization of proper names in certain syntactic functions.

Nevertheless, onomastic vocabulary is usually spoken of as a poorly organized system (when taken in its entirety), with a "low coefficient of consistency" of its material. Obviously, at first it would be more natural to investigate system connections and especially the degree of their ordering not in the entire onomastic vocabulary (onomastic space), but in its individual categories — in anthroponymy, toponymy, cosmonymy, etc. In terms of their structural and systemic organization, certain sections of onomastic vocabulary (for example, personal names, especially forms of "subjective" assessment) may not be inferior to the usual vocabulary of the language, and sometimes even surpass it. For example, many personal names (both male and female) form a diminutive form with the suffix -enka (Vasenska, Borenska, Kapgenka, Mashenska, Tanyushka, etc.), and with the suffix -ka disparaging forms {Vaska, Borka, Katka, Masha, Tanka, etc.). Conclusion V. N. Toporova's statement that in onomastics "the gap between the blocks of systemically organized elements is incomparably greater than in the language as a whole" can only be accepted with reservations, since "in the language as a whole" there are many sections and layers (especially in vocabulary) with poor structure and consistency.

Thus, understanding the onomastic sector of language as a system subordinate in its basic laws to the neonomastic "metropolis" of language does not detract from the originality of onomastic material and does not deny the possibility of finding in it such types and forms of connections that are either absent altogether or poorly represented in the neonomastic array of language. The task is to study onomastics without losing sight of the systemic connections both within the onomastic space (between units of the same category, between different onomastic units and categories) and on the scale of the language as a whole.

REFERENCES

1. Begmatov E. A. O'zbekiston nomlari ma'lumotiislmlari ma'nosi (izoxlilug'at). 14 600 ismlar izoxi.2-nashri. — Toshkent: O'zbekiston milliy ensiklopediyasi (lug'at), 2007. — 608 r.

2. Bondaletov V. D. Semiotic study of toponymy (names of populated places in the Penza region).— In: Toponymy of Central Russia, Moscow, 1974, pp. 70-78.
3. Vorobyova I. A. On the issue of the systemic nature of toponymy (based on the geographical names of Kuzbass).— In: Local History of Kuzbass, vol. 4. Novokuznetsk, 1971, pp. 168-177;
4. Yermolovich D.I. atoqli otlr tillar va madaniyatlar o'rtasida. -M.: R.Valent, 2001.
5. Petrovskiy N.A. Rus shaxsiy ismlar lug'ati.-M.: Izdatelstvo Sovetskaya ensiklopediya,1966.
6. Toporov V. N. Some considerations in connection with the construction of theoretical toponomastics.— In: Principles of Toponymy, Moscow, 1964, p. 9,
7. Nafasov T. Markayev O'tish: Saytda Harakatlanish, Qidiruv O'zbek etnoantroponimlari // Onomastika O'zbekiston onomastikasi. Sat. tez.II rep. ilmiy-amaliy.conf. - Qarshi, 1989. — P. 136-140.
8. Nikonov V. A. Ism va jamiyat. –M.: Ilmiy. 1974. — 278 p.
9. Superenskaya A.V. Atoqli otlar struktrasi fonologiya va morfonologiya. -M.: Nauka, 1969.
10. Koziyeva I. K. The Boundaries of Onomastic Vocabulary 10th International Conference on Computer Science and Engineering (UBMK), Istanbul, Turkiye, 2025, pp. 1563-1568, doi: 10.1109/UBMK67458.2025.11206932.
11. Koziyeva I. K. the history of the development of russian anthroponymy //международный журнал языка, образования, перевода. – 2022. – т. 3. – №. 3.