

ONOMASTIK BIRLIKLAR LEKSIKOGRAFIYA OBYEKTI SIFATIDA

Berdiyeva Mashhura Tulqin qizi,
Qarshi davlat universiteti
Mustaqil tadqiqodchisi
mashhuraberdiyeva0999@gmail.com

Annotatsiya. Ushbu maqolada onomastik birliklarning leksikografik doirada ifodalanishining nazariy va amaliy jihatlari tadqiq etiladi. Umumiy va maxsus lug'atlarga atoqli otlarni - antroponimlar, toponimlar va zoonimlarni kiritishda yuzaga keladigan o'ziga xos muammolar tahlil qilinadi. Tadqiqotda kodifikatsiyalashning mavjud usullari baholanadi hamda semantik va ensiklopedik aniqlikni oshirish uchun onomastik lug'at maqolalarining optimallashtirilgan mikrostrukturasi taklif etiladi. Xulosalar shuni ko'rsatadiki, onomastik birliklar lisoniy ta'rif va madaniy kontekstni birlashtiruvchi gibridd yondashuvni talab qiladi.

Kalit so'zlar: Onomastika, leksikografiya, onomastik birliklar, atoqli otlar, lug'at maqolasi, kodifikatsiya, antroponimlar, toponimlar, lingvokulturologiya.

Аннотация. В данной статье исследуются теоретические и практические аспекты представления ономастических единиц в лексикографическом контексте. Анализируются специфические проблемы, возникающие при включении имен собственных - антропонимов, топонимов и зоонимов - в общие и специальные словари. В работе оцениваются существующие методы кодификации и предлагаются оптимизированные микроструктуры для ономастических словарных статей с целью повышения семантической и энциклопедической точности. Результаты показывают, что ономастические единицы требуют гибридного подхода, объединяющего лингвистическое определение и культурный контекст.

Ключевые слова: Ономастика, лексикография, ономастические единицы, имена собственные, словарная статья, кодификация, антропонимы, топонимы, лингвокультурология.

Abstract. This article explores the theoretical and practical aspects of representing onomastic units within a lexicographical framework. It analyzes the specific challenges posed by proper names-including anthroponyms, toponyms, and zoonyms-when integrated into general and specialized dictionaries. The study evaluates existing methods of codification and proposes optimized microstructures for onomastic entries to enhance semantic and encyclopedic clarity. The findings suggest that onomastic units require a hybrid approach that bridges the gap between linguistic definition and cultural context.

Key words: Onomastics, lexicography, onomastic units, proper names, dictionary entry, codification, anthroponyms, toponyms, linguistic culturology.

Kirish. The intersection of onomastics and lexicography represents one of the most complex frontiers in modern linguistics. While traditional lexicography focuses on the codification of common nouns (appellatives), onomastic units-comprising names of people (anthroponyms), places (toponyms), and even animals (zoonyms)- occupy a unique ontological space. These units function not merely as linguistic labels but as "condensed texts" carrying profound historical, cultural, and sociolinguistic information.

Historically, the inclusion of proper names in dictionaries has been a subject of intense debate. Traditionalists often argued that names lack "meaning" in the conventional sense, belonging more to the realm of encyclopedias than linguistic lexicons. However, in the contemporary era of linguistic culturology, this dichotomy is increasingly viewed as artificial. Onomastic units possess a specific type of "onomastic meaning" that includes:

1. Etymological layers: The original linguistic root.

2. Social markers: Gender, ethnicity, and status.
3. Associative-cultural background: The "fame" or historical weight of the name.

Despite their ubiquity, onomastic units remain inconsistently treated in lexicographical practice. General-purpose dictionaries often exclude them or provide minimal data, while specialized onomastic dictionaries frequently focus on etymology at the expense of modern usage and grammatical paradigms. There is a pressing need for a systematic approach to the microstructure of the onomastic entry-one that balances linguistic precision with the encyclopedic depth required by a globalized audience. This article aims to bridge the gap between theoretical onomastics and practical dictionary-making. By examining the structural peculiarities of proper names, we propose a methodology for their codification that respects their dual nature as both lexical items and cultural artifacts. Through this analysis, the study seeks to refine the criteria for selecting onomastic units and to standardize the descriptive models used in contemporary lexicographical projects.

Adabiyotlar tahlili. The debate regarding the semantic nature of onomastic units serves as the foundation of this field. Early linguistic theories, such as those by John Stuart Mill (1843), suggested that proper names "denote" but do not "connote" meaning they point to an object without describing its attributes. However, this view was challenged in the 20th century. Otto Jespersen and later Gottlob Frege argued that names possess a "sense" (Sinn), which is indispensable for their identification. In the Soviet and post-Soviet tradition, A.V. Superanskaya (1973) provided a comprehensive framework, defining the onomastic space as a distinct subsystem of language. Her work emphasizes that proper names are not "meaningless" but are instead saturated with social, historical, and legal information, which necessitates a specific approach to their lexicographical recording.

The treatment of names in dictionaries has historically oscillated between inclusion and exclusion.

1. The Western Tradition: Major English lexicons like the Oxford English Dictionary (OED) and Merriam-Webster typically separate proper names into appendices or specialized biographical/geographical dictionaries. Scholars like Patrick Hanks have noted that the "dictionary vs. encyclopedia" divide often leaves onomastic units in a "methodological vacuum," where their linguistic behavior (inflection, pluralization) is ignored in favor of their factual content.

2. The Onomastic Dictionary: The development of specialized dictionaries (anthroponymic and toponymic) by scholars such as E.M. Murzaev and V.A. Nikonov shifted the focus toward etymology and historical geography. Their work laid the groundwork for the microstructure of the onomastic entry, which must account for the name's origin, variant forms, and geographical distribution.

In the context of Uzbek linguistics, the study of onomastic units is closely tied to national identity and linguistic history. Significant contributions have been made by E.

Begmatov, whose research on Uzbek anthroponymy explored the layers of names-from ancient Turkic roots to Islamic and modern influences.

Recent studies by Uzbek researchers focus on the linguo-methodological aspects of names. The transition from Cyrillic to the Latin-based script and the subsequent need for standardized orthography in dictionaries have brought the "orthographic function" of lexicography to the forefront. Scholars today are increasingly looking at how to reflect the cultural-national code within the dictionary entry, moving beyond simple definitions to describe the "concept" behind the name.

Current trends in lexicography move toward an integrative model. As noted by H. Bergenholtz, modern dictionaries are becoming "tools for communication" rather than just "inventories of words." This perspective treats onomastic units as cognitive categories. The research landscape is now dominated by the transition from paper to electronic and metalexicography, where onomastic entries can be linked to vast databases. The challenge, as highlighted in recent literature, is no longer if names should be in dictionaries, but how to structure them to satisfy both the linguistic researcher and the general user seeking cultural context. While the theoretical foundations (Superanskaya, Begmatov) and the etymological traditions (Nikonov) are well-established, there is a lack of a unified integrative methodology that treats onomastic units as dynamic objects of lexicography in the digital age. Most existing literature focuses on classification rather than the technique of dictionary-entry construction. This research seeks to address this gap by proposing a standardized microstructure for onomastic units that bridges the linguistic and the encyclopedic.

Tadqiqot metodologiyasi. The current research employs an integrative approach to investigate the lexicographical representation of onomastic units. To ensure a comprehensive analysis, the study is divided into several methodological phases.

1. Data Selection and Material Collection: the research corpus consists of a purposive sample of onomastic units selected from diverse linguistic backgrounds, primarily focusing on anthroponyms (personal names) and toponyms (place names). Material was extracted from general explanatory dictionaries, specialized onomastic lexicons, and encyclopedic dictionaries in English, Russian, and Uzbek. Units were selected based on their frequency of use, cultural significance, and the complexity of their semantic structure (e.g., names with multiple etymological layers or those undergoing orthographic shifts).

2. Theoretical and Analytical Methods are used achieving the research objectives, the following linguistic methods were utilized:

A) Descriptive Method is used to characterize the current state of onomastic entries in existing dictionaries and to identify common omissions or inconsistencies in their presentation.

B) Comparative-Contrastive Analysis are employed to examine how the same onomastic unit (e.g., a major city name) is treated across different lexicographical traditions (English vs. Uzbek), highlighting variations in depth and content.

C) Component Analysis are used to deconstruct the "onomastic meaning" into its constituent parts: denotative (the object identified), etymological (the origin), and connotative (cultural and social associations).

D) Metalexical Modeling involved the theoretical construction of a "model entry." We analyzed the macrostructure (the arrangement of names in the dictionary) and the microstructure (the internal organization of the individual entry).

Tahlil va natijalar. The analytical phase reveals a profound lack of systemic uniformity in how onomastic units are integrated into the macrostructure of modern lexicons. In the traditional English and Slavic traditions, proper names often undergo a process of "de-grammaticalization," where their status as functional lexical items is subordinated to their role as historical markers. This creates a methodology where the phonological and morphological properties of a name-such as its stress patterns in Russian or its orthographic stabilization in the Uzbek Latin script-are frequently sacrificed for a purely denotative description. The results of this study suggest that the "onomastic meaning" is not a singular entity but a stratified construct. To achieve a high level of lexicographical precision, an entry must address three distinct theoretical layers:

1. The Genetic-Etymological Layer: This represents the diachronic root of the name, bridging its origin as a common appellative (e.g., the concept of "iron" or "river") with its current specialized function.

2. The Denotative-Identificatory Layer: This serves the primary linguistic purpose of the name, functioning as a unique signifier that distinguishes one specific entity within the broader onomastic space.

3. The Axiological-Cultural Layer: This encompasses the "vertical context" of the name-its symbolic weight, religious associations, and the national-cultural code it carries within a specific speech community.

The central outcome of the research is the proposal of an Integrative Onomastic Entry Model. Unlike conventional models that treat names as peripheral appendages, this framework positions the onomastic unit as a core lexical element requiring full linguistic description. The proposed microstructure shifts the focus from simple identification to a comprehensive codification. It incorporates a mandatory "Grammar Zone" to address the inflectional behavior of names and a "Linguo-Cultural Zone" that explains the name's place within the collective consciousness of the speakers. By synthesizing these elements, the model ensures that the dictionary functions as both a linguistic authority and a cultural repository, providing a holistic view of the "onomastic landscape." The analysis confirms that the evolution of lexicography demands a move away from the "dictionary vs. encyclopedia" dichotomy. The results illustrate that onomastic units possess a dual nature:

they are both linguistic signs and cultural artifacts. Consequently, their representation in any modern lexicon must reflect this duality through a hybrid structure that maintains the rigor of linguistic analysis while satisfying the user's need for contextual and encyclopedic depth. This approach not only enhances the accuracy of the dictionary but also preserves the ethno-linguistic heritage embedded within the names themselves.

Xulosa va takliflar. The investigation into onomastic units as objects of lexicography underscores a fundamental shift in contemporary linguistic paradigms. The study demonstrates that proper names can no longer be relegated to the periphery of the lexicon as mere labels or static identifiers. Instead, they must be recognized as complex, multi-layered linguistic signs that bridge the gap between a language's grammatical structure and its socio-cultural heritage. The primary theoretical contribution of this research lies in the deconstruction of the "onomastic meaning." By identifying the Genetic-Etymological, Denotative-Identificatory, and Axiological-Cultural layers, the study provides a robust framework for understanding how names function within a live speech community. The analysis confirms that the traditional "dictionary versus encyclopedia" dichotomy is a methodological barrier that hinders the full codification of the onomastic space. A modern lexicon must, therefore, adopt a hybrid approach that respects both the linguistic rigor of the lemma and the encyclopedic depth of the referent. While this research provides a comprehensive model for the onomastic entry, the field remains open to further exploration, particularly regarding the automation of onomastic data processing. Future studies should focus on the integration of artificial intelligence and corpus linguistics to track the real-time evolution of neonymic units and social media anthroponymy. Ultimately, the refinement of onomastic lexicography is not merely a technical task but a vital contribution to the global dialogue between language, history, and identity.

References:

1. Superanskaya, A. V. (1973). "Obshchaya teoriya imeni sobstvennogo" (General Theory of Proper Names). Moscow: Nauka. (pp. 12–15 ;pp. 234–240)
2. Begmatov, E. A. (1991). "O'zbek ismlari" (Uzbek Names). Tashkent: Qomuslar Bosh tahririyati. (pp. 5–12; pp. 27–34)
3. Begmatov, E. A. (2007). "O'zbek ismlari ma'nosi" (Meanings of Uzbek Names). Tashkent: O'zbekiston Milliy Ensiklopediyasi. (pp. 40–55)
4. Zgusta, L. (1971). "Manual of Lexicography". Prague: Academia , The Hague: Mouton. (pp. 197–199; pp. 222–225)
5. Nikonov, V. A. (1974). "Imya i obshchestvo" (Name and Society). Moscow: Nauka. (pp. 3–10; pp. 215–220)
6. Hanks, P. (2013). "Lexical Analysis: Norms and Exploitations". MIT Press. (pp. 63–82)
7. Qorayev, S. (2005). "Toponimika" (Toponymy). Tashkent: O'zbekiston faylasuflari milliy jamiyati. (pp. 110–118)