

THE CONCEPT OF A TOPONYMIC INDICATOR AND FEATURES OF ITS APPLICATION

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17217178>

Begimov Odil Tukhtamishovich

Head of the Department of Uzbek Language and Literature, Karshi Engineering and Economic Institute, Doctor of Philology (Karshi, Uzbekistan)

Annotation

Indicators play an important role in toponymy. These same indicators serve as a source for the creation of oronyms and other types of names of objects, together with other lexical units expressing orographic concepts. They not only express an object, but also have the ability to convey certain information about it. The article discusses the concept of an indicator and its application in oronymy.

Key words

toponym, oronym, indicator, orographic object, orographic term, oronymic term, oronymic indicator, name, common noun, proper noun.

INTRODUCTION

Among the various words used as part of toponyms of a particular region, the most interesting are lexical units that indicate the type of object being studied, such as village, stream, mountain, river, lake, valley, pass, peak. Without knowing what geographical object the researcher is interacting with, it is impossible to achieve any positive result in the study of geographical names, or even express any opinion about toponyms. Along with this, the names of toponymic objects may contain simple appellatives that served for their formation. It is considered important to distinguish such toponymic units and use them with their appropriate term. Various approaches to this issue can be seen in the scientific literature on linguistics. In particular, G.I. Donidze, reflecting on this issue, proposed using the phrase toponymic vocabulary in relation to the set of words and phrases used in geographical names - word combinations used as part of geographical names, indicating to which object these names belong - in toponymic terms [1,164].

METHODOLOGICAL BASIS AND METHODS OF RESEARCH

The research methodology is based on the trend of historicity and modernity observed in linguistics, that is, all events of a certain historical process are based on interpretation without separating them from historical conditions and events.

The scientific and theoretical basis of the study consists of methods of analysis and comparison of scientific opinions on toponymy used in modern linguistics. In the linguistic study of toponyms, methods were used to approach dialectical patterns in a combination of community and individuality, essence and event, form and content. The article used comparative historical analysis of recovering and dormant structures and formations with a comparison of linguistic facts as the main research method.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

G.I. Donidze, in his article on the study of oronymic vocabulary of Turkic languages [2], also touches on this issue in detail. In particular, he showed that the oronymic vocabulary of the Turkic languages consists of two groups of words that are quantitatively unequal: from word-terms (oronymic terms), which are small in number, and from many different words found in the names of orographic objects [2, 33].

Thus, we can use the phrase oronymic terms in relation to lexical units used in the names of orographic objects, as an integral part of toponymic terms.

It should not be overlooked that any orographic term cannot participate in the creation of oronyms. Therefore, to clarify this issue, it is necessary to separate the concepts of "oronymic term" and "orographic term". Research has shown that in the Uzbek language, as in other Turkic languages, any orographic term cannot be oronymic. But any oronymic term can be considered at the same time orographic. For example, the word "mountain" is found as an appellative name denoting this type of object, and as part of oronyms such as Bobotag, Aktag, Karatag.

Consequently, based on the considerations stated above, by the concept of oronymic terms we mean words-terms denoting orographic objects that are found only as part of oronyms and serve in their formation.

In studies done in the field of linguistics and the relevant scientific literature, there are different approaches to naming the concept of "oronymic term". In particular, Russian linguists G.I. Donidze [2], N.A. Baskakov [3], O.T. Molchanov [4], V.A. Nikonov [5] in his articles on the study of oronyms used the concepts of "geographical term", "orographic term" and "oronymic term".

In addition, similar uses can be seen in a number of works in which Turkic oronyms were studied monographically. In particular, Akhmedov Tofik Mursaly ogly, in his doctoral dissertation on the study of the system of toponyms of Azerbaijan, also used the terms "geographical name", "oronymic words" and in some places the term "indicator" [6]. Also, Israfilov Vagif Ismail oglu, in his dissertation on the study of oronyms and hydronyms of the Azerbaijani language

on the territory of Georgia, used terms such as “nomenclature term”, “topotherm” in relation to oronymic terms [7].

Russian linguist B. A. Serebrennikov used the term “toponymic indicators” in relation to lexical units expressing the type of object used as part of toponyms [8]. In the article by V.N. Popova, devoted to the study of hydronymic terms, one can see that she used the term “hydronymic indicator” in relation to terms denoting hydraulic engineering objects [9].

The concept of indicator in the dictionary of N.V. Podolskaya is used in toponyms as “a geographical term indicating what type of toponym it belongs to”, and the Latin word indicator means “indicator”. [10,133].

In Uzbek linguistics, including in studies on toponyms (scientific articles and dissertations), the tradition of using the term “toponymic indicator” in relation to a geographical term that is found in toponyms and indicates the type of object can be said to have begun in the 70s last century. This can be found in the article by Z. Dusimov on toponymic indicators [11]. This concept was later expanded and deepened in subsequent studies by Z. Dusimov and, as a result, in his published works.

In the studies of T. Nafasov, the concept of indicator is interpreted as “a word participating in the name of the area, denoting the type of object” [12].

In the last decades of the last century, as a result of efforts to Uzbekize our language, the word “termin”, like many other Russian words, fell out of use and the word “atama” began to be used instead. Probably because of this, during this period in scientific works on the study of toponyms, instead of the term “toponymik termin”, the use of “toponimik atama” came into use. In particular, this can be seen in the Ph.D. thesis of N. Begaliev [13].

At the same time, since the 80s of the last century, in scientific research on toponymy, instead of the term “toponymic indicator”, the term “toponymik aniklagich” (“toponymic determinant”) began to be used. The initial use of this term was observed in the works of S. Naimov [14]. Also, in the abstract of T.Zh. Ernazarov’s historical and comparative study of the regional toponymy of Shakhriyabz can also be seen using the term “toponymik aniklagich” (“toponymic determinant”) [15].

Similarly, in a research work on the study of hydronyms in relation to lexical units denoting the type of hydrographic object, one can see that they are named by terms such as “gidronymik termin” (“hydronymic term”), “gidronymik atama” (“hydronymic term”), “gidronymik aniklagich” (“hydronymic determinant”), “gidronymik indikator” (“hydronymic indicator”), “indikator-termin”, “darakchi termin”, “termin-indikator” [16].

The Uzbek explanatory dictionary states that the term “indikator” is borrowed from the Latin word “indicator”, which means “index”, “indicator” and is used in the following cases:

- a) in physics and technology, this is the general name for devices that determine physical quantities, mass, pressure, load, etc.;
- b) this is a substance added in small quantities to demonstrate the nature of chemical processes [17].

If we call indicators the lexical units participating in the names of localities that denote the object they represent, then the terms included in oronyms indicating their relationship to this object should be called oronymic indicators. Indicators play an important role in toponymy. In addition, indicators have the ability not only to represent an object, but also to provide certain information about it [18, 59].

Oronymic indicators of the Uzbek language and its local dialects have not been specifically studied. Only in studies on toponymy and scientific articles are some related comments, interpretations and analyzes given. The functional and semantic features of indicators in the toponymic system of the Uzbek language were specially studied by U. Radzhabov [19]. Also, the linguistic features of hydronymic indicators were specially studied by N. Ulukov. His works provide a detailed analysis of the concept of a hydronymic indicator and its lexical and semantic features [16].

In his work, Sh. Temirov, based on studying all the research in this area, prefers to use the term oronymic indicator. He argues that lexical units used as part of oronyms to indicate how orographic an object is, denoting a name, are oronymic indicators [20].

The genetic connection of oronyms with indicators is a concept known to everyone. These same indicators, together with other lexical units expressing orographic concepts, serve as a source for the creation of oronyms and other types of object names. But these connections also depend on the peculiarities of the formation of oronyms. They are especially observed during conversion, that is, during the direct transformation of common nouns into oronyms, without any addition of endings. Such a connection is not limited to the creation of names of objects of one type, but covers the formation of names of objects of all types.

The difference between indicators and oronyms is that while the former name geographic objects of the same type, the latter name such objects separately. Therefore, one of them represents a concept and the other does not. This opinion coincides with the opinion of E. Kurilovich that “if geographical terms designate,

then toponyms directly name.” To put it more simply, indicators are common nouns, i.e., they are considered appellatives, while oronyms are proper names.

According to G.I. Donidze, such an attitude is one of the particular manifestations of such general concepts as “toponymic term” and “geographical term.” For example, in Turkic and many other languages, any geographical term cannot be toponymic, but at the same time, a toponymic term in these languages, which has the ability to participate in the formation of geographical names, can be the basis for defining commonly used or so-called “local” geographical terms, can be the basis for defining geographical terms [2, 33].

Considering the many cases of words transitioning from one type to another, it should be separately noted that oronyms and oronymic indicators do not correspond to any transitional state. They can be either oronyms or indicators of the third, i.e. there can be no average state. For example, while the mountain indicator means height relative to ground level, gorge means depth. If you add at least one more symbol to these terms, then dozens of names are formed, denoting different shapes and features of the mountain and gorge. Moreover, these terms and the names derived from them usually have the peculiarity of narrow local use. However, one point cannot be ignored here: oronymic indicators are not the same either in area or in semantic volume. Even the most common ones can be very comprehensive or very abstract at the same time. They group geographical phenomena, separating them from each other according to only a few characteristics, or, more precisely, only according to one characteristic.

Yu. A. Kurilovich, repeating this operation several times, believes that for each of the words, river, mountain, lake, forest, etc., which are in common use, the bottom row can be more local to form a pyramid of geographical terms, and less abstract than the top row. In this case, the terms in each subsequent row become more precise due to the fact that they accept a larger number of designations of geographical objects [21, 37].

This also applies to oronymic indicators. If we compare them with the names of orographic objects, then oronyms form the lowest of such pyramids. Since all the trends that form the described pyramid of oronymic indicators end with the same oronyms. Locality reaches its norm, the number of the carrier object drops to one, abstractness disappears, the features taken into account in the name cover all the features of a given orographic object.

According to the definition of Yu. A. Karpenko, the division of oronyms into dichotomous parts is replaced by a multi-level hierarchy, which is fully permitted by geographical terms, more or less separated from toponyms and in a sense considered transitional [22, 37].]. If oronyms lose the differential sign denoting an

orographic object, they become indicators, such as: Singir, Dara, Tepa. And vice versa, if the indicator is used with any differential feature of the orographic object it represents, it becomes an oronym. For example: tog (mountain), dara (gorge), tepa (hill) - indicator; Karatag, Oktog, Govdara, Oktepa are oronyms. The use of indicators and their functional scope changes over time. Some indicators are used more and others less [18, 60]. It is clear that these features in the use of indicators lead to changes in their form and meaning. These changes occurring in the indicators are identified in the process of special linguistic analyses. Indicators that have changed shape and lost their meaning become toponymic formants. This is confirmed by the statement of E.M. Murzaev that many topoformants originated from indicators [23,17].

CONCLUSION

Based on the above considerations, it can be noted that oronyms, by their origin, are associated with oronymic indicators and, as one of their components, perform the following onomastic function:

- 1) represent and specify the type of orographic objects;
- 2) as part of oronyms they participate in the naming of orographic objects;
- 3) characterize the named object;
- 4) distinguishes an orographic object from other similar objects.

As studies show, in Turkic languages, including Uzbek, there are a large number of oronymic indicators and their range is wide. Therefore, the collection of oronymic indicators characteristic of the modern Uzbek literary language, dialects, dialects, synchronic and diachronic study of their lexical-semantic, etymological features based on the comparative typological method, from the point of view of areal linguistics, is important in the study of oronyms.

REFERENCES:

1. Donidze G. I. *Gidronimicheskie terminy v tyurkskih yazyikah.* – V sb.: *Onomastika.* M., 1969. s. 164-171.
2. Donidze G.I. *Oronimicheskaya leksika tyurkskih yazyikov Sovetskogo Soyuz.* - *Oronimika (Sbornik statey).* M., 1969, str. 33.
3. Baskakov N. A. *Printsiipy izberatel'nosti naimenovaniya gor u altaytsev gornogo Altaya.* - *Oronimika (sbornik statey),* M., 1969, str. 39-42.
4. Molchonova O. T. *Struktura oronimov i gidronimov gornogo Altaya.* - *Oronimika (sbornik statey),* M., 1969, str. 42-46.
5. Nikonov V.A. *Zametki po oronimii Kirgizii.* – V sb.: *Onomastika Sredney Azii.* Moskva, 1978. str. 86-105.

6. Ahmedov Tofik Mursalyi oglyi. Sistema azerbaydjanskiy toponimov. ADD, Baku, 1987, 55 str.
7. Israfilov Vagif Ismail oglyi. Azarbaydjanoyazyichnyie oronimyi i gidronimyi Gruzinskiy SSR. AKD, Baku, 1989 22-str.
8. Serebrennikov B.A. O metodah izucheniya toponimicheskikh nazvaniy. - Voprosyi yazyikoznaniya, 1959. -№ 6. – S. 36-50.
9. Popova V.N. Gidronimicheskie terminyi Pavlodarskoy oblasti. - Toponimika Vostoka. – M., 1969. – S. 150.).
10. Podolskaya N.V. Slovar russkoy onomasticheskoy terminologii. – Moskva: Nauka, 1978. – S. 133.
11. Dusimov Z. Toponimik indikatorlar. – ŶTA. T., 1972, № 5, -B. 71-76.
12. Nafasov T. Ŷzbekiston toponimlarining izoxli luŶati. – Toshkent: Ŷkituvchi, 1988. – B. 287.
13. Begaliev N. Samarqand viloyati gidronimlari (lisoniy taxlil). Filol. fanlari nomzodi diss. avtoreferati. Toshkent, 1994. S. 20.
14. Naimov S. Toponimik aniqŶlagichlar xaqida.// Ŷzbek tili va adabiŶti. – Toshkent, 1983. - № 4. -B. 63-64.
15. Enazarov T. Shahrisabz hududi joy nomlarining tarihiy-qiyosiy tahlili. Filol. fanlari nomzodi... avtoref. T., 1993. -24 b.
16. Ulukov N.M. Uzbek tili gidronimlarining tarihiy-lisoniy tadkiki. Doktorlik diss. avtoreferati, Toshkent, 2010. -S. 45.
17. Uzbek tilining izohli lugati. – Moskva: Rus tili, 1981. – 1-t. – B. 327.
18. Dusimov Z. Horazm toponimlari. T.: Fan, 1985. -104 b.
19. Rajabov U. H. Topnimik indikatorlarning funksional-semantik hususiyatlari. Nomzod. diss. avtoreferati. Toshkent, 2009. -S. 19.
20. Temirov SH. Samarqand viloyati oronimlarkrining lisoniy tadkiki: Filol. fan. nom. ... diss. avtoref. – Samarqand, 2019. – B.20.
21. Kurilovich E. Ocherki po lingvistike. M., 1962. str. 252.
22. Karpenko YU.A. Toponimyi i geograficheskie terminyi (voprosyi vzaimosvyazi). - Mestnyi geograficheskie terminyi. M., «Mysl», 1970. str. 36 - 45.
23. Murzaev E.M. Mestnyie geograficheskie terminyi i ih rol v toponimii. – V sb.: «Mestnyie geograficheskie terminyi». M., 1970, s. 17.