

ТІЛ БІЛІМІНІҢ МӘСЕЛЕЛЕРІ
ПРОБЛЕМЫ ЯЗЫКОЗНАНИЯ
PROBLEMS OF LINGUISTICS

IRSTI 14.35.07

DOI: [10.59102/kufil/2024/iss4pp9-22](https://doi.org/10.59102/kufil/2024/iss4pp9-22)

G. Akhmetova

Alikhan Bokeikhan University, Semey, 071400, Kazakhstan

LEXICO-SEMANTIC NATURE OF TOPONYMS: THEORY AND ANALYSIS

The study of the lexico-semantic nature of toponyms is becoming increasingly significant in today's anthropocentric world, which focuses on language through human experience and interaction with the environment. Toponyms reflect how people conceptualize space and convey cultural and social perceptions through geographic names. The forces of globalization and urbanization pose a threat to local linguistic and cultural characteristics, making the study of toponyms crucial for preserving diversity. This process aids in the creation of a systematized knowledge base that can serve as a foundation for further scientific and applied research. It entails the classification, analysis, and synthesis of existing approaches and data, fostering a deeper understanding of the toponymic system and its role in the cultural-historical context. The theoretical significance lies in the systematization of existing approaches and methods for analyzing the toponymic system, which facilitates a deeper understanding of the processes of naming and forming geographical names, as well as their role in reflecting the cultural-historical context of toponyms in the regions of Kazakhstan. The practical significance lies in the potential for use in linguistic, ethnographic, and sociolinguistic research, offering a deeper understanding of the ethnocultural composition of the regions and the historical processes that have influenced the formation of Kazakhstan's toponymic system. The methodological foundation of the article is based on the works of leading domestic and international scholars in the fields of linguistic cultural studies, country studies, and sociolinguistics, whose names and research problems are thoroughly presented in the introduction. The main conclusion of the research is that the study has revealed the existence of diverse scientific approaches and paradigms that reflect the multifaceted and complex nature of Kazakhstan's toponymic system. Various theoretical and methodological approaches enable a deeper understanding of the lexico-semantic features of toponyms, their historical and cultural significance, and their role in shaping national and cultural identity.

Key words: toponymy, toponym, lexico-semantic analysis, anthropocentrism, cultural heritage, ethnocultural diversity, national identity.

MAIN PROVISIONS

The issue of studying the lexico-semantic nature of toponyms at the present stage is particularly relevant for Kazakhstan, a country where national identity is being shaped within a multicultural and multilingual space that intertwines various ethnic groups, historical eras, and cultural traditions. Kazakhstan's toponymic system has developed over centuries under the influence of both nomadic and sedentary cultures, as well as the interactions between Turkic, Persian, Slavic, and other peoples, which is reflected in the significant diversity of geographical names.

The contemporary shift in the scientific paradigm of linguistics, particularly the recognition of anthropocentrism as a fundamental property of language, has sparked increased interest in toponymic studies. In this context, toponyms are viewed not only as linguistic units but also as reflections of a

nation's history and its cultural-linguistic development. The recognition of the importance of toponym studies for linguistic science necessitates a detailed examination of the toponymic systems of individual regions of Kazakhstan. Analyzing the patterns of lexico-semantic organization of toponyms, their word-formation potential, as well as their historical and cultural characteristics, is essential for forming a comprehensive understanding of the functioning of Kazakhstan's toponymic system.

Moreover, the study of toponyms holds significance not only from a scientific perspective but also from a practical one, as it contributes to the preservation of cultural heritage, strengthens the position of the state language, and supports national identity in the context of active state-building. Research into toponyms through lexico-semantic analysis plays an important role not only in understanding the ethnogenesis and historical geography of regions but also in uncovering the deep cultural and historical meanings embedded in geographical names. Place names reflect the worldview, traditions, and values of the peoples who inhabited these territories over the centuries. “Significant influence on the development and study of toponymy in Kazakhstan as a whole was exerted by the works of Soviet scholars, who not only collected and systematized geographical names within the territory of Kazakhstan but also, where possible, conducted their etymological analysis” [1, 227]. The works of both domestic and foreign researchers, such as V. Zhuchkevich (systematization and classification of Kazakhstan’s toponyms), E. Koichubaev (compilation of a concise explanatory dictionary of Kazakhstan’s toponyms), B. Bektasov (comprehensive systematization of toponyms related to water and land in Kazakhstan), Sh. Kamollidin (research on ancient Turkic toponymy in Central Asia), S. Vodopyanova (formulation of a methodology for conducting a toponymy laboratory workshop), T. Dzhanuzakov (study of the toponymy of Central Kazakhstan), and T. Imangulov (creation of a tourist-toponymic dictionary for the Almaty region), among others, have made significant contributions to the development of toponymic science, emphasizing the multifaceted nature and importance of studying toponymic systems.

Particular attention is paid to the study of the toponymy of specific regions and areas of the Republic of Kazakhstan. Regional toponymic studies conducted by A. Kozhanov (Atyrau region), B. Bektasov (Kostanay region), G. Madiyev (East Kazakhstan region), A. Zhartybaev (Karaganda region), K. Sembiev (Kyzylorda region), K. Rysbergenov (South Kazakhstan region), U. Yerzhanov (West Kazakhstan), and others have significantly advanced the field of domestic toponymy. These studies can be further expanded, as many regions of Kazakhstan remain insufficiently explored from a toponymic perspective. It is crucial to conduct a detailed analysis of geographical names in small settlements, natural objects, and local toponyms, as these can reveal the historical, cultural, and linguistic characteristics of specific regions. Moreover, it is essential to consider the modern processes of urbanization and landscape changes, which impact the formation and disappearance of toponyms, making continued research both relevant and vital for the preservation of the country’s cultural heritage.

The toponymy of Kazakhstan represents an extremely diverse and complex field, which has attracted the attention of researchers for many generations. Currently, the systematization of the republic’s toponyms is being undertaken by specialists from various scientific disciplines, including geography, history, linguistics, tourism, and local history. Notable scholars in this field include Dr. of Geography A. Gorbunova, Candidates of Historical Sciences Z. Dzhandosova and I. Yerofeeva, Doctors of Historical Sciences M. Kozha, E. Orazbek, M. Semba, G. Sultangaliyeva, A. Rogozhinsky, as well as Dr. of Geography K. Kaimuldinov.

This paper is devoted to the collection and analysis of theoretical materials related to the study of the lexico-semantic nature of toponyms. The main goal of the research is to study and systematize them. The research examines various theoretical approaches to the study of toponyms and highlights the main methods for their analysis in terms of their lexical and semantic nature within the scientific landscape of Kazakhstan.

INTRODUCTION

The nomination of objects in the surrounding reality is a continuous process that occurs in parallel with the expansion of human knowledge about the world. This process includes both the classification of objects through the use of common nouns and their individualization via proper names. Toponyms, as a result of long historical and cultural development, reflect various aspects of societal life. Since the names of geographical objects have been formed over centuries, every language contains toponyms that originated in different eras and are associated with various spheres of human activity. Many of these names have been inherited from peoples who previously inhabited the given territory, carrying elements of their culture and language. Each toponym represents a cultural-historical code that reflects the everyday life, beliefs, artistic representations, and historical interactions of a people. These names encode linguistic information often unavailable from other sources: toponyms preserve forms, sounds, and words that have fallen out of use. In this regard, geographical names serve as an invaluable resource for linguistics, helping to reconstruct the development of language and culture over the centuries.

E. Sapir argues in his article “Language, Race, and Culture,” one of his most well-known and influential works, that language is not merely a means of communication but also a way of expressing the cultural values and worldview of a society: “Language not only reflects cultural differences, but it is also a means of creating them. Each language contains unique ways of perceiving the world, which are culturally conditioned” [2, 223]. Toponyms, being an important part of language, are lexical units that not only name geographical objects but also carry a complex system of semantic meanings and cultural codes. Petar Ilievski notes that “What fossils are to biology, and sediments to geology, toponyms are to cultural history of a country because they reflect the various ethnic, economic, political and other changes in the past of the country” [3, 169]. The study of toponyms allows us to delve into the interaction between language and the surrounding world, revealing how different peoples conceptualize space through the lens of their own language. Lexico-semantic analysis of toponyms, therefore, becomes one of the key methods for understanding their origins, structure, and meanings.

It is well known that the history of the peoples inhabiting a particular territory plays a significant role in the composition of a country’s toponymy, as well as the expansion and deepening of knowledge about its geography, economy, local folklore, and linguistic characteristics. In the Kazakh language, many toponyms contain references to natural features of the landscape, such as mountains, rivers, and deserts, reflecting a close connection between the people and their environment and their perception of the landscape. G. Ualikhan notes that “such a systematization is related to the characteristics of Kazakh tribes and their way of life. The Kazakh people are known for their nomadic lifestyle, and the place of nomadic settlement was usually close to a water source. Thus, this division is based on the behavioral culture of the Kazakh people” [4, 27].

Of particular interest are also the toponyms that reflect historical events, the names of notable figures, and social processes, such as migrations and the settlement of new territories. V. Zhuchkevich identifies three main layers in the toponymy of Kazakhstan: 1) the earliest pre-Kazakh (likely Iranian); 2) Turkic-speaking (Kazakh with individual Arabic and Mongolian fragments); 3) Russian-speaking. According to Zhuchkevich’s typology, the majority of Russian-speaking toponyms in Kazakhstan fall into the category of patronymic names (derived from the names and surnames of notable individuals) [5, 229].

Modern research in the field of toponymy addresses a wide range of aspects, including etymology, morphology, and the functional characteristics of toponyms. However, particular attention is given to their semantic nature, as semantics is what allows us to uncover the connections between language and culture that are reflected in geographical names. The lexical and semantic features of toponyms can reveal historical processes, cultural contacts, and migrations of peoples, as well as changes in the perception of space.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study of the Kazakh language using onomastic material alongside appellative lexicon began as early as the 1930s-1950s in the works of renowned Kazakh linguists, laying the foundation for the further development of this scientific field. For instance, phonetic changes in words were described, the history of the Kazakh language and its dialectal features were studied, the origins of tribal names – characteristic of the hierarchically organized tribal structure of Kazakh society – were researched, and etymological analysis was employed to trace etymons and uncover word meanings. These and many other aspects of research were conducted based on concrete facts from the field of onomastics. This significantly deepened the understanding of the historical development of the Kazakh language and its connection to cultural and social processes.

The first systematic toponymic study in the form of a doctoral dissertation on the topic “Kazakh Folk Geographical Terms” (1949) was conducted by G. Konkashpaev. These and other works have provided valuable material for the present study, and the methodological approaches presented in them have formed the basis for the analysis of the lexico-semantic and morphological nature of Kazakhstan's toponyms. The aforementioned scholarly works contain both theoretical and practical methods developed for the systematization and classification of toponymic data, enabling a comprehensive analysis of toponymy based on extensive empirical materials. G. Konkashpaev carried out an in-depth analysis of a large body of toponymic material, identifying toponyms of various origins in Kazakhstan and paying special attention to the role of geographical terms in their composition. He also published the first toponymic work – “Dictionary of Kazakh Geographical Names” (1963). The aim of this research was to systematize and structure theoretical and practical materials on the lexico-semantic nature of toponyms to create a systematized knowledge base, which served as the foundation for subsequent scientific and applied research in this field (see Table 1).

Table. 1. “Works of Kazakh Scholars in the Field of Toponymy”¹.

No.	Name	Scholar	Year	Type of work
1	2	3	4	5
1.	“Kazakh Folk Geographical Terms”	G. Konkashpaev	1949	Doctoral Dissertation
2.	“Geographical Names of Mongolian Origin in the Territory of Kazakhstan”	G. Konkashpaev	1959	Article
3.	“Geographical Names of Kazakhstan”	A. Abdrakhmanov	1959	Monograph
4.	“Dictionary of Kazakh Geographical Names”	G. Konkashpaev	1963	Dictionary
5.	“Proper Names in the Kazakh Language”	T. Dzhanuzakov	1965	Textbook
6.	“Structural and Semantic Classification of the Names of Kazakh Lakes in Pavlodar Region”	V. Popova	1966	Article
7.	“General Features of Turkic Geographical Terminology in Central Asia and Kazakhstan”	G. Konkashpaev	1970	Article
8.	“Comprehensible Incomprehensibilities”	O. Sultanyeva	1973	Textbook
9.	“Brief Toponymic Dictionary of Kazakhstan”	E. Koichubaev	1974	Dictionary

¹ Author's note: The table can be supplemented and extended.

10.	“Main Problems of Kazakh Language Onomastics”	T. Dzhanuzakov	1976	Monograph
11.	“Essay on Kazakh Onomastics”	T. Dzhanuzakov	1982	Monograph
12.	“Lexico-Semantic Typology of Kazakhstan’s Oronyms”	E. Kerimbaev	1988	Candidate Dissertation
13.	“Historical and Etymological Study of Kazakhstan’s Toponyms”	A. Abdrakhmanov	1991	Monograph
14.	“Ethnocultural Foundations of the Nomination and Functioning of Kazakh Proper Names”	E. Kerimbaev	1992	Doctoral Dissertation
15.	“Kazakh Onomastics in Ethnocultural, Nominative, and Functional Aspects”	E. Kerimbaev	1995	Monograph
16.	“The Structural-Semantic Nature of Kazakhstan’s Toponyms (Comparative-Historical Research)”	V. Popova	1997	Monograph
17.	Names of Distant Ancestors”	V. Makhpirov	1997	Monograph
18.	“Kazakh Onomastics: Linguistic Analysis of Toponyms and Microtoponyms”	O. Sultanyeva	1998	Monograph
19.	“Place Names of the Relief (Semantic, Morphological Analysis, and Phonosemantic Description)”	G. Ermekbayev	1999	Candidate Dissertation
20.	“Methods of Linguistics: Dictionary-Reference”	A. Shayakhmetova	2000	Dictionary-Reference
21.	“Names of Restaurants in the City”	S. Imanberdieva	2001	Monograph
22.	“Ethno-Ecological Foundations of Kazakh Toponyms”	K. Kaymuldinova	2001	Monograph
23.	“Kazakh Onomastics. The Secrets of Names 3”	T. Dzhanuzakov	2007	Monograph
24.	“Semantic Boundaries of Folk Geographical Terms and Their Role in Terminology Creation”	T. Dzhanuzakov	2009	Article
25.	“Historical-Semantic Interpretation of Toponyms in the Orkhon-Yenisei Monuments”	L. Nakhanova	2014	Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) Dissertation
26.	“Kazakh Toponymy: Etymology, Structure, Semantics”	M. Tobugov	2018	Article
27.	“Lexico-Semantic Features of East Kazakhstan Toponyms”	A. Alimkhan, Zh. Qayirbayev, S. Kasenov	2021	Article
28.	“Kazakh ‘Cosmic’ Toponymy: Exploring the Cultural Landscape	Z. Naurzbaeva, K. Medeuova	2021	Article

	around the Baikonur Cosmodrome”			
29.	“Toponymic Atlas of Kazakhstan with Pop-up Tips (Preliminary Work on Compilation)”	A. Jusupov, Z. Moldakhmetova	2023	Article

These and other works have provided valuable material for the present study, and the methodological approaches presented have formed the basis for the analysis of the lexico-semantic and morphological nature of Kazakhstan's toponyms. The aforementioned scholarly works contain both theoretical and practical methods developed for the systematization and classification of toponymic data, enabling a comprehensive analysis of toponymy based on extensive empirical material.

RESULTS

The findings of this study cover a wide range of issues related to the origins and structural features of Kazakh toponyms. They include data from both field expeditions and archival materials, ensuring a comprehensive approach to the analysis of toponymic systems. Among the most significant scholarly works are dissertations and monographs, such as those by G. Konkashpaev and T. Dzhanuzakov, which focus on the etymology and historical-cultural aspects of toponymic research. Dictionaries and textbooks, such as “Dictionary of Kazakh Geographical Names” and “Brief Toponymic Dictionary of Kazakhstan” by E. Koichubaev, make a substantial contribution to the systematization of toponymic material and serve as a foundation for further lexico-semantic and morphological analysis. In addition, articles and expedition materials, such as “Place Names of Central Kazakhstan” (by T. Dzhanuzakov and A. Abdrakhmanov), along with the works of V. Popova, provide valuable data for a detailed analysis of regional toponyms.

The methodological foundation, based on the works of scholars such as E. Koichubaev and V. Makhpirov, incorporates a set of methods for the lexico-semantic and morphological analysis of toponyms. The practical application of these methods not only facilitates the systematization of a vast array of toponymic information but also allows for the identification of key lexico-semantic patterns and productive word-formation models within the structure of toponymic units.

According to E. Koichubaev, five distinct toponymic layers can be distinguished in our country's territory: 1) the most ancient layer, containing elements of ancient languages; 2) an ancient layer with elements of Turkic-Mongolian and Turkic-Iranian languages, as well as ancient suffixes; 3) a Turkic layer reflecting the key characteristics of Turkic language families with their variations; 4) a layer reflecting the features of modern Turkic languages; and 5) a layer characterized by Russian toponymic influences [6, 5]. In turn, V. Makhpirov analyzed toponymic layers and identified three key strata of ancient Turkic toponyms: 1) directly Turkic geographical names; 2) geographical names of non-Turkic origin; 3) toponyms derived from Iranian language sources [7, 158]. This indicates that Kazakh toponymy has made significant progress in studying the multi-layered structure of geographical names, reflecting both ancient and more modern linguistic and cultural influences. These studies contribute to a deeper understanding of the country's historical and cultural heritage and demonstrate the high level of theoretical and practical development in this field.

The methodology of lexico-semantic analysis developed in these studies is based on a detailed examination of the meanings and etymological origins of toponyms. The classification of toponyms is carried out according to semantic features such as names of natural objects, anthroponyms, and historical-cultural designations. The classifications mentioned above provide a deeper understanding of which elements of geographical, historical, and cultural realities are reflected in geographical names, which, in turn, contributes to a comprehensive analysis of the cultural and historical aspects of the region.

The etymological analysis, based on the methods developed by T. Dzhanuzakov and A. Abdrakhmanov, involves the study of the linguistic roots of toponyms and their historical evolution.

“The choice of a conventional, specifically toponymic, or complex method of etymological research of toponyms depends on the nature of the material and the need to study the formation and development of toponyms under certain historical conditions. However, these methods are inseparable and can be applied in a combined and mixed manner” [8, 130]. Such a comprehensive approach allows for “a clearer understanding of the lexico-semantic and lexico-grammatical patterns in the formation of toponyms in a given territory” [8, 121], as well as revealing cultural and linguistic borrowings and establishing connections between changes in toponymy and historical processes occurring in the region.

The analysis of the semantic fields of toponyms helps to distinguish between primary and secondary meanings of place names, revealing their connection to symbolic and historical processes in Kazakhstan. This aspect of analysis was particularly developed in the works of E. Koichubaev and V. Popova.

Morphological analysis of toponyms, based on the research of T. Dzhanzuzakov, G. Konkashpaev, and O. Sultanyeva, involves the use of various approaches. In word-formation analysis, toponyms are broken down into morphemes (roots, affixes, prefixes, and suffixes), which helps to identify patterns in their formation. The analysis of compound toponyms (e.g. “Taldy-Kurgan”, “Karatau”) reveals syntactic and morphological patterns in their structure. The specific features of compound toponyms are thoroughly examined in the works of V. Popova and T. Dzhanzuzakov, which is essential for understanding regional linguistic characteristics.

Morphemic analysis provides a deeper understanding of the mechanisms of word formation in Kazakh toponymy and highlights which morphological elements are used to designate geographical objects. This aspect has been studied in detail in the works of O. Sultanyeva and T. Dzhanzuzakov.

Frequency analysis of toponyms, based on data from dictionaries and expedition materials, allows for the identification of the prevalence of certain types of toponyms in various regions of Kazakhstan and their frequency of use. This method reveals trends in the use of lexical units within the toponymic system of the region. Quantitative analysis, carried out using materials from toponymic dictionaries such as “Ancient Turkic Features in the Toponyms of Kazakhstan” (1972), “Brief Toponymic Dictionary of Kazakhstan” (1974), “Dictionary of Place Names of Kazakhstan” (1985), and others, enables statistical processing of data, highlighting structural features and the most frequent word-formation models.

Cartographic analysis of toponyms, proposed in the works of G. Konkashpaev and A. Abdrakhmanov, enables the study of the spatial distribution of toponyms across the regions of Kazakhstan. This approach uses both modern geographic maps and historical materials, allowing for an analysis of changes in the country's toponymic system. Mapping toponyms to geographical objects helps to explore regional characteristics and identify geographical structures reflected in place names. The historical analysis of cartographic data helps track changes in the toponymic system and establishes connections between name changes and historical events in Kazakhstan.

The comparative-historical method, widely applied in the research of E. Kerimbaev and A. Abdrakhmanov, is used to identify relationships between Kazakh toponymy and the toponymy of other Turkic-speaking peoples. The comparison of Kazakh toponyms with those from other regions of Central Asia and Turkic countries highlights both common traits and unique features. Comparative analysis with the toponymy of Turkic-speaking regions helps establish patterns in the structure and semantics of toponyms, allowing for the tracing of cultural and historical connections between peoples. The analysis of toponyms across vast areas inhabited by Turkic-speaking peoples shows that the Turkic layer of toponymy is the most widespread [9, 191]. At the same time, G. Konkashpaev, in his study of toponyms in Kazakhstan, concluded that a significant portion of these names have Mongolian origins, with their appearance dating back to the period from the 13th to the 18th centuries [10, 85-98].

The studied materials and methodological approaches outlined in the works of leading Kazakh scholars in the fields of toponymy and onomastics allow for a comprehensive practical analysis of Kazakhstan's toponymic system. The use of lexico-semantic and morphological analysis, along with statistical and cartographic methods, enables a thorough investigation aimed at identifying the lexical,

semantic, and structural characteristics of toponyms. This approach contributes to a deeper understanding of the role of toponyms in preserving cultural heritage and their significance in the historical and cultural context of Kazakhstan.

DISCUSSION

The study of toponymy is justified by its significant scientific and practical importance for a range of disciplines. “Toponymic lexis is a systematic organization, where pragmatic factors, such as geographic conditions, ethnic composition, historic events and the view of the world play a major role” [11, 152]. Toponyms are of particular interest to fields such as history, geography, archaeology, and ethnography, as one of the key features of toponymy is its extralinguistic nature.

The primary methods used in toponymic research, as in onomastics in general, are of a linguistic nature. Among them are the comparative-historical method, comparative phonetics, morphological and lexico-semantic analysis, component analysis, and others. This underscores that toponymy, like onomastics, is a complex linguistic phenomenon. Toponyms represent a significant layer of language that reflects its historical development. As part of the lexicon, they follow linguistic laws, which confirms that toponymy belongs to the field of linguistic science.

However, it is crucial to consider its close connection with history and geography. “Toponyms also function as geographical concepts, having spatial reference and serving as a means of designating locations” [12, 1935]. Toponymy includes a historical component, although it does not directly pertain to the history of peoples or states, but rather to the development of language. “Research shows that toponymic names are classified by semantic composition depending on certain characteristics, such as the names of people, features of local inhabitants, lakes, mountains and hills, coastal features, vegetation, water color, the nature of water flow, and other characteristics that form toponyms” [13, 174]. Historical events are not always directly reflected in toponyms, as they form an autonomous system that changes according to its own laws. As V. Zhuchkevich notes, the importance of toponymy for historical science lies in the historical conditioning of geographical names [14, 26-27], indicating the close connection between toponymy and history. Thus, each of these disciplines is intricately intertwined with toponymy, highlighting its interdisciplinary nature.

The lexico-semantic principle is one of the most widely used in linguistic classifications. “It is obvious that it is impossible to create a unified classification of place names that would reflect the entire multidimensional nature of the toponymic vocabulary” [15, 28]. Nevertheless, scholars continue to develop various classification systems, striving to organize toponyms based on their lexico-semantic, structural, and historical-cultural features. Although these classifications cannot capture all aspects, they provide a deeper understanding of the patterns of toponym formation and their role in reflecting geographical, ethnic, and historical processes. V. Makhpirov points out that lexico-semantic classification should be a logical continuation of etymological analysis and serve as its objective confirmation [7, 130]. In the process of scientific research on toponymic lexicon, it is essential to apply methods and achievements from linguistic sciences. The linguistic analysis of toponyms in a specific territory involves their classification by lexico-semantic and structural word-formation types. The principles of linguistic classification of toponyms have attracted the attention of many scholars, and perspectives on this issue vary. Some researchers believe that semantic analysis is fundamental to toponymic classifications, while others prioritize the typological approach.

Lexico-semantic classifications of toponyms have been developed in the works of many foreign, Russian, and Kazakh scholars. In the context of Turkic toponymy, significant lexico-semantic classifications have been proposed by E. Murzaev, A. Tsagaeva, T. Churkin, O. Molchanova, I. Dron, and others. The classification proposed by V. Makhpirov in his work *Ancient Turkic Onomastics* is particularly important for our research. He identifies the following lexico-semantic groups of geographical names of the ancient Turks: 1) dedication toponyms (memoratives), including anthroponyms, ethnonyms, toponyms derived from other toponyms, and those related to religious beliefs; 2) descriptive toponyms (descriptives), which reflect local geographical conditions,

visual characteristics of objects, and subjective assessments; 3) occasional toponyms [7, 103-111]. Thus, lexico-semantic classification is one of the key and most frequently used methods in the analysis of toponymic material.

The typological (structural-word formation, morphological) principle of classifying toponymic units also plays an important role in the study of toponyms. It allows for the identification of structural models and components of toponyms, such as roots and formants (suffixes), as well as appellatives (special geographical terms). This approach helps address one of the main tasks of toponymic research-identifying models of toponym formation and constructing a systematic structure for these names.

V. Makhpirov, analyzing the structural-grammatical features of ancient Turkic proper names, identifies the following categories: 1) proper names formed from non-Turkic lexical material; 2) proper names of Turkic origin; 3) simple non-derived (root) names; 4) derived names; 5) names with plural affixes; 6) polymorphemic affixes; 7) compound names; 8) types of compound proper names [7, 113-125].

Researchers also address stratigraphic classification while determining toponymic types, which distinguishes the main linguistic layers of geographical names in a region. Stratigraphic classification, closely related to the typology of toponyms, allows for identifying which layers of vocabulary are present in geographical names, revealing layers influenced by both intralinguistic and extralinguistic factors. Some scholars consider stratigraphic classification to be the only acceptable method, as it is also viewed as historical, reflecting sequential layers of toponyms, each with its own characteristic features.

E. Koichubaev, studying the toponymy of Kazakhstan, identifies the following stratigraphic layers: 1) the most ancient layer with elements of ancient languages; 2) an ancient layer with Turkic-Mongolian and Turkic-Iranian elements and endings; 3) a Turkic-speaking layer reflecting the main features of Turkic language families; 4) a layer of modern Turkic languages; 5) a layer with Russian toponymic overlays [6, 5-6].

A different stratigraphy of Turkic toponyms was proposed by A. Abdrakhmanov, who distinguishes: 1) toponyms formed on the basis of native languages, including the Altai and ancient Turkic periods; 2) toponyms of the Neo-Kazakh language; 3) borrowed toponyms, including Iranian, Arabic, Mongolian, Finno-Ugric, and Russian [8, 31-33].

Each of the classifications discussed (lexico-semantic, typological, and stratigraphic) represents an important approach in toponymic research aimed at a deeper understanding of geographical names and their linguistic nature. All these classifications are based on linguistic and extralinguistic principles motivated by various factors.

CONCLUSION

The study of onomastic material and the processes involved in the formation of toponyms confirms that they represent an important source of the lexical corpus of any language, requiring special attention and thorough analysis. Toponyms are not isolated lexical units but form a complex, structured system with its own patterns, principles, and internal connections. A key feature of toponyms is their ability to individualize specific objects, while also possessing universal characteristics that reflect common traits of human thinking and world perception. At the same time, toponyms contain specific elements related to the historical and cultural context of a particular language, region, and period.

The study of onomastics holds particular significance for students, specialists in native and foreign languages, researchers, and scholars. Toponyms require not only proper spelling, pronunciation, and interpretation but also carry a rich linguistic, cultural, and geographic potential, contributing to the development of knowledge about one's native culture and language. In educational practice, onomastic data can serve as an interesting and useful learning resource.

As our research has shown, the theoretical and practical study of Kazakhstan's toponyms continues to develop dynamically. This work focused on the lexico-semantic and morphological

nature of Kazakh toponyms, which allowed us to identify the key patterns in their structure, origin, and functioning. Understanding toponyms as cultural-historical markers and their connection to linguistic and social processes opens new perspectives for further research and deepening knowledge in the field of onomastics.

The research also revealed the existence of various scientific approaches and paradigms that reflect the complexity and multifaceted nature of Kazakhstan's toponymic system. The theoretical and methodological approaches discussed provide a deeper understanding of the lexico-semantic characteristics of toponyms, their historical and cultural significance, and their role in shaping national and cultural identity.

REFERENCES

- 1 Ajtenov, Zh., Umitkaliev, U. and Sajlaubaeva, N (2024), K voprosu o toponimah indoiranskogo proiskhozhdeniya, svyazannyh s vodnymi ob'ektami na territorii Srednego Priirtysh'ya (po materialam Pavlodarskoj, Vostochno-Kazahstanskoj i Abajskoj oblastej) [On the Issue of Indo-Iranian Toponyms Related to Water Bodies in the Middle Irtysh Region (Based on Materials from Pavlodar, East Kazakhstan, and Abai Regions)], Vestnik KazNU. Seriya istoricheskaya [Bulletin of KazNU. Historical Series], 113(2), 225–233 (2024). [In Russian] <https://doi.org/10.26577/JH.2024.v113i2-019> (In Russian).
- 2 Sapir, E (2014), “Language, Race, and Culture”, *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 221-235. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139629430.011> (In English).
- 3 Jačeva-Ulčar, E (2009), “Geographical names of FYRO Macedonia as part of its cultural heritage”. *Geographical Names as a Part of the Cultural Heritage*. Wien: Institut für Geographie und Regionalforschung der Universität Wien. pp. 169-172. (In English).
- 4 Ualihan G. Osobennosti nominacii kazahskih toponimov [Features of Kazakh Toponymic Nominations], *Norwegian Journal of Development of the International Science*, 92, 26-28 (2022).
- 5 Zhuchkevich V. Obshchaya toponimika [General Toponymy] (Minsk, 1968). (In Russian).
- 6 Koichubaev E. Kratkij tolkovyj slovar' toponimov Kazahstana [Brief Explanatory Dictionary of Kazakhstan's Toponyms] (Almaty, 1974). (In Russian).
- 7 Makhpirov V. Imena dalekih predkov (istochniki formirovaniya i osobennosti funkcionirovaniya drevnetyrkskoj onomastiki) [Names of Distant Ancestors (Sources of Formation and Features of Ancient Turkic Onomastics)] (Almaty, 1997). (In Russian).
- 8 Abdrakhmanov A. K voprosu o metodah etimologicheskogo issledovaniya toponimov Kazahstana [On the Methods of Etymological Research of Kazakhstan's Toponyms] (Almaty, 1984). (In Russian).
- 9 Musaev K. Leksikologiya tyurkskih yazykov [Lexicology of Turkic Languages]. (Moscow, 1984). (In Russian).
- 10 Konkashbaev G. Geograficheskie nazvaniya mongol'skogo proiskhozhdeniya na territorii Kazahskoj ASSR [Geographical Names of Mongolian Origin in the Territory of the Kazakh SSR], *Izvestiya AN KazSSR: Seriya filologii i iskusstva* [Proceedings of the Academy of Sciences of the Kazakh SSR: Series of Philology and Art], 1(11), 85-98 (1959). (In Russian).
- 11 Otsomieva-Tagirova, Z. (2017), “Toponymical microsystem of the northern dialect of the Avar language”, *Philological sciences. Issues of theory and practice*, vol. 12–3(78), pp. 152–154.
- 12 Shi, J. (2021), “Lexico-Semantic Features of Toponymic Nomination in the Russian and Chinese Languages (Comparative Analysis)”, *Philology. Theory & Practice*, vol. 14(6), pp. 1934-1937. <https://doi.org/10.30853/phil210282> (In English).
- 13 Seitova Sh., Abdyhanova B. Semanticheskij sostav gidronimov (na osnovanii gidronimii VKO, rajona Altaj) [The Semantic Composition of Hydronyms (Based on the Hydronymy of East Kazakhstan, Altai District)], *Tiltanym*, 3, 173-183 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.55491/2411-6076-2023-3-173-183> (In Russian).

- 14 Zhuchkevich V. Toponimika: Kratkij ocherk toponimiki SSSR [Toponymy: A Brief Overview of the Toponymy of the USSR] (Minsk, 1965). (In Russian).
- 15 Urazmetova, A., Shamsutdinova, J. (2017), "Principles of place names classifications", *XLinguae*, vol. 10(4), pp. 26-33. <https://doi.org/10.18355/XL.2017.10.04.03> (In English).

Received: 01.10.2024

Топонимдердің лексика-семантикалық табиғаты: теория және талдау

Г.С. Ахметова

Alikhan Bokeikhan University, Семей, 071400, Қазақстан Республикасы

Қазіргі әлемде топонимдердің лексика-семантикалық табиғатын зерттеу мәселесі күн сайын ерекше өзектілікке ие болуда, бұл антропоцентризмге көшуге негізделген, ол тілді адам тәжірибесі мен қоршаған ортамен өзара әрекеттесу призмасы арқылы зерттеудің маңыздылығын атап көрсетеді. Топонимдер тілдің бір бөлігі ретінде адамның кеңістікті қалай түсінетінін және географиялық атаулар арқылы өз мәдени және әлеуметтік түсініктерін қалай жеткізетінін түсінуге көмектеседі. Ғаламдану және урбанизация жағдайында жергілікті тілдік және мәдени ерекшеліктердің жойылуы байқалады. Топонимдерді зерттеу және құжаттау тілдік және мәдени алуан түрлілікті сақтауға ықпал етеді, бұл лексика-семантикалық топонимдердің табиғаты бойынша теориялық және практикалық материалдар жасау үшін, сондай-ақ одан әрі ғылыми және қолданбалы зерттеулерге негіз бола алатын жүйеленген деректер базасын құру үшін өте маңызды. Бұл топонимикалық жүйені тереңірек түсінуге және оның мәдени-тарихи контексттегі рөліне ықпал ететін бар тәсілдер мен деректерді жіктеуді, талдауды және жинақтауды қамтиды. Теориялық маңыздылығы – топонимикалық жүйені талдаудың қолданыстағы тәсілдері мен әдістерін жүйелеу, бұл атаулардың номинация және қалыптасу процестерін тереңірек түсінуге, сондай-ақ Қазақстан аймақтарындағы топонимдердің мәдени-тарихи контекстін көрсетудегі рөлін түсінуге ықпал етеді. Практикалық маңыздылығы – тіл білімі, этнография және әлеуметтану зерттеулерінде қолдану әлеуеті, бұл аймақтардың этномәдени құрамы мен топонимикалық жүйенің қалыптасуына әсер еткен тарихи процестерді тереңірек түсінуге ықпал етеді. Мақаланың әдістемелік негізі – тіл мәдениеттануы, лингвострановедение және социолингвистика саласындағы жетекші отандық және шетелдік ғалымдардың еңбектері, олардың есімдері мен олар зерттеген мәселелер мақала кіріспесінде егжей-тегжейлі көрсетілген. Зерттеудің негізгі қорытындысы: зерттеу Қазақстанның топонимикалық жүйесінің көпқырлығын және күрделілігін көрсететін әртүрлі ғылыми тәсілдер мен парадигмалардың бар екенін анықтады. Әртүрлі теориялық және әдіснамалық тәсілдер топонимдердің лексика-семантикалық ерекшеліктерін, олардың тарихи-мәдени маңыздылығын және ұлттық және мәдени сәйкестікті қалыптастырудағы рөлін тереңірек түсінуге мүмкіндік береді.

Кілт сөздер: топонимия, топоним, лексика-семантикалық талдау, антропоцентризм, мәдени мұра, этномәдени әртүрлілік, ұлттық сәйкестік.

ӘДЕБИЕТТЕР ТІЗІМІ

- 1 Айтенов Ж. К., Үмітқалиев У. У., Сайлаубаева Н. Е. Орта Ертіс өңіріндегі су нысандарына байланысты үнді-ирандық шығу тегі бар топонимдер мәселесіне қатысты (Павлодар, Шығыс Қазақстан және Абай облыстарының материалдары бойынша) // ҚазҰУ Хабаршысы. Тарих сериясы. – 2024. – № 113(2), – Б. 225–233.. <https://doi.org/10.26577/JH.2024.v113i2-019>
- 2 Sapir E (2014), "Language, Race, and Culture", *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 221-235. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139629430.011>.

- 3 Jačeva-Ulčar E (2009), “Geographical names of FYRO Macedonia as part of its cultural heritage”. *Geographical Names as a Part of the Cultural Heritage*. Wien: Institut für Geographie und Regionalforschung der Universität Wien. pp. 169-172.
- 4 Уәлихан Г. А. Қазақ топонимдерінің номинациясының ерекшеліктері // *Norwegian Journal of Development of the International Science*. – 2022. № 92. – Б. 26-28.
- 5 Жучкевич В. А. Жалпы топонимика. – Минск: Жоғары мектеп, 1968. – 432 б.
- 6 Койчубаев Е. Қазақстан топонимдерінің қысқаша түсіндірме сөздігі. – Алматы: ҚазКСР Ғылым, 1974. – 275 б.
- 7 Махпиров В. У. Алыс ата-бабалардың есімдері (ежелгі түркі ономастикасының қалыптасу көздері және ерекшеліктері). – Алматы: ҚР ҰҒА Шығыстану институты, 1997. – 302 б.
- 8 Абдрахманов А. А. Қазақстан топонимдерін этимологиялық зерттеу әдістері туралы мәселе // *Түркі ономастикасы / А.Т. Қайдаровтың редакциясымен*. – Алматы: Ғылым, 1984. – 284 б.
- 9 Мусаев К. М. Түркі тілдерінің лексикологиясы. – М., 1984. – 226 б.
- 10 Конкашбаев Г. К. Қазақ КСР аумағындағы моңғол текті географиялық атаулар // *ҚазКСР ҒА Хабарлары: Филология және өнер сериясы*. – 1959. – № 1(11). – Б. 85-98.
- 11 Otsomieva-Tagirova Z (2017), “Toponymical microsystem of the northern dialect of the Avar language”, *Philological sciences. Issues of theory and practice*, vol. 12–3(78), pp. 152–154.
- 12 Shi J (2021), “Lexico-Semantic Features of Toponymic Nomination in the Russian and Chinese Languages (Comparative Analysis)”, *Philology. Theory & Practice*, vol. 14(6), pp. 1934-1937. <https://doi.org/10.30853/phil210282>
- 13 Сеитова Ш. Б., Абдиханова Б. А. Гидронимдердің семантикалық құрамы (ШҚО, Алтай ауданының гидронимиясы негізінде) // *Тілтаным*. – 2023. – № 3. – Б. 173-183. <https://doi.org/10.55491/2411-6076-2023-3-173-183>
- 14 Жучкевич В. А. Топонимика: КСРО топонимикасының қысқаша шолуы. – Минск: Жоғары мектеп, 1965. – 321 б.
- 15 Urazmetova A. V., Shamsutdinova J. Kh (2017), “Principles of place names classifications”, *XLinguae*, vol. 10(4), pp. 26-33. <https://doi.org/10.18355/XL.2017.10.04.03>

Материал 01.10.2024 баспаға түсті

Лексико-семантическая природа топонимов: теория и анализ

Г.С. Ахметова

Alikhan Vokeikhan University, Семей, 071400, Республика Казахстан

В современном мире проблема исследования лексико-семантической природы топонимов изо дня в день приобретает особую актуальность, основанием чему послужил переход к антропоцентрическому подходу, который подчеркивает значимость изучения языка через призму человеческого опыта и взаимодействия с окружающей средой. Топонимы, являясь частью языка, помогают понять, как человек осмысляет пространство и передает свои культурные и социальные представления через географические названия. В условиях глобализации и урбанизации происходит стирание локальных языковых и культурных особенностей. Изучение и документирование топонимов способствует сохранению языкового и культурного разнообразия, что особенно важно для создания теоретико-практических материалов по теме лексико-семантической природы топонимов для создания систематизированной базы знаний, которая может послужить основой для дальнейших научных и прикладных исследований. Это включает классификацию, анализ и обобщение существующих подходов и данных, что способствует более глубокому пониманию топонимической системы и её роли в культурно-историческом контексте. Теоретическая значимость – систематизация существующих подходов и методов анализа топонимической системы, что способствует углубленному пониманию процессов номинации и формирования

географических названий, а также их роли в отражении культурно-исторического контекста топонимов регионов Казахстана. Практическая значимость – в потенциале использования в лингвистических, этнографических и социолингвистических исследованиях, что способствует более глубокому пониманию этнокультурного состава регионов и исторических процессов, повлиявших на формирование топонимической системы Казахстана. Методологической основой статьи служат труды ведущих отечественных и зарубежных учёных в области лингвокультурологии, лингвострановедения, социолингвистики, имена которых, а также исследуемые ими проблемы, подробно представлены во введении статьи. Основной вывод проведенного исследования: исследование проблемы выявило существование разнообразных научных подходов и парадигм, отражающих многогранность и сложность топонимической системы Казахстана. Различные теоретические и методологические подходы позволяют глубже понять лексико-семантические особенности топонимов, их историко-культурное значение и роль в формировании национальной и культурной идентичности.

Ключевые слова: топонимия, топоним, лексико-семантический анализ, антропоцентризм, культурное наследие, этнокультурное разнообразие, национальная идентичность.

СПИСОК ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ

- 1 Айтенов Ж. К., Умиткалиев У. У., Сайлаубаева Н. Е. К вопросу о топонимах индоиранского происхождения, связанных с водными объектами на территории Среднего Прииртышья (по материалам Павлодарской, Восточно-Казахстанской и Абайской областей) // Вестник КазНУ. Серия историческая. – 2024. – № 113(2), – С. 225–233. <https://doi.org/10.26577/JH.2024.v113i2-019>
- 2 Sapir E (2014), “Language, Race, and Culture”, *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 221-235. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139629430.011>.
- 3 Jačeva-Ulčar E (2009), “Geographical names of FYRO Macedonia as part of its cultural heritage”. *Geographical Names as a Part of the Cultural Heritage*. Wien: Institut für Geographie und Regionalforschung der Universität Wien. pp. 169-172.
- 4 Уалихан Г. А. Особенности номинации казахских топонимов // *Norwegian Journal of Development of the International Science*. – 2022. № 92. – С. 26-28.
- 5 Жучкевич В. А. Общая топонимика. – Минск: Вышэйная школа, 1968. – 432 с.
- 6 Койчубаев Е. Краткий толковый словарь топонимов Казахстана. – Алматы: Наука КазССР, 1974. – 275 с.
- 7 Махпиров В. У. Имена далеких предков (источники формирования и особенности функционирования древнетюркской ономастики). – Алматы: Институт востоковедения МНАН РК, 1997. – 302 с.
- 8 Абдрахманов А. А. К вопросу о методах этимологического исследования топонимов Казахстана // *Тюркская ономастика / под ред. А.Т. Кайдарова*. – Алматы: Наука, 1984. – 284 с.
- 9 Мусаев К. М. Лексикология тюркских языков. – М., 1984. – 226 с.
- 10 Конкашбаев Г. К. Географические названия монгольского происхождения на территории Казахской АССР // *Изв. АН КазССР: Серия филологии и искусства*. – 1959. – № 1(11). – С. 85-98.
- 11 Otsomieva-Tagirova Z (2017), “Toponymical microsystem of the northern dialect of the Avar language”, *Philological sciences. Issues of theory and practice*, vol. 12–3(78), pp. 152–154.
- 12 Shi J (2021), “Lexico-Semantic Features of Toponymic Nomination in the Russian and Chinese Languages (Comparative Analysis)”, *Philology. Theory & Practice*, vol. 14(6), pp. 1934-1937. <https://doi.org/10.30853/phil210282>

13 Сеитова Ш. Б., Абдыханова Б. А. Семантический состав гидронимов (на основании гидронимии ВКО, района Алтай) // Tiltanym. – 2023. – № 3. – С. 173-183. <https://doi.org/10.55491/2411-6076-2023-3-173-183>

14 Жучкевич В. А. Топонимика: Краткий очерк топонимики СССР. – Минск: Высшая школа, 1965. –321 с.

15 Urazmetova A. V., Shamsutdinova J. Kh (2017), “Principles of place names classifications”, *XLinguae*, vol. 10(4), pp. 26-33. <https://doi.org/10.18355/XL.2017.10.04.03> (Scopus).

Материал поступил в редакцию журнала 01.10.2024

ISRTI_16.21.45

DOI: [10.59102/kufil/2024/iss4pp22-32](https://doi.org/10.59102/kufil/2024/iss4pp22-32)

A.O. Akzhigitova¹, A.B. Salkynbai², B. Shalabai³

¹Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, 050000, Republik of Kazakhstan

²Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, 050000, Republik of Kazakhstan,

³Shokan Ualikhanov Kokshetau University, Kokshetau, 020000, Republik of Kazakhstan

SUBSTANTIVIZATION OF PARTICIPLE FORMS IN KAZAKH WORD FORMATION

Although the theory of substantivization has been considered in Kazakh linguistics since the first half of the twentieth century, there are numerous unresolved issues. For instance, the substantivization of pronouns, adverbs, and numerals remain to be poorly studied. Consequently, in our article, we examined the substantivization of participial forms and delineated the principal indicators that elucidate the nature of substantivization. Furthermore, the ways of formation and the scope of application of names derived from substantivized participles.

The main purpose of this article is to elucidate substantivized participles from the cognitive basis, delineate their word-forming and functional nature. The article is based on scientific opinions, principles, theoretical concepts and notions related to substantivization in linguistics. The names created by the forms of substantivized participles were analysed, and their function in the sentence was considered. Furthermore, substantivised words were regarded conditionally as fully and partially substantivised ones.

Key words: theory of substantivization, verb, participial forms, word formation, fully substantivised words, partially substantivised words.

MAIN PROVISIONS

The theory of substantivization was first studied in Kazakh linguistics in the first half of the 20th century. A. Baitursynuly can be considered the first scientist to address the issue of substantivization. In his work “Til-Kural” Baitursynuly divides adjectives into two categories and analyses their function in sentences. At the same time, he categorises several functions performed by adjectives and related to one of them he expresses the following opinion: “Some adjectives serve to replace nouns. For instance, instead of stating the ‘arzan etting sorpasy tatymas (soup from cheap meat is tasteless)’, the phrase ‘arzannyn sorpasy tatymas (soup from the cheap is tasteless)’”. Consequently, such words are designated as ‘zat-syn’, which are used to replace both nouns and adjectives [1].

In accordance with the aforementioned definition, it is posited that possessive pronoun, cases, personal endings and plural nouns endings. The work demonstrates that A. Baitursynuly provided the name of substantivization and confirmed its definition in linguistics. K. Zhubanov states that all