

Onomastic Units as An Object of Lexicographic Research

Mashhura Berdiyeva

Independent Researcher, Karshi State University, Uzbekistan

Received: 31 December 2025; **Accepted:** 22 January 2026; **Published:** 27 February 2026

Abstract: This article considers the issues of lexicographic research of onomastic units. Onomastic units are lexical units such as names of persons, places, and objects, which reflect the semantic and morphological features of the language. The main purpose of the study is to determine the methods of expression of onomastic units in lexicographic dictionaries, their formation, semantic composition, and criteria for inclusion in the dictionary. The article also analyzes the difficulties encountered in the process of lexicographic compilation of onomastic units and ways to systematize them on a scientific basis. At the same time, the theoretical and practical significance of onomastic units in the field of lexicography is discussed.

Keywords: Onomastics, onomastic unit, lexicography, dictionary, semantics, morphology.

Introduction: In linguistics, onomastics is a field of study that has gained particular attention in recent years. Onomastic units are lexical items that include the names of people, places, and objects, as well as their classifications. While reflecting the semantic, morphological, and lexical features of a language, they also hold great cultural and historical significance. Furthermore, onomastic units serve as a means of reflecting the social, political, and cultural life of a society, as they embody the life experiences, values, and traditions of the people living in a specific period and region.

The study of onomastic units helps linguists to understand the lexical structure of a language more deeply. For example, a language's morphological characteristics, word-formation principles, and phonetic changes can be identified through personal names, toponyms, or anthroponyms. At the same time, the study of onomastic units is also relevant in the field of lexicography, as they play an important role in enriching dictionaries, organizing them systematically, and presenting them in a user-friendly format.

Furthermore, the scientific study of onomastic units is conducted in an integrated manner with other disciplines, incorporating information from fields such as historiography, ethnography, sociology, and cultural

studies. In this way, onomastics serves as a vital tool not only for linguistic study but also for the preservation of national culture and history.

This article is dedicated to a deep analysis of the lexicographical study of onomastic units, their placement in dictionaries, and their systematization methods. The research also examines the scholarly and practical challenges that arise during the process of lexicographing onomastic units, such as identifying semantic peculiarities, differentiating homonymous names, and establishing criteria for their inclusion in dictionaries. Additionally, a primary objective of the article is the systematic classification of onomastic units and the determination of their morphological and semantic characteristics.

Such research holds great significance not only for lexicography but also for the fields of onomastics, morphology, and semantics. The findings can serve as an important resource for enriching lexicographical practice, preserving linguistic richness, and researching national culture. At the same time, the systematic study of onomastic units contributes to the further development of linguistic theory and practice.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The internal structure of the language's lexical system,

its systematic formation, functioning, and development are considered some of the most important scientific issues in linguistics. In Uzbek linguistics, the scholarly investigation into the principles of the lexical system, its existence based on interconnected elements, and its expansion over time intensified starting in the 1960s and 1970s. It was precisely during this period that the systemic features of the language's vocabulary, its development based on internal laws, and the interrelationships between lexical units began to be studied consistently [10, p. 22].

As a result of these studies, it was scientifically substantiated that the lexical system of a language constitutes an independent, internally interconnected, and continuously developing complex structure. This approach has served as an important theoretical foundation for a deeper understanding of the lexical potential of the Uzbek language, as well as for explaining the emergence of new units and the process of their integration into the system.

In recent years, onomastic units have attracted particular attention in linguistics and are being studied as an important object of lexicographic research. In scholarly literature, various aspects of onomastic units — their semantic, morphological, and phonetic features, the methods of their representation in dictionaries, and their systematization — are analyzed in detail. At the same time, the interrelation of onomastic units with language, culture, and history, as well as the approaches through which they are examined in research, are also elucidated. Scholarly sources in this field provide researchers with the opportunity to study the topic in a more systematic and theoretically grounded manner.

Within the field of Turkology, comprehensive studies on onomastics have also been conducted. These studies are aimed at examining the origin, morphological and semantic characteristics, and lexicographic treatment of onomastic units in Turkic languages. In particular, N.A. Baskakov, in his works, proved that more than one hundred personal names widely used in the Russian language today are of Turkic origin [7, p. 98–103]. His research serves as an important source for identifying the historical roots of onomastic units, classifying them typologically, and incorporating them into dictionaries on a scientific basis.

In Uzbek linguistics, research conducted in this field has been comprehensively analyzed in the works of E.A. Begmatov. The primary focus of these studies was not on determining the general position of proper nouns within the lexical system; rather, it was directed toward substantiating their existence within the lexical system as a distinct and independent subsystem [8, p. 3–5]. Thus, Begmatov's works contribute to identifying the lexical-structural and semantic features of proper nouns, revealing their specific systemic organization, and providing a scientific basis for the study of the lexical richness of the language. This approach further clarifies the role and significance of onomastic units within linguistic theory.

In world linguistics, issues of onomastics have occupied a central place in the scholarly research of numerous linguists. In particular, representatives of European and Russian linguistic schools have made significant contributions to the study of the origin, semantic features, classification, and functional aspects of proper nouns. The research carried out in this direction laid the groundwork for the formation of onomastics as an independent linguistic discipline.

In particular, E. Pulgram conducted an in-depth analysis of the issues concerning the differentiation of the linguistic nature of proper nouns from that of common lexical units, elucidating their semantic, functional, and structural characteristics on the basis of specific scholarly criteria. The scholar emphasized that proper nouns do not denote a general concept but rather name a unique and specific entity, substantiating that their referential function constitutes their primary defining feature. Furthermore, E. Pulgram demonstrated that proper nouns fundamentally differ from common nouns in terms of their position within the language system, their usage in the process of speech, and their nominative function. As a result, his research established a solid theoretical foundation for the formation of onomastics as an independent field of linguistics [5, p. 132].

A. Gardiner approached proper nouns from the perspective of the communicative process, emphasizing that their principal function is not the transmission of information per se, but the precise identification of a particular person, place, or object [2]. He argued that the meaning of proper nouns becomes actualized within the speech situation, that is, their

referential nature is directly linked to the process of communication. According to the scholar, proper nouns perform the function of individual identification within the language system, in contrast to general naming devices, and it is this feature that determines their distinctive linguistic status.

In Russian linguistics, issues of onomastics have been regarded as an important component of the language system, and the semantic as well as structural characteristics of proper nouns have been thoroughly investigated.

The Russian linguist G. Ya. Sizranova, in her textbook *Onomastics*, identifies the 1960s as a crucial turning point in the formation of the theory of proper nouns as a scientific discipline. According to her, it was precisely from this period that proper nouns began to be regarded as an independent and significant object of linguistic research [11, p. 3–4]. Previously studied within the limited framework of general linguistic units, proper nouns, during this period, started to be systematically analyzed within a distinct scholarly field—onomastics.

Sizranova further emphasizes that during this process the fundamental concepts of onomastics were formed, and its object and subject of research were clearly defined. In the course of scholarly inquiry, specific methods and approaches for the study of proper nouns were developed, and theoretical frameworks emerged that made it possible to analyze their semantic, functional, and structural characteristics. As a result, onomastics secured a firm position within the system of linguistics as an independent scientific discipline and established a solid methodological foundation for subsequent research.

In the textbook *Historical Anthroponymy in the 11th–17th Centuries* written by the Russian onomastic scholar E. N. Dianova, the formation and development of the Russian onomastic system during the 11th–17th centuries are examined in detail. The author demonstrates the emergence of personal names and nicknames during this period, the methods of their formation, and their significance in social life. Dianova also emphasizes that the system of personal naming functioned not only as a means of identifying an individual, but also as an important indicator of social status and family standing.

The textbook provides a comprehensive account of the origins of personal names and nicknames, the principal mechanisms underlying their formation, as well as their transformations within linguistic and cultural contexts. According to the author, an in-depth study of historical onomastics not only contributes to a better understanding of the development of the Russian language and culture, but also enables future historians and history teachers to acquire essential professional skills in analyzing historical sources, working with diverse scholarly literature, and conducting independent research [9, p. 167].

Russian, Uzbek, and European linguists share a common objective in their study of proper nouns and onomastic units: to determine their status as independent, systematic, and dynamically developing lexical units within the language system. At the same time, research conducted within all three schools examines the semantic, functional, and structural characteristics of proper nouns, elucidates their referential and communicative functions, and defines their distinctive position within linguistic theory. Several common features can be identified across these studies.

The study of proper nouns and onomastics. Scholars representing the Russian, Uzbek, and European linguistic traditions approach proper nouns as significant lexical units of language. They analyze their semantic, morphological, and structural properties, seeking to determine their role and function within the language system.

Referential and communicative functions. Research generally emphasizes the referential function of proper nouns, that is, their role in identifying a specific individual, place, or object. At the same time, following the approach of A. Gardiner and other European scholars, attention is also paid to the communicative role of proper nouns in the process of speech.

Systemic approach. In all three traditions, proper nouns and onomastic units are regarded as an independent, internally interconnected, and evolving component of the language system. This approach enables a deeper investigation of their position within the lexical and semantic system, their interrelations, and the processes of their inclusion in dictionaries.

At the same time, differences can also be observed in

the research traditions of Russian, Uzbek, and European linguistics. These differences are primarily manifested in their historical contexts, methodological approaches, and theoretical foundations. Uzbek linguists tend to examine proper nouns in connection with the local lexical system and the linguocultural context, emphasizing their status as independent units within the language and clarifying their function in the lexical system. Russian scholars, in contrast, place greater emphasis on historical development, thoroughly investigating the historical roots, social significance, and methodological directions of research on proper nouns. European researchers, for their part, analyze the linguistic nature of proper nouns from the perspective of general linguistic principles, elucidating their semantic, nominative, and functional characteristics through universal theoretical frameworks.

Thus, each school studies proper nouns and onomastics with its own specific focus, methods, and approaches, which further highlights the multifaceted nature of the subject and demonstrates how it has developed within different linguistic traditions [4].

The following scholarly investigations subsequently served as a theoretical foundation for the study of Turkic languages, including Uzbek onomastics.

METHODOLOGY

In the present study, a comprehensive approach was employed in the lexicographic analysis of onomastic units. In the course of the research, the descriptive method was applied to identify the forms in which onomastic units are presented in dictionaries and to

characterize their general features. Through the comparative-analytical method, the modes of interpretation of proper nouns found in various lexicographic sources were compared, and their common as well as distinctive features were determined.

The structural-semantic method served as the principal tool for identifying the internal structure and semantic layers of onomastic units. In addition, on the basis of the classification method, onomastic units were divided into types and their position within the dictionary system was established. The generalization of the research findings was carried out using both inductive and deductive methods of analysis.

DISCUSSION AND RESULTS

The Discussion and Results section provides a systematic analysis of the scientific findings obtained in the course of the lexicographic study of onomastic units and examines them in comparison with existing lexicographic and onomastic approaches. Particular attention is given to the specific features of the presentation of proper nouns in dictionaries, as well as to the criteria employed for their classification and systematization. The theoretical and practical significance of the results obtained is also elucidated.

Furthermore, the conclusions reached during the research are interpreted in terms of their contribution to determining the position of onomastic units within the dictionary system. It is also noted that various linguistic schools adopt diverse approaches to the field of onomastics, reflecting differences in theoretical orientation and methodological perspective.



Figure 1. Research Objects of Linguistic Schools

Onomastics is a branch of linguistics concerned with the origin, formation, structure, and usage of names of persons, places, objects, and other entities, and it plays an important role in elucidating the relationship between language and culture. Onomastics is divided into several types and directions.

First, anthroponymy studies personal names, that is, given names, surnames, pseudonyms, and nicknames of individuals. This field focuses on investigating naming systems, their historical origins, and their social contexts. The second major direction is toponymy, which encompasses research related to place names, including the names of cities, villages, rivers,

mountains, and other geographical entities.

In addition, onomastics includes zoonymy (the study of animal names) as well as other minor branches concerned with the naming of various objects and phenomena. Each branch of onomastics employs its own specific methods and research approaches, aiming to determine the origin of names, their semantic characteristics, their morphological and phonetic formation, and their functions in speech.

At the same time, onomastics examines the cultural, historical, and social aspects of naming practices, thereby providing opportunities for in-depth analysis within both linguistics and cultural studies.

Table 1. Examples Related to the Study of Types of Onomastic Names

Field of Study	Research Object	Analytical Approach and Authors	Examples
Anthroponymy	Personal names: first name, last name, pseudonym	Analyzes the historical roots, semantic layers, and socio-cultural functions of personal names. In these studies, the etymology, principles of formation, and role of names in speech are studied by Mehrinoza Jiyanaliyeva Oybek qizi, D. Abdurahimova, and S. Mo'minov [3];	Alisher, Nilufar, Azizbek
Toponymy	Names of cities, villages, and	The etymological, semantic, and cultural identity aspects of geographical names are analyzed. The	Tashkent, Samarkand,

	mountains	historical development and regional characteristics of names, as well as ethnic and cultural connections, are studied in detail by D.A. Turdaliyeva [6].	Bukhara
Hydronymy	Names of water bodies	The origin, semantic structure, and relationship of water names with the natural-cultural context are studied. The phonetic, morphological, and historical features of names are analyzed;	Qorasuv, Oqsoy, Suv
Zoonymy	Animal names	The linguocultural, metaphorical, and folkloric aspects of animal names are analyzed. The use of names in social and cultural contexts and their connection with other onomastic units are studied; authors: conference papers	Wolf, Crow, Elephant

A review of the relevant literature and scientific works reveals that the components of onomastics - anthroponymy, toponymy, hydronymy, and zoonymy - hold a well-established position within linguistics. Each branch employs a distinct analytical approach, deeply examining the semantic, morphological, cultural, and historical layers of names. Anthroponymy investigates the historical roots and social context of personal names; toponymy, the cultural and etymological features of geographical names; hydronymy, the natural-cultural connections of water body names; and zoonymy, the linguocultural and metaphorical aspects of animal names.

The analysis indicates that onomastics, as a linguistic field, not only illuminates the origin and semantics of names but also enables an understanding of the interconnectedness of culture, history, and social life through them. Furthermore, the research samples contribute to the continued development of onomastic studies in Uzbek linguistics and promote their application in practical research. Consequently, a systematic analysis in the field of onomastics offers a comprehensive approach that integrates the linguistic, cultural, and historical aspects of names, thereby creating a solid theoretical foundation for future scholarly inquiry in this area.

CONCLUSION

Onomastics, the study of names, represents an important component of the linguistic system and also holds distinct significance as an object of lexicography. Names serve as means of identifying various entities,

such as persons, places, bodies of water, or animals, and they constitute an essential part of the lexical richness of a language. For this reason, onomastic units are important to study as an independent category within the lexical system.

From a lexicographic perspective, onomastics is particularly noteworthy for several reasons. First, it allows for the analysis of the semantic, morphological, and phonetic properties of names. Second, it facilitates the identification of their historical roots and etymological sources. Third, names perform referential and identificatory functions within the contexts of language and culture. Consequently, onomastic units are systematically recorded and classified in dictionaries and name collections with special attention.

Research demonstrates that subfields such as anthroponymy (personal names), toponymy (place names), hydronymy (names of water bodies), and zoonymy (animal names) are clearly defined as lexicographic objects. Through these subfields, dictionaries illuminate the origins, formation, and semantic layers of names. Moreover, onomastics provides a framework for systematically compiling names, and for consistently explaining their meanings, historical development, and usage in speech.

Thus, onomastics is not only an object of linguistic and cultural research but also holds a solid position as a lexicographic object within the fields of linguistics, lexicography, and cultural studies. This discipline enables a deeper understanding of the richness of a

language and the system of names, while also providing a well-founded methodological basis for future scholarly research.

REFERENCES

1. Abdurahimova D., Mo'minov S. Diachron Analysis of Uzbek Anthroponymy. Andijan: Agir Academy Science, 2022.
2. Gardiner A. The Theory of Proper Names. London, 1957.
3. Jiyanaliyeva M. Perspectives on Anthroponyms in Uzbekistan: A Historical and Sociolinguistic Study of Personal Names in Andijan. GRN Journal of Linguistics, 2021.
4. Melibayeva S. Islamic Influence on Uzbek Personal Names. CAJLPC Journal, 2020.
5. Pulgram E. Theory of Names. Berkeley, 1954.
6. Turdaliyeva D.A. Linguocultural Features of Godonyms in Tashkent. Scientific Journal of Linguistics, 2019.
7. Баскаков Н.А. Русские фамилии тюркского происхождения. Антропонимика. Москва, 1970. С. 98-103.
8. Бегматов Э. Номшунослигимизнинг тадқиқ йўллари. Тил ва адабиёт таълими, 1992, 2-сон. С. 3-5.
9. Дианова Е.В. Историчекая антропонимика. Учебное пособие. Ч.1. Историческая антропонимика XI–XVII веков. Петразаводск: Изд. Петразаводск, 2019. С. 167.
10. Рахматуллаев Ш. Семема – мустақил тил бирлиги. Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти, 1984, 5-сон. С. 22.
11. Сызранова Г.Ю. Ономастика. Учебное пособие. Тольятти: Изд-во ТГУ, 2013. С. 3-4.