

ONOMASTIC SPACE IN LITERARY DISCOURSE: COGNITIVE, CULTURAL AND
LINGUOPOETIC DIMENSIONS

Andaniyazova Dilrabo Ruziqulovna

Leading Researcher, Institute of Uzbek Language, Literature and Folklore,
Academy of Sciences Doctor of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor

dilrabo.andaniyazova1406@gmail.com

ORCID: 0009-0002-8135-5390

Abstract: This article examines the concept of the onomastic scope of a literary text from a linguopoetic perspective. Modern onomastic studies have expanded beyond the traditional investigation of the origin and classification of proper names to encompass their functional, cognitive, cultural, and aesthetic dimensions. Within literary discourse, onomastic units perform not only nominative functions but also contribute to textual coherence, characterization, symbolic representation, intertextuality, and the realization of the author's artistic intention. The study aims to determine the structural composition, functional organization, and linguo-poetic significance of the onomastic scope in literary texts. The research employs descriptive, structural-semantic, and linguo-poetic methods to analyze various categories of proper names occurring in Uzbek literary works. The findings demonstrate that the onomastic scope constitutes an integrated functional-semantic system in which anthroponyms, toponyms, mythonyms, zoonyms, and other onomastic units interact to create artistic meaning. The study also proposes a classification model for analyzing the onomastic scope of literary texts and highlights its role in ensuring textual integrity, cultural representation, and aesthetic expressiveness. The results confirm the importance of examining literary onomastics as a distinct field situated at the intersection of linguistics, literary studies, and cultural semiotics.

Keywords: literary onomastics, onomastic scope, poetonym, anthroponym, toponym, linguo poetics, literary text, intertextuality.

Introduction

Proper names constitute one of the most complex and multifunctional categories of language. Traditionally, onomastic studies have focused on the etymology, classification, and historical development of names. However, the emergence of anthropocentric, cognitive, and discourse-oriented paradigms has substantially transformed the understanding of proper names and their functions in communication. Contemporary linguistic scholarship increasingly recognizes that proper names are not merely nominative units but also powerful semiotic signs capable of conveying cultural memory, historical knowledge, ideological meanings, and aesthetic values.

Within literary discourse, proper names acquire a special status. They function as linguopoetic instruments that contribute to characterization, textual cohesion, symbolic representation, intertextuality, and the realization of the author's artistic intention. Literary names often transcend their identifying role and become meaningful elements of the artistic structure of a text. As a result, literary onomastics has emerged as an interdisciplinary field located at the intersection of linguistics, literary criticism, cultural studies, and semiotics.

The concept of the onomastic scope (or onomastic space) occupies a central position in contemporary literary onomastics. The term refers to the totality of proper names functioning within a literary work and forming a coherent functional-semantic system. This system



encompasses anthroponyms, toponyms, mythonyms, zoonyms, hydronyms, biblionyms, chrononyms, and other categories of proper names. Their interaction creates a multidimensional network of meanings that significantly influences the perception and interpretation of literary discourse.

Despite considerable achievements in onomastic research, the majority of studies continue to focus on the classification, etymology, and semantic characteristics of individual proper names. Comparatively little attention has been devoted to investigating the onomastic scope as an integrated linguopoetic mechanism responsible for textual coherence, semantic density, and artistic expressiveness. This gap is particularly evident in studies of Uzbek literary discourse, where comprehensive analyses of literary onomastic systems remain relatively limited.

The present study addresses this research gap by examining the onomastic scope of literary texts from a functional-semantic and linguopoetic perspective. The research seeks to determine the structural organization of the onomastic scope, identify its constituent elements, and reveal the principal functions performed by onomastic units in literary discourse.

The objectives of the study are:

1. To define the concept of the onomastic scope in literary texts;
2. To classify the principal categories of literary onomastic units;
3. To investigate the functional-semantic relationships among different categories of proper names;
4. To determine the linguopoetic functions of onomastic units;
5. To reveal the contribution of the onomastic scope to textual integrity and artistic meaning.

The novelty of the study lies in the interpretation of the onomastic scope as a multidimensional linguopoetic system rather than a simple aggregate of proper names. Furthermore, the study proposes a functional model for analyzing literary onomastic units and demonstrates their role in the creation of artistic meaning within literary discourse.

Literature Review

Theoretical foundations of modern onomastics were established by scholars such as A.V. Superanskaya, N.V. Podolskaya, and A.A. Reformatsky, whose studies demonstrated that proper names form a specific lexical subsystem characterized by unique semantic and functional properties. Although identification and individualization remain their primary functions, literary texts often endow proper names with additional semantic and aesthetic potential.

Several theoretical approaches have been developed for the study of proper names.

The referential approach regards proper names as linguistic units whose principal function is to designate particular entities. Although this perspective explains the naming function of proper names, it does not adequately account for their artistic and symbolic roles in literary discourse.

Structuralist and semiotic theories have considerably expanded the understanding of literary names by emphasizing their ability to generate meaning through cultural, historical, and associative connections. Within this framework, each proper name functions as a sign carrying multiple layers of significance.

From the perspective of cognitive linguistics, proper names activate complex knowledge structures stored in human memory. The mention of a historical figure or geographical location may evoke extensive cultural and historical information associated with that entity.

The linguocultural approach considers proper names as important indicators of national culture because they reflect collective historical experience, cultural values, and national identity.

Recent developments in linguo-poetics have further transformed the study of literary names by emphasizing their aesthetic functions. Researchers commonly distinguish several major functions of literary proper names: characterization, symbolism, intertextuality, evaluation, and aesthetic expression.



Materials and Methods

The research is based on literary texts from Uzbek literature and selected theoretical works in onomastics and literary linguistics.

The following methods were employed:

Descriptive analysis for identifying and classifying onomastic units;

Structural-semantic analysis for determining relationships among different categories of proper names;

Linguo-poetic analysis for examining the artistic functions of onomastic units;

Functional analysis for identifying the role of proper names in textual organization and meaning construction.

The study examines anthroponyms, toponyms, mythonyms, zoonyms, hydronyms, biblionyms, chrononyms, and cosmonyms occurring in literary discourse.

Results

The analysis demonstrates that the onomastic scope of a literary text constitutes a multilayered functional-semantic system.

Its central layer consists of:

anthroponyms;

toponyms;

mythonyms;

zoonyms.

The peripheral layer includes:

hydronyms;

cosmonyms;

biblionyms;

phytonyms;

chrononyms.

The degree of activation of these units varies according to literary genre. Historical novels predominantly employ anthroponyms and toponyms, whereas fantasy and mythological narratives rely more heavily on mythonyms and fictional names.

The study also proposes three principal dimensions for investigating the onomastic scope:

1. Analysis of the onomastic system of an individual literary work;
2. Analysis of the onomastic scope across the works of a particular author;
3. Analysis of onomastic units within a specific literary genre.



The findings indicate that not all proper names within a literary text possess equal linguo-poetic value. While many names perform primarily nominative functions, others acquire poetonymic status by serving significant artistic purposes.

Examples from Uzbek literature reveal that poetonyms frequently function as instruments of intertextuality, cultural reference, historical reconstruction, and symbolic representation.

Discussion

The findings support the view that the onomastic scope should be regarded as an integrated semiotic system rather than a simple collection of proper names. This perspective corresponds to the functional-semantic approach proposed by Derevyago, who describes the onomastic field as a unified system centered around anthroponyms.

The analysis also demonstrates that the linguo-poetic significance of proper names depends not on their quantity but on their integration into the artistic structure of the text. Proper names become aesthetically meaningful when they contribute to characterization, thematic development, symbolic interpretation, or intertextual reference.

The study further confirms observations made by previous scholars regarding the special role of historical and mythological anthroponyms in poetic discourse. Such names often function as compressed cultural signs capable of conveying extensive historical and cultural information.

Consequently, the onomastic scope emerges as a crucial mechanism through which literary texts achieve semantic density, cultural depth, and artistic coherence.

Conclusion

The onomastic scope of a literary text represents a complex functional-semantic and linguo-poetic system that contributes significantly to textual organization and artistic meaning.

The study demonstrates that proper names perform a wide range of functions extending beyond identification. They participate in characterization, symbolic representation, intertextual communication, cultural transmission, and aesthetic expression.

The proposed analytical model includes the identification, classification, frequency analysis, linguocultural interpretation, and linguo-poetic evaluation of onomastic units. Such an approach enables a systematic investigation of literary onomastics and provides new opportunities for understanding the interaction between language, culture, and artistic discourse.

Future research may focus on comparative studies of onomastic systems across different literary traditions and genres, thereby contributing to the further development of literary onomastics as an interdisciplinary field.

References

1. Derevyago, A. N. (2008). Proper names in literary texts. Moscow State University Press.
2. Yuldashev, M., Andaniyazova, D. Linguopoetics of zoonims in the literary text. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, 2022. Vol. 6, Scopus Source: <https://www.scopus.com/sourceid/21101044228> – P. 5691–5699.
3. Karimov, Q. (1967). Personal names in Kutadgu Bilig. *Uzbek Language and Literature*, 2, 42–45.
4. Khudoyberganova, D. (2016). The role of onomastic units in Muhammad Yusuf's poetry. *Sources of Knowledge*, 6, 75–80.
5. Nyström, S. (2018). Names and meaning. In C. Hough (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of names and naming* (pp. 39–51). Oxford University Press.



6. Podolskaya, N. V. (2019). Dictionary of Russian onomastic terminology. Moscow: Nauka.
7. Reformatsky, A. A. (2017). Introduction to linguistics. Moscow Academic Press.
8. Rymes, B. (2020). Communicating beyond language. Routledge.
9. Saussure, F. de. (2011). Course in general linguistics. Columbia University Press.
10. Sjöblom, P. (2018). Literary onomastics and fictional names. *Onoma*, 53, 95–112.
11. Smith, G. (2021). Proper names and cultural memory in literary discourse. *Journal of Literary Semantics*, 50(2), 89–105. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jls-2021-2003>.
12. Superanskaya, A. V. (2018). General theory of proper names. Moscow: Librokom.
13. Toporov, V. N. (2017). Myth. Ritual. Symbol. Image. Progress Publishers.
14. Van Langendonck, W., & Van de Velde, M. (2019). Names and grammar. Oxford University Press.
15. Yakubov, Sh. (1994). Onomastics of Alisher Navoi's works (Doctoral dissertation). Tashkent State University.
16. Andaniyazova, D. Ethno-cultural bases of anthroponyms of Turkic people. *ANGLISTICUM:Journal of the Association-Institute for English Language and American Studies*. Volume 13/ Issue 4/. - Teotovo, 2024. Impact factor ICV: 86.76 Andaniyazova, D. Relationship Between Real and Occasional Onomastic Units 3 bet Vol. 05Issue 07.2025. PAGE NO.46-49 <https://doi.org/10.37547/ijll/Volume05Issue07-14>

