Websites:
http://www.sciencepub.net/nature
http://www.sciencepub.net

Emails:
naturesciencej@gmail.com
editor@sciencepub.net

Nature and Science

MARSLAND PRESS
Multidisciplinary Academic Journal Publisher

# Problems Of Classification And Grouping Of Geographical Places Names

Abbasov Subkhon Burkhonovich, Valiyeva Shakhnoza Islomovna

Department of Geography and Ecology, Samarkand State University named after Sharof Rashidov, 140104, Samarkand, Uzbekistan
Telephone: +998937298973 e-mail: shaxnoza-valieva82@mail.ru

**Abstract:** The article provides information on toponymic classifications of geographical objects. The toponymic classification of natural and man-made geographical objects is covered. Classifications of geographers, toponymist scientists are analyzed.

[Abbasov S. and Valiyeva Sh. **Problems of classification and grouping of geographical places names.** *Nat Sci* 2023,21(1):39-42]. ISSN 1545-0740 (print); ISSN 2375-7167 (online). http://www.sciencepub.net/nature. 06.
doi:10.7537/marsnsj210123.06.

**Keywords:** toponym, classification, toponymic denotations, hydronym, oykonim, oronim.

## 1. Introduction

Toponymic classifications name various geographical objects grouped according to their general geographical features and form the basis of the toponymic system. The toponymic system has this territorial character and is a unique dictionary system for expressing regional geographical reality. Toponymic classification and grouping are important in regulating place names of any country or region.

Scientists have long paid special attention to toponymic materials in scientific research, which has led to the existence of different approaches, different classifications of toponyms. At the present stage of research, the problem of classification of toponymic units remains one of the most pressing issues. The issue of creating any scientific classification is a very complex task, because it depends on the direction, principles, research objectives. A single classification problem that covers all aspects of toponymy is considered unattainable by some scholars.

The first attempts to classify geographical names date back to the 19th century, and Frantsishekom Palatsky (1834), F. Mikloshichem (1865), T. Was carried out by Wojciechowski (1873), later the principles of classification F. Chern and P. Vasha (1907), p. Skok (1921), V.P. Semenov-Tyan-Shansky (1924) and other scientists used them in their scientific work and they were divided into morphological groups and semantic categories.

As toponymy became an independent science, scientists proposed different classifications of toponyms. However, as a result of a different approach to toponymic research, different classifications of toponyms and microtoponyms have emerged, and they have been developed by toponymist, linguist V. D. Belenkaya (1969), V. A. Zhuchkevich (1980), E. M. Murzaev (1963, 1965, 1974,), V. A. Nikonov (1965), A.V. Superanskaya (1967), A. I. Popov (1965), A. M. Selishchev (1968), E. Ekwaal (1960), covered in research.

Currently, the complexity of the problem of classification of toponyms is explained by the lack of a single approach to solving this problem, as in addition to the linguistic aspects of toponyms are also considered in terms of landscape-geography. According to some researchers, it seems almost impossible to create a single and universal classification of toponymic material [2, 42-p].

The difficulty in creating a single classification is explained by the different approaches to this issue. For example, E. M. Murzaev also suggests classifying geographical names according to historical principles [2, 44 –57-p].

E. M Murzaev (1963) believes that the toponymic system is a set of specific features or characteristics that are legitimately repeated in the process of formation of geographical names and their modern stability [3; 4].

## 2. Material and Methods

There are many toponymic denotations (signs), which include continent, ocean, sea, country, lake, river, city, street and so on. Geographical names differ depending on the type of object named (ocean, city, relief shape, etc.) and there are semantic classifications of their specific natural geographical features. These are:

- toponymic classifications of natural geographical objects (Table 1);
- toponymic classifications of geographical objects created from human toponymy (Table 2).

Any geographical names of a particular region have already formed a toponymic system.

**Table 1. Toponymic classification of natural geographical objects**

| Toponyms | | Toponym referents | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Hydronyms | Oceanonym | Water objects o | ocean |
| | Pelagonim | | sea |
| | Potamonim | | river |
| | Limnonim | | lake |
| | Gelonim | | swamp |
| Insulonim | | islands | |
| Oronim | | mountains, hills | |
| Speleonim | | caves, underground systems | |
| Drimonim | | forest massifs | |

**Table 2. Toponymic classification of objects created from human toponymy**

| Toponyms | | Toponym referents | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Xoronim | | names of large geographical areas, administrative-territorial units with boundaries accepted in official documents, ie names of countries and units of their division | |
| Oykonim (names of different settlements) | astionim, polisonim | Settlements | cities |
| | komonim, chorionim | | villages |
| Urbanonim | godonim | Objects within cities | streets |
| | agoronim | | field |
| | microchoronym | | districts within the city |
| | ergonim | | enterprises |
| | oykodomonim | | buildings |
| | ekklezionim | | temples, mosques |
| | dromonim | | roads |
| | necronym | | cemeteries |
| | agroonim | | agricultural lands |
| | microdrimonim | | national park, recreation parks |

The versatility of toponymy requires reference to different principles of classification of the object under study. While the first principle is based on the structural and linguistic features of geographical place names, the second principle takes into account non-linguistic realities outside of toponymy [5, 115-138].

All classifications of toponyms can be divided into two parts, on the one hand, based on non-linguistic factors (geographical, historical, cultural, etc.) and on the other hand, linguistic (structural, morphological, semantic, etymological, etc.) groups.

**3. Results and Discussions.**

A.V. Superanskaya (1967) classified oronyms, hydronyms, oykonims, dromonims and other similar toponyms by geographical objects for the nomination of non-linguistic systematization toponyms, taking into account the specific features of the geographical object. Its toponymic classification includes:

1) names of natural geographical objects 2) names of man-made objects; 3) names of settlements; 4) names of city objects, including all classes of toponyms on toponymic nomination objects. However, the names of large and small geographical objects grouped as follows: 1) macrotoponyms, 2) mesotoponyms, 3) microtoponyms.

Toponymy has three geographical aspects. These are:

- regional (Uzbekistan);
- division of geographical names by denotation: city (Samarkand), river (Zarafshan);
- semantic (meaningful).

In semantic classification, nouns are distinguished according to the semantic meaning of the bases that make them up, and then according to the specific features of the invariant appellants from which the toponyms are formed [6, 27-33-p; 7, 73-79-p, 8, 73-79-p].

The lexical-semantic division of geographical names takes into account their semantic meaning and belonging to a certain group of toponyms. Toponymy also includes names that reflect the specific features of the landscape, their toponymic denotation includes: mountain, hill, hill, cliff, spring, deep, valley, coast, river, lake, meadow, sandy, clay, rock, etc.

The semantic diversity of toponyms is very large, so the division of geographical names according to the semantic principle is also given in the works of V.A. Zhuchkevich [1, 89 – 96-p] and E.M.Murzaev [4, 90 – 100 -p].

Swedish linguist E. Ekwaal (1960) in his Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names on the classification of toponyms proposes to systematize place names according to their lexical structure. The scientist divides the names into the following

1) toponyms related to relief;
2) toponyms formed from the names of animals, plants, etc. [7, 224-245].

Thus, the choice of names indicates a connection between natural conditions and the surrounding reality. The weakness of semantic classifications is that only words that are involved or have geographical names are taken into account, while the chronology of origin of names and linguistic-cultural conditions are beyond the scope of the study. Also, V.A. Zhuchkevich (1980) proposes a classification of names according to their etymology.

1) toponyms with clear meaning;
2) toponyms that require etymological analysis to determine their meaning;
3) toponyms whose meaning cannot be explained [1, 88-p].

Uzbek geographers and toponymic scientists have also carried out a number of scientific works on the classification of geographical names. Among them is the toponymic research work of H. Hasanov (1985). The scientist divided the names of geographical places into the following classifications [9]:

- names depending on the condition of the place, the surface and the climate;
- hydronyms;
- names related to plants and animals;
- Mineral-related names;
- names related to the profession;
- names related to people, tribes, and clans;
- names assigned to a person's last name;
- mythical and religious names;
- new age names.

Later, the geographer, toponymist P. Gulomov (2013) classified geographical names into three major groups [10].

1) Names that appear depending on the natural feature of the place;
2) names that appear in connection with socio-economic, political circumstances;
3) mythical and strange names.

**4. Conclusion.**

Toponymic classifications are currently controversial and controversial due to different onomastic phenomena and their different parameters. However, it is the classification that systematizes the names, taking into account the diversity of the material available and the different approaches to its study accordingly. Local and foreign toponymists have not yet come to a unified approach to the systematization of toponyms, as it is important to take into account not only linguistic data, but also geography.

**Corresponding Author:**
Shakhnoza Valiyeva
Department of Geography and Ecology,
Samarkand State University named after Sharof Rashidov,
140104, Samarkand, Uzbekistan
Telephone: +998937298973
e-mail: shaxnoza-valieva82@mail.ru

**References:**

[1]. Zhuchkevich, V. A. General toponymy: Textbook. 3rd ed., revised. - Mn.: Higher. school, 1980. - 288 p.
[2]. Murzaev, E. M. Toponymy is popular. -M.: "Knowledge", 1973. - 64 p.

[3]. Murzaev, E. M. Essays on toponymy. - M. : Thought, 1974. - 382 p.
[4]. Murzaev, E. M. Geography in names. 2nd ed. , revised and additional – M.: Nauka, 1982. – 176 p
[5]. Superanskaya, A. V. The general theory of the proper name. - Ed. 2nd, rev. - M.: Publishing house LKI, 2007. - 368 p.
[6]. Aleksandra V. et al. Principles of place names classifications. XLinguae, Volume 10, Issue 4, October 2017, ISSN 1337-8384. –P. 27-33.
[7]. Ekwall, E. The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place Names 4 th ed. Oxford, 1960. – 598 p.
[8]. Khayitova F.A. Principles of Toponyms (Place Names) Classifications. International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding. Volume 7, Issue 6July, 2020 Pages: 73-79.
[9]. Hasanov H. Geographic nomlar siri. -T .: Uzbekiston, 1985. -120 p.
[10]. Gulomov P.N. Comments on the types of toponyms and zoning of place names. Information of the Geographical Society of Uzbekistan. Volume 42 -T .: 2013.

12/15/2022