ISSN:2828-6235
Impact factor:13.77

International Journal of Literature and Language Studies(IJLLS)

THE STUDY OF ARTIONYMS IN UZBEK LINGUISTICS: THEORETICAL METHODOLOGY, EMPIRICAL SOURCES, AND DEVELOPMENTAL STAGES

Safiyazova Nazokat Yangibayevna
Ma‘mun universiteti Ijtimoiy-gumanitar fanlar fakulteti
O‘zbek va sharq tillari kafedrasi o'qituvchisi
nazokatsafiyazova@gmail.com
Doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23422508

Abstract. This study investigates the genesis, historiography, theoretical-methodological foundations, and perspectives of artionyms—titles of works of art—within Uzbek onomastics. The paper examines the stages of proper name research in Uzbek linguistics, elucidating the emergence of artionymics as an autonomous field against traditional domains (anthroponymy, toponymy). It synthesizes the linguistic cataloging, naming traditions, and lexical-semantic strata of Uzbek fine arts, sculpture, applied decorative arts, and graphics. The methodology integrates comparative-historical, descriptive, contextual, and linguacultural approaches. The findings establish that the study of artionyms in Uzbek linguistics traversed three primary phases: artistic-descriptive registration, structural-lexical analysis, and modern linguacultural interpretation. The article provides a theoretical and methodological foundation for compiling specialized artionymic dictionaries and standardizing art discourse linguistics.

Keywords: artionym, Uzbek onomastics, nomination theory, national art, linguaculture, lexical-semantic system, fine art catalogues, aesthetic sign, naming logic, artistic discourse.

Аннотация. Данное исследование посвящено формированию, истории изучения, научно-методологическим основам и перспективам исследования артионимов – наименований произведений искусства – в узбекском ономастическом языкознании. В статье анализируются этапы исследования имен собственных в узбекском языкознании, освещаются закономерности выделения артионимии как самостоятельного объекта исследования на фоне традиционных отраслей (антропонимии, топонимии). Обобщены процессы каталогизации произведений национального изобразительного, скульптурного, декоративно-прикладного искусства и графики, их номинативные традиции и лексико-семантические пласты. В работе использованы сравнительно-исторический, описательный, контекстуальный и лингвокультурологический методы. В результате доказано, что изучение артионимов в узбекском языкознании прошло три ключевых этапа: художественно-описательную фиксацию, структурно-лексический анализ и современную лингвокультурологическую интерпретацию. Статья служит теоретической и методологической базой для составления артионимических словарей и лингвистической систематизации искусствоведческого дискурса.

Ключевые слова: артионим, узбекская ономастика, теория номинации, национальное искусство, лингвокультурология, лексико-семантическая система, каталоги изобразительного искусства, эстетический знак, логика именования, художественный дискурс.

INTRODUCTION. The vocabulary of any national language evolves in direct connection with the historical experience, spiritual and aesthetic values, and cognitive development of its people. Onomastics, the branch of linguistics that investigates proper names, represents one of the most dynamic subfields, with human naming, boundary-setting, and conceptual assimilation of

reality positioned at its core [1, p. 15]. In Uzbek linguistics, onomastic research emerged as an independent academic domain in the second half of the 20th century, primarily focusing on personal names (anthroponymy), place names (toponymy), hydronyms (hydronymy), and ethnonyms (ethnonymy) [2, p. 45]. However, the advancement of societal cultural life and the flourishing of national visual arts, sculpture, decorative-applied arts, and theater have engendered a distinct stratum of onomastic units within the linguistic system designating works of art. Termed *artionyms* in linguistics, the titles assigned to masterpieces of art are not merely lexical labels; they are complex semiotic units that unify precise nominative-identifying functions with profound aesthetic, connotative, and symbolic dimensions [3, p. 56].

Following the independence of Uzbekistan, the resurgence of national identity, historical restoration, and the preservation of cultural heritage brought about a paradigm shift in the naming conventions of artworks. The titles of national masterpieces have become an integral component of the Uzbek lexical repository. Nonetheless, the historiography of artionym research in Uzbek linguistics, its theoretical and methodological criteria, the nominative patterns within the native language, and their lexical-semantic nature have yet to be systematically consolidated into a comprehensive monographic study. This gap necessitates an in-depth analysis of the development, current status, and scholarly trajectories of this field within Uzbek linguistics. The objective of this study is to examine the historiographical and theoretical dynamics of artionym research in Uzbek linguistics, establish their ontological status within national onomastics, elucidate the nominative-semantic models underlying titles of Uzbek works of art, and delineate promising directions for future inquiry.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND SOURCES. The methodological foundation of this research is grounded in the foundational works of the Uzbek school of onomastics (E. Begmatov, T. Nafasov, B. Yuldoshev, S. Qoraev, N. Uluqov), scholars of general linguistics and nomination theory, as well as classical theoretical paradigms of international onomastics [1, p. 28; 2, p. 72; 4, p. 38]. To achieve the research objectives, the following methods were employed: **Comparative-historical method:** Applied to reconstruct the chronological progression and theoretical evolution of literary and artistic names in Uzbek linguistics. **Descriptive method:** Utilized to register, classify, and analyze the lexical-grammatical structure of artionyms documented in catalogs of national fine and monumental arts. **Componential semantic analysis:** Employed to delineate the denotative, connotative, poetic, and aesthetic strata embedded within the structure of artionyms [5, p. 62]. **Linguacultural and conceptual analysis:** Served as the primary approach for conceptualizing the links between artionyms and the national mentality, historical memory, Sufi symbolism, and cultural archetypes of the Uzbek people [6, p. 85]. The empirical corpus of the study was derived from officially registered titles cataloged in the State Museum of Arts of Uzbekistan, the Center for Contemporary Art (CAMUZ), the archives of the Academy of Arts of Uzbekistan, and solo exhibition catalogs of prominent national painters and sculptors [7, p. 45; 8, p. 112].

THEORETICAL AND HISTORICAL ASPECTS OF ARTIONYM RESEARCH IN UZBEK LINGUISTICS. The Genesis of Uzbek Onomastics and the Inception of Artionyms. Systematic research into proper nouns in Uzbek linguistics accelerated in the 1960s. Initial inquiries centered on dialectology, toponymy, and anthroponymy, with Professor E. Begmatov's fundamental works establishing the national school of onomastics [2, p. 85]. Scholars such as T. Nafasov and S. Qoraev expanded this framework through regional and historical toponymic studies, while Professor B. Yuldoshev established the theoretical foundations of Uzbek onomastics and systematized functional classifications of proper nouns [1, p. 95]. Nevertheless, the linguistic nature of titles given to fine and applied art, sculptures, miniatures, and memorial monuments was long examined exclusively within art history and cultural studies, remaining overlooked as an autonomous category within general linguistics [9, p. 34]. Although art historians (such as A.

Umarov, N. Akhmedova, and E. Gulomova) treated artwork titles as interpretive anchors for thematic analysis, their derivational models, syntactic patterns, and semantic shifts remained outside the purview of linguistic investigation [7, p. 88].

The growing scholarly interest in the term *artionymy* coincided with the broader anthropocentric turn in Uzbek linguistics. Researchers recognized that an artwork's title is not a mere differentiating tag, but rather a sophisticated synthesis of authorial cognition, folk aesthetics, and the expressive potential of language [3, p. 72].

Periodization of Artionym Research in Uzbekistan. The linguistic study of artionyms in Uzbek linguistics and cultural studies can be systematically categorized into three major chronological phases: **First Phase: Lexicographic Registration and Descriptive Documentation (1950s–1980s).** Titles of artworks during this period were recorded in museum catalogs, exhibition brochures, and literary texts. Linguistic inquiry was predominantly stylistic; under the conventions of socialist realism, titles reflecting agricultural labor, industrial construction, and ideological loyalty (e.g., *Cotton Pickers*, *The Builders*, *Portrait of a Brigadier*) were treated as standard lexical items in dictionaries [8, p. 55], without granting them dedicated onomastic status. **Second Phase: Integration into Onomastic Systems and Structural-Semantic Inquiries (1990–2010s).** Uzbekistan's independence spurred a reevaluation of national arts and linguistics. Scholars including B. Yuldoshev and N. Uluqov compiled explanatory glossaries of onomastic terminology, formally incorporating the term *artionym* into Uzbek linguistic dictionaries [1, p. 110; 4, p. 60]. The proliferation of titles invoking national values, historical polymaths, geographical places, and folkloric archetypes (e.g., *Amir Temur*, *Alpomish*, *Tomiris*, *Navoiyona*) prompted rigorous morphological and lexical analyses. **Third Phase: Cognitive-Linguacultural and Discursive Studies (2010s–Present).** Artionyms are currently analyzed as carriers of national concepts, symbolic archetypes, and instruments of intertextuality [6, p. 114]. The correlation between linguistic levels and titles across sculpture, painting, and graphic arts is increasingly examined through cognitive and semiotic lenses.

LEXICAL-SEMANTIC CLASSIFICATION OF ARTIONYMS IN THE UZBEK LEXICON. An analysis of empirical data collected from fine art and sculpture catalogs in Uzbekistan reveals the following primary lexical-semantic categories: **Anthroponymic Artionyms:** Representing one of the most prominent groups, these incorporate the names of historical figures, thinkers, writers, and contemporaries: *Alisher Navoiy* (monumental sculpture); *Portrait of Queen Tomiris* (S. Rakhmonov); *Boborahim Mashrab* (Sh. Usmanov); *Girl from Sayram* (D. Ruzibaev) [7, p. 60; 8, p. 92].

Linguistically, these proper names function either as standalone nouns or in conjunction with determiners, elevating the historical and social status of the referent to a conceptual level. **Toponymic and Spatial Artionyms:** Titles capturing the geographical landscape, ancient cities, rivers, and mountain ranges of Uzbekistan: *Azure Samarkand* (B. Jalolov); *Evening in the Chirchiq Valley* (U. Tansiqbaev); *The Mountains of Zaamin* (N. Kuzibaev); *Streets of Ancient Bukhara* (M. Sodiqov) [7, p. 74; 8, p. 125].

In these structures, geographical toponyms combine with aesthetic epithets to form the verbal landscape of the national toposphere [1, p. 134]. **Ethnocultural and Ritual Artionyms:** Units reflecting traditional domestic life, customs, and ceremonies of the Uzbek people: *Horseman* (*Chavandoz*) (U. Uroqov); *Wedding* (*Toy*) (D. Ruzibaev); *Bride* (*Kelin*) and *The Young Bride* (*Kelinchak*) (S. Rakhmonov, J. Quttimuradov); *Cradle Celebration* (*Beshik Toyi*) (R. Akhmedov) [7, p. 85; 8, p. 140].

These artionyms operate as cultural codes that preserve collective traditions and mentalities. **Philosophical-Abstract and Affective Artionyms:** Titles conveying internal psychological experiences, abstract notions, and philosophical meditations on existence: *The Thinker* (*Mutafakkir*) (D. Ruzibaev); *Silence* (*Sukunat*) (M. Sodiqov); *Melancholy* (*Mahzunlik*) (S. Rakhmonov);

Caravan of Time (*Vaqt Karvoni*) (M. Qogarov) [7, p. 98; 8, p. 155]. Abstract nouns and genitive metaphors dominate this category, revealing the cognitive depth of the artwork [5, p. 110].

DISCUSSION: PRESSING ISSUES AND FUTURE TRAJECTORIES OF UZBEK ARTIONYMICS. A critical review of research on artionyms in Uzbek linguistics highlights several unresolved academic challenges: **Terminological Standardization:** Contemporary studies frequently conflate the term *artionym* with descriptive phrases such as *titles of works* or broad terms like *ideomarkers* [4, p. 82]. The status of *artionymics* as an independent branch must be consolidated through formal linguistic criteria. **Artionymic Lexicography:** While comprehensive dictionaries exist for anthroponyms, toponyms, and pseudonyms in Uzbekistan, an *Explanatory Onomastic Dictionary of Art Titles of Uzbekistan* has yet to be compiled [2, p. 105]. Creating such a resource is essential not only for linguistics, but also for international cultural curation. **Translation and Cross-Cultural Communication:** In rendering Uzbek artionyms into languages such as English, French, or German, culture-bound concepts (*chavandoz*, *surur*, *khum*, *mahzunlik*) are often subjected to mechanical, literal translation, obscuring their deeper connotations [6, p. 130]. This creates barriers for international audiences seeking to appreciate Uzbek artistic discourse.

CONCLUSION. An analysis of the historiography and theoretical underpinnings of artionym research in Uzbek linguistics leads to the following conclusions: Artionymy constitutes an autonomous, rich, and promising subdiscipline of Uzbek onomastics, serving as a semiotic bridge between material-aesthetic artistic forms and national linguistic cognition. Scholarship in Uzbekistan has successfully transitioned from descriptive inventorying toward systemic cognitive-linguacultural and discourse analysis. Anthroponymic, toponymic, ethnocultural, and abstract-philosophical names constitute the primary lexical strata of the Uzbek artionymic system, with two-component compound structures showing the highest productivity. The imperative tasks for future research include compiling a unified linguistic corpus of national visual, sculptural, and architectural artwork titles, publishing dedicated etymological and linguacultural explanatory dictionaries, and broadening the scope of multimodal art discourse analysis.

REFERENCES

1. Yo‘ldoshev B. O‘zbek onomastikasi asoslari. – Samarqand: SamDU nashri, 2018. – 186 b.
2. Begmatov E. O‘zbek tili antroponimikasi. – Toshkent: Fan, 2013. – 264 b.
3. Superanskaya A.V. Obshchaya teoriya imeni sobstvennogo. – Moskva: Nauka, 1973. – 366 s.
4. Uluqov N. O‘zbek tili onomastikasi terminlarining izohli lug‘ati. – Toshkent: Fan, 2008. – 128 b.
5. Rahmatullayev Sh. O‘zbek tilining etimologik lug‘ati. – Toshkent: Universitet, 2003. – 480 b.
6. Maslova V.A. Lingvokulturologiya: Uchebnoye posobiye. – Moskva: Akademiya, 2007. – 208 s.
7. O‘zbekiston zamonaviy san’at muzeyi (CAMUZ) katalogi. – Toshkent: O‘zbekiston, 2018. – 160 b.
8. O‘zbekiston Badiiy akademiyasi. XX-XXI asr o‘zbek tasviriy san’ati antologiyasi. – Toshkent: Tasviriy oyina, 2020. – 240 b.
9. Umarov A. O‘zbekiston san’atshunosligi masalalari. – Toshkent: G‘afur G‘ulom nomidagi nashriyot, 2012. – 176 b.