

The Linguo-Cognitive Nature of Micro and Macro-Toponyms in the Anthropocentric Paradigm: A Case Study of Uzbek and English Languages

MATYAKUBOV KHAKIMBOY KHAMIDJANOVICH
Khorezm Mamun Academy, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

This article examines the distinction between microtoponyms and macrotoponyms within the framework of the anthropocentric paradigm in modern linguistics. Unlike traditional approaches that rely on the physical size of geographical objects, the study emphasizes cognitive and social factors, particularly the relationship between the nominator and the denotate, as well as the level of social localization and lexicalization. The research aims to develop a new interpretation of micro- and macrotoponyms based on English and Uzbek linguistic materials, identifying their differential features and cognitive models in the nominative process. The methodology is based on comparative-typological analysis, cognitive modeling, and linguocultural interpretation. The findings demonstrate that the classification of toponyms depends not on their physical scale but on their cognitive status and degree of recognition within the linguistic community. Microtoponyms are characterized as dynamic, locally bound units with strong appellative features, whereas macrotoponyms function as stable symbols embedded in collective memory. The study also highlights the role of microtoponyms in reflecting national worldview, cultural values, and cognitive metaphors, particularly in literary texts where they perform stylistic and text-forming functions. Furthermore, strategies such as domestication, foreignization, and cultural compensation are discussed in relation to the

translation of microtoponyms. The results contribute to the development of cognitive onomastics and provide a deeper understanding of the relationship between language, culture, and human perception.

Keywords: Anthropocentric paradigm, microtoponym, macrotoponym, linguocognitive approach, toponymy, concept, language and cognition, national-cultural features, Uzbek and English languages.

INTRODUCTION

The establishment of an anthropocentric paradigm in modern linguistics requires the study of onomastic units not only as linguistic signs, but also as cognitive products of human thought and culture. The issue of differentiating the names of micro and macro objects in the field of toponymy has been controversial for many years. While in traditional toponymy this classification was based mainly on the physical size of a geographical object, the modern linguocognitive approach brings to the fore the mental connection between the nominator (namer) and the denotate (object). Problem statement. The vague boundaries between microtoponyms and macrotoponyms in the toponymic system hinder the verification of linguistic terms. In many cases, the difference between the name of a small geographical object (microtoponym) and the name of a large territorial unit (macrotoponym) is determined only by the size of the object. However, the status of these units in the cognitive landscape of the language speaker depends not on the size of the object, but on their social determination and the level of linguistic lexicalization.

PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this article is to develop an anthropocentric interpretation of the concepts of micro- and macrotoponyms based on the material of the English and Uzbek languages, to identify their differential features, and to compare cognitive models in the nominative process.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Although the issues of microtoponymy have been studied by scientists such as J. J. Varbot, V. N. Nikonov, I. G. Akhmetzyanov, in most of them the physical scale of the object was taken as the leading criterion. For example, V. N. Nikonov called microtoponymy “the largest and most specific section of toponymy” and included only the names of small objects in it. However, in the studies of A. V. Pravdikova in the English language material, the issue of microtoponyms “reflecting the national picture of the world” was raised, which is close to our anthropocentric approach.

SCIENTIFIC NOVELTY

In this study, for the first time, the distinction between micro- and macrotoponymy based on the following two cognitive factors:

1. De-appellativization: the degree to which a name loses its common noun character and becomes a symbol of a specific place.
2. Social localization: the extent to which a name remains within a certain microgroup (for example, a village) or is identified on a national and global scale.

METHODOLOGY

The research used methods of comparative typological analysis, cognitive modeling, and linguo-cultural interpretation. Toponymic pairs such as White House/Акуй, White Stone/Актош, High Street/КарраҚача in English and Uzbek were subjected to linguo-cognitive analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In the anthropocentric paradigm, the onomastic landscape of a work of art is viewed as a complex system reflecting the author's

individual worldview. In this case, microtoponyms are not only spatial units, but also perform text-forming and stylistic functions.

Using the English language as an example, in fiction, for example, the inn (inn/tavern) appears as a symbol of traditional British national values and conservatism. The author enriches the space poetically and aesthetically through the artistic processing of the internal form of the microtoponym (language play). For example, by associating the name Kensington in London with the combination can sing, he gives it a new cognitive meaning.

Similarly, in Uzbek literary sources, in particular in the works of Ogahi, the names of Chorbag, Havuz, or a certain steppe determine the social hierarchy. If macrotoponyms (Khiva, Khorezm) serve as a ready-made spatial reference point, then toponyms such as Labi Havuz form the cognitive-emotional basis of the text. Through these units, the integral connection between a person and his living environment is revealed.

Our research shows that the division of toponyms into micro or macro levels does not depend on the size of the object, but on its status in the linguistic community and the scope of recognition.

| Nominative model | In English | In Uzbek | Quantitative analysis |
|------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---|
| Symbolicmacro-transformation | <i>The White House</i> (Washington) | <i>Oqy</i> (Tashkent/ Bukhara) | Initially, the name of a micro-object based on a color symbol has become a political and spiritual symbol, and has been elevated to a macro-status. |
| Functional lexicalization | <i>High Street</i> | <i>Bozorboshi/ Kattako'cha</i> | The process of transition of a place that is the center of trade and social life from a kindred horse to a noble horse. |
| Urbanonymic hierarchy | <i>Piccadilly Circus</i> | <i>Eskishahar / Chorsu</i> | These units can represent both local space (micro) and national identity (macro). |

For example, the micro-toponym Fleet Street is simply a street name for London, but at the cognitive level it has become a

macro-symbol denoting the concept of “English press”. Accordingly, the Kaaba unit in the Uzbek language participates in paremias as a metaphor for “a distant and sacred place” and is perceived as a macro-onim in the minds of the speakers of the language, regardless of its physical size.

In English linguistic culture, the concepts of house (cottage, house, castle) are the main indicators of privacy and social status. In English onomastics, the onomastization of even individual rooms within a house indicates the urbanistic orientation of this people [1: 22]

In the Uzbek onomastic landscape, due to the agricultural and oasis culture, microtoponyms with water (*ariq*, *yap*, *soy*, *hawuz*) and garden components dominate. While in English the emphasis is on the “house” in the Brook Cottage (a house by the stream), in Uzbek culture the emphasis is on the water object that is the source of life in names such as “Falonchinin ariqi” or “Maktab hawuzi.”

The choice of strategy when transferring microtoponyms from one language to another depends on the pragmatic purpose of the author.

In the field of onomastics, the attitude to the concept of microtoponymy is different. In particular, J. J. Varbot emphasizes that a microtoponym is “a specific name of a small geographical object, usually meaning a separate building, garden, square, etc., known to a relatively small circle of people living near it.” V. A. Nikonov, on the other hand, considers microtoponymy to be the largest section of toponymy, including “names of small objects” such as a stream, field, bridge, and road [2: 27].

However, from the perspective of the anthropocentric paradigm and cognitive onomastics, the boundary between micro- and macrotoponyms is determined not by the physical size of the object, but by the breadth of denotative and connotative boundaries in the minds of language speakers.

Within the framework of cognitive onomastics, this difference can be justified as follows:

- Macrotoponym is a ready-made symbol in collective memory. Macrotoponyms are mental constructs that are firmly established in the social consciousness and are identified by the general public. In addition to being a spatial designation for speakers of a language, they also serve as a cultural code on a national or global scale. For example, although the White House is a specific building in Washington, D.C., it has a macro-status in the minds of speakers of a language as a “center of political power.” Here, it is not the physical size of the object that matters, but its cognitive weight in society [3: 46].
- Microtoponym is a "living" lexeme at the individual or local level. Microtoponyms are units that have not yet completely lost their appellative (cognate) character, having a spatial identity only within a certain small group (for example, residents of a village). As V. A. Nikonov rightly noted, they are "in the process of becoming a proper noun." The fact that a white-painted building in a village is called the White House acquires a spatial meaning only for the residents of this neighborhood. For a representative of another region, it remains simply a white house (appellative). Thus, in a microtoponym, the connection between the name and its description has not yet been broken, it is still at the lower stage of the lexicalization process.

The difference between macro- and micro-toponymy is not related to the linguistic material, but to the scale of identification in the human mind. For example, the name of the White House restaurant in Tashkent is local (micro), while the White House in Washington is global (macro). Accordingly, micro-toponyms can turn into macro-toponyms over time and due to social necessity. In this process, the name is separated from its appellative character and becomes an independent mental image. The same situation can be seen in the name of the Qoshko'pir district: the name of a small bridge (micro) over time has become the stable name of a certain administrative unit (macro) and today has cognitively distanced itself from its original figurative meaning of two bridges [4: 4].

In short, microtoponyms are “living” units that live on the “periphery” of the language, are rapidly changing, and have local significance, while macrotoponyms are units located in the “core” of the language system, are stable, and are encoded in the national cultural memory. This distinction is very important for linguistics, as it allows us to determine the degree to which onomastic units reflect the worldview and culture of the speakers of the language.

Microtoponyms are the layer with the highest conceptualization potential in the lexical system of the language. The study of these units within the anthropocentric paradigm requires the disclosure of the national mental models behind them. As V. I. Suprun noted, “a set of proper names is a unique and important sign of a certain ethnicity, and onomastics is a manifestation of nationality in the language.” For example, in the English linguistic culture, High Street is not just a street name, but a metonymic construct denoting the business and trade center of a city or village. This unit is cognitively associated in the minds of English speakers with the concept of “retail sector”. The units of Bazarboshi or Katta Ucha in the Uzbek toponymic landscape are based on the same mental model. If in English the center is conceptualized through the quality of High (high/main), in the Uzbek onomastic consciousness social life is organized around the concepts of bazaar (economic center) or katta (hierarchical dominance) [5: 15].

Indicators (terminological appellations) in the composition of microtoponyms reflect the system of national values. In English microtoponymy, the unit Cottage (for example, Rose Cottage, Old Cottage) is a cognitive metaphor for coziness, privacy, and the idyll of rural life. This unit verbalizes the urbanistic orientation of the English people and the ethno-forming principle “home is my fortress” [5: 25].

In the Uzbek onomastic landscape, especially in the works of the Khorezm oasis and Ogahi, the component of the pond (for example, Labi pond, Tosh pond) occupies a central place. In hot climates, the pond is conceptualized not only as a hydraulic structure, but also as a source of life and a center of social relations. A comparative analysis shows that if in the English

mind the idealization of space is focused on comfort in the house, then in the Uzbek mentality the well-being of space is built around a water source [6: 22].

The transfer of microtoponyms from one language to another is not just a linguistic process, but a phenomenon of linguocultural transference. According to A.V. Pravdikova, “when translating a work of art, it is necessary to take into account the communicative-pragmatic purpose of the author and to create an analogous pragmatic effect in the translation.” The following strategies are dominant in this process [7: 184]:

1. **Domestication:** The onomastic unit is adapted to the cultural understanding of the target language. For example, by translating the expression “Bluebell Glade” in the English text as “Bluebell Glade, the internal form and aesthetic effect of the toponym are revived.
2. **Foreignization:** The name retains its national form and serves as a marker of “foreignness.” Transcribing Baker Street or Scotland Yard units helps to maintain a British feel.
3. **Cultural compensation:** If a microtoponym has a strong symbolic meaning (for example, Downing Street or Fleet Street), it is necessary to use explanations in the translation. This fills the semantic gap that arises due to the lack of “background knowledge” of the speaker.

As V. A. Nikonov noted, “the next linguistic trend does not simply accept the names of the previous layer, but adapts them to its own linguistic laws.” A similar adaptation process is observed in the translation process, which serves to preserve the properties of microtoponyms not only to denote a place, but also to express a national worldview.

CONCLUSION

As a result of the conducted linguistic and comparative analyses, the following scientific conclusions were reached:

- In the anthropocentric paradigm, the division of toponyms into micro or macro levels is determined not by the physical scale (volume) of the object, but by the scale of perception and cognitive status in the minds of language speakers. A physically small object (for example, The White House) acquires the status of a macrotoponym as a result of its transformation into a symbol entrenched in the social consciousness;
- Microtoponyms are located in the peripheral layer of the language, and they retain a strong appellative (cognate) feature. These units have a spatial identity only within a certain small social group and are at the lower stage of the process of becoming a proper name;
- In the onomastic landscape of microtoponyms, national mental models and cognitive metaphors play a leading role;
- In literary texts, microtoponyms perform not only a locative function, but also text-forming and stylistic functions. They act as key words in the formation of the author's individual worldview;
- the use of domestication, foreignization, and cultural compensation strategies in the translation of microtoponyms serves to eliminate the difference in "background knowledge" of language speakers and to restore the national worldview.

REFERENCES

1. Pravdikova A. V. 2009. Microtoponymy as a reflection of the picture of the world: Based on English Literature of the 19th-20th centuries: *Abstract of Cand. Sci. (Philological Sciences) Dissertation*. Volgograd.
2. Varbot J. J. 1998. *A Brief Conceptual and Terminological Handbook of Etymology and Historical Lexicology*. Russian Academy of Sciences, V. V. Vinogradov Russian Language Institute.
3. Nikonov V. A. 2011. *Introduction to Toponymy*. 2nd ed. Moscow: LKI Publishing House.

4. Pravdikova A. V. 2009. Microtoponymy as a reflection of the picture of the world: Based on English Literature of the 19th-20th centuries. Abstract of Cand. Sci. (Philological Sciences) Dissertation. Volgograd.
5. Suprun V. I. 2000. Onomastic field of the Russian language and its components. Volgograd: Peremena.
6. Pravdikova A. V. 2009. Microtoponymy as a reflection of the picture of the world: based on English literature of the 19th-20th centuries: Abstract of Cand. Sci. (Philology) Dissertation. Volgograd.
7. Nikonov V. A. 2011. *Introduction to Toponymy*. 2nd ed. Moscow: LKI Publishing House.

MATYAKUBOV KHAKIMBOY KHAMIDJANOVICH

DOCTORAL CANDIDATE,

KHOREZM MAMUN ACADEMY,

KHIVA, UZBEKISTAN.

E-MAIL: <GREATHAKIM9091@MAIL.RU>

PH: +998885176006