

**КӨРКӨМ ТЕКСТТЕГИ ЗООНИМДЕРДИН ЛИНГВИСТИКАЛЫК ЖАНА
СЕМИОТИКАЛЫК ӨЗГӨЧӨЛҮКТӨРҮ
(ЧЫҢГЫЗ АЙТМАТОВДУН ЧЫГАРМАЛАРЫНЫН НЕГИЗИНДЕ)**

Эргешова Сейил Бактыбековна,

Ошский государственный университет, город Ош, Кыргызская Республика, кандидат филологических наук, доцент.

Адиева Нурзат Качыбековна,

Ошский государственный университет, город Ош, Кыргызская Республика, преподаватель.

Эралиева Толгонай Тургунбаевна,

Ошский государственный университет, город Ош, Кыргызская Республика, преподаватель

Аннотация. Макалада ономастика, анын бөлүмдөрү, ономастиканын тил илиминдеги орду, кыргыз тилиндеги зоонимдердин өзгөчөлүгү каралып, ономастиканын аз изилденген катмары зоонимия, анын лексикалык мааниси, ички иерархиясы, лингвистикалык техникасы ж.б. өзгөчөлүктөрү белгиленди.

Ачкыч сөздөр: ономастика, зооним, онимдер, тексттин структурасы, Айтматовдун чыгармаларындагы зоонимдер.

Аннотация. В статье рассматриваются ономастика, ее разделы, место ономастики в лингвистике, специфика зоонимов кыргызского языка, малоизученный слой ономастики-зоонимия, ее лексическое значение, внутренняя иерархия, лингвистические приемы и т.д. особенности отмечены.

Ключевые слова: ономастика, зоонимы, структура текста, зоонимы в творчестве Айтматова.

Abstract. The article discusses onomastics, its sections, the place of onomastics in linguistics, the specifics of the zoonyms of the Kyrgyz language, the little-studied layer of onomastics-zoonymy, its lexical meaning, internal hierarchy, linguistic techniques, etc.

Keywords: onomastics, zoonyms, hyponyms, text structure, zoonisms in Aitmatov's work.

Introduction. Onomastics, translated from Ancient Greek, means the art of naming. It is a branch of linguistics that studies proper names, their origins, and their original meanings. The object of study in onomastics is onyms (proper names), which serve to distinguish a named object from other objects. This article examines animal names that occupy an important place in onomastics, analyzing the specific features of zoonyms, their role within the onomastic space, and the main characteristics and differences between zoonymy and semiotics. The place of onomastics in linguistics, the specific features of zoonyms in the Kyrgyz language, their lexical meanings, internal hierarchy, linguistic mechanisms, and other characteristics remain insufficiently studied in modern scholarship. In particular, the study of descriptive and symbolic systems in onomastics is a pressing issue today. Zoonymy—the system of proper names given to animals—is one of the least explored branches of onomastics and raises many

unresolved research questions. The theoretical and methodological foundations of the main directions of onomastics, as well as the origins of zoonyms and other onymic units, are examined. Special attention is paid to the analysis of proper names assigned to animals.

Human language, unlike the language of animals, is a socio-natural phenomenon. In the conditional sense, animal “language” does not convey abstract information and lacks dialogic characteristics. Human language is socially and geographically conditioned, whereas animals communicate in the same way regardless of location; that is, their communication is not divided by collective or territorial boundaries. The article identifies the lexical-structural and ethnolinguistic features of zoonyms and analyzes their role in enhancing the intertextual and linguistic features of literary works, focusing on zoonyms found in the works of Chingiz Aitmatov. In onomastics, there are specialized research directions dedicated to the study of proper names in fiction, oral folk poetry, periodicals, and official-business style texts (Ryadchenko N. G., 1994, p. 32). Among these areas, this study focuses on onomastics related to animal imagery and interaction within literary texts.

Methodology. As the methodological foundation of the study, educational and methodological works published by Ch. T. Aitmatov, G. A. Arkhipov, K. Z. Zulpukarov, B. Sh. Usubaliev, A. K. Murzakhmetov, L. Ükübaeva, N. G. Ryadchenko, and T. V. Shmeleva were used.

The article employs methods of analysis and synthesis, generalization and systematization, as well as observation and descriptive analysis. The semiotic analysis of literary works selected as the object of study is considered the primary methodological approach. The main sources are works on onomastics, zoonymy, and semiotics.

Problems of onomastics, including personal names, geographical names, animal names, and names of various urban objects, are comprehensively analyzed in T. V. Shmeleva’s work *Onomastics*. The scholar also addresses issues related to classical and onomastic terminology.

N. G. Ryadchenko emphasizes that zoonymy is the youngest branch of onomastics and highlights the significant differences between zoonyms and anthroponyms. E. V. Guseva notes that a distinctive trend in the development of zoonymy is the prevalence of nicknames, which reflect the relationship between humans and their domestic animals.

One of the founders of semiotics, C. S. Peirce, classified semiotic signs into indices. Signs that reflect reality through resemblance to the object differ from symbols, which represent objects through non-resembling or conventional features. F. de

Saussure laid the theoretical foundations of semiotics by viewing the sign as a two-sided psychological entity, consisting of a concept and an acoustic image. C. W. Morris introduced the concept of metasigns, emphasizing their function of conveying information about signs themselves.

The research presented in this article is based on the works of the above-mentioned scholars. The system of signs in literary texts is considered the main object of semiotic analysis in their theoretical frameworks. Prior to conducting semiotic analysis of a literary text, it is necessary to identify and interpret hidden codes through individual interpretative experience. In general, all processes related to the transmission and processing of information in nature, the animal world, and human society are carried out through sign systems or elements related to such systems.

A broader understanding of semiotics, including the consideration of parasemiotic phenomena, makes it possible to identify the sources and conditions of the emergence of certain types of classical signs and to comprehend the historical essence of the semiotic world.

This study is based on the intersection of semiotics and onomastics. The main theoretical directions of onomastics serve as an important methodological basis for interpreting linguistic and social motivations. Through zoonyms, it is possible to reveal characters' traits, folk worldviews, and philosophical symbols. Comparing the symbolic meanings of animal names in Kyrgyz folklore and literature with those in the works of Chyngyz Aitmatov proves effective in interpreting zoosymbols in his writings. By employing zoonyms as signs or mythological codes, Aitmatov integrates mythic symbols into mass consciousness, demonstrating his high level of mastery in using mythological thinking and symbolism.

Results. In onomastics, there are traditionally several branches distinguished according to the categories of proper names and the nature of the objects being named (Ryadchenko, 1988, p. 27). Animal communication differs significantly from human communication; it is a genetically fixed system of innate signals granted at birth. However, animal language remains an insufficiently studied phenomenon. Signs in animal communication do not reflect surrounding reality through processes of generalization and synthesis, and even if such elements exist, they are not directly related to communicative mechanisms.

One of the least explored layers of onomastics is zoonymy—the system of animal names. Zoonyms (from *zoon* — animal, *onum* — name) are proper names given to animals (“Manas Encyclopedia,” 1995). The practice of naming domestic animals emerged from practical necessity, similar to naming geographical locations. Zoonyms possess specific lexical meanings, internal hierarchies, and distinctive linguistic features

(Ryadchenko, 1988, p. 54). Zoonymic names largely resemble or closely correspond to proper names found in Kyrgyz and other Turkic-Mongolic oral traditions.

This study analyzes animal-based modes of communication and zoonyms in the works of Chingiz Aitmatov as its primary research object. Accordingly, the names given to animals in Aitmatov’s literary texts are examined as significant onomastic units.

In Kyrgyz culture, naming traditions are closely connected with social consciousness, worldview, and customs. An ethnocultural code is a system of symbols that conveys a people’s philosophy of life, values, and historical experience through signs. In Aitmatov’s artistic universe, the onomastic system profoundly reveals the destinies of characters, the state of society, and the broader historical context. The writer assigns names not merely as labels, but as carriers of ethnocultural codes, thereby reinforcing the symbolic, psychological, and semantic layers of characters. Although Aitmatov’s onomastics is rooted in national ethnocultural traditions, it ultimately transcends them to express universal human values.

The onomastic system in Aitmatov’s works represents an artistic interpretation of ethnocultural codes. Each character’s name is connected with national history, customs, mythology, and collective consciousness. Onomastic units reveal character traits, preserve ethnic values, and integrate national and universal meanings.

The world we inhabit can indeed be described as a world of names and titles. Animal proper names and their structural features are presented in a particularly complex and expressive manner in Aitmatov’s works. Zoonymic codes often reflect external features of animals, such as color, combining both direct nomination and metaphor. For example, the camel named Karanar (“Black Nar”) is not a random designation. The description emphasizes its black head, strong curved neck, broad chest, dark tufts of hair, black humps, tail tip, and powerful legs, creating an image that combines strength and beauty (Aitmatov, Vol. 4, 2008, p. 32).

The author assigns names based on traditional usage, aligning them with people’s aspirations, beliefs, customs, physical appearance, and character traits. The compound Kara (black) + nar (a strong, single-humped camel) enhances the emotional and aesthetic effect of the text. Age measurement through the term asyy (a five-year livestock unit) further demonstrates the integration of ethnolinguistic elements into narrative structure.

In Aitmatov’s works, compound words are frequently used as zoonyms. In the novella “Farewell, Gulsary!”, the horse’s name Gulsary (gul — flower, sary — yellow) exemplifies this phenomenon. The entire narrative revolves around this zoonym, and the title itself reflects the central symbolic function of the animal’s name (Aitmatov, Vol. 2, 2008, p. 243). Gulsary is portrayed as a sentient being—capable of crying, listening to

music, rejoicing, and suffering—becoming spiritually united with the human protagonist Tanabai. Through this human–animal unity, Aitmatov conveys the tragic historical trajectory of Soviet society.

Onomastic units in Aitmatov’s works often reveal characters’ inner worlds, destinies, and philosophical depth. They function as semiotic tools that expose not only individual psychology but also the mentality of an entire era. Thus, onomastics in Aitmatov’s prose exists as an integral component of artistic semiotics.

The relationship between image and sign, essence and meaning, is evident throughout the compositional structure of his texts. Aitmatov demonstrates a remarkable ability to depict both human and animal worlds on an equal footing, particularly in works such as “The Day Lasts More Than a Hundred Years”. The wolves Akbara and Tashchainar are endowed with human-like names and characteristics, reinforcing emotional expressiveness and narrative coherence (Aitmatov, Vol. 5, 2008, p. 11).

The symbolic use of color (ak — white) in names such as Akdaly, Akbary, and Akbara intensifies the emotional resonance of the text. The semantic structure and narrative development are closely tied to these zoonyms. Through dialogue and monologue, Aitmatov skillfully selects linguistic means to enhance expressiveness, recognizing the word as the primary element of artistic creation.

Animal images in Aitmatov’s works are often positioned on an equal level with humans, a feature also evident in mythological representations. The totemic figure of Mother Deer (Bugu-Ene) in “The White Ship” embodies sacred ancestry and cultural memory, symbolizing the rupture between humanity and nature. Similarly, the crane (turna) in “Early Cranes” represents hope, renewal, and longing for homeland.

In “When the Mountains Fall”, the snow leopard named Jaabars (jaa — arrow, bars — leopard) exemplifies metaphorical comparison. The animal’s agility is likened to an arrow, reinforcing the stylistic and semantic richness of the text (Aitmatov, Vol. 6, 2008, p. 287).

Thus, in Aitmatov’s literary universe, each zoonym functions as an artistic sign, a philosophical code, and a repository of cultural memory. Zoonymic analysis reveals the linguistic, ethnolinguistic, and semiotic features of literary texts. Aitmatov’s onomastic and zoonymic system represents a unique manifestation of Kyrgyz artistic semiotics, bridging humanity and nature, past and present, reality and myth. Zoonyms in his works transcend linguistic function to become symbols of philosophical, ecological, and universal human significance.

Conclusion.

1. This article examines zoonyms through semiotic tools using examples from literary works, thereby contributing to the semiotic description and analysis of artistic texts.

2. The lexical-structural and ethnolinguistic features of zoonyms were identified, and the role of onomastics in enhancing intertextuality, linguistic specificity, and overall artistic expressiveness was analyzed through zoonyms in the works of Chyngyz Aitmatov.

3. Semiotics, as the study of signs, also applies to the animal world, where signs possess their own structural organization. From this perspective, the study reveals how intertextuality, graphical, and linguistic features function within a literary work and contribute to its artistic integrity. From a semiotic standpoint, meaning is constructed through a system of relationships between humans, objects, concepts, and signs. Therefore, the article demonstrates that literary works reflect situations of semiotic interaction between humans and animals. Semiotic analysis reveals the codes through which images, situations, and problems are constructed at various textual and communicative levels, an issue addressed in this study.

4. The onomastic and zoonymic system in Chyngyz Aitmatov’s works represents a unique manifestation of the artistic semiotics of the Kyrgyz worldview. Through a system of signs, the writer reveals the interconnections between humans and nature, past and present, reality and myth. Using onomastic descriptors, sign systems, and zoonymic analysis, the linguistic-structural, ethnolinguistic, and semiotic features of literary texts were examined through examples from Aitmatov’s works.

5. Aitmatov’s onomastics should be regarded as a phenomenon of national artistic thought, while his zoonyms function as universal signs of human consciousness.

References:

1. Aitmatov, Ch. T. (2008). *Collected Works in Eight Volumes*. Bishkek.
2. Arkhipov, G. A., & Ivanov, V. I. (1971). Zoonyms in Udmurtia. In *Onomastics of the Volga Region* (Vol. 2, pp. 306–309). Gorky.
3. Golovanova, E. I. (2009). Usernames of personal computers as an object of poliparadigmatic analysis. In *Ethnolinguistics. Onomastics. Etymology: Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference* (Yekaterinburg, September 8–12, 2009, pp. 60–62). Yekaterinburg.
4. Guseva, E. V. (2002). Traditional and frequent animal nicknames in the linguistic worldview of the modern urban resident. *Bulletin of Moscow University, Series 9: Philology*, No. 4, 91–104.
5. Narmyrzayeva, K. Zh. (2012). *Stylistic Features of Nouns in the Works of Ch. Aitmatov*. Osh, pp. 71–86.
6. Ozhegov, S. I. (1990). *Dictionary of the Russian Language*. Moscow.
7. Ryadchenko, N. G. (1988). Zoonymy as a class of onomastic vocabulary. In *Topical Issues of Russian Onomastics* (pp. 88–96). Kyiv.
8. Ryadchenko, N. G. (1994). Zoonymy. Russian zoonymy. In *Russian Onomastics and the Onomastics of Russia: Dictionary* (pp. 77–84). Moscow.