ЛИНГВИСТИКА / LINGUISTICS / ЛИНГВИСТИКА

Linguocultural and cognitive features of Kazakh and English toponyms

A.E. Smatova[1] , B.M. Tleuberdiev*[2] , N.K. Omarov[3]

M. Auezov South Kazakhstan University, Shymkent, Kazakhstan

(E-mail: [1]Smatova.80@mail.ru, [2]tleuberdiev_bolatbek@mail.ru, [3]nurlybek.omarov.73@mail.ru)

Abstract. The article presents a comparative linguistic analysis of the linguocultural and cognitive features of toponymic units in the Kazakh and English languages. The study focuses on the names of natural and geographical entities that hold cultural and cognitive significance in both nations. Toponyms in Kazakh and English are shaped by distinct historical, social, and environmental contexts, and their semantic features reflect a range of culturally encoded meanings. The article systematically examines the concept of toponymic conceptualization, its linguistic realization, and its role in constructing national identity. The primary objective is to explore toponymic concepts as cognitive structures that encapsulate ethnocultural values, thereby revealing culturally specific aspects of the Kazakh and English worldviews. Through the collection, classification, and comparative analysis of geographical names, the study identifies shared and divergent cognitive patterns between the two linguistic communities. Using a linguocognitive approach, the analysis of key toponymic concepts such as *ауыл* (village), *атамекен* (native land), *дала* (steppe), *төбе* (hill), and *су* (water) demonstrates how toponyms function not only as place names but also as carriers of national consciousness and cultural memory. The findings underscore the significance of toponymy as both a nominative and cognitive-cultural phenomenon, contributing to a deeper understanding of the linguistic worldviews of the Kazakh and English peoples.

Keywords: toponymy, conceptology, cognitive linguistics, national worldview, linguoculturology, intercultural communication, toponymic system.

*corresponding author

Introduction

In contemporary linguistics, examining units of the toponymic system in close connection with human cognition and socio-spiritual activity is one of the key areas of research. In this context, the anthropocentric approach enables the study of toponymic vocabulary from a cognitive perspective. When viewed as a product of human consciousness and cognitive activity, the system of toponyms – intertwined with national history, culture, and spiritual heritage – offers valuable insights into the worldview of an ethnic group. Exploring the national and cultural characteristics of different ethnicities through toponyms is now recognized as a significant area in modern science. Accordingly, studying the body of Kazakh and English toponyms within a new scientific paradigm – based on cognitive, conceptual, and linguocultural approaches – aims to expand the theoretical framework of toponymy. The toponymic picture of the world reflected through the toponyms of each language is characterized by toponymic concepts, which are shaped by mental and toponymic stereotypes.

Taking into account the principles of linguistic nomination, mental categories, and cultural codes, identifying the cognitive-pragmatic aspects of the toponymic system is one of the key tasks in modern Kazakh and English linguistics. When the body of toponyms is examined in close connection with national history, culture, and spiritual heritage, it allows for a deeper and more accurate understanding of the nature of toponyms in both countries. Therefore, exploring the national and cultural dimensions of different worldviews through toponyms from a cognitive perspective has become a pressing issue today. Considering the role and significance of toponyms in shaping our understanding of the world through language, identifying the mental and cognitive characteristics of toponymic units is among the most relevant challenges in contemporary Kazakh and English linguistic studies. Thus, in the field of toponymic lexicon, the cognitive-pragmatic exploration of a language's toponymic system – based on the laws of linguistic nomination and the nature of human thought – is both a promising and highly relevant direction for research.

A comprehensive study of the meaning, structure, and function of Kazakh and English proper names within the framework of the "language – consciousness – nation" triad is one of the key issues in contemporary Kazakh and English onomastics. Although the cognitive worldviews of these two ethnic groups are reflected through proper names, there remains a lack of systematic scholarly research in this area. Kazakh and English proper names serve as vital linguistic units that encapsulate the historical memory, culture, spiritual identity, and values of a people, acting as a mirror of their connection with the surrounding world and centuries of accumulated experience. From this perspective, the linguistic and cognitive analysis of their semantic features is both necessary and highly relevant.

Investigating the national and cultural aspects of different worldviews through toponyms from a cognitive standpoint remains a pressing issue in modern linguistic studies. Examining toponyms that embody the national consciousness of both ethnic groups within a new scientific paradigm opens the way for the development of a new direction in toponymic research.

Research Materials and Methods

The methodological foundation of this study is based on the principles of linguoconceptology, ethnolinguistics, cultural linguistics, and comparative-typological linguistics. The linguocognitive

Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің ХАБАРШЫСЫ.
ФИЛОЛОГИЯ сериясы
ISSN: 2616-678X. eISSN: 2663-1288

2025
№3 (152)

115

and semantic analysis of Kazakh and English toponyms was conducted within the frameworks of cognitive linguistics and intercultural communication. The research materials included widely used place names and hydronyms in the Kazakh and English languages, names of geographical features, as well as toponymic dictionaries and encyclopedic sources. In addition, linguistic data reflecting the national worldview and cultural codes of each language were also utilized as sources. The collected toponymic data were analyzed using conceptual analysis methods to identify their semantic, pragmatic, and ethnocultural characteristics. Through comparative analysis, the study focused on the similarities and differences within the toponymic systems of both languages, comparing their cognitive and cultural underpinnings. The onomastic systems of Kazakh and English were examined in detail, and theoretical insights were offered within the fields of cognitive onomastics and onomastic linguoconceptology. The scientific findings and conclusions obtained throughout the research contribute to a deeper theoretical understanding of key issues in cognitive linguistics, general and comparative linguoconceptology, ethnolinguistics, cultural linguistics, and onomastic semiotics. This approach allows for the examination of the functional features and social significance of toponyms in Kazakh and English within the context of speakers' linguistic consciousness and the historical-social experience of their ethnolinguistic communities.

The Kazakh-English toponymic landscape has developed over several centuries under complex historical, cultural, and linguistic conditions. In general, toponymy is considered one of the key branches of Kazakh and English linguistics and onomastics, and it continues to attract considerable scholarly interest. This is evidenced by the growing number of publications dedicated to various aspects of the field. This article examines the lexico-semantic characteristics of Kazakh and English toponyms and addresses issues related to their classification. It explores the nuances of toponymic naming in both languages and emphasizes the importance of lexico-semantic categorization in uncovering the meanings of place names. During the research process, data related to linguistic conceptual units and meanings were collected and analyzed using conceptual, cognitive, and linguocultural methods.

The study of Kazakh and English toponyms not only expands the theoretical foundation of this field but also contributes to a deeper understanding of cultural exchange, national values, and developmental processes between the two nations. Furthermore, it offers a comprehensive insight into the structure and dynamics of the toponymic landscape. The theoretical and methodological basis of this research is grounded in the works of leading domestic and international scholars. In particular, the studies of T. Zhanuzak, N. Uali, G.B. Madiyeva, E. Kerimbayev, and B. Tileuberdiev provided the primary theoretical foundation for identifying key directions in onomastics, linguoconceptology, and cognitive linguistics. Additionally, the cognitive and conceptual orientation of the research, as well as the exploration of the interrelation between language and national culture, was informed by the theoretical perspectives of Zh. Mankeyeva, K.K. Rysbergen, and B. Tileuberdiev. In the field of ethnolinguistics, the work of A. Kaidar (2013) – particularly his *Kazaktar Ana Tili Aleminde: Etnolingvistikalyk Sozdik (Kazakhs in the World of Their Native Language: An Ethnolinguistic Dictionary)* – was used to reveal the ethnolinguistic characteristics of certain toponymic units. These scholarly contributions enabled the systematization of the research focus and facilitated a comprehensive analysis of linguocultural concepts.

T. Zhanuzak's *"Zher-su ataulary" (Place Names) (An Etymological Reference Book)* (2011) is a foundational work that systematically explores the etymology of geographical names in the Kazakh language. This research provides valuable insight into the connection between Kazakhstan's rich toponymic heritage and the national worldview. Additionally, the scholar's work *"Tarihi zher-su attarynyn tuptorkini" (The Origins of Historical Place Names)* (Zhanuzak, 2010) focuses on the genesis of historical toponyms, making it a significant contribution from the perspectives of historical linguistics and etymology. T. Zhanuzak's extensive contributions to the field of *Kazakh onomastics – such as "Kazak onomastikasy: zhetistikteri men bolashagy" (Kazakh Onomastics: Achievements and Prospects)* (2004) and the five-volume *"Kazak onomastikasy" (Kazakh Onomastics)* (2021), published in 2021 – are the result of decades of dedicated research and are of considerable importance to national onomastic studies.

In the area of conceptual linguistics, Zh. Mankeyeva's study *"Kazak tilindegi etnomadeni ataulardyn tanymdyk negizderi" (Cognitive Foundations of Ethnocultural Terms in the Kazakh Language)* (2008) is dedicated to the spiritual and cognitive dimensions of language understanding. Her work addresses key theoretical and epistemological principles of anthropocentric research in cultural-linguistic data and outlines the historical foundations of ethnolinguistic studies in Kazakh. Furthermore, B. Tileuberdiev's works, including *"Kazak onomastikasynyn lingvokognitivtik aspektileri" (Linguocognitive Aspects of Kazakh Onomastics)* (2006) and *"Kazak onomastikasynyn kognitivtik, lingvokonseptologiyalyk negizderi" (Cognitive and Linguoconceptual Foundations of Kazakh Onomastics)* (2019), examine proper names from the perspective of cognitive lexicology and linguoconceptology. He offers a characterization of onomastic concepts as cognitive categories and investigates the cognitive and linguocultural aspects of Kazakh proper names in depth.

The works of Eilert Ekwall, Victor Watts, David Mills, and Kenneth Cameron were used in studying English toponymy. Eilert Ekwall is recognized as one of the most authoritative researchers in English toponymy. His *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names* (Ekwall, 1960) serves as a fundamental reference on the etymology of English geographical names, offering an in-depth analysis of the historical development and phonetic changes of English toponyms. Victor Watts, a prominent figure in the English Place-Name Society, focused on the study of place names in medieval English records. His edited volume, *The Cambridge Dictionary of English Place-Names* (Watts, 2010), is a major scholarly work that analyzes the semantics, historical context, and dialectal variations of place names, providing essential insights into the cultural and contextual characteristics of English toponymy. David Mills is another significant scholar in the field, known for his *A Dictionary of British Place-Names* (Mills, 2011), a widely used lexicographic work containing over 17,000 rich and interesting toponyms tracing their development from ancient times to the present. Kenneth Cameron, author of *English Place Names* (Cameron, 1996) and other academic publications, has conducted historical-linguistic research on English toponymy, identifying the influences of Germanic, Scandinavian, and Celtic languages on English place names. Regarding cognitive toponymy, Irina Martynenko's article *On the Term "Cognitive Toponymy"* (Martynenko, 2020) explores the theoretical foundations of analyzing toponyms from cognitive and linguistic traditions. The author investigates the justification for introducing the terms "cognitive toponymy" and "cognitive toponym," arguing

Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің ХАБАРШЫСЫ.
ФИЛОЛОГИЯ сериясы
ISSN: 2616-678X. eISSN: 2663-1288

2025
№3 (152)

117

their necessity within onomastic terminology and proposing definitions for these concepts. Additionally, Martynenko offers hypotheses concerning the goals and tasks of cognitive toponymy as a scientific discipline. In A.N. Belyaev's article *O toponimicheskom kontsepte (On the Toponymic Concept)* (Belyaev, 2019), the cognitive foundations underlying the formation of the toponymic concept are thoroughly examined.

Núria Garcia-Quera's study, "The Etymology of Opaque Place Names Based on a Cognitive and Interdisciplinary Method" (Garcia-Quera, 2025), focuses on the investigation of the etymology of opaque toponyms. According to the author, methods for researching the etymology of such toponyms have been in use since the 19th century. However, Garcia-Quera identifies certain weaknesses in these traditional approaches during the research process. Consequently, she proposes a new methodology grounded in cognitive and geographical principles and reports on its practical application.

In the study *"Linguistic Erosion: The Risk of Losing Kazakh and English Toponyms Under the Influence of Dominant Languages and Cultures", B. Karayeva and A. Meirbekov* (2025) examine the phenomenon of linguistic erosion, which describes the alteration or distortion of Kazakh and English toponyms under the influence of dominant languages and cultures. The primary aim of the research is to identify the mechanisms behind the loss of traditional place names and to propose strategies for their preservation. The authors analyze the theoretical foundations of linguistic erosion and emphasize its significance in maintaining cultural diversity and historical continuity.

Results and Discussion

Language is not merely a means of conveying information; it also serves as a concentrated reflection of a person's worldview and experiences. From this perspective, language functions as a tool for materializing human cognition about the world, as well as a means of preserving and transmitting this knowledge within collective consciousness. Thus, language represents the primary form through which the image of the world exists and manifests human cognitive experience. The linguistic image of the world is the verbal representation of the reality formed in the human mind as a result of interaction with the surrounding environment. In other words, the understanding of the world processed in human consciousness is encoded within the system of linguistic units and is passed down from generation to generation through these units.

Cognitive linguistics is oriented towards the study of natural language, viewing language not only as a tool for organizing, transmitting, and processing information but also as a form of human cognitive ability. The primary task of cognitive linguistics is to analyze linguistic units in order to uncover the cognitive processes within the human mind – specifically, how information is perceived, processed, and retained. This approach allows for the exploration of not only the structural system of language but also the human thinking system, worldview, and experience. Moreover, cognitive linguistics is closely linked with applied linguistics, playing a significant role in areas such as foreign language acquisition, language teaching methodology, translation studies, and optimization of linguistic communication. Thus, understanding the mechanisms of information transmission, processing, and storage through language contributes to more

118   **2025**
№3 (152)

Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің ХАБАРШЫСЫ.
ФИЛОЛОГИЯ сериясы
ISSN: 2616-678X. eISSN: 2663-1288

effective language learning and facilitates the construction of cognitive models based on linguistic data. Before examining the ethnocognitive reflections within the toponymic system, it is essential to clarify the concepts of *cognition* (ethnocognition or ethical cognition), worldview, and the regional *toponymic image of the world.* The linguistic image of the world, formed in the consciousness and language of any nation, represents the result and reflection of ethnocognition because only that which is cognitively recognized finds its rightful place in language and consciousness. The worldview carries an ethnic character since it embodies the cognition of the ethnic group, possessing distinct ethnocultural (ethnic) features. The ethnocultural factors unique to each ethnos shape the ethnic traits of worldview. The linguistic image of the world is always the product and linguistic representation of ethnocognition. The nation's ideas and concepts about the world form within its worldview and are expressed through its language. Consequently, when referring to the *linguistic image of the world,* we must speak of the *image of the ethnos' universe.* The *onomastic national image of the world* constitutes a fragment of the general folk (national) image of the world and is realized, constructed, and formed at the level of *proper names.* As B.M. Tileuberdiev (2006) notes: "If the linguistic image of the world is represented in linguistic units at various levels as the national image of the world, then proper names at the onomastic level can logically be considered fragments of the national linguistic image of the world and can form the *onomastic national image of the world".* The scholar further explains the onomastic (national) image of the world: "By the onomastic (national) image of the world, we mean a systematic and complex set of onomastic concepts, which represents the linguistic reflection of national cognition at the level of proper names. The life, existence, economy, consciousness, aesthetic preferences, mythological, religious, and ethnic concepts, as well as social experience of a nation and an individual, leave their indelible traces in language – that is, in vocabulary, phraseology, and both common and proper names. These traces are not only linguistic marks but also cognitive signs and symbols of cognition" (Tileuberdiev, 2006). According to B.M. Tileuberdiev, *the onomastic image of the world* with ethnocognitive characteristics is internally divided into the *mythonymic image of the world*, the *anthroponymic image of the world,* and the *toponymic image of the world* (Tileuberdiev, 2006).

Toponyms, which study place names such as those of rivers, lakes, and other geographic features, constitute a significant branch of onomastics. These names are not merely labels for specific geographical objects but also serve as carriers of an ethnos' cognitive and cultural codes. From this perspective, ethnocognitive toponymic layers represent a collection of place names grounded in a particular ethnos' worldview, historical and cultural experience, lifestyle, spiritual and material values, and reflect their linguistic-mental representation. Through such names, the people's relationship with nature, space, and social environment is revealed; in other words, toponyms act as cultural-linguistic indicators reflecting a nation's unique perception of the surrounding world. Thus, toponyms are recognized not only as geographic names but also as important sources that embody the historical and cognitive image of an ethnos' worldview. These layers hold a special place within the structure of the toponymic system, as they serve as preservers of a people's historical memory and cultural code. Ethnocognitive toponyms often develop based on traditional occupations (such as animal husbandry, hunting, and agriculture), beliefs, legends, and folklore heritage, illustrating culturally grounded ways of perceiving space.

Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің ХАБАРШЫСЫ.
ФИЛОЛОГИЯ сериясы
ISSN: 2616-678X. eISSN: 2663-1288

2025
№3 (152)

119

Moreover, analysis of the ethnocultural content of language through these layers allows for the reconstruction of an ethnos' model of world perception and the understanding of their cognitive and symbolic consciousness. Through ethnocognitive toponyms, one can discern a nation's historical memory related to space, spiritual values, and cultural identity.

Recognition of the environment and its linguistic representation are universal processes common to all ethnic groups. The mental operations underlying the act of linguistic nomination – such as seeing, hearing, sensing, perceiving, comparing, recognizing, and speaking – reflect cognitive processes shared by all humans. However, within this unified cognitive system, the ethnocultural component holds a special place. Particularly in cognitive semantics, national and cultural peculiarities become clearer through the verbal and non-verbal representation of linguistic units. These differences primarily depend on each nation's unique mentality, cognitive system, and their specific ways of perceiving the ethnological space. Conceptualizing objects and phenomena, classifying them into certain conceptual categories, and representing them in the national linguistic consciousness are recognized as distinctive manifestations of ethnic worldview. Thus, although cognitive activity in toponymic nomination has general characteristics, its national-cultural coloring is uniquely expressed in each language.

The linguistic image of the world and the national identity vary among ethnic groups, depending on their experience and knowledge. This is because the semiotic function of linguistic signs is not only linked to the external world but also serves as the foundation for what a person has observed, learned, and internalized in life. Toponymic names that reflect the national spiritual essence of the Kazakh people are closely related to national concepts such as "aul" (village) and "dala" (steppe). The concept of "aul" in the Kazakh language is connected to the traditional culture, ethnographic and everyday features, national worldview, and ancient understandings of the Kazakh people. Since ancient times, the "aul" has been a significant traditional community and settlement that organizes the ethnological space of the Kazakh people and regulates their lifestyle culturally and socially. For Kazakhs, the word "aul" means not just a settlement but carries deep cultural and spiritual meaning. In the national worldview of Kazakhs, the word "aul" has cognitive meanings such as "homeland," "ancestral land," "place of descendants," and "family hearth." Its axiological, associative, and connotative potential can be considered very strong. For the majority of Kazakhs, the "aul" primarily represents their native land where their umbilical cord was tied and where their relatives live – the "small" homeland (Rysbergen, 2011).

The reason we specifically focus on the concept of "auyl" (village, *ауыл)* in our research is that it clearly reflects not only the topographic frames characteristic of the toponymic concept but also the traditional culture, ethnographic and everyday life features, national worldview, ancient beliefs, and fundamental value system of the Kazakh people.

The concept of "auyl" *(ауыл)*, derived from an oikonymic appellative name, holds a central place in the cognitive base of the Kazakh people, not only as a toponymic-informational value but also as a spiritual value. That is, it has a very strong axiological, associative, and connotative potential. For most Kazakhs, the "auyl" is primarily their small homeland where their umbilical cord is buried and where their relatives and kin reside. In the Kazakh language, toponyms related to the word "auyl" include names like Abay Auyl, Zhanaauyl, Karasu Auyl, and others. In English, there are also place names associated with the concept of "village." The word "village" means a

"rural area," "settlement," or "habitation." English toponyms related to the concept of "village" mostly originate from Old English and Old Scandinavian words that denoted a settlement, farm, or dwelling place. Common examples include suffixes like "-ton" (from the Old English word "tun"), "-ham" (Old English "hām"), and "-by" (Old Scandinavian "býr"). All of these mean a settlement, village, or habitation. Additionally, suffixes like "-sted" (Old English "stede") and "-stow" (Old English "stōw") were also used to mean place, locality, or settlement.

English toponyms related to the concept of "village" are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. English toponyms associated with the concept of "village" (ауыл)

Toponymic suffix / component	Meaning	Examples
-ton	The Old English word tun means settlement or farm	Brighton, Taunton, Kingston, Abingdon, Caerleon, and Castleton
-ham	The Old English word hām means house, home, or village	Birmingham, Nottingham, and Buckingham
-by	The Old Scandinavian word býr means settlement or village	Grimsby, Derby, Whitby
-worth	The Old English word worth means enclosure or place	Kenilworth and Knebworth, Tamworth, Smallworthy
-wick / -wich	The Old English word wich means settlement or dwelling	Warwick, Norwich, Gatwick, Greenwich and Ipswich.
-stead	The Old English word stead means place, space or room	Hampstead, Farmstead Stansted and Elstead

The concept of *ауыл* (village) in the Kazakh language has an ethnocultural character that reflects notions and understandings inherent to the national mentality. For the Kazakh people, the word *ауыл* is not just a spatial term but also carries cultural, historical, and ethnic significance. In English culture, the word "village" is often contrasted with the hustle and bustle of urban life and symbolizes a peaceful, calm life connected with one's homeland.

The conceptual notion of *атамекен* (homeland) in both Kazakh and English languages is a linguistic, cultural, and cognitive phenomenon grounded in the worldview, historical experience, and culture of two distinct ethnic groups. This concept holds unique meanings in each language and reflects the people's relationship with space, land, and their spiritual connection.

In Kazakh, *атамекен* refers to the ancestral land, a place passed down from generation to generation. It is not only a physical location but also a spiritual space and a cornerstone of national memory. For Kazakhs, the concept of атамекен is intertwined with ideas like "birthplace," "ancestral home," and "black hearth" – symbolizing the land where one's bloodline originates.

English toponyms corresponding to *атамекен* reflect various historical and cultural nuances. These place names represent ideas related to the homeland, family heritage, or specific clans and lineages. The English toponyms related to *атамекен,* туған жер (birthplace), and қара шаңырақ (black hearth) concepts in Kazakh are characterized by several features.

Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің ХАБАРШЫСЫ.
ФИЛОЛОГИЯ сериясы
ISSN: 2616-678X. eISSN: 2663-1288

2025
№3 (152)

121

Toponyms connected to the English concept of *атамекен* represent a complex linguistic and cultural phenomenon manifesting at various cognitive levels. While the Kazakh notion of атамекен denotes the birthplace, ancestral settlement, and spiritual foundation of a lineage, in English this concept is formed through multiple cognitive structures. The English атамекен concept in toponymy functions as a preserver of historical memory and a carrier of cultural codes.

For the English, concepts like native land, ancestral home, homestead, and native village reflect ideas related to ancestral places. Toponyms often depict these as private lands or family farms. For example, place names such as Hemingford, Wilton, and Grantham are frequently associated with particular family lineages.

As a geographical space, the English notion of атамекен is linked with specific physical features, such as riverbanks, hilltops, or forests. For instance:
• Oakham – "village where oak trees grow,"
• Riversdale – "river valley,"
• Hillington – "settlement on the hill."

For English, the homeland is not only a physical location but also a symbol of national identity and spiritual homeland. Here, toponyms merge with national symbols, historical events, or religious-spiritual connections. For example,
• Canterbury symbolizes Christianity and English spirituality,
• Windsor is associated with the national monarchy and is a name embedded in national memory.

The English concept of "homeland" is a polysemantic notion. The toponymic names associated with the English concept of "homeland" often indicate spatial dimensions of size. For example, *Mickleby* means "large house or village," while *Littleton* means "small settlement." Toponyms expressing spatial dimensions include *Longton* ("long village"). Some toponyms reflect directional location, such as *Eastham* ("village in the east") and *Netherby* ("village located below"). The word *Nether* in Old English means "lower," "beneath," or "bottom." The suffix *-by* is borrowed from Old Norse (Scandinavian) and means "settlement," "village," or "dwelling place." Therefore, *Netherby* can be interpreted as "lower settlement" or "village located below."

In English, the concept of "homeland" also refers to settlements located near notable geographical features. For example, *Clapham* means "settlement on a hilltop," and *Trentham* means "settlement on the River Trent." For the English people, the notion of "homeland" may also express a prominent natural feature. For instance, *Ashton* refers to a "settlement with ash trees," and *Clayton* means "settlement on clay soil."

This concept can also encompass man-made environments created through human activity, such as *Brigstock* (bridge town) and *Milnthorpe* ("settlement with a mill"). In English, the term "homeland" may refer to land historically owned or associated with certain individuals. For example, *Bedworth* means "Beda's settlement," and *Rennington* means "place belonging to Ren."

It can also represent settlements of specific local communities. For example, *Danby* means "village of the Danes," and *Normanton* means "settlement of northern people." The concept of "homeland" also extends to occupational meanings – for example, *Linton* means "flax-growing farm," and *Sutterton* means "village of shoemakers." Additionally, it appears in religiously

connoted place names such as *Felixkirk* ("Church of Felix") and *Marstow* ("sacred place of Martin").

In accordance with the objective of our research, we have identified the cognitive nature of conceptual structures such as *steppe, homeland, water,* and *hill* in both Kazakh and English. The connotative meanings of the linguistic units that convey these concepts have also been analyzed to reveal their full semantic content.

For the Kazakh people, the concept of *dala* (the steppe) is not merely a geographical notion; it is the foundation of national worldview, spiritual space, historical consciousness, and traditional lifestyle. In Kazakh culture, the word *dala (дала)* holds philosophical, ethnic, and poetic meaning.

The concept of *dala* in the Kazakh worldview embodies ideas such as space, vastness, freedom, harmony between nature and humans, respect for the land, and the representation of a nomadic way of life. For the Kazakhs, the word *dala* carries deep cultural and spiritual meaning. The steppe is a symbol of freedom. It is a place where ancestral memory and spiritual heritage are preserved, as every hill, river, or ridge carries traces of ancestral history.

The semantic field of the lexeme *dala* in Kazakh is broad and serves as the basis for a variety of nominations. Examples include: *алтын дала* (golden steppe), *бетпақ дала* (arid steppe), *жазық дала* (flat steppe), *дала өркениеті* (steppe civilization), *мидай дала* (seemingly endless steppe), *орманды дала* (forested steppe), *қазақ даласы* (Kazakh steppe), *тың дала* (virgin steppe), *ұлы дала* (Great Steppe), and *others.* These expressions reflect the Kazakhs' space-oriented way of life. In particular, the names of pastures reflect ethnocultural knowledge, economic structures, and an intimate connection with the natural landscape. Such names include traditional terms *like zhailau* (summer pasture), *qonys* (settlement), *kuzeu* (autumn pasture), *qystau* (winter quarters), and *kokteu* (spring pasture), as well as specific place names. The *dala* concept, due to its parametric nature, is presented as a sub-concept rich in ethnocultural content within the larger structure of the *space* concept. It represents nearly all topographic objects in the real ethnogeographic landscape in both horizontal (right, left, west, east, the four corners of the world) and vertical dimensions (up, down, sky, earth, underground – oriented toward depth) (Rysbergen, 2011).

In English, forest and grove names are very common. This phenomenon reflects the English people's deep connection to nature, as well as the special place forests and groves occupy in their national consciousness. For example, place names related to woods and groves are often associated with words such as *bear, carr, derry, fen, frith, greave, grove, heath, holt, lea, moor, oak, rise, scough, shaw, tree, well, with, wold,* and *wood.* Examples include: *Blackheath, Hazlewood, Oakley, Southwold, Staplegrove.*

The lexeme "wold" holds important semantic and cultural significance in representing rural landscapes in the English language. The word *wold* originates from the Old English form *wald,* meaning "forest." As forests became sparse and open, treeless hills began to dominate the landscape, and the meaning of the term shifted to refer to hilly plains or grassy open spaces.

This meaning is preserved in toponyms such as Southwold and Cotswolds, where the term reflects a lifestyle rooted in English rural tranquility and traditional pastoralism. Today, such names evoke imagery of peaceful countryside life and the long-standing relationship between people and the land.

Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің ХАБАРШЫСЫ.
ФИЛОЛОГИЯ сериясы
ISSN: 2616-678X. eISSN: 2663-1288

2025
№3 (152)

123

Toponyms associated with the *word* wold are presented in Table 2 below.

Table 2. Toponyms in English associated with the word wold

Toponym	Meaning in English	Kazakh Translation (Semantic Meaning)
Southwold	*South + wold*	Southern plain / Upland region in the south
Cotswolds	*Cot + wold*	Sheepfold hills / Pasturelands in the uplands
Wolds	Plural form of *wold* – rolling open landscapes	Hills / Rolling plains
Willoughby Wold	*Willoughby + wold*	Willoughby hill / Willoughby plain
Hainton Wold	*Hainton + wold*	Hainton hill / Hainton upland
Brinkhill Wold	*Brinkhill + wold*	Brinkhill hill / Brinkhill heights

The lexeme *wold* in the English language holds significant semantic and cultural meaning in representing rural landscapes. The word *wold* originates from the Old English form *wald* (meaning "forest"). As forests began to thin and treeless open hills became more common, this term evolved to signify a hilly plain or grassy open area. Preserved in toponyms such as *Southwold* and *Cotswolds*, this concept today symbolizes the tranquility of the English countryside and a lifestyle rooted in traditional livestock farming.

In English, lexemes related to pastures and open fields such as *combe, croft, den, ergh, field, ham, haugh, hay, ing, land, lease, lock, meadow, rick, ridding, rode, shot, side, thwaite, wardine, worth,* and *worthy* represent linguistic units that reflect a culture and lifestyle closely tied to agriculture and the rural landscape.

These components, found in toponyms such as *Applethwaite, Cowden, Smallworthy, Southworth,* and *Wethersfield,* express the linguistic representation of traditional land use, including cultivation, grazing, haymaking, and the establishment of permanent settlements. Such names serve as important onomastic sources that reveal the interconnection between natural environments and economic activities, as well as the historical foundations of a sedentary way of life.

In contrast, the nomadic lifestyle and traditional livestock economy of the Kazakh people were fully adapted to the laws of nature and seasonal changes. As a result, settlement names such as *zhailau* (summer pasture), *kokteu* (spring pasture), *kuzieu* (autumn pasture), and kystau (wintering place) emerged. For Kazakhs, the *zhailau* had to be a place with lush grass, fertile land, abundant water, and cool air, suitable for summer grazing. In the zhailau, yurts were spaced widely apart. Examples like *Kyzylzhailau* ("Red Summer Pasture") and *Akzhailau* ("White Summer Pasture") describe the natural environment and specify seasonal migration routes. *Kokteu* refers to spring pastures, used when grass first sprouts in the spring months. Examples include Koktal and Koktem auyly, which reflect the renewal of nature and the spring migration. Kuzieu is the interim settlement used in the fall after descending from the summer pastures in preparation for winter. Examples: *Karakuzeu, Sarykuzeu, Aktanbek kuzegi* – these names are often related to the autumn season and the yellowing of vegetation. Kystau is a warm and protected wintering location with little snow, used for winter livestock keeping. Examples:

124   **2025**
№3 (152)

Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің ХАБАРШЫСЫ.
ФИЛОЛОГИЯ сериясы
ISSN: 2616-678X. eISSN: 2663-1288

Kystaukol, Akylbai kystauy—these places are known as safe and suitable winter areas for livestock. These pasture-related names reflect ethnocultural concepts of spatial organization, techniques of utilizing nature, and economic experience. They also showcase the Kazakh people's harmonious relationship with nature, and their ability to distinguish spatial and seasonal dimensions. Due to their nomadic lifestyle and focus on livestock breeding, Kazakhs often named places after domestic animals. Examples include *Aigyrketken* ("Where the Stallion Left"), *Akbaital* ("White Mare"), *Buzau Shoky* ("Calf Hill"), *Mynzhylky* ("A Thousand Horses"), *Koitas* ("Sheep Stone"), *Akkozy* ("White Lamb"), *Tuyeorkesh* ("Camel Hump"), *Toktykol* ("Lamb Lake"), *Koyandy* ("Hare Place"), *Kaskyrtobe* ("Wolf Hill"), *Kulandy* ("Wild Donkey Area"), and others.

Similarly, in English, many toponyms are also based on names of domestic animals or wild creatures. For example, *Cowley* means "a field where cows graze"; *Horsham* is related to horses; *Goatacre* refers to a place where goats graze.

Toponyms referring to wild animals also exist in English. For instance, *Wolferton* comes from Old English and consists of two parts: *wulf* meaning "wolf" and ton meaning "settlement." Therefore, *Wolferton* translates to "the place of wolves."

In English, place names related to hills and slopes are also common. Examples of such terms include: *bank, barrow, borough, breck, cam, cliff, crook, down, edge, head, hill, how, hurst, ley, ling, lith, mond, over, pen, ridge, side,* and *tor.* Some examples of place names are: *Barrow, Blackdown, Longridge, Redcliff, Thornborough,* and *Windhill.*

The English word "hill" means a small elevated area or mound. Similarly, in Kazakh, toponyms containing the word "төбе" (meaning "hill") are frequently encountered. Examples include *Altyntobe, Aktobe, Kultobe, Karatobe,* and *Myntobe.* The word "төбе" in Kazakh is not only a geographical term but also serves as a symbol of national identity and spiritual space. It expresses spatial orientation and direction, as well as carrying historical, cultural, and social meanings. The English word "ridge" means a long, narrow hill or elevated crest. The toponym *Longridge* perfectly corresponds to its geographical location since it is situated on a long ridge above the Ribble River.

Water has always been the primary source of life and the basis of human existence. In the collective consciousness of the people, the vivid and mental representations about water, rivers, lakes, seas, and springs are verbalized within the concept of "water" and "river." As a cultural landscape, the "water" space interpreted in the people's consciousness is reflected in the hydronymic systems of both peoples. The concept of "water" is expressed through lexemes such as river, spring, and lake. In Kazakh, water has different types, including *flowing water, drinking water, salty water, rainwater, underground water, snowmelt,* etc. Many toponyms in Kazakh are formed using words related to water such as *су (water), өзен (river), теңіз (sea), көл (lake), бұлақ (spring), бастау (source), құдық (well), жылға (stream), қайнар (spring), бөген (dam), саз (clay),* and *батпақ (swamp).* Examples include Sairamsu, Bogen River, Ulkenkol, Maibulak, Karabastau, Karakuduksay, and others. The concept of "water" in Kazakh is not only spatial but also represents spiritual and cultural ideas through natural names like rivers, springs, and lakes. These lexemes reveal the connection between nature and humans, space and consciousness, ancestral heritage, and present life. In English, place names related to rivers and streams are

Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің ХАБАРШЫСЫ.
ФИЛОЛОГИЯ сериясы
ISSN: 2616-678X. eISSN: 2663-1288

2025
№3 (152)

125

also common. English toponyms related to rivers and streams reflect the people's interaction with nature and the importance of water sources in economy and daily life as a linguistic and cultural phenomenon. Such names are formed through lexemes like *batch, beck, brook, burn, ey, fleet, font, ford, keld, lade, lake, latch, marsh, mere, mouth, ore, pool, rith, wade, water,* and *well.* These lexemes describe the size and flow of the river, the qualities of the water, or places where the water flows.

– *Beck, brook, burn* – small rivers, streams (mostly used in Northern England). All three words refer to natural flows of freshwater smaller than a river.

– *Ford* – a crossing, a shallow place in a river or stream used to cross. Toponyms with "ford" denote important river crossings, trade routes, or cattle driving paths. For example, Oxford (Ox + ford), Bradford (Brad – broad, wide + ford), Hereford (Here – army + ford).

– *Pool, lake, mere* – small lakes, bodies of water.

– *Well, font* – spring sources, places where clean water emerges.

– *Marsh* – swampy land, wetland areas.

– *Mouth* – the mouth of a river.

– *Fleet, lade* – canal, artificial water channel.

Toponymic names related to the English concept of "water," such as Broadwater – meaning a wide water area, part of a lake or river; Fishlake – a lake or reservoir rich in fish; Mersey – a river name (from Mere + ey, meaning a river near a lake); Rushbrooke – a reed-filled stream (rush meaning reed, brooke meaning stream); Saltburn – a salty stream or seaside (salt meaning salt, burn meaning stream) – carry specific meanings. These English River and stream names are not only geographical but also represent a linguocultural and historical phenomenon. They reflect the people's understanding of space and nature, historical memory, and linguistic traditions. Such toponyms demonstrate the significant place of the water concept in English culture and allow for comparison with Kazakh names like *бұлақ (spring), өзен (river), and құдық (well).*

The research results can be effectively used in systematizing the toponymic conceptual sphere between ethnic groups and forming the core conceptual framework of ethnocultural space. During the study, the cognitive and cultural significance of Kazakh and English toponyms was deeply examined, and their role in the intercultural conceptual sphere was identified. Based on the collected data and analyses, the following important conclusions were reached:

1. It has been proven that Kazakh and English toponyms hold a special significance in shaping the ethno-conceptual notion as mirrors of national consciousness, historical memory, and cultural space. These names are closely connected with the people's national worldview and historical experience.

2. The cognitive nature of toponyms is reflected in their naming motivation, symbolic content, and semantic load.

3. By comparing the toponymic systems of both languages, a basic concept of ethno-cultural space is formed. These concepts occupy a stable place in linguistic consciousness and serve as channels for transmitting cultural codes.

4. The research results can be applied theoretically and practically in the fields of cognitive onomastics, ethnolinguistics, and linguoculturology. In particular, these conclusions play a crucial role in the educational process, in studying the continuity of language and culture, as well as in strengthening national identity.

The study comprehensively revealed the cognitive onomastic nature of Kazakh and English toponyms and made a significant theoretical and practical contribution to their systematization and interpretation from a linguoconceptological perspective.

Conclusion

The conducted study comprehensively examined the cognitive and linguocultural nature of toponymic names in the Kazakh and English languages. The linguoconceptological system of toponyms, as reflections of national identity and ethno-worldview, was thoroughly explored, and through comparative analysis, their semantic, axiological, and onomastic potential was identified. In particular, the representations of concepts such as "village," "homeland," "water," and "hill" in Kazakh and English were analyzed as important cultural data reflecting the historical experiences and relationships with nature of both peoples. For example, the concept of "homeland" in Kazakh and English is manifested through each ethnic group's historical memory, cultural values, and spatial perception. In Kazakh, this notion portrays an integral worldview deeply connected to spiritual and cultural roots, while in English, it appears as a symbolic meaning based on historical and familial heritage. A comparative analysis of the linguocultural and cognitive features of the "homeland" concept in both languages allows for a better understanding of similarities and differences in national worldviews and facilitates deeper intercultural communication.

For both Kazakh and English toponymy, the names based on geographical features, their nomination, data, and names related to human habitation share similar characteristics. However, the groups within these categories differ. The differences in naming geographical objects are linked to the distinct historical periods that these peoples have experienced. In both languages, toponyms function not only as local geographical markers but, above all, as cultural-historical complexes reflecting the history of the peoples inhabiting the territories and the stages of land development. The toponyms of the United Kingdom trace their roots to at least five different peoples—the Celts, Romans, Anglo-Saxons, Scandinavians, and elements from the French language—while Kazakh toponyms originate from Altai, Old Turkic, Old Kazakh languages, borrowed root toponyms, as well as modern Kazakh and Russian languages. All these people have contributed to the country's toponymy, shaping the current form of Kazakh and English place names as we know them today.

It has been established that the majority of Kazakh toponyms are closely linked to the nomadic lifestyle and traditional economic structures. Seasonal settlement names such as zhailau (summer pasture), kuzeu (autumn settlement), and kystau (wintering place) are enriched with ethnocognitive content and are described as cultural mechanisms for mastering nature and space. In contrast, English toponyms related to forests, water sources, hills, and plains reflect the people's adaptation to the natural environment and are formed based on their historical and cultural codes.

The research results enabled the systematization of the toponymic conceptual spheres of both ethnic groups and the identification of basic concepts that form the foundation of their ethnocultural space. Through comparative analysis, the motivations behind naming, symbolic

Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің ХАБАРШЫСЫ.
ФИЛОЛОГИЯ сериясы
ISSN: 2616-678X. eISSN: 2663-1288

2025
№3 (152)

127

meanings, and cognitive load of toponyms were compared, demonstrating their potential in explaining intercultural and linguistic connections. Thus, this study holds both theoretical and practical value in the fields of cognitive onomastics, ethnolinguistics, and linguistic-cultural studies, providing a scholarly analysis of the continuity between language and culture, as well as the manifestations of national consciousness and historical memory.

Conflict of interests, acknowledgements and funding information
The paper contains no conflict of interests.

Contribution of the authors. During the research work, **Aliya Eralievna Smatova** actively participated in collecting and sorting research data, analyzing their content, gathering examples in English, discussing the article, and formatting the final version. **Bolatbek Makulbekovich Tleuberdiev** developed the main idea and concept of the study, conducted an in-depth analysis of the research materials, and was responsible for writing the substantive part of the article. **Nurlybek Kuralbekovich Omarov** contributed theoretical conclusions related to the research topic, provided examples of toponyms in the Kazakh language, and was responsible for finalizing and preparing the article for publication. All stages of the work were coordinated equally among the authors, ensuring the integrity of the research and the accuracy of the data through mutual agreement and scientific collaboration.

References
Беляев, А.Н. (2019). О топонимическом концепте. Вестник Челябинского государственного университета. Филологические науки, 1(423), 13–21. https://doi.org/10.24411/1994-2796-2019-10102

Жанұзақ, Т. (2011). Жер-су атаулары (этимологиялық анықтамалық). Алматы: Өнер.

Жанұзақ, Т. (2010). Тарихи жер-су аттарының түптөркіні. Алматы: Сөздік-Словарь ЖШС.

Жанұзақ, Т. (2021). Қазақ ономастикасы: 5 томдық (Т. 4). Нұр-Сұлтан: Халықаралық Түркі академиясы.

Жанұзақ, Т., & Рысберген, Қ. (2004). Қазақ ономастикасы: жетістіктері мен болашағы. Алматы: Азия.

Қайдар, Ә. (2013). Қазақтар ана тілі әлемінде: этнолингвистикалық сөздік (2-том). Алматы: Сардар баспа үйі.

Караева, Б., & Мейрбеков, А. (2025). Тілдік эрозия: басым тілдер мен мәдениеттердің ықпалы салдарынан қазақ және ағылшын топонимдерін жоғалту қаупі. Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің Хабаршысы. Филология сериясы, 150(1), 95–111. https://doi.org/10.32523/2616-678X-2025-150-1-95-111

Манкеева, Ж. (2008). Қазақ тіліндегі этномәдени атаулардың танымдық негіздері. Алматы: Жібек жолы.

Рысберген, Қ. Қ. (2011). Ұлттық ономастиканың лингвокогнитивтік негіздері. Алматы: Дайк-Прес.

Тілеубердиев, Б. (2006). Қазақ ономастикасының лингвокогнетивтік аспектілері. Алматы: Арыс баспасы.

Тілеубердиев, Б. (2019). Қазақ ономастикасының когнетивтік, лингвоконцептологиялық негіздері [Монография]. Алматы: CyberSmith.

Cameron, K. (1996). English place names. London: Batsford.

Ekwall, E. (1960). The concise Oxford dictionary of English place-names. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Garcia-Quera, N. (2025). The etymology of opaque place names based on a cognitive and interdisciplinary method. Language Sciences, 107, 1–31. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2024.101688

Martynenko, I. (2020). On the term «cognitive toponymy». Russian Linguistic Bulletin, (3(23)), 55–61. https://doi.org/10.18454/RULB.2020.23.3.15

Mills, A. D. (2011). A dictionary of British place names. London: Oxford University Press.

Watts, V. (2010). The Cambridge dictionary of English place-names: Based on the collections of the English Place-Name Society. Cambridge, UK; New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

А.Е. Сматова, Б.М. Тлеубердиев*, Н.К. Омаров
Южно-Казахстанский университет имени М. Ауэзова, Шымкент, Казахстан

Лингвокультурные и когнитивные особенности казахских и английских топонимов

Аннотация. В данной научной статье проводится сравнительно-лингвистический анализ лингвокультурных и когнитивных особенностей топонимов в казахском и английском языках. Объектом исследования выступают наименования природно-географических объектов, значимых в национальной культуре и когнитивном сознании двух народов. Казахские и английские топонимы формировались под влиянием исторических, социальных и природных факторов, что определяет их семантические и культурные особенности. В статье системно рассматривается понятие топонимического концепта, его языковая репрезентация и роль в этнокультурной картине мира. Цель исследования – рассмотреть топонимические концепты как структуру, отражающую этнокультурное содержание языковой картины мира, и на этой основе выявить особенности мировоззрения казахского и английского народов. Для достижения данной цели собирается, систематизируется и проводится сопоставительный анализ информации, связанной с географическими названиями как значимыми элементами когнитивной системы двух народов. Изучение топонимических единиц неродственных казахского и английского языков на основе этнокультурных данных и лингвокогнитивного подхода позволяет выявить семантические особенности, отражённые в национальном сознании, а также определить общие черты и различия в мышлении двух этносов. Сравнительно-когнитивный анализ таких топонимических концептов, как «ауыл», «родная земля», «степь», «холм», «вода», раскрывает национальное мировоззрение казахского и английского народов и усиливает научную значимость данного исследования. В результате исследования доказывается, что топонимия является не только номинативной системой, но и важным когнитивно-культурным феноменом, отражающим национальный менталитет. Данное исследование способствует более глубокому пониманию языковой и культурной картины мира двух народов.

Ключевые слова: топонимия, концептология, когнитивная лингвистика, национальное мировоззрение, лингвокультурология, межкультурная коммуникация, топонимическая система.

А.Е. Сматова, Б.М. Тілеубердиев*, Н.Қ. Омаров

М. Әуезов атындағы Оңтүстік Қазақстан университеті, Шымкент, Қазақстан

Қазақ және ағылшын топонимдерінің лингвомәдени және когнитивтік ерекшеліктері

Аңдатпа. Бұл ғылыми мақалада қазақ және ағылшын тілдеріндегі топонимдердің лингво-мәдени және когнитивтік ерекшеліктері салыстырмалы-лингвистикалық тұрғыда талданады. Зерттеу нысаны ретінде екі тілдің ұлттық мәдениеті мен танымдық санасында маңызды орын алатын жер-су атаулары алынған. Қазақ және ағылшын топонимдері – белгілі бір тарихи, әлеуметтік, табиғи-географиялық факторлармен тығыз байланысты, сол себепті олардың семантикалық ерекшеліктері әртүрлі мәдени кодтармен айқындалады.Мақалада топонимиялық концепт ұғымы, оның тілдік репрезентациясы және ұлттық мәдениеттегі орны жүйелі түрде талданады. Зерттеу жұмысының негізгі мақсаты – топонимиялық концептілерді дүниенің тілдік бейнесіндегі этномәдени мазмұнды бейнелейтін құрылым ретінде қарастыра отырып, қазақ және ағылшын этностарының дүниетанымдық ерекшеліктерін анықтау. Бұл мақсатқа қол жеткізу үшін екі халықтың когнитивтік жүйесіндегі маңызды құрылымдық элемент ретінде топонимиялық кеңістіктегі жер-су атауларына қатысты ақпараттарды жинақтап, жүйелеу және салыстырмалы талдау жүргізу көзделеді.

Туыс емес қазақ және ағылшын тілдеріндегі топонимиялық бірліктерді этномәдени деректер негізінде лингвокогнитивтік әдіс арқылы зерттеу арқылы ұлттық санада көрініс табатын мағыналық ерекшеліктерді айқындап, екі этностың ойлау жүйесіндегі ортақ белгілер мен айырмашылықтарды анықтау – зерттеудің ғылыми маңыздылығын айқындайды. Зерттеу жұмысында «ауыл», «атамекен», «дала», «төбе», «су» секілді топонимиялық концептілерді салыстырмалы-танымдық тұрғыда талдау – қазақ және ағылшын халықтарының ұлттық дүние-танымын ашуға мүмкіндік береді әрі зерттеудің ғылыми құндылығын арттырады.Зерттеу нәтижесінде топонимияның тек номинативтік жүйе емес, сонымен бірге ұлттық менталитетті бейнелейтін маңызды когнитивтік-мәдени феномен екені дәлелденеді. Бұл зерттеу екі ұлттың тілдік және мәдени дүниетанымын тереңірек түсінуге септігін тигізеді.

Түйін сөздер: топонимия, концептология, когнитивтік лингвистика, ұлттық дүниетаным, лингвомәдениеттану, мәдениетаралық коммуникация, топонимиялық жүйе

References

Belyaev, A.N. (2019). O toponimicheskom kontsepte [On the toponymic concept]. Vestnik Chelyabinskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Filologicheskie nauki, (1(423)), 13–21. https://doi.org/10.24411/1994-2796-2019-10102 (in Russian)

Zhanuzak, T. (2011). Zher-su ataulary (etimologiyalyk anyktamalyk) [Place names (etymological reference)]. Almaty: Oner. (in Kazakh)

Zhanuzak, T. (2010). Tarihi zher-su attarynyn tuptorkini [The origin of historical place names]. Almaty: Sozdik-Slovar ZhShS. (in Kazakh)

Zhanuzak, T. (2021). Kazak onomastikasy: 5 tomdyk (T. 4) [Kazakh onomastics: In 5 volumes (Vol. 4)]. Nur-Sultan: Khalykaralyk Turki akademiyasy. (in Kazakh)

130 **2025**
№3 (152)

Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің ХАБАРШЫСЫ.
ФИЛОЛОГИЯ сериясы
ISSN: 2616-678X. eISSN: 2663-1288

Zhanuzak, T., & Rysbergen, K. (2004). Kazak onomastikasy: zhetistikteri men bolashagy [Kazakh onomastics: Achievements and prospects]. Almaty: Aziya. (in Kazakh)

Kaidar, A. (2013). Kazaktar ana tili aleminde: etnolinguistikalyk sozdik (2-tom) [Kazakhs in the world of the mother tongue: Ethnolinguistic dictionary (Vol. 2)]. Almaty: Sardar baspa uyi. (in Kazakh)

Karaeva, B., & Meirbekov, A. (2025). Tildik eroziya: basym tilder men madenietterdin ykpaly saldarynan kazakh zhane agylshyn toponimderin zhogaltu kaupi [Language erosion: The threat of losing Kazakh and English toponyms under the influence of dominant languages and cultures]. Bulletin of L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University. Philology Series, 150(1), 95–111. https://doi.org/10.32523/2616-678X-2025-150-1-95-111 (in Kazakh)

Mankeeva, Zh. (2008). Kazak tilindegi etnomadeni ataulardyn tanym dyk negizderi [Cognitive foundations of ethnocultural terms in the Kazakh language]. Almaty: Zhibek zholy. (in Kazakh)

Rysbergen, K.K. (2011). Ulttyk onomastikanyn lingvokognitivtik negizderi [Linguo-cognitive foundations of national onomastics]. Almaty: Daik-Press. (in Kazakh)

Tileuberdiev, B. (2006). Kazak onomastikasynyn lingvokognetivtik aspektileri [Linguo-cognitive aspects of Kazakh onomastics]. Almaty: Arys baspasy. (in Kazakh)

Tileuberdiev, B. (2019). Kazak onomastikasynyn kognetivtik, lingvokontseptologiyalyk negizderi [Cognitive and linguo-conceptological foundations of Kazakh onomastics] [Monograph]. Almaty: CyberSmith. (in Kazakh)

Cameron, K. (1996). English place names. London: Batsford.

Ekwall, E. (1960). The concise Oxford dictionary of English place-names. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Garcia-Quera, N. (2025). The etymology of opaque place names based on a cognitive and interdisciplinary method. Language Sciences, 107, 1–31. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2024.101688

Martynenko, I. (2020). On the term «cognitive toponymy». Russian Linguistic Bulletin, (3(23)), 55–61. https://doi.org/10.18454/RULB.2020.23.3.15

Mills, A. D. (2011). A dictionary of British place names. London: Oxford University Press.

Watts, V. (2010). The Cambridge dictionary of English place-names: Based on the collections of the English Place-Name Society. Cambridge, UK; New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Авторлар туралы мәлімет:

Сматова Әлия Ералиевна – PhD докторант, М. Әуезов атындағы Оңтүстік Қазақстан университеті, Шымкент, Қазақстан. E-mail: Smatova.80@mail.ru, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9920-4676

Тілеубердиев Болатбек Мақұлбекұлы – хат-хабар үшін автор, филология ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, М. Әуезов атындағы Оңтүстік Қазақстан университеті, Шымкент, Қазақстан. E-mail: tleuberdiev_bolatbek@mail.ru, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6285-5579

Омаров Нұрлыбек Құралбекұлы – филология ғылымдарының кандидаты, доцент, М. Әуезов атындағы Оңтүстік Қазақстан университеті, Шымкент, Қазақстан. E-mail: nurlybek.omarov.73@mail.ru, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8885-817X

Сматова Алия Ералиевна – PhD докторант, Южно-Казахстанский университет имени М. Ауэзова, Шымкент, Казахстан. E-mail: Smatova.80@mail.ru, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9920-4676

Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің ХАБАРШЫСЫ.
ФИЛОЛОГИЯ сериясы
ISSN: 2616-678X. eISSN: 2663-1288

2025
№3 (152)

131

Тлеубердиев Болатбек Макулбекович – автор для корреспонденции, доктор филологических наук, профессор, Южно-Казахстанский университет имени М. Ауэзова, Шымкент, Казахстан. E-mail: tleuberdiev_bolatbek@mail.ru, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6285-5579

Омаров Нурлыбек Куралбекович – кандидат филологических наук, доцент, Южно-Казахстанский университет имени М. Ауэзова, Шымкент, Казахстан. E-mail: nurlybek.omarov.73@mail.ru, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8885-817X

Smatova Aliya Eralievna– PhD student, M. Auezov South Kazakhstan University, Shymkent, Kazakhstan. E-mail: Smatova.80@mail.ru, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9920-4676

Tleuberdiev Bolatbek Makulbekovich – corresponding author, Doctor of Philology, Professor, M. Auezov South Kazakhstan University, Shymkent, Kazakhstan. E-mail: tleuberdiev_bolatbek@mail.ru, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6285-5579

Omarov Nurlybek Kuralbekovich – Candidate of Philology, Associate Professor, M. Auezov South Kazakhstan University, Shymkent, Kazakhstan. E-mail: nurlybek.omarov.73@mail.ru, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8885-817X