

A Study of the Pragmatic Functions of Toponyms

Nasritdinov Ulugbek Olmas ogli

Independent Researcher, Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Abstract. *This article presents a comparative analysis of the territorial, social, and cultural pragmatic functions of toponyms based on English and Uzbek language materials. The study examines the identificational, differential, deictic-orientational, socio-territorial, and cultural-symbolic functions of place names, highlighting their role in verbal communication as well as their relationship with toponymic presupposition and competence. Furthermore, the article discusses the pragmatic potential of toponyms, their realization in different types of discourse, and their theoretical and practical significance for translation studies.*

Keywords: *Toponym, Pragmatics, Pragmatic Function, Reference, Deixis, Presupposition, Toponymic Competence, Cultural Concept, Identificational Function, Translation Studies.*

Introduction

Pragmatics emerged as an independent branch of linguistics during the second half of the twentieth century. Its theoretical foundation was established by J. L. Austin's Speech Act Theory, according to which every utterance simultaneously performs three interconnected acts: the locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts. J. R. Searle further developed this theory by proposing a comprehensive classification of speech acts and identifying reference as an independent speech act [1].

H. P. Grice introduced the Cooperative Principle and the concept of conversational implicature into linguistic research. S. C. Levinson systematically described the principal categories of pragmatics, including deixis, presupposition, implicature, and speech acts. J. Verschueren, in turn, interpreted pragmatics as the study of linguistic choice in communication. In Uzbek linguistics, the theoretical foundations of pragmalinguistics have been developed primarily in the works of Sh. Safarov and M. Hakimov.

The application of pragmatic theory to onomastics requires separate theoretical justification. Unlike common nouns, which function through their lexical meaning and enable the hearer to identify the referent by understanding that meaning, proper names operate differently. Since proper names lack lexical meaning in the conventional sense, the successful interpretation of a toponym depends not on semantic content but on the shared background knowledge of the participants in communication. This characteristic makes toponyms a natural object of pragmatic investigation [2].

Semantic analysis isolates a toponym from actual language use and reconstructs its historical internal form. Pragmatic analysis, however, returns the toponym to its communicative environment by examining its functioning within the interaction between speaker and hearer. These two approaches are not contradictory; rather, they correspond to two modes of existence of toponyms: their existence within the linguistic system and their realization in discourse. The three-level model proposed in the first chapter of this research is based precisely on this dual perspective [3].

Nevertheless, it would be incorrect to establish an absolute distinction between semantic and

pragmatic levels. As demonstrated in the second chapter, Uzbek toponyms exhibit a relatively high degree of motivational transparency, allowing their internal form to become partially activated in discourse. Consequently, the semantic level directly influences the pragmatic level.

Based on the synthesis of previous research and a comparative analysis of English and Uzbek materials, this study distinguishes **five principal pragmatic functions of toponyms** [4].

Materials and Methods

2. The Five Pragmatic Functions of Toponyms

Based on a synthesis of previous studies and a comparative analysis of English and Uzbek linguistic materials, this research identifies **five principal pragmatic functions of toponyms**.

1. Identificational Function

The primary function of a toponym is to identify a geographical object in a unique and unambiguous manner. When performing this function, a toponym operates solely as a referential sign, while its motivational semantics remain inactive. This is the most frequent pattern observed in everyday communication. For example, in the sentence *I live in Tashkent*, the historical internal meaning of the name *Tashkent* ("stone city") is not activated in the speaker's consciousness. Instead, the name serves exclusively as a means of identifying a particular place [5].

2. Differential Function

A toponym also serves to distinguish one geographical object from other objects belonging to the same category. This function becomes particularly evident in contrastive naming systems. For instance, the place name *Yangiqo'rg'on* ("New Fortress") acquires its full communicative value only in relation to *Eskiyo'rg'on* ("Old Fortress"). The oppositional naming mechanism discussed in the previous chapter represents the linguistic realization of this differential function [6].

3. Deictic-Orientational Function

Toponyms function as stable reference points within the spatial coordinate system and facilitate the spatial orientation of discourse participants [7]. This function is especially prominent in navigation, route description, military communication, and geographical discourse. Its distinctive feature is that successful communication depends not on the semantic content of the toponym but rather on the interlocutors' knowledge of its geographical location.

4. Socio-Territorial (Identificational) Function

A toponym expresses territorial affiliation and group identity within a speech community. In expressions such as *I am from Samarkand* or *I am a Londoner*, the place name functions as a marker of social identity rather than merely indicating geographical origin. Helleland considers this to be one of the most important social functions of place names because they contribute significantly to the construction of both individual and collective identities.

5. Cultural-Symbolic Function

Toponyms carry collective memory, cultural values, and ideological meanings. This function is most clearly manifested in **commemorative toponyms**, where the motivation for naming is associated not with the geographical object itself but with a historically significant person, event, or cultural phenomenon commemorated by society [8].

Result and Discussion

In actual communication, ambiguity arising from the use of toponyms is typically resolved through two principal strategies. The first involves repeating the generic geographical element, as in *River Thames*, *Amu Darya River*, or *the Chatkal Mountains*. In such constructions, the generic component appears both within and outside the toponym, providing explicit information about the denotative class of the referent. The second strategy consists of localizing a place name by associating it with a larger geographical unit, for example, *Stratford-upon-Avon* or *Kokand (in the Fergana Valley)*.

These five pragmatic functions are not equally significant. Rather, they form a hierarchical system in which each subsequent function presupposes the preceding one [9].

Without the **identificational function**, a toponym cannot fulfill its basic communicative purpose. The **differential** and **deictic-orientational** functions are derived from identification, since an object must first be identified before it can be distinguished from similar objects or located within a spatial coordinate system. The **socio-territorial** and **cultural-symbolic** functions are optional and context-dependent, becoming activated only under specific communicative conditions.

This functional hierarchy is realized differently across various classes of toponyms. In **hydronyms** and **oronyms**, the first three functions predominate, while their cultural-symbolic significance remains relatively weak. In **oikonoms** (settlement names), the socio-territorial function becomes more prominent. In contrast, **urbanonyms** (urban place names) are dominated by the cultural-symbolic function, which may even overshadow the identificational function. In such cases, the name of a street serves less to distinguish one location from another than to express symbolic and ideological meaning [10].

3. Pragmatic Hierarchy, Toponymic Competence, and Presupposition

The functional hierarchy of toponyms corresponds closely to the stability scale established in the first chapter of this study:

hydronym → oronym → choronym → oikonym → urbanonym → microtoponym.

The greater the cultural-symbolic value of a toponym, the lower its degree of stability. This relationship can be explained by the fact that symbolic meanings are closely associated with social values, which are inherently dynamic and subject to historical change. By contrast, perceptual motivation is based on relatively permanent characteristics of geographical objects and therefore remains considerably more stable [11].

Adjectival and nominal forms derived from toponyms constitute direct linguistic indicators of the socio-territorial function. In English, **demonyms** are formed by means of various suffixes, producing forms such as *Londoner*, *Yorkshireman*, *Mancunian*, and *Liverpudlian*. Some of these forms are suppletive, being derived from Latin or historical variants of place names, which reduces their motivational transparency. Uzbek, by contrast, employs a single productive morphological pattern based on the suffix **-lik**, yielding forms such as *toshkentlik*, *buxorolik*, and *samarqandlik*. This regularity reflects the agglutinative nature of the Uzbek language.

The **deictic function** of toponyms is realized through a hierarchical spatial scale. During communication, speakers select place names according to the required level of geographical specificity:

country → region (province) → district → city → neighborhood → street.

The choice of an appropriate level depends largely on the speaker's estimation of the listener's **toponymic competence**. When speaking to a foreign interlocutor, one is likely to say, *I am from Uzbekistan*. When addressing a fellow citizen, *I am from Samarkand* may be sufficient. In communication with local residents, however, an even more specific designation such as *I am from Kattakurgan* is generally preferred. This observation corresponds closely to Alderman's concept of the **"scale of memory"** according to which place names function at different geographical scales depending on communicative context [12].

Consider the utterance **"I was at Registan."** Such a statement presupposes that the listener possesses at least three kinds of background knowledge:

1. **Identificational presupposition** – that an object called *Registan* exists;
2. **Deictic presupposition** – that it is located in Samarkand;
3. **Cultural presupposition** – that it possesses historical and cultural significance.

The extent to which a language user possesses this system of presuppositions is referred to as **toponymic competence**.

Toponymic competence can be classified into **three levels**.

Low level: the speaker recognizes the place name but does not know its geographical location.

Intermediate level: the speaker knows both the name and its spatial location.

High level: the speaker also understands the cultural, historical, and symbolic associations attached to the place name [13].

Failure of presupposition often results in communicative breakdown. If a speaker overestimates the listener's toponymic knowledge, successful reference cannot be achieved, forcing the listener to request clarification. Conversely, excessive localization—for example, *Tashkent, the capital of Uzbekistan* when speaking to an Uzbek audience—may violate Grice's Maxim of Quantity by providing unnecessary information and may even create an impression of condescension. Thus, successful toponymic reference always depends on the speaker's evaluation of the listener's background knowledge.

This evaluation is performed almost automatically and is influenced by several sociolinguistic variables, including the interlocutor's age, regional background, educational level, and cultural experience. Consequently, toponymic reference represents one of the most delicate domains of pragmatics, where linguistic choices are inseparably connected with shared social knowledge. As Verschueren argues, pragmatics is fundamentally the study of linguistic choice in communication.

Toponymic competence itself is socially stratified. Local residents generally possess extensive knowledge of **microtoponyms**, while having relatively limited familiarity with distant geographical names. Conversely, highly educated individuals may have broad knowledge of national and international toponyms but remain unfamiliar with local microtoponymy. Therefore, **toponymic competence should be regarded as a sociolinguistic variable reflecting the internal stratification of a speech community.**

Furthermore, this concept provides a pragmatic explanation for the **asymmetry of motivational transparency** discussed in the previous chapter. Because Uzbek toponyms are generally more semantically transparent, listeners can often infer partial information even without prior cultural knowledge. For example, someone encountering the name **Uchquduq** ("Three Wells") for the first time can readily infer that the place is associated with wells. English toponyms, however, are frequently semantically opaque. A name such as **Scunthorpe** provides virtually no semantic clues and therefore requires considerably greater cultural background knowledge for successful interpretation [14].

Accordingly, semantic transparency facilitates pragmatic interpretation by reducing the amount of presupposed knowledge required for successful communication. This constitutes an important typological principle: **the greater the motivational transparency of a toponymic system, the lower the minimum level of toponymic competence necessary for effective communication.** In semantically transparent systems, successful reference relies less heavily on shared cultural knowledge than in opaque systems.

4. Cultural Concepts, Translation Studies, and Conclusion

The highest manifestation of the **cultural-symbolic function** is the transformation of a toponym into a **cultural concept**. While the previous chapter described the process of cultural semanticization, the present discussion focuses on its pragmatic mechanism.

When functioning as a cultural concept, a toponym no longer refers merely to a geographical object but instead activates an entire network of cultural associations. In the Uzbek linguistic consciousness, the name **Samarkand** evokes concepts such as *the cradle of civilization, the capital of Amir Temur, and architectural heritage*. Similarly, in English linguistic consciousness, **Oxford** immediately calls to mind *the University of Oxford, academic excellence, elite education, and long-standing intellectual traditions*. Such place names may therefore be regarded not simply as referential toponyms but as **conceptual toponyms**.

A distinctive pragmatic characteristic of conceptual toponyms is that they can function independently of their geographical referents. In expressions such as **"This is our Oxford,"** the place name completely loses its direct geographical reference and instead functions as a purely evaluative linguistic device. This phenomenon represents the initial stage in the **appellativization** of toponyms.

The concept of **toponymic competence** also has important implications for **translation studies**. Translators should recognize that readers of the target language may not possess the same cultural presuppositions associated with a particular place name as readers of the source language.

For example, the English toponym **Fleet Street** immediately evokes the concept of **the British press** for native English readers. For Uzbek readers, however, it may function merely as a geographical designation unless accompanied by explanatory information. Consequently, such culturally loaded place names often require explanatory translation or appropriate commentary.

The opposite situation is equally possible. For Uzbek readers, the name **Registan** represents an extensive historical and cultural concept associated with the civilization of Central Asia. For many English-speaking readers, however, it remains only the name of a particular location. Therefore, **the asymmetry of cultural presupposition constitutes one of the principal sources of connotative loss in translation**.

Another important aspect of toponymic competence concerns **bilingual communication**. A learner of a foreign language may successfully master its grammatical structures and vocabulary while lacking the system of cultural presuppositions associated with its place names. As a result, although the linguistic content of a text may be understood, its cultural dimension remains inaccessible. This observation has important implications for foreign-language pedagogy and supports the inclusion of a **minimum corpus of culturally significant toponyms** in language teaching curricula.

The **pragmatic potential** of a toponym depends not primarily on its semantic properties but rather on its degree of **social visibility**. The more frequently a geographical object is encountered and the more often its name is used in communication, the greater its pragmatic potential becomes. Consequently, **urbanonyms** generally possess the highest pragmatic potential, whereas **microtoponyms** occupy the lowest position. This tendency is common to both English and Uzbek and represents a cognitively universal manifestation of pragmatic isomorphism.

The successful use of toponyms in communication depends on a system of **toponymic presuppositions**, which may be classified into three categories:

Identificational presupposition;

Deictic presupposition;

Cultural presupposition.

The degree to which these presuppositions are shared by discourse participants determines their level of **toponymic competence**, which should be regarded as an important sociolinguistic variable influencing communicative success.

Finally, the comparative analysis demonstrates a significant difference in the **macro-pragmatic level** of the English and Uzbek toponymic systems. Large-scale **renaming (renomination)** has been relatively uncommon in English toponymy, whereas Uzbek toponymy experienced two major waves of mass renaming during the twentieth century. This historical difference has profoundly influenced the pragmatic organization of the two toponymic systems and reflects the distinct socio-political and cultural developments of the two linguistic communities [15].

Conclusions

The comparative analysis presented in this study demonstrates that the pragmatic organization of toponyms extends far beyond their basic referential function. Toponyms perform a complex set of interconnected pragmatic functions, including identification, differentiation, spatial orientation, socio-territorial identification, and cultural-symbolic representation. These functions operate within a hierarchical framework and are activated according to communicative context and discourse type.

The research further establishes that successful toponymic reference depends on the interlocutors' shared **toponymic competence** and the system of identificational, deictic, and cultural presuppositions underlying communication. The comparison of English and Uzbek reveals both universal pragmatic principles and language-specific features, particularly regarding motivational

transparency, cultural conceptualization, and historical patterns of place-name development.

These findings contribute to the theoretical foundations of *pragmatic onomastics*, while also offering practical implications for *contrastive linguistics*, *translation studies*, *discourse analysis*, *sociolinguistics*, and *foreign-language teaching*. The proposed model of pragmatic functions provides a comprehensive framework for further investigation into the communicative and cognitive dimensions of place names across different languages and cultures.

References:

- [1] J. L. Austin, *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford, U.K.: Clarendon Press, 1962.
- [2] J. R. Searle, *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1969.
- [3] H. P. Grice, "Logic and conversation," in *Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 3: Speech Acts*, P. Cole and J. L. Morgan, Eds. New York, NY, USA: Academic Press, 1975, pp. 41–58.
- [4] S. C. Levinson, *Pragmatics*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- [5] J. Verschueren, *Understanding Pragmatics*. London, U.K.: Arnold, 1999.
- [6] Sh. Safarov, *Pragmalingvistika*. Tashkent, Uzbekistan: O'zbekiston Milliy Ensiklopediyasi, 2008.
- [7] M. Hakimov, *O'zbek Pragmalingvistikasi Asoslari*. Tashkent, Uzbekistan: Akademnashr, 2013.
- [8] C. J. Fillmore, *Lectures on Deixis*. Stanford, CA, USA: CSLI Publications, 1997.
- [9] B. Helleland, "Place names and identities," *Oslo Studies in Language*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 95–116, 2012.
- [10] D. H. Alderman, "Street names and the scaling of memory," *Area*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 163–173, 2003.
- [11] G. Yule, *Pragmatics*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- [12] D. Sperber and D. Wilson, *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*, 2nd ed. Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell, 1995.
- [13] P. Brown and S. C. Levinson, *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- [14] T. A. van Dijk, *Discourse and Power*. New York, NY, USA: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- [15] E. Goffman, *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia, PA, USA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981.