DOI: 10.17951/ff.2019.37.1.149-156

ANNALES
UNIVERSITATIS MARIAE CURIE-SKŁODOWSKA
LUBLIN – POLONIA
VOL. XXXVII SECTIO FF 1-2019

HANNA MEZENKO
Vitebsk State University named after P.M. Masherov, Belarus
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5192-767X
e-mail: mezenka1@yandex.ru

Names of Topographic Objects within Settlements as a Unit of Belarusian Toponymic Terminology: Problems of Splitting and Integration

Nazwy obiektów topograficznych w osadach jako jednostka białoruskiej terminologii toponimicznej: kwestie podziału i integracji

In the last few decades, such a branch of linguistics as terminology has been developing dynamically and actively, especially in Belarus. At the present stage, anatomical, botanical, zoological, mathematical, agricultural, faunal, philosophical, judicial terms, as well as the terminology of road and water transport are being studied.

In general, it should be noted that the 20th century was the time of creation of the foundations of the Belarusian national terminology.

However, some terminological systems and subsystems are still insufficiently investigated. The abovementioned is primarily concerned with the modern onomastic terminology, which until that time had not become the object of special research.

By the way, not only modern Belarusian but Slavonic onomastic terminology in general, including intra-settlement, needs further theoretical justification and lexicographic processing.

The development and improvement of any academic discipline is always accompanied by a transformation of its conceptual apparatus: it cannot exist without its own, strictly organized terminological system. The appearance of new, previously unexplored objects of research makes it necessary to establish the peculiarities of their functioning, the identification of nominative specificity, etc. So, the toponymic

space is conditionally divided into sectors, which are allocated based on the nature of the relationship of the names with the named objects: hydronymy, oikonymy, oronymy, chrononymy, insulonymy, necronymy etc. On this basis, each sector in turn is divided into smaller categories, so as a result, pelagonymy, potamonymy, limnonymy, gelonymy are distinguished within hydronymy; astionymy and komonymy – within oikonymy, etc.

But this is only one of the ways of development – the fragmentation of the object of analysis. There is another way in which "the emphasis is on searching for a generalizing beginning for an already existing corpus of onyms" (Suprun, 2012, p. 39).

The issues of fragmentation and integration of the onymic units, used to indicate topographic features within urban centers, are brought to life by the problem of coordination of terminology. It is well known that lately the efforts of the researchers of the onymic material are aimed at identifying and describing new categories of proper names.

The study of this system of names is primarily important for the study of intra-settlement processes, as well as for typological comparisons.

The relevance of the work is due to the fact that this sector of toponyms has not yet been subjected to special consideration.

The object of the study in the article is the sector of toponymic space, including the nominations of topographic objects within settlements of different types.

The article aims to determine the types of onymic units used to indicate topographic objects within a settlement; to invent a term for naming the integrated sector of this part of the onomastic space.

The research material is based on the publications dedicated to these questions by Belarusian, Russian, Polish, Slovenian and other onomatologists (M.L. Darafeyenka, I.L. Kapylov, H.M. Mezenko, A.V. Tsikhanenka; M.V. Galamidava, R.V. Razumov, A.M. Salavyov, V.I. Suprun; M. Buchynsky, S. Grabets, Z. Zakrewsky, J. Safarevich, E. Supranovich, K. Handke, M. Blich, Van Li, K. Cameron, J. Krshka and others).

In 1965 and 1972, respectively, the terms urbanonymy and urbanonym entered scientific circulation (Superanskaâ, 2009, p. 167, 187).

In 1991 the first dissertation devoted to the study of the ways of the development and modern state of the system of urbanonyms on the example of Belarus urbanonymy appeared (Mezenko, 1991). In the workplace the status of urbanonym in onomastics was identified; the limits of the urbanonym space were revealed; the structural, urbanonym-creating, semantic types of urbanonyms and their areas were determined; the peculiarities of the manifestations of the principles of the nomination in different fields of urbanonyms were shown, and criteria for the evaluation of names and renaming of city facilities were established.

In Elena A. Sizova's dissertation *Лингвокультурологический анализ урбанонимов* (2004), these terms were used when comparing the systems of the names of inner-city objects of Moscow, London, and Paris.

At the same time, the system of urbanonyms of the Russian provincial cities of the late 18th–20th centuries, for example, the cities of Kostroma, Rybinsk, and Yaroslavl was discussed by Roman V. Razumov (2003).

By the first decade of the 21st century, such a sphere of the onomastic space as the names of intra-rural objects remained undeveloped. That is why, for the first time it was proposed and justified by us in the report delivered at the 15th all-Polish onomastic conference "New proper names – new research trends", which was held in Krakow on 21–23 September, 2006 (Mezenko, 2007), that it is quite natural to use the term *vikonym*, by which we understand the proper name of any intra-rural topographic object, both existing and used in previous eras.

Despite the critical assessment of this term by Vasilij I. Suprun (Madieva and Suprun, 2017), we cannot agree with the suggestion to replace it with the artificial term *rusticonym.* Unlike the proposed term, more successful in semantic and derivational plans, *vikonym* (from lat. *vīcānus* **[vicus]** (Dvarèckij, 1976, p.: 1075) "rural, rustic" and Greek (νομα – "name"), which, when used to refer to objects within the rural space, is directly motivated by the basis of *vic* – with the meaning "*rural, rustic*".

Recently, the system of intra-rural names, or vikonymy, received a monographic description in Marina L. Dorofeenko's candidate dissertation *Виконимия Белоруси: номинтивный, лингвогеографический, лингвокультурологический аспекты* (Dorofeenko, 2015). For the first time the specificity of the nominative vikonymy was defined; the semantic features of vikonymy were presented in a linguistic – geographical plan; the fragment of the/a personal form of onomastic picture of the world – vikonymous, was modeled; and the complexity of cultural codes, implemented by vikonymy of Belarus, was discovered.

There is another type of settlement – gardening partnerships, the names of their objects – a large and yet unexplored area of toponymy. For the nomination of the objects located within these types of settlements, in 2014 we suggested the term *hortensionym* "a proper name of any topographic object within the garden partnership" (Mezenko, 2014). We believe that this term formed from the Latin *hortensius* "gardening" and the Greek *ὄνομα* "name", successfully corresponds to the considered category of onyms and the existing criteria for evaluating the term (Padol'skaâ, 1988, pp. 11–12).

Each of the described fields of intra-settlement names brings together names of various objects located in borders of settlements of different types: urbanonyms, vikonyms, hortensionyms. On the one hand, urbanonyms, vikonyms, hortensionyms represent the unity organized in a certain way, since they function within

settlements, and from this point of view they should have a special term that would distinguish them, say, from hydronymy, oikonymy, etc. (in our opinion, *conlocatyanonymy* (from lat. *conlocationem* "settlement") successfully meets the requirements for the formation of a new term), on the other – they all have a clearly expressed specificity. To confirm the autonomy of these categories of toponyms, it is necessary to identify the similarities and differences that exist between them.

Let's emphasize several features according to which urbanonyms, vikonyms, hortensionyms are differentiated.

LEXICO-SEMANTIC

Among the lexico-semantic differences, there is a mismatch in the order of the used principles of the nomination of intra-urban, intra-rural, and intra-garden objects. Thus, in urbanonymy, the names corresponding to different principles of nomination have the following range: in 53.7% of names involves the principle of nomination of the object regarding other objects (*Віцебская вул.* / *Vitsebskaya vul.*); 33.6% – the principle of nomination of the object in its relationship to a person (*вул. Марка Шагала / vul. Marka Shagala*); 6.5% – the principle of nomination of the object by its properties and qualities (*Лугавая вул.* / *Lugovaya vul.*); in 6.2% – the principle of nomination of the object after an abstract concept (*пл. Свабоды / pl. Svabody*).

Vikonymy is characterized by a different range of names, corresponding to different principles of nomination: 49.1% of them corresponds to the principle of nomination of the object by its properties and qualities (*Палявая вул.* / *Polevaya vul.*); 29.6% – the principle of nomination of the object regarding other objects (*Брэсцкая вул.* / *Brestskaya vul.*); 11.6% – the principle of nomination of the object in its relationship to man (*вул. Маструкова / vul. Mastrukova*); 9.7% – the principle of nomination of the object in connection with an abstract concept (*Ударны завул. / Udarny zavul.*).

Hortensionymy has its own range of names that correspond to different principles of nomination: 85.5% of the names correspond with the principle of nomination of the object by its properties and qualities (*Маленькі завул.* / *Malenky zavul.*); and 12.1% with the principle of nomination for the thematic correspondence of names of objects to specific names of a certain garden partnership (*Паравозная вул. / Paravoznaya vul., Цеплавозная вул. / Tseplovoznaya vul., Электравозная вул.* / *Elektrovoznaya vul.* in the garden association "Locomotive"); 2.9% – to the principle of nomination of the object in connection with the abstract concept (*Радасны завул.* / *Radasny zavul.*); 1.0% – the principle of nomination of the object with regard to other objects (*Шумілінскі тупік / Shumilinsky tupik*); 0.5% – in the nomination of the object for its connection with the person (*вул. Мічурына / vul. Michurina* – garden partnership "Michurinets").

NOMINATIVE

Within the framework of nominative distinctions, the degree of discrepancy of productivity of the models of attribution in the listed categories of intra-settlement names is distinguished. Caused by different grammatical belonging of the components of the own part of the name, models of primary attribution are widely presented in urbanonymy and are placed in the following order: 1) an adjective with the suffix *-sk* + nomenclature term (next *NT*): *Кобрынская вул.* / *Kobrinskaya vul.*; 2) an adjective with the suffix *-n* + *NT*: *Дальняя вул.* / *Dalnaya vul.*; 3) an adjective with the suffix */-ov/ -ev* + *NT*: *Кляновая вул.* / *Klyanovaya vul.*; 4) confixal adjective + *NT*: *Загарадная вул.* / *Zagaradnaya vul.*; 5) non-derivative adjective + *NT*: *Вузкі завул.* / *Vuzki zavul.*; 6) complex adjective + *NT*: *Чырвоназнамённая вул. / Chyrvonaznamennaya vul.*

In vikonymy, the second model takes the first place (*Паўночная вул.* / *Pavnocznaya vul.*), then the third one (*Палявая вул.* / *Palyavaya vul.),* followed by the first model (*Магілёўская вул.* / *Magilevskaya vul.*).

In hortensionymy the first and the second urbanymy models have switched in terms of the degree of efficiency.

The primary attribution by genitives, which is so widely represented in urbanonymy (*вул. П.Броўкі / vul. P. Brovky*), is used three times less often in vikonymy (*вул. Я.Купалы / vul. Y. Kupaly*) and is almost absent in hortensionymy (*вул. Мічурына / vul. Michurina*).

Such models, which are explained primarily by the size of the settlement, primary attribution by nominative (*вул. Няміга / vul. Nemiga*) and ordinal numerals (*Другая лінія / Druhaya linya*), are not spread within vikonymy and hortensionymy.

As the results of our study prove, the secondary attribution is the most widespread in urbanonymy and hortensionymy.

STRUCTURAL

In structural features we focus on three differences:

1) the number of structural types themselves do not match: in urbanonymy there are currently thirteen that are involved; in vikonymy, only two ordinary types, attributive and genitive, are actively used; and in hortensionymy – among the simple types is the attributive, and among the complex ones is the numerative-attributive;

2) in hortensionymy the number of complex units is 2.6 times higher than the number of simple ones; in vikonymy – on the contrary: the number of simple units in their structure names considerably exceeds the number of the complex; and in urbanonymy the researched proportions are closer to hortensionymy than to vikonymy;

3) the set of nomenclature terms differ. In urbanonymy, for example, there are about twenty of them; in vikonymy – ten; in hortensionymy – mainly two – street and lane. The difference is explained by the size of settlements and the linear objects accordingly located in them.

GRAMMATICAL

Within the framework of grammatical differences, it is necessary to emphasize a noticeable discrepancy in the use of noun forms in the composition of the proper part of the names. Thus, while in urbanonymy the number of names with a noun in its structure is approximately 35–37% of the units, in vikonymy – only 7.6%, and hortensionymy – only about 1%.

LINGUISTIC AND CULTURAL

As a result of the cultural development of the people, the system of intra-settlement names acts as a part of the onomastic picture of the world and reflects the perception of the environment by the linguistic personality. Among the linguistic and cultural differences, there is a difference in the level of transmission of information about the surrounding space, culture, and history of the people. Thus, in urbanonymy there are many intra-urban names marked by national or planetary precedent, while in vikonymy and hortensionymy – regional and even zonal. According to this parameter, vikonymy is much closer to hortensionymy, than to urbanonymy.

There is a discrepancy of orientational priorities in different categories of intra-settlement names. So, if the preferred orientations in urbanonymy are the names of the architectural facilities, in vikonymy – it is the land and territories that have economic importance. In hortensionymy, the most numerous names are those in which as motivators are the names of the garden partnership itself.

CONCLUSIONS

Thus, in the framework of the Belarusian intra-settlement terminology, consistency is achieved by strict classification with the allocation of generic (conlocatyanonym) and species (urbanonym, vikonym, hortensionym) concepts and considering the parallelism of species.

Even though intra-city, intra-village and intra-garden names have a largely similar structure and principles of nomination, they are characterized by five types of differences: lexical and semantic, nomination, structural, grammatical, linguistic and cultural.

All the listed types of names of topographic objects within the settlement, which have both general and bright individual characteristics, should be considered as autonomous categories of intra-settlement names, which is represented by the sector of conlocatyanonyms.

The study of the names of topographic objects operating within the settlements of different types, in a comparative aspect, provides additional material to identify not only difference but also general trends.

The main positions and the results of the article could be used in the further study of the functioning of onomastic terminology, directions, and conditions of its development; in solving the problems of supplementation of onomastic terminology, which will contribute to the development of the theoretical base of terminology.

The applied factual material could be used in lexicographic practice – when creating terminological dictionaries.

Translated into English by Marharyta Svirydava

REFERENCES

Dorofeenko, Marina Leonidovna. (2015). *Vikonimiâ Belorusi: nomintivnyj, lingvogeografičeskij, lingvokul'turologičeskij aspekty: avtoref. dis. ... kand. filol. nauk*. Minsk. [Дорофеенко, Марина Леонидовна. (2015). *Виконимия Белоруси: номинтивный, лингвогеографический, лингвокультурологический аспекты*: *автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук.* Минск.]

Dvarèckij, Iosif Hananovič. (1976). *Latinsko-russkij slovar'*. Moskva: Russkij âzyk. [Дварэцкій, Іосиф Ханановіч. (1976). *Латинско-русский словарь*. Москва: Русский язык.]

Madieva, Gul'mira Baânžanovna, Suprun, Vasilij Ivanovič. (2017). Sistema sovremennoj urbanonimičkskoj terminologii. *Voprosy onomastiki*, *14(2)*, pp. 115–125. [Мадиева, Гульмира Баянжановна, Супрун, Василий Иванович. (2017). Система современной урбанонимичкской терминологии. *Вопросы ономастики*, *14(2)*, с. 115–125.]

Mezenko, Anna Mihajlovna. (1991). *Urbanonimiâ Belarusi. avtoref. dis. ... dokt. filol. nauk*. Minsk. [Мезенко, Анна Михайловна. (1991). *Урбанонимия Беларуси. автореф. дис. ... докт. филол. наук*. Минск.]

Mezenko, Anna Mihajlovna. (2007). Vikonimiâ kak razdel toponimiki: sostoânie, perspektivy. In: Aleksandra Cieślikowa, Barbara Czopek-Kopciuch, Katarzyna Skowronek (eds.), *Nowe nazwy własne – nowe tendencje badawcze* (pp. 379–390). Kraków: Wyd. PANDIT. [Мезенко, Анна Михпйловна. (2007). Виконимия как раздел топонимики: состояние, перспективы. In: Aleksandra Cieślikowa, Barbara Czopek-Kopciuch, Katarzyna Skowronek (eds.), *Nowe nazwy własne – nowe tendencje badawcze* (pp. 379–390). Kraków: Wyd. PANDIT.]

Mezenko, Anna Mihajlovna. (2014). Hortensionim kak vid toponima: status, osobennosti funksionirovaniâ. *Učenye zapiski Tavričeskogo nacional'nogo universiteta im. V.I. Vernadskogo. Seriâ "Filologiâ. Social'nye kommunikacii"*, *27(2)*, pp. 75–79. [Мезенко, Анна Михайловна. (2014). Хортенсионим как вид топонима: статус, особенности функсионирования. *Ученые записки Таврического национального университета им. В.И. Вернадского. Серия "Филология. Социальные коммуникации"*, *27(2)*, с. 75–79.]

Padol′skaâ, Natal'â Vladimirovna. (1988). *Slovar′ russkoj onomastičeskoj terminologii*. Moskva: Nauka. [Падольская, Наталья Владимировна. (1988). *Словарь русской ономастической терминологии*. Москва: Наука.]

Razumov, Roman Viktorovič. (2003). *Sistema urbanonimov russkogo provincional'nogo goroda konca XVIII–XX vv. (na primere gorodov Kostromy, Rybinska i Âroslavlâ): avtoref. dis. ... dokt. filol. nauk*. Âroslavl'. [Разумов, Роман Викторович (2003). *Система урбанонимов русского провинциального города конца XVIII–XX вв. (на примере городов Костромы, Рыбинска и Ярославля*): *автореф. дис. ... докт. филол. наук*. Ярославль.]

Sizova, Elena Anatol'evna. (2004). *Lingvokul'turologičeskij analiz urbanonimov: avtoref. dis. ... dokt. filol. nauk*. Pâtigorsk. [Сізова, Елена Анатольевна. (2004). *Лингвокультурологический анализ урбанонимов*: *автореф. дис. ... докт. филол. наук*. Пятигорск.]

Superanskaâ, Aleksandra Vasil'evna. (2009). *Obŝaâ teoriâ imeni sobstvennogo*. Moskva: Librokom. [Суперанская, Александра Васильевна. (2009). *Общая теория имени собственного*. Москва: Либроком.]

Suprun, Vasilij Ivanovič. (2012). Ob"ekt onomastičeskogo analiza: granicy drobleniâ i perspektivy integracii. In: *Onomastika Povolž'â: materiâly HIII Meždunarodnoj naučnoj konferencji* (pp. 39–42). Âroslavl': Izd-vo ÂGPU. [Супрун, Василий Иванович. (2012). Объект ономастического анализа: границы дробления и перспективы интеграции. В: *Ономастика Поволжья: материялы XIII Международной научной конференции* (с. 39–42). Ярославль: Изд-во ЯГПУ.]

ABSTRACT

The article discusses the types of onymic units – urbanonyms, vikonyms, hortensionyms, which, being used in naming of topographical features within the boundaries of settlements, have yet to be terminologically standardized; it is stressed that concrete implementation of these types of onym is characterized by a number of special features which are detected at different language levels. It is suggested to view the listed types of names of topographic objects within settlements as stand-alone categories of inter-settlement names representing the sector of conlocatyanonyms. It is concluded that the modern Belarusian intra-settlement terminology requires further theoretical comprehension and lexicographic processing.

Keywords: vikonym, inter-settlement names, urbanonym, hortensionym

ABSTRAKT

W artykule omówiono różne typy jednostek onimicznych – urbanonimy, wikonimy, hortensionimy – używane w nazewnictwie obiektów topograficznych znajdujących się w granicach miejscowości. Konkretna realizacja tych typów onimów charakteryzuje się szeregiem cech, które funkcjonują na różnych poziomach językowych. Wymienione typy nazw obiektów topograficznych w obrębie miejscowości należy traktować jako samodzielne kategorie nazw, stanowiących kategorię konlokatianonimów Współczesna białoruska terminologia dotycząca obiektów wewnątrz miejscowości wymaga dalszego opracowania teoretycznego i leksykograficznego.

Słowa kluczowe: wikonim, nazwy obiektów w obrębie miejscowości, urbanonim, hortensionim

Article submission date: 06.02.2019
Date qualified for printing after reviews: 03.09.2019