

## PRINCIPLES OF CLASSIFICATION OF TOPONYMIC NAMES

Lutfullina Alfiya Akhmadfaridovna

English language teacher at KSPI

Email : [alifiya\\_91@mail.ru](mailto:alifiya_91@mail.ru)

### Annotation.

This article is devoted to one of the controversial issues in the field of modern linguistics - the classification of toponyms. There are various opinions of linguists about the classification of proper names, many of which are given in this article. The exact interpretation of the terms that denote the various names of objects in our universe is given.

**Key words:** toponymy, geographical name, macrotoponym, microtoponym, hypertoponym, hydronym, oronym, dreamonym, insulonym, oceanonym, pelagonym, potamonym, limnonym, gelonym, speleonym.

A common disadvantage of classification schemes of toponymy is "the inability to put all the diversity of millions of geographical names in the Procrustean bed of a classification" [Murzaev 1982: 115]. D.R. Stewart makes an attempt to classify toponyms based on several principles at the same time. He identifies 10 categories of names:

- 1) *descriptive names and compass-point names* (names that characterize the qualities of the object being determined, and locative names);
- 2) *associative names*;
- 3) *incident names* (names given for any incident, to which D.R. Stewart also refers names associated with animal names and calendar holidays);
- 4) *possessive names*;
- 5) *commemorative names* (commemorative or memorial names with socio-historical connotation, given in memory or in honor of prominent figures, as well as hyphenated names);
- 6) *commendatory names* (names given by any attractive features of a geographical object);
- 7) *folk etymologies* (names formed as a result of false etymology);
- 8) *manufactured names* (artificially created names);
- 9) *mistake names* (names that arose as a result of various typographical errors);
- 10) *shift names* (names based on one original name, subsequently transferred to a number of nearby objects) [Stewart 1975].

There is no way to create a unified classification of toponyms that would reflect the entire multidimensional essence of toponymic vocabulary. Classifying toponymic nominations, it is necessary to take into account the multifaceted (intra- and extralinguistic) principles of the allocation of toponymic units, such as:

- 1) parametric characteristics of the object,
- 2) ontological characteristics of the object,
- 3) localization of the object,
- 4) motivational characteristics of toponyms,
- 5) etymological characteristics of toponyms,
- 6) motivation of toponyms,
- 7) chronological characteristics of toponyms,
- 8) structural characteristics of toponyms,
- 9) toponymic polysemy,
- 10) degree of toponymic nomination.

1. The classification of toponyms based on the parametric characteristics of the named object involves the division of toponyms into macrotoponyms (names of large geographical objects or objects created by man, and political and administrative units) and microtoponyms (individualized names of small geographical objects, features of the local landscape, familiar only to local residents). There is no hard border between these

types; nevertheless, it can be argued that macrotoponyms are more functionally stable and standardized, and microtoponyms are characterized by relative instability and mobility.

Depending on the geopolitical, economic and socio-cultural significance of geographical objects designated by toponyms, hypertoponyms, macrotoponyms, regiononyms and microtoponyms are distinguished [Muryasov 2015 (a): 73-74]. Hypertoponyms include the names of continents, oceans, and countries; macrotoponyms combine names of large regions, states, regions, capitals of states, mountain systems, large seas, rivers, islands; regiononyms are the names of cities, districts, small rivers, mountains, etc. of regional significance; microtoponyms are used to designate small objects in individual localities and are known only to a limited circle of people (ravine, mountain, river, field, forest, building, road, park, block, etc.).

2. The classification of toponyms by the type of named objects is characterized by uniformity throughout the globe. The peculiarity of this type of classification is that toponymic categorization "repeats the structure and content of categories of natural objects, i.e. forms an ontological model of categorization of the world" [Shcherbak 2012: 90]. Despite the fact that the toponymic vocabulary is an extensive layer in the language system, the whole variety of toponymy can be reduced to a relatively small number of types, among which the names of natural objects and objects created by man. The names of natural objects include hydronyms, oronyms, dreamonyms and insulonoms. Hydronyms are the names of all water bodies, and the branch of linguistics that studies hydronyms is called hydronymics. The hydrographic network, which is a collection of reservoirs and watercourses of land, includes oceans, seas, rivers, lakes, swamps and reservoirs. The names of oceans (the smallest toponymic class) are combined by the term oceanonyms, the names of seas are referred to pelagonyms, the names of rivers – to potamonoms, the names of lakes – to limnonoms, the names of swamps – to gelonoms. The names of small hydrographic objects that have a narrow sphere of use (streams, springs, wells) are usually classified as microhydronyms. Oronyms combine the names of relief elements and its forms (mountains, capes, hills, mounds), and the section of toponymy that studies oronyms is called oronymy.

One of the types of homonyms are speleonoms (names of caves, chasms, grottoes, wells, mines and entire underground systems). Dreamonyms are the names of woodlands, and the subsection of toponymy that studies dreamonyms is called dreamonymy. Insulonoms are a subclass of place names that combine the names of islands. Some names may refer to different groups at the same time, for example, the names of underground rivers and lakes, refer to both hydronyms (potamonoms) and oronyms (speleonoms)

Objects related to human activity, i.e. created or improved by people; include horonyms, oikonoms, urbanonyms. Horonyms are the names of territories that have certain borders (countries, administrative districts, historical, geographical, natural landscape, economic areas), and the field of linguistics that deals with the study of horonyms is called horonymics. Oikonoms (names of localities) are divided into astyonoms or polysonoms (names of urban settlements) and comonyms or horionoms (names of rural settlements). The section of toponymy that studies oikonoms is called oikononymics. The names of inner-city objects (blocks, streets, squares, boulevards, alleys, embankments, avenues of memorial monuments, theaters, museums, cinemas, cafes, hotels, shops, individual houses and other small objects inside settlements) are combined under the term urbanonyms. The study of urbanonyms deals with such a section of toponymy as urbanonymy. There are a number of terms that characterize the elements of the inner-city toponymic system: godonyms (street names), agoronyms (names of squares), microhoronyms (names of inner-city districts, quarters), ergonyms (names of enterprises), oikodomonyms (names of buildings), ecclesionoms (names of temples, churches, monasteries, chapels), dromonyms (names roads), necronoms (names of cemeteries), agroonyms (names of land plots, fields, arable land), microdrimonoms (names of forests and parks). Urbanonyms, as a rule, belong to microtoponyms, since they are known only to a limited circle of people living in a certain area.

3. According to the classification of toponyms by their origin and the attribution of toponyms to a certain lexico-semantic or thematic group of vocabulary, there are anthropotoponyms, topotoponyms, ethnotoponyms, zootoponyms, phytotoponyms, ergotoponyms, etc. Anthropotoponyms are geographical names derived from anthroponoms (Columbus, Baltimore, Washington, Fort Johnson, Woodrow Wilson Bridge, Cape Kennedy); toponyms (toponymic metonymy) – geographical names derived from geographical terms or from existing toponyms (Mississippi River → Mississippi State, Missouri River → Missouri State); ethnotoponyms – toponyms derived from the names of tribes, peoples and other ethnic units (Kansas,

Massachusetts, Dakota, Utah, Essex, Cornwall, Devon, Dorset, Hitchin, Oundle, Threkingham, Normanton, Irby); zootonyms – names given to geographical objects by animal species (Bearpaw Creek, Beaver, Buffalo, Squirrel, Butterfly, Eagle, Fox, Lizard); phytotonyms are toponyms reflecting flora (Big Oak Mountain, Birch Creek, Willowood Park, Alder Lake); ergotonyms are geographical names reflecting a person's social status and professional activity (Artist Point, Butcherknife Canyon, Driver, Hunter Creek, Lawyers Hill, Patroon Creek, Weaver), etc.

4. According to etymology, toponyms are divided into native, borrowed and hybrid. Borrowed names undergo changes and reinterpretation over time, adapting to the phonetic and grammatical features of the borrowing language. Thus, the toponyms of Great Britain are divided into toponyms of Anglo-Saxon, Celtic, Latin, Scandinavian and Norman-French origin. US toponyms combine names of Anglo-Saxon, Indian, Spanish, French, Dutch, German, Finnish, Greek, East Slavic, Italian, Swedish, Norwegian, Danish, Polish, Japanese, Czech, Arabic and Armenian origin.

5. The classification based on the clarity of the internal form (motivation) of a toponym assumes two groups of geographical names: motivated toponyms (Bearpaw Mountain, Newtown, Oakland, Oceanside) and unmotivated toponyms with unclear, obscured semantics, the meaning of which cannot be deciphered (Arran, Nefyn, Rathlin, Rosyth, Scramoge, Wenvoe). Over time, toponominations can move from one group to another.

6. The chronological classification of toponyms is based on the division into archaic (ancient, obsolete toponyms) (New Amsterdam) and living (existing at the moment) toponyms (New York).

7. According to the structural principle, place names are divided into simple (Dawn, Deer, Park, Herman, Happy), derived (Birmingham, Buckingham, California, Gatwick, Middleton), complex (Bridgewater, Lakewood, Longview, Oceanside, Springfield) and composite (Blue Mountains, Death Valley, Elmwood Place, Michigan City, Mount Forest, State of Colorado).

8. According to the principle of distinguishing the number of designates (objects designated by geographical names), single-sign, multi-sign and empty toponyms can be distinguished [Grodzinsky 1973].

Single-signature or ideal toponyms perform the function of individualization to the highest degree, i.e. these are toponyms that relate to only one geographical object (the city of Dinosaur, located in Colorado, the city of Viper, Kentucky). Multisignature toponyms have a large number of referents (Kentucky is the name of localities in Mississippi, Illinois, Arkansas; localities with the name Arizona are found on maps of Texas, Nevada, Louisiana; the city of Petersburg occurs 35 times; Moscow – 24 times). Empty toponyms do not have real geographical features, for example, the names of fictional geographical features that never really existed (on the high-road to Needham, in Queer Street). Based on the same principle, D.I. Ermolovich divides toponominations into single and multiple ones [Ermolovich 2001: 107]. Single toponyms are those that in the linguistic collective consciousness are associated with one toponymic object (London, New York, Washington, Paris), although they may belong to many other, usually smaller geographical objects (there are 7 localities in the United States with the name New York, 19 – London, 23 – Paris, 35 – Washington). Multiple toponyms are not associated in the linguistic consciousness with any one geographical object. This includes the rest of the mass of toponyms. As an example, the toponymy Big Lake, whose designates are lakes, reservoirs, swamps and settlements, is found in the United States according to the "Geographic Names Information System" GNIS 183 times, or the toponym Little Creek, referring to 506 different designates.

9. Classification by degree of nomination divides toponyms into primary (toponyms originating directly from common names, for example, Hunter Place, Red Mouth Creek, Riverwood, Tornado Canyon) and non-primary (geographical names originating from other proper names, for example, Columbus, Hercules, Hudson River, Saint Terese, Washington) [Superanskaya 1967: 38-41].

10. Classification according to the principle of localization of designated objects distinguishes "own" and "foreign" toponyms [Kuzikov 1985: 9]. The term "own" toponyms implies geographical names naming objects within the considered language area, for example, for the toponymy of the United Kingdom and the United States, "their" toponyms will be: Washington, Alabama, New York, Mississippi, Birmingham, Thames, London, etc. "Foreign" toponyms are toponyms designating objects outside the area of the language in question For example: Norway, Argentina, Qatar, Sierra Leone, The Netherlands, Thailand, Spain. It is necessary to include in this classification a subgroup of "semi-unique" toponyms used to denote toponymies

of the same language, but of different countries and cultures, for example, the toponymy of New Zealand and Australia. Such toponyms occupy an intermediate position between "their own" and "foreign" toponyms.

### **References**

1. Murzaev E.M. Geography in names. – М.: Nauka, 1982. – 177 p.
2. Stewart G.R. Names on the Globe. – New York: Oxford University Press, 1975. – 411 p.
3. Гродзинский Е. Очерк общей теории имен собственных. – М., 1973. – 87 с.
4. Ермолович Д.И. Имена собственные на стыке языков и культур. – М.: Р.Валент, 2001. – 200 с.
5. Кузиков В.В. Топонимика немецкого языка. Учебное пособие. – Уфа: Изд. Баш. ун-та, 1985. – 80 с.
6. Мурашов Р.З. Имена собственные в системе языка: монография / Р.З. Мурашов. – Уфа: РИЦ БашГУ, 2015 (а). – 128 с.
7. Суперанская А.В. Связь топонимов с называемыми объектами // История топонимики в СССР / Тез. докладов. – М.: АН СССР, 1967. – С. 74-80.
8. Щербак А.С. Когнитивные основы региональной ономастики: монография. – Тамбов: Издательский дом ТГУ им. Г.Р. Державина, 2012. – 319 с.