Kopach, A. The essence of the onomatological analysis of place names // In Honorem : сборник статей к 90-летию А. Е. Супруна / под ред. Е. Н. Руденко, А. А. Кожиновой. – Минск : РИВШ, 2018. – С. 129–132.

The research of ways and means of creating the form of a toponymic sign is understood here as the onomatological analysis of place names. It should be borne in mind that "'direct language' expressing the notion is not a word, but a nomination (name) which can be represented by a designation of different structure" (Нечай 1991: 24; see also Суперанская 1965: 54). Thus, I deliberately avoid the concept of structural, derivational, and formant analysis, which "are designed to study the morphemic and / or formative structure of proper names" (Мезенка 1997: 35). Formant analysis, if it is understood as the identification of an onomastic series in identity-based finite elements of names, is based solely on formal features. The same formal final elements of an onym may be the result of various operations of derivation. Therefore, they can not reflect the means of formation of onyms bringing all types of resultative units to one group regardless of their formative structure. The same final elements may not even be morphemes. Hence, the method of finding formants is non-applicable for an onomasiological approach due to the inability to identify the ways and means of naming water bodies with it.

The analysis of structural and derivational peculiarities is more productive. It allows for the identification of onymic types and models as well as bases and affixes. However, "onomasiology combines the units of naming from all levels of the structure of language" (Кубрякова 1986: 37). Syntactic means combined with full words, prepositions and conjunctions may take a part as a creator of onyms. If the most productive way of naming in Slavic names of rivers and lakes is morphemic derivation, then the hydronyms of the USA are usually created through the use of syntactic means. In addition, syntactic derivation is presented in fairly frequent examples showing the different nature of relations between the components of Belarusian place names. The fact that there are both single-

component and multicomponent units permits us to more accurately define the analysis of ways and means of naming individual objects as onomatological.

Another reason why the latter term is preferable is the following. When applying a semasiological approach to onymic vocabulary, researchers begin by establishing the most common classes of proper names of a specific subsystem of toponymy (simple, complex, and compound), depending on the sequence of components, parts of speech and grammatical form. Such an approach does not reveal the specifics of creating each individual name because it puts all single-component and multicomponent units "on a par", and then identify affixes within simple names and the types of components of complex and composite classes. At the same time there are multicomponent semantic derivatives, i.e. units which have become part of toponymy without any materially expressed derivational formants on the basis of ready-made combinations of words. Formal analysis of names artificially separates single-word and multiword semantic derivatives from each other and considers them in different groups. Thus, the peculiarities of the word-formation of simple units receive a satisfactory interpretation. Effectively they are subject to derivational analysis while semasiologically identifying the types of multicomponent names breaks single-level means of place naming on formal grounds. Moreover, the approach to onymic vocabulary from form does not explain the existence of non-traditional forms of hydronyms like *Vaŭkavysk i Žuraŭka (Ваўкавыск i Жураўка), Abruby-Čyscik (Абрубы-Чысцік)*, etc. and can identify in such names not only means of onym-making, but also the morphemic structure of each of the two parts of onyms if the researcher lacks comparative material on the area surrounding these sites.

The inadequacy of the term "word-formative analysis" with respect to place names is clearly seen in the study of names of two different groups of languages. Onomatological analysis considers the ways and means of names appearing in a particular subsystem of names before they are distributed into predictable structural classes by formal properties.

On the one hand, place names are the lexical elements of language and reflect general word-formation processes. On the other hand, as proper names they are characterized by their own specifics. Auxiliary morphemes noticed in names are not necessarily word-formative. These important parts of names often appear at a pretoponymic stage of developing word structure in the appellative or proper subsystem of names. Morphemes that are not involved in the act of place naming within a specific subsystem are traditionally not considered toponymic morphemes (Гусева 1971: 97; Касим 1977: 67; Корепанова 1969: 6; Лебедева 1956: 11; Суперанская 1969: 22). Morphemic analysis of names in such a situation turns out to be unnecessary. That's why the analysis of the ways and means of creating place names is conducted on a toponymic level when not all the affixes available in the stems of names are considered, but only those of them which present their derivational means. For the purpose of singling out these means place names are compared with appellatives, anthroponyms, names of populated places and water objects which constitute the derivational basis of the names in question. Therefore, names of the same structure with the same final elements can often be distributed into different groups because they relate to different onym-making types.

We can't but say here about the limitations of onomatological analysis which aims at defining the formal indicators of onym-making.

Definition of a place name as a simple transition from an appellative or a proper name of a language to a new unit of a toponymic subsystem by means of a formative reduces the process of naming to a formal linguistic approach. In functional and onomasiological research the function of units under investigation in the society is in the forefront. Identification of materially expressed morphemes which were used as a means of forming a new unit, is unable to fully show the specificity of the reflection of reality in human consciousness. Instead we should turn to the modelling of a toponymic sign by studying the sequence of objectification of its ideal content .Even within "single-functional" proper names differentiation of units is carried out differently both in terms of expression and in

terms of content, and "in respect of system relations not purely formal, but categorical changes are probably the most important" (Suprun 1964: 35).

So, structural and word-formative analyses do not quite accurately reflect the ways and means of naming since they separate units that use the same derivational formants on formal grounds. Semantic derivations in simple and complex names are considered separately. Furthermore, the notion of "word-formative analysis" is applied with respect to one-word onyms, but in relation to multistructural names of languages from different groups it would probably be more accurate to speak of onomatological analysis. Onomatological analysis is limited though, and shows no interest in categorical changes inside the toponymic sign.

Bibliography

Гусева Л.Г. Географическая терминология Каргопольского края и её отражение в топонимике // Ученые записки Уральского университета. Сер. филологии. 1971. Вып. 18, № 114. С. 86-98.

Касим Г.Ю. Псевдокомпозиты в топонимии // Вопросы ономастики. Русская топонимия и географическая терминология. Свердловск, 1977. Вып. 12. С. 67-75.

Корепанова А.П. Словообразование гидронимов бассейна Нижней Десны: Автореф. дис. … канд. филол. наук: 661 / АН УССР, Отделение литературы, языка и искусствоведения. Киев, 1969.

Кубрякова Е.С. Номинативный аспект речевой деятельности. М.: Наука, 1986.

Лебедева А.И. Словообразование в Псковской топонимике // Учёные записки Ленинградского университета. Сер. филол. наук. 1956. Вып. 24, № 198. С. 10-51.

Мезенка Г.М. Беларуская анамастыка: Навуч. дапаможнік для студэнтаў ун-таў. Мінск: Вышэйшая школа, 1997.

Нечай М.Н. Семантика географического термина и его употребительность в топонимии // Номинация в ономастике: Сб. ст. / Под ред. М.Э.Рут. Свердловск: Изд-во Урал. ун-та, 1991. С. 90-94.

Суперанская А.В. Структура имени собственного (Фонология и морфология). М.: Наука, 1969.

Суперанская А.В. Топонимические системы и ономастические схемы // Всесоюзная конференция по топонимике СССР. 28 января – 2 февраля 1965 г. Тез. докл. и сообщ. / МФГО. Л., 1965. С. 53-57.

Супрун А.Е. К системной интерпретации грамматических данных лингвогеографии // Проблемы лингво- и этногеографии и ареальной диалектологии: Тез. докл. / АН СССР, Ин-т славяноведения. М.: Наука, 1964. С. 34-36.