

ANNALES
UNIVERSITATIS MARIAE CURIE-SKŁODOWSKA
LUBLIN – POLONIA

VOL. XXXVII

SECTIO FF

1-2019

ARTUR GAŁKOWSKI

University of Lodz, Poland

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2471-0886>

e-mail: artur.galkowski@uni.lodz.pl

Development of International Works on Onomastic Terminology: Review of Slavic Approaches

Rozwój międzynarodowych prac nad terminologią
onomastyczną: przegląd ujęć słowiańskich

INTRODUCTION AND RESEARCH FRAMEWORK

When undertaking a review of international (Slavic and non-Slavic) approaches to onomastic terminology (ONTERM), it should be emphasized at the outset that, like any other terminology related to a given discipline or sub-discipline, ONTERM is essentially a scientific terminology. The discipline, in this case, is linguistics, and the subdiscipline – onomastics, i.e. the science dealing with the processes of creation and functioning and the description of proper names in the linguistic and extra-linguistic space. Such an assumption means that onomastics can be treated as an independent branch of linguistics in the first place, but in fact it is scientifically heterogeneous, which means that it can be perceived as an interdisciplinary science. This is mainly due to two groups of factors. The first concerns the subject of onomastic research itself, including the diversity of cultural spheres in which objects in naming appear (bionymic, abionymic, literary, media, spiritual sphere), and the second – methods and procedures according to which onomasticons, their subsets, and individual onyms can be described, ranked, and included in a broader research discourse (e.g. anthropological, archaeological, sociological, semiotic, pragmatic, textual, etc.). ONTERM is also subject to the terminological practices of “in” and “as a result of application by” other disciplines and cultural areas (e.g.

geography, sociology, history, genealogy, heraldry, advertising, literature, art, media, etc.), while maintaining scientific and categorical independence.¹

However, deviating from the relationship and dependence of onomastics on linguistics is not the best perspective that the science of proper names should set itself, as noted by Mieczysław Karaś, quoted by Jan Svoboda in his report on one of the first meetings of the team of Slavic onomasticians, working since the late 1950s on the international standardisation and unification of ONTERM²:

An analysis of terms related to onomastics is necessary to prevent confusion of terms and names used by the aforementioned disciplines (sociology, history, geography, linguistics), which are sometimes quite remote. Acquisition and introduction of incorrect terms should be prevented. The most significant connection can be found between onomastics and linguistics. Onomastic terminology per se should incorporate exclusively onomastic terms; as for terms shared by other disciplines, only those that have different intension of use in onomastics should be used (Svoboda, 1961, p. 322; cf. Blanár, 1962, p. 279; translated into English by Marianna Bachledová).³

As a scientific terminology, ONTERM is an element of specialist terminology, being a part of the terminological-systemic corpora (see, for example, below for the works in the project of the corpus of the Slovak ONTERM). Thus, it appears as a component and basis for carriers of the notions of metalanguage of specialists, onomasticians and others, in line with the signalled assumption permitting interdisciplinarity in this branch of linguistics and the metalinguistic/metaonomastic approach (cf. Rutkowski, 2012; Kazimirova, 2013a). To a narrower extent, it is also a component of the general (colloquial) language, because its subject is a common material in the everyday communication of language users, who are often the authors of metalanguage statements about a specific proper name (speaking about its

¹ It seems that in the present time onomastics has reached such a degree of “linguisticization” as postulated by Stanisław Rospond (1956a, p. 246, 1957, p. 114), i.e. its inclusion in the strictly linguistic (system-structural) framework, that it may move into the next stage of its development, which the Polish onomastician announced as an undertaking of research consisting in “more certain extra-linguistic investigations” or “cultural-linguistic investigations” (Rospond, 1956a, pp. 247–248).

² The focus was on the lecture entitled “Terminologia onomastyczna” by Karaś at the Second International Slavic Onomastic Conference in Berlin in 1961. Among the seven postulates adopted at that time, it was indeed agreed that “work on onomastic terminology should be closely related to work on linguistic terminology” and that “it is necessary to strive to align onomastic terminology also with other disciplines” (Karaś, 1963, pp. 405–406).

³ Original text: “Rozbor termínů souvisejících s onomastikou musí zabránit tomu, aby se mísily pojmy a názvy, užívané uvedenými disciplinami [sociologie, historie, geografie, lingvistika], někdy dost odlehlými, aby se přejímaly nebo zaváděly termíny nevhodné. Nejvýrazněji se projevuje souvislost onomastiky s lingvistikou. Do vlastní onomastické terminologie je třeba pojmut termíny výlučně onomastické a z termínů společných několika disciplinám ty, které v onomastice mají odchylný rozsah užití”.

origin, functional meaning, form, referent, etc.), and in special situations they create, select and give such linguistic units to given objects in a non-linguistic reality. This results in a certain relaxation of ONTERM and its extension far beyond the strict limits of terminology as science, terminography and “terminology” understood as a scientific discipline, which should also be taken into account in the terminological description for the sub disciplinary linguistic and general purposes of science, allowing for interdisciplinarity in onomastic studies.

Turning to the further argument, it should also be noted that ONTERM is an effect of quite liberal “terminology”, which on an international and interlinguistic scale presents a rich diversity of lexical constructions, equivalent headwords, synonyms and paronyms used to determine onomastic phenomena and facts. This is happening despite, and simultaneously because of, the unprecedented history of onomastics and some of its subdivisions in the development and perspectives of the other humanities. The beginnings of onomastics (not counting the general philosophical reflection on proper names) date back to the second half of the 19th century, while ONTERM itself began to take shape and systematize in the second half of the 20th century.

Modern ONTERM studies can show four types of research orientation: 1. As a continuation of the terminological traditions of onomastic schools in the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s; 2. As a process of supplementing and modifying known systems of “historical” ONTERM; 3. As a formula ignoring historical tradition in the application of ONTERM, resulting from their ignorance or unintentional omission; 4. As disowning scientific traditions and creating new terminological bases.

It should be added formerly that ONTERM, from the international perspective, can be considered at the global scale, at the scale of the linguistic-cultural area/region and finally at the author’s scale, i.e. as proposals of individual researchers, specialists, and non-specialists in the field of proper names.

The focus of this review is in the Slavic area: East, West and South, but also make reference to the broader international perspective that has undoubtedly emerged and is emerging with Slavic⁴ participation.

⁴ The terminological material analysed herein derives from sources considered in the broader perspective of the international ONTERM review, such as dictionaries and glossaries (published traditionally and online), compendia, guides, manuals, instructions, term indexes in onomastic publications, and other works in the form of selected articles and monographs concerning ONTERM. The searches based on personal consultations were conducted among representatives of the *ICOS Terminology Group*, a *subcommittee of the Slavic Onomastics Commission*, *U.S. Board on Geographic Names*, *Société française d’Onomastique*, *Société canadienne d’onomastique*, *Associazione Onomastica & Letteratura O&L*, *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Namenforschung (GfN) e.V.* and authors of portals devoted to onomastic issues such as *e-onomastics*.

BASICS OF INTERNATIONAL CONCEPTUALIZATIONS
AND WORKS IN THE 1960S AND 1970S
(CZECH-SLOVAKIAN ONOMASTIC SCHOOL)

The starting point for the international works on ONTERM was, in my opinion, a two-part study of the German personal and local names by Adolf Bach (1943–1956), followed by a compendium of onomastic knowledge by Teodolius Witkowski (1964), a linguist of Slavic origin working in East German research centres and cooperating with onomastic commissions in several Slavic countries (cf. Gałkowski, 2019). Witkowski's terminological proposals should be regarded as the salient conceptual basis, which has been developed not only in German onomastics (cf. Witkowski, 1966, pp. 400–401). Characteristic of the above is the fact that the author did not force himself to create terms coined from elements derived from classical languages, but proposed semantically clear and descriptive headwords in German, used for naming onomastic facts, but also forms of work and research methodology in onomastics (e.g. *Firmennamen* “company names”, *Ereignisnamen* “event names”, *Erstnennung* “first mention”, *Doppelname* “double name”, *binäre Nomenclatures* “binary nomenclature”, etc.).

Witkowski's terminological compendium was a pioneering work, but it nevertheless referred to the universalised concept of ONTERM, which was being developed in the Slavic circle and which the international Slavic circles began to demand during the Fourth International Slavic Congress in Moscow in 1958. At the 1st Conference of the International Onomastic Commission held in Krakow in 1959⁵, a group of onomasticians from many Slavic countries and the GDR responded with the idea of a common terminological project, which over the next twenty years had several published editions. Probably at that time the decision was already made on the system concept of ONTERM, which was in fact a result of the shape of the terminological lists of onomastic headwords and their concepts published subsequently.⁶ The key to such an approach was an intensional and extensional

⁵ During the conference, Svoboda from Prague presented a lecture entitled “The project of normalization of Slavic onomastic terminology”, which inspired the discussion participants to prepare the Slavic dictionary ONTERM under the direction of the Czech onomastician (Karaś, 1959, pp. 578–579).

⁶ This is confirmed by many reports from the meetings of the Onomastic Terminology Subcommittee established at the Second International Slavic Conference in Berlin in 1961 as part of the work of the Slavic Onomastics Commission of the International Slavist Committee. Its composition gradually expanded and changed. Its first members were: J. Svoboda, M. Hraste, M. Karaś, J. Stanislav, T. Witkowski, J. Zaimow (Karaś, 1963, p. 406; cf. also Karaś, 1975, p. 326). The project of the international dictionary ONTERM took on a particularly concrete dimension during the specially dedicated Terminology Conference held in Kraków in 1971 (cf. Miodunka, 1973). It was

terminological componential semantics. It is mentioned by Wojciech Włoskowicz (2018, pp. 78–79).

One of the first attempts by an author at the ONTERM conceptual and systemic order in the work of Slavic onomasticians was the one presented by Svoboda in the Prague bulletin of the naming committee of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences ČSAV (Svoboda, 1960). In confrontation with parallel concepts (e.g. Šmilauer, 1960) and later (e.g. Šmilauer, 1976), the Svoboda diagram is the starting point for further decisions and developments in the field of ONTERM on Slavic grounds. The Czech onomasticians included the system of onomastic concepts into the four-area system. The first one is dedicated to its own “generic” names (*vlastní jména, obecně*), i.e. issues which we presently include in the onomastic theory (e.g. headword and definition of proper name, onomastics, name giving act), but also structural issues (e.g. terms such as complex names, lists, identifying element, univerbation, etc.). The second and third areas are “things names” (*názvy věcí*), with the division into “proper names of places” (*vlastní jména míst*, chapter two) and “names of other things” (*názvy ostatních věcí*, chapter three). The fourth area is called the “names of living creatures” (*vlastní jména živých tvorů*), including, *inter alia*, anthroponymy.⁷

The second section in the Svoboda system will be reduced to the scope of abionymy (including geonymy and cosmonymy) in subsequent attempts to order ONTERM, while the third section will be reduced directly to chrematonymy in its maximalist scope.

Interestingly, from an international perspective, the terms used and described by Svoboda (1960) were irregularly used but were supplemented in large numbers by equivalents or synonymic forms in German, English, French, and Polish. This demonstrates the Czech onomastician’s concern not to disassociate the terminology from the state of research in other language areas, or to be directly inspired by them. We can find here, among other items, such references as Fr. *sciences onomastiques, noms de hameaux, géo-onomastique, noms d’êtres inanimés, noms de lieux-dits, non habités, noms de quartiers, dénominations de places publiques, onomastique personnelle, prénom, nom de baptême, nom de famille, surnoms, noms citadins, noms urbains, noms ruraux, noms propres d’animaux*, etc.; Ger.

then decided, among other things, that Witkowski would prepare definitions of particular terms in German, which is not without significance for the further effect of teamwork among Slavic onomasticians (Miodunka, 1973, p. 374).

⁷ The translation into Polish of all the terms proposed by Svoboda (1960) was presented by Karaś (1968a). Some of the translations are an original proposal of the Polish onomastician, e.g. *formant antroponimiczny* (anthroponymic formant), *formant toponimiczny* (toponymic formant), *nazwa pamiątkowa* (commemorative name), *nazwy rzeczowe* (things names), etc.

Namenkunde, sinngemisse Namengebung, Flexionsformen, Gruppenbenennung, Insassennamen, Naturnamen, Rodungsnamen, Seenamen, Tiernamen, Sachnamen, etc.; En. *place names, minor names, names of uninhabited places, oronyms, names of inanimate objects, additional names*, etc.; Pol. *nazwa rodu, zawołania herbowe, nazwy miejscowe, nazewnictwo geograficzne, nazwa miejscowa herbowa, nazwy terenowe*, etc. As far as Polish headwords are concerned, Svoboda refers to the main source, i.e. Witold Taszycki's (1946) and Stanisław Rospond's (1956a, 1956b) toponomastic and terminological proposals. The German ones are the most numerous and were created *ad hoc* on the basis of the studies of Adolf Bach (1943–1956). However, it is difficult to determine from which French and English-speaking sources they are derived in the other two languages; nevertheless, they display relations with the terminological-onomastic tradition of French and English, to which references are rather rare, albeit noticeable, in subsequent works on ONTERM in the Slavic area.

The concept outlined by Svoboda (1960, 1961), under his direction and with the participation of several other onomasticians (including Witkowski), would then develop into a basic system, which includes a description of 415 terms published more than ten years later in the 14th issue of the ČSAV naming committee bulletin (Svoboda et al., 1973).

At the same time, the problems of TERMON in Slavic terms were addressed by Vasil Nimčuk (1966, 1968) in relation to the Ukrainian ONTERM, Karaś (1968b) in relation to the Polish ONTERM, and Jan Petr (1969) in relation to the Lusatian ONTERM.

THE FIRST UNIFIED SYSTEM OF INTERNATIONAL ONOMASTIC TERMINOLOGY (*OSNOVEN SISTEM...*)

The most well-known and most popular edition of the Slavic ONTERM system is the multilingual list developed under the auspices of the Czech onomastician (Svoboda et al., 1973), namely the dictionary *Osnoven sistem...*, published in book form in 1983 in Skopje. The dictionary was eventually edited by Božidar Vidoeski with the assistance of a twelve-member team of representatives of various languages and members of the Slavic Onomastics Commission of the International Slavist Committee. From that point, the work has been considered the main reference for ONTERM in the Slavic area, but it should not be forgotten that its basis and genesis is derived directly from the effects of the work and inspiration of Svoboda, who chaired the terminology sub commission of the Slavic Onomastics Commission. The 1983 edition of *Osnoven sistem...* is dedicated to him.

This dictionary has a similar “arrangement of subjects” (Miodunka, 1973, p. 373; cf. Olivová-Nezbedová, 1998) as in previous studies of the system. It consists of the following blocks: 1. bionyms (including anthroponyms and zoonyms), 2. abionyms (toponyms, hydronyms, chrematonyms) and 3. analytical description of onymy (here linked with the theory and linguistic-cultural problems of proper names), arranged basically in “hierarchical logical relations” (Włoskowitz, 2018, p. 82). The total number of terms listed in *Osnoven sistem...* is 220, but it should be noted that some of them remain headwords in three input languages: Macedonian, Russian and German, under which the constituent terms in twelve languages are specified (e.g. sections 0.42. *Namenfrequenz*, 11.1. *Entstehung und Entwicklung der Anthroponyme*, 11.3. *die Toponyme hinsichtlich der Form*, etc.).

Undoubtedly, *Osnoven sistem...* is a resultant and reference point for many works in the field of ONTERM, which were created in parallel or later in the international scientific area related to onomastics. However, despite the general agreement on the definition of terms in the phase of creation of *Osnoven sistem...*, not all of them are consistent with the terminological proposals contained in the dictionary from the Czech-Slovak school⁸. Among other things, it has created a definition of chrematonymy that the Russian onomastic school does not agree with, although not always consistently (see below). In the Polish area, this term later appears in a conceptual reference to either the Czech-Slovakian or Russian concepts; in *Osnoven sistem...* (headword with number 23) the term chrematonym in the field assigned to the Polish language has no equivalent at all, while in the Slovak and Czech languages it is a *chrematonymum*, similarly as in the case of Russian *хремато́ним*, Ukrainian *хремато́нім*, Belarusian *храмато́нім*, etc. The broad definition of a chrematonym given in Macedonian, Russian and German is unfortunately narrowed down to an object or product name, which is expressed by two pairs of linguistic equivalents indicated by *Osnoven sistem...*: Bulgarian *име на предмет / име на стока* (“item/object name” / “product name”), German *Chrematonym / Sacheigenname* (“names of thing”, but also names of some physical phenomena).⁹

The example of the concept of chrematonym illustrates the discrepancies that have arisen in the international arena in the field of ONTERM. Much depended on the original inspiration of the authors of the dictionaries, lists, and glossaries, but also the nomenclature traditions adopted by the linguistic area.

⁸ A comprehensive and critical review of the dictionary was presented by Stanisław Urbańczyk (1986), who proposed additional solutions to the shortcomings and terminological differences between languages in this publication.

⁹ For more information on the definition and scope of the chrematonym see e.g. Artur Gałkowski (2018).

WORKS AND INFLUENCE OF THE CONCEPTS OF THE RUSSIAN ONOMASTIC SCHOOL

In parallel with the development of the ONTERM of the Czech-Slovakian onomastic school, works on the ONTERM in the Russian area continued. Their effect is as valued and exploited as the *Grundsystem und Terminologie der slawischen Onomastik* (Svoboda et al., 1973) and thus, *Osnoven sistem...* from 1983, a dictionary of Russian ONTERM published in Moscow in 1978 and 1988 edited by Natalia Podol'skaâ and Alexandra Superanskaâ (*Словарь русской ономастической терминологии*). The dictionary contains approximately 700 terms, arranged alphabetically in its first version. In the latter, its resources are slightly expanded, e.g. by the term *геортоним* “heortonym”, which in Russian onomastics refers to relatively extensive material and theoretical studies, also in comparison with other linguistic areas (cf. e.g. Česnokova, 2012).

The Dictionary of Podol'skaâ and Superanskaâ (1978, 1988) refers to Slavic sources, but also to English, German and French-speaking sources. The terminological-toponomastic glossary *Lexique des termes utiles à l'étude des noms de lieux* by Henri Dorion and Jean Poirier (1975) contained many terms adapted to the Russian language in the dictionary of the Russian onomastician duo, such as: *потамоним* “potaponym” (Fr. *potamonyme* in the meaning of *nom de fleuve ou de cours d'eau* “name of river or watercourse/stream”, Dorion and Poirier, 1975, p. 110). Witkowski's compendium (1964) and Smith's onomastic thesaurus (1967) were also invariably important points of reference in this case.

The Russian dictionary, in turn, became the material to imitate in the preparation of several other similarly composed lexicographic works in the field of ONTERM, e.g. in the Belarusian language a list of Mikalai Biryła's writings *Анамастычная тэрміналогія* in a volume devoted to terminology (Biryła, 1993), in Ukrainian, the vocabulary of Dmiro Bučko and Natalia Tkačova *Словник української ономастичної термінології* (Bučko and Tkačova, 2012) or an extensive encyclopaedia of Bulgarian onomastics *Енциклопедия на българската ономастика* by Todor Balkanski and Kiril Cankov (2010).

The Russian point of view is visible in these studies in the scope of many terms. However, not all authors of the definitions consider, for example, chrematonym to be the name of an object of material culture (name of an object, a product, a work that came from human hands), as the authors of the Russian dictionary put it. In Biryła, chrematonyms are defined as names of effects of human activity, which include, for example, the names of holidays, i.e. objects of immaterial, even spiritual culture (*храматонім = уласная назва вынікаў чалавечай дзейнасці — святаў, параходаў, карцін*, Biryła, 1993, p. 40).

Many Russian, Ukrainian and Belarusian authors contributed great parts in the reflections on ONTERM. These include: Natalia Vasil'eva (1998, 2012, 2014), Vasilij Suprun (e.g. Suprun, 2011; Madieva and Suprun, 2017), Irina Kazimirova (2011, 2013a, 2013b), and Tatiana Aliferčyk (2017). Vasileva, with whom one should agree at this point, sees the source of the developing ONTERM as a consequence of the labelling of more and more objects, whose names inevitably become the subject of onomastic studies:

One of the reasons for the terminological diversity of onomastics is the specificity of the onomastic knowledge itself, directed – especially recently – at the discovery of new categories of proper names and their description. Such a description requires labeling of objects, the necessary differentiation of them at the level of metalanguage, which tends to be more fractional (Vasil'eva, 2014, p. 373; translated into English by Marharyta Svirydava).¹⁰

The results of such an approach are new onomastic terms, also popularized as internationalisms, e.g. within the urbanonymy – Rus. *пилонимы* “pylonyms” understood as names of gates, derived from Gr. *πύλη pyli* “gate”; Rus. *гефиронимы* “gephyronyms” meaning bridges, from Gr. *γέφυρα géfyra* “bridge” (Madieva and Suprun, 2017, p. 117).¹¹

CROATIAN WORKS AND CONCEPTS

Attempts to capture ONTERM have also been made and continue to be developed by Croatian onomasticians. Not all of them become successful, but they are nevertheless material for scientific discussion in the arena of domestic linguistic and international area. For example, Valentin Putanec (1976) expressed the need to introduce theoretical terms such as the Croatian *idionim* (Cro. *jezični znak za jedinku u vrsti* “linguistic sign for a single copy of a given genre/class/species”, from Gr. *ἴδιος ídios* “own, specific”) and *koinonim* (Cro. *jezični znak za vrstu* “linguistic sign for a whole class/species”, from Gr. *κοινή koiné* “common”).

The terminological proposals of Vladimir Skračić (2011), who presented Croatian adaptations or created new hydronymic terms, e.g. Cro. *paralionim*, i.e. names of the coasts, the coastal strip of land (from Gr. *παράλια paralia* “coast”), Cro. *akronim* as

¹⁰ Original text: “Одной из причин, вызывающей терминологическое многообразие ономастики, является специфика самого ономастического знания, направленного – особенно в последнее время – на обнаружение новых разрядов собственных имен и на их описание. Такое описание нуждается в этикетировании объектов, в необходимом разграничении их на уровне метаязыка, которое стремится быть все более дробным”.

¹¹ In the field of urbanonymic terminology, see also Razumov and Goráev (2019).

the name of a rocky protrusion in the sea (from Gr. ἀκρα *acra* “rocky protrusion”), Cro. *hormonim* as a port name (from Gr. ὄρμος *hòrmos* “port, harbour”), Cro. *bentonym* as a sea depth name (Gr. βένθος *bénthos benthos* “depth”), Cro. *edaphonym* as sea bottom, sea bottom soil (Gr. ἔδᾶφος *edafos* “bottom, submarine soil”), etc.

One of the unsuccessful and even harmful works pretending to be an analysis of the Croatian system ONTERM, which appears very promising by its title, is an article by Siniša Vuković (2007) *Onomastička thermonologija. Inventar termina i stratifikacija onomastike kao prilog teoriji imenoslovlja u cjelini*. The author, with excessive carelessness and mixing the scope of the terms *proprium* and *appellativum*, introduces terms such as Cro. *ichtionim*, *ornitonim*, *entomonim*, etc. as the names of fish, birds, insects, etc., respectively. Such a proposal cannot be accepted for the simple reason that the names of species of living organisms are not proper names. The onomasticians currently working on the Croatian ONTERM, Anđela Frančić and Ankica Čilaš Šimpraga, draw attention to this issue (cf. Frančić and Čilaš Šimpraga, 2019). More information on some past and present concepts of ONTERM in Croatian onomastics is included in the above-mentioned publication, together with the proposal to include ONTERM in the project of Croatian specialized terminology *Struna – Hrvatsko Strukovno Nazivije* (<http://struna.ihjj.hr/>, access: 27.03.2019).

SLOVAK WORKS AND CONCEPTS

It is difficult to imagine today’s ONTERM presentation without the tools of electronic exhibition via the Internet. ONTERM digitalisation is currently taking place in many countries and onomastic centres. One such project in the working phase is the development of the Slovak ONTERM within the corpus of the Slovak scientific and specialist terminology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences SAV (*Slovenská terminologická databáza*, https://terminologickyportal.sk/wiki/O_projekte, access: 27.03.2019). The description of a single headword in the database, apart from the mere indication of the term and its definition, will also include a reference to hyperonyms and synonyms, etymology, equivalents in other languages, examples in the form of proper names, where the term refers to them, bibliography and comments. The work on individual ONTERM divisions is divided among the members of the Slovak Onomastic Commission. The project also has an international dimension (cf. Harvalík and Valentová, 2018, pp. 57–60).¹²

¹² For more on the historical development of the Slovakian ONTERM see Majtán (1976, 1979) and Valentová (2017).

Pavol Odaloš is in favour of a systematic approach to ONTERM in the Slovak (and more broadly Slavic) area. The scientist positions his theory in certain opposition to the already undertaken corpus work on the Slovak ONTERM. He draws attention to the “system of creating terms in the onomastic terminology system” (Odaloš, 2019, p. 56), with the explanation:

A systemic nature is understood as promoting system creation; in reality it results in regularity of term creation provided by using selected elements in the second part of the given term [...], the way onym as a term is created [...], origin of the term parts [...], term form [...] and the ways their subordination is expressed in the system of terms (Odaloš, 2019, p. 56; cf. Odaloš 2017; translated into English by Marianna Bachledová)¹³.

This kind of systematic approach can be seen in the many existing concepts of specific sections of the Slovak ONTERM, which naturally radiate into the Czech and other Slavic areas. This applies, for example, to the development of a systematic classification of chrematonyms according to the concept of Milan Majtán (1989), which is then referred to by Rudolf Šrámek and Miloslava Knappová (1996) on an international level, as well as Edward Breza (1998) on a Polish and Artur Gałkowski (2010, 2011, 2012, 2014, 2018) on a Slavic and Romance level. The classification of Majtán, apart from a number of well-structured chrematonomastic terms, led to a reflection on this area of science about the problem of “propriality” of language units, which are used for individual or serial indication of onymic objects (Majtán, 1989, p. 10). This is a term whose notion is taken up not only by onomasticians, but in any case, it goes far beyond the framework of a purely onomastic discourse, which has been observed in science since ancient times (cf. Haraj, 2011; Stalmaszczyk and Fernández Moreno, 2016).

ICOS LIST OF KEY ONOMASTIC TERMS IN SLAVIC AND EXTRA-SLAVIC CONTEXTS

ONTERM online studies in the Slavic area are linked to the project of the terminology group of ICOS International Council of Onomastic Sciences, which prepared a list of key terms in onomastics in three conference languages (English, German, French). The list is available on the ICOS website (<https://icosweb.net/drupal/terminology>, access: 28.03.2019). We are ready to translate the list with the

¹³ Original text: “Pod systémovosťou chápeme podporu profilovania systémovosti, ktorá sa realizuje ako pravidelnosť tvorenia termínov na základe používania vybraných častí v druhej časti termínu [...], spôsob vzniku termínu onymum [...], pôvod častí termínov [...], formu termínu [...] a spôsoby vyjadrenia podradenosti v sústave termínov”.

definitions of terms into other languages, including Polish, Slovak, Croatian, and Macedonian.¹⁴ One of the sample publications of this glossary is included in a bilingual (Hungarian-English) publication prepared by onomasticians from Hungary *Magyar és nemzetközi névtani terminológia. Hungarian and International Onomastic Terminology* (Bölcskei, Farkas and Slíz, 2017, pp. 101–123).¹⁵ The method of presentation of this translation can be used for similar works in other linguistic areas.¹⁶

The list of ICOS key terms was created under the direction of Milan Harvalík, who in the years 2012–2017 chaired the ICOS and simultaneously coordinated the work of the ICOS terminology group. At the moment, the list is being extended by new terms, in addition to translations into different languages. It is also envisaged to separate keywords as specific “tags” accompanying onomastic scientific texts.

It should be stressed that the list of ICOS ONTERM is the result of cooperation and compromise between a group of specialists from different language areas who have reached a consensus on basic onomastic concepts. The reference to the Slavic-onomastic tradition in approaching the ICOS terminology is, in my opinion, significant.

The commitment and direction given by Milan Harvalík in the ICOS terminology group is also reflected in the activities of the terminology sub commission of the Slavic Onomastics Commission of the International Slavist Committee.¹⁷ The work of the sub commission is linked to the corpus and terminology project of the Slovak Onomastics Commission, as well as to the solidifying project of the Polish ONTERM (*TERMON*), undertaken by the members of the Onomastic Section of the Committee on Linguistics of the Polish Academy of Sciences.

¹⁴ The Polish list of key ICOS onomastic terms is published on the following website www.onomastyka.uni.lodz.pl (Lista ICOS...).

¹⁵ The book also contains a Hungarian translation from English of the glossary of terms used in the standardisation of UNGEGN geographical names (pp. 125–176, 177–189).

¹⁶ The Polish edition of the dictionary has been prepared by the Commission for Standardisation of Geographical Names outside the Republic of Poland (STUSNG). Not all STUSNG terminology proposals should be considered relevant, especially in the perspective of tradition and current terminology and economic findings of the studies (cf. Wolnicz-Pawłowska, 2017; Bijak, 2019, pp. 49–50).

¹⁷ The assumptions of the work on ONTERM, summaries of the undertaken tasks and their effects have been presented and repeated by the Czech onomastician in many publications since the beginning of the 2000s (e.g. Harvalík, 2003, 2007, 2014, 2019; also, Harvalík and Valentová, 2018).

CZECH ONOMASTIC SCHOOL – TO APPLY THE CONCEPT OF RUDOLF ŠRÁMEK

All these undertakings are guided by the goal of developing a terminology in which basic (invariable conceptual “core” of ONTERM) and additional (formally and conceptually variable “satellites” of ONTERM) headwords will be determined, including the terms of the methodological-analytical instrumentarium according to the thematic key. Rudolf Šrámek has long been advocating for this kind of concept of ONTERM. He recalled it during the discussions triggered by the terminological issues of the XXI MiOKO International and Polish National Onomastic Conference (Kazimierz Dolny, October 4–6, 2018). The Slavic onomastic doyen also advocates the creation of a dictionary in the Slavic and Extra-Slavic areas, which would consist of an alphabetical inventory part of ONTERM¹⁸ and a part in which the terminology would correspond to their problematic subject matter:

The whole work should take the form of a dictionary divided into two basic parts: [...] alphabetic dictionary of all terms used by Slavic onomastics (onomastics in the individual Slavic countries, Slavic-oriented onomastics in non-Slavic countries). It would provide an inventory of terms or a terminological database. The dictionary should include not only exclusively onomastic terms (e.g. onomasticon), but also terms pertaining to general linguistics, which have found their place in Slavic onomastics, and their use in onomastics has been specified (*reconstruction, dissimulation, desemantisation of proprium*). [...] In the second part of the dictionary, the terms would be arranged based on their objective relations, while definitions would not be included – only minor commentaries or notes would be listed if necessary. Objective arrangement into groups (= objective fields) would have to respect certain thematisation. Thematic arrangement should reflect the current state in Slavic onomastics and its internal arrangement. [...] The overall view [of onomastics as a scholarly discipline] can be summarised as follows (the whole system can be easily extended or adjusted, and each group can be further divided) (Šrámek, 2003, p. 37–39; translated into English by Marianna Bachledová).¹⁹

¹⁸ A kind of resultant of such an inventory on the Slavic scale are indices of terms attached to various onomastic publications, e.g. *Ślowiańska onomastyka* vol. II: in Polish (568–571), Czech (571–574), Slovak (574–575), German (575–576), Russian (576–579), Ukrainian (579–585), Belarusian (586–587), Bulgarian (587–591), Macedonian (591–593), Serbian (593–596), Croatian (596–598), and Slovenian (598–602).

¹⁹ Original text: “Celé dílo by mělo mít povahu slovníku, který by měl dvě základní části: [...] Abecední slovník všech termínů, kterých slovanská onomastika (onomastika jednotlivých slovanských zemí, slavisticky orientovaná onomastika w neslovanských zemích) dnes užívá. Byl by to jako jakýsi inventarizační soupis termínů, jakási terminologická databáze. Slovník by měl obsahovat nejen termíny vysloveně onomastické (např. *onomastikon*), ale i termíny obecně lingvistické, které našly ve slovanské onomastice uplatnění a byly na onomastickou práci specifikovány (*rekonstrukce, dissimilace, desémantizace proprii*). [...] Druhá část slovníku by představovala uspořádní termínů podle věčných souvislostí a neobsahovala by definice, nýbrž jen podle potřeby malé komentáře, poznámky apod. Věčné uspořádní do skupin (= věčných polí) musí respektovat určitou tematizaci. Tematické us-

The concept of a thematic dictionary stems from the even broader perspective provided by the Czech linguist to the whole discipline of onomastics, indicating its tasks and the internal detailed division (cf. Šrámek, 1999, pp. 161–170). It is significant that the “terminology of onomastics and in onomastics” remains an integral part of it, which consists primarily of: general ONTERM problems; basic onomastic concepts; (other) terms and concepts related to onomastics theory and methodology; (other) linguistic terms taken over/applied by onomastics; ONTERM development; differences in ONTERM approaches (according to languages, schools, etc.); bibliography and organization of work on ONTERM (Šrámek 1999, p. 162; cf. Šrámek, 2008).²⁰

CONCLUSIONS

Šrámek’s multifaceted approach should be accepted, recognising that such an approach to ONTERM can fill the gap that is created in the rapidly developing science of onomastics. Its conceptual apparatus draws both from within its theoretical-analytical discourse and from the outside, i.e. from various disciplines and areas of culture, without which even its strictly linguistic orientation would not give results that are satisfactory for the objectives onomastics sets for itself in the light of the subject of its research. Different authors and teams agree with this vision, which has in mind a comprehensive elaboration of ONTERM. Apart from all the discussed topics, there are also Polish experts who express their opinions and proposals for the elaboration of ONTERM during scientific meetings, meetings of onomastic committees, and meetings of research centres and organizations that brings together interested academic circles²¹. The author of this article will devote separate research to the Polish concepts and approaches of ONTERM, as well as to onomastic and terminological issues in the non-Slavic area.

Translated into English by Marek Robak-Sobolewski

pořádání by mělo být odrazem současného stavu slovanské onomastiky a jejího vnitřního uspořádání. [...] Celkový obraz [onomastiky jako vědecké disciplíny] vypadá ve velmi stručné podobě takto (celou systematiku lze snadno rozšiřovat a upravovat a každou skupinu lze dále podrobně členit)”.

²⁰ See also Blanár (1973); Šmilauer (1976); Zgusta (1995); Odaloš (2018) for the thesis of Šrámek’s ONTERM theory.

²¹ See, among others, Taszycki (1946); Rospond (1957); Karaš (1968a; 1978); Rzetelska-Felczko (1993); Abramowicz and Dacewicz (1995); Kaleta (1998); Gałkowski (2012); Rutkowski (2012); Siwiec (2012); Wolnicz-Pawłowska (2016, 2017); Włoskowicz (2018); Bijak (2019); also in international and interdisciplinary perspective, e.g. Gałkowski (2010); Wolnicz-Pawłowska (2017).

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- Lista ICOS... – *Lista ICOS kluczowych terminów onomastycznych*. (2018). Translated and elaborated by Artur Gałkowski, Urszula Bijak. Łódź–Kraków: Grupa Terminologiczna ICOS International Council of Onomastic Sciences. [Http://onomastyka.uni.lodz.pl/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Lista-ICOS-kluczowych-termin%C3%B3w-onomastycznych.pdf](http://onomastyka.uni.lodz.pl/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Lista-ICOS-kluczowych-termin%C3%B3w-onomastycznych.pdf)
- Słowańska onomastyka – Rzetelska-Feleszko, Ewa, Cieślíkowa, Aleksandra (edited with the participation of Jerzy Duma). (2002–2003). *Słowańska onomastyka. Encyklopedia*. Vol. 1–2. Warszawa–Kraków: Towarzystwo Naukowe Warszawskie
- STUSNG – *Słownik terminów używanych przy standaryzacji nazw geograficznych*. (2014). transl. Marek Łukasik. Warszawa: Główny Urząd Geodezji i Kartografii. (Kadmon, Naftali (ed.). (2002). *Glossary of Terms for the Standardization of Geographical Names*. New York: United Nations.)
- Osnoven sistem... – Vidoeski, Božidar (ed.). (1983). *Osnoven sistem i terminologija na slovenskata onomastika. Osnovnaâ sistema i terminologija slavânskoj onomastiki. Grundsystem und Terminologie der slawischen Onomastik*. Skopje: Makedonska akademija na naukite i umetnostite. [Видоески, Божидар (ред.). (1983). *Основен систем и терминологија на словенската ономастика. Основная система и терминологија славянској ономастики. Grundsystem und Terminologie der slawischen Onomastik*. Скопје: Македонска академија на науките и уметностите.]

REFERENCES

- Abramowicz, Zofia, Dacewicz, Leonarda. (1995). Założenia słownika polskiej terminologii onomastycznej. *Onomastica*, 60, pp. 247–253.
- Aliferčyk, Taccâna Mikalaeŭna. (2017). Nekatoryâ problemy belaruskaj anamastyčnaj tэрминалогii. *Belaruskaâ lingvistyka*, 79, pp. 65–73. [Аліферчык, Таццяна Мікалаеўна. (2017). Некаторыя праблемы беларускай анамастычнай тэрміналогіі. *Беларуская лінгвістыка*, 79, с. 65–73.]
- Bach, Adolf. (1943–1956). *Deutsche Namenkunde*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Balkanski, Todor, Cankov, Kiril. (2010). *Enciklopediâ na balgarskata onomastika*. Veliko Tarnovo: Faber. [Балкански, Тодор, Цанков, Кирил. (2010). *Енциклопедия на българската ономастика*. Велико Търново: Фабер.]
- Bijak, Urszula. (2019). Polska terminologia onomastyczna. Ku harmonizacji systemu. In: Alexandra Chomová, Jaromir Krško, Iveta Valentová (eds.), *Konvergenie a divergenie v propriálnej sfére. 20. slovenská onomastická konferencia. Banská Bystrica 26.–28. júna 2017. Zbornik referátov* (pp. 44–52). Bratislava: Veda.
- Biryła, Mikalaj Vasilevič. (1993). Anamastyčnaâ tэрминалогіâ. In: Lûboŭ Adamaŭna Antanûk i inš. (eds.), *Tэрминалагiчны зборник, 87–88* (pp. 25–40). Minsk: AN Belarusi, Navuka i tэхnika. [Бірыла, Мікалай Васілевіч. (1993). Анамастычная тэрміналогія. У: Любоў Адамаўна Антанюк і інш. (рэд.), *Тэрміналагiчны зборник, 87–88* (с. 25–40). Мінск: АН Беларусі, Навука і тэхніка.]
- Blanár, Vincent. (1962). K príprave súpisu slovanskej onomastickej terminológie. *Československý terminologický časopis*, 1, pp. 278–287.
- Blanár, Vincent. (1973). Teoretické problémy onomastickej terminológie. *Makedonski jazik*, 24, pp. 51–62.
- Bölscei, Andrea, Farkas, Tamás, Slíz, Mariann (eds.). (2017). *Magyar és nemzetközi névtani terminológia. Hungarian and International Onomastic Terminology*. Uppsala–Budapest: ICOS, Society of Hungarian Linguistics. DOI:10.26546/5061110.9.
- Breza, Edward. (1998). Nazwy obiektów i instytucji związanych z nowoczesną cywilizacją (chrematonymy). In: Ewa Rzetelska-Feleszko (ed.), *Polskie nazwy własne. Encyklopedia* (pp. 343–361). Warszawa–Kraków: Wydawnictwo Instytutu Języka Polskiego PAN.

- Bučko, Dmitro Grigorovič, Tkačova, Nataliâ Vasilivna. (2012). *Slovník ukraïns'koï onomastičnoï terminologïi*. Harkiv: Ranok. [Бучко, Дмитро Григорович, Ткачова, Наталія Василівна. (2012). *Словник української ономастичної термінології*. Харків: Ранок.]
- Česnokova, Petra. (2012). *Lingvokul'turologičeskie osobennosti češskih i russkih nazvanij prazdnikov. Dissertaciâ na soiskanie učenoi stepeni kandidata filologičeskikh nauk (ms.)*. Volgograd. [Чеснокова, Петра. (2012). *Лингвокультурологіческие особенности чешских и русских названий праздников. Диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук (ms.)*. Волгоград.]
- Dorion, Henri, Poirier, Jean. (1975). *Lexique des termes utiles à l'étude des noms de lieux*. Québec: French and European Publications Inc.
- Frančić, Anđela, Čilaš Šimpraga, Ankica. (2019). Pogled u hrvatsku onomastičku terminologiju. In: Alexandra Chomová, Jaromír Krško, Iveta Valentová (eds.), *Konvergenec a divergenec v propriálnej sfére. 20. slovenská onomastická konferencia, Banská Bystrica 26.–28. júna 2017. Zborník referátov* (pp. 29–43). Bratislava: Veda. Vydavateľstvo Slovenskej akadémie vied.
- Gałkowski, Artur. (2010). Problemi di terminologia onomastica. Contributi per un dibattito. *Rivista Italiana di Onomastica RION*, 2, pp. 604–624.
- Gałkowski, Artur. (2011). *Chrematonimy w funkcji kulturowo-użytkowej. Onomastyczne studium porównawcze na materiale polskim, włoskim, francuskim*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Gałkowski, Artur. (2012). Propozycje a rozstrzygnięcia terminologiczno-pojęciowe dotyczące chrematonimii. In: Izabela Luc, Małgorzata Podgórek (eds.), *W komunikacyjnej przestrzeni nazw własnych i pospolitych. Księga jubileuszowa dedykowana Profesorowi Robertowi Mrózkowi* (pp. 187–200). Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Gałkowski, Artur. (2014). Quelques remarques sur le statut de la chrematonomastique dans les études onomastiques. *Onomastica*, 58, pp. 79–88.
- Gałkowski, Artur. (2018). Definicja i zakres chrematonimii. *Folia onomastica Croatica*, 27, pp. 1–14.
- Gałkowski, Artur. (2019). Ricordo di Teodolius Witkowski (1930–2018). *Rivista Italiana di Onomastica*, 24(1), pp. 521–522.
- Haraj, Igor. (2011). *Vlastné meno w myslení antiky a stredoveku*. Martin: Matica slovenská.
- Harvalík, Milan. (2003). K současnému stavu slovanské onomastické terminologie. In: Maria Biolik (ed.), *Metodologia badań onomastycznych* (pp. 43–49). Olsztyn: Ośrodek Badań Naukowych im. Wojciecha Kętrzyńskiego w Olsztynie.
- Harvalík, Milan. (2007). K voprosu o sovremennoj onomastičeskoj terminologii. *Voprosy onomastiki*, 4, pp. 5–13. [Harvalík, Milan. (2007). K voprosu o sovremennoj onomastičeskoj terminologii. *Voprosy onomastiki*, 4, s. 5–13.]
- Harvalík, Milan. (2014). Towards a Common Onomastic Terminology? The Next Step. In: Joan Tort i Donada, Montserrat Montagut i Montagut (eds.), *Els noms en la vida quotidiana. Actes del XXIV Congrés Internacional d'ICOS sobre Ciències Onomàstiques. Names in daily life. Proceedings of the XXIV ICOS International Congress of Onomastic Sciences. Annex. Secció I* (pp. 21–25). Barcelona: Generalitat de Catalunya – Departament de Cultura. DOI:10.2436/15.8040.01.4.
- Harvalík, Milan. (2019). Mezinárodní a slovanská onomastická terminologie: Reflexe, realita a vize. In: Alexandra Chomová, Jaromír Krško, Iveta Valentová (eds.), *Konvergenec a divergenec v propriálnej sfére. 20. slovenská onomastická konferencia, Banská Bystrica 26.–28. júna 2017. Zborník referátov* (pp. 23–28). Bratislava: Veda. Vydavateľstvo Slovenskej akadémie vied.
- Harvalík, Milan, Valentová, Iveta. (2018). The Current State and Perspectives of Onomastic Terminology. *Onomastica Uralica*, 14, pp. 53–63.
- Kaleta, Zofia. (1998). Kierunki i metodologia badań. Terminologia. In: Ewa Rzetelska-Feleszko (ed.), *Polskie nazwy własne. Encyklopedia* (pp. 45–81). Warszawa–Kraków: Towarzystwo Naukowe Warszawskie, Instytut Języka Polskiego PAN.

- Karaś, Mieczysław. (1959). Międzynarodowa Komisja Onomastyczna w Krakowie. *Onomastica*, 5(2), pp. 578–580.
- Karaś, Mieczysław. (1963). II Międzynarodowa Slawistyczna Konferencja Onomastyczna w Berlinie 17–20 X 1961. *Onomastica*, 8, pp. 401–407.
- Karaś, Mieczysław. (1968a). W sprawie polskiej terminologii onomastycznej. *Onomastica*, 13, pp. 352–360.
- Karaś, Mieczysław. (1968b). Słowiańska terminologia w zakresie obiektów zamieszkałych. *Zpravodaj Mistopisné komise ČSAV*, 9, pp. 133–141.
- Karaś, Mieczysław. (1975). Międzynarodowy Komitet Slawistów – Komisja Onomastyczna – Sprawozdanie. *Onomastica*, 20, pp. 324–327.
- Karaś, Mieczysław. (1978). O niektórych problemach onomastyki polskiej. *Onomastica*, 23, pp. 7–23.
- Kazimirova, Irina Andreevna. (2011). Onomastična terminosistema A. O. Bilec'kogo v súčasnej terminografii. In: Irina Svätoslavivna Gnatúk (ed.), *Ukraïns'ka leksikografiâ v zagal'noslov'âns'komu konteksti: teoriâ, praktika, tipologiâ: Larisi Grigorivni Skripnik* (pp. 406–411). Kii'v: Vidavničij dim Dmitra Burago. [Казимиrowa, Ирина Андреевна. (2011). Ономастична терміносистема А. О. Білецького в сучасній термінографії. In: Ирина Святославівна Гнатюк (ред.), *Українська лексикографія в загальнослов'янському контексті: теорія, практика, типологія: Лариси Григорівни Скрипник* (с. 406–411). Київ: Видавничий дім Дмитра Бураго.]
- Kazimirova, Irina Andreevna. (2013a). Metaâzyk ukraïnskoj onomastiki v kontekste slavânskoj tradicii. *Vestnik Čelâbinskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*, 31(322), pp. 40–42. [Казимиrowa, Ирина Андреевна. (2013a). Метаязык украинской ономастики в контексте славянской традиции. *Вестник Челябинского государственного университета*, 31(322), с. 40–42.]
- Kazimirova, Irina Andreevna. (2013b). Onomastična terminologiâ ukraïns'koï movi v aspekti problemi garmonizaciï. *Mova i kul'tura*, 16(2), pp. 186–193. [Казимиrowa, Ирина Андреевна. (2013b). Ономастична термінологія української мови в аспекті проблеми гармонізації. *Мова і культура*, 16(2), с. 186–193.]
- Lista ICOS kluczowych terminów onomastycznych. (2018). Translated and elaborated by Artur Gałkowski, Urszula Bijak. Łódź–Kraków: Grupa Terminologiczna ICOS International Council of Onomastic Sciences. <http://onomastyka.uni.lodz.pl/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Lista-ICOS-kluczowych-termin%C3%B3w-onomastycznych.pdf>
- Madieva, Gul'mira Baňžanovna, Suprun, Vasilij Ivanovič. (2017). Sistema sovremennoj rusckoj urbanonimičeskoj terminologii. *Voprosy onomastiki*, 14(2), pp. 115–125. DOI: 10.15826/vopr_onom.2017.14.2.014. [Мадиева, Гульмира Баянжановна, Супрун, Василий Иванович. (2017). Система современной русской урбанонимической терминологии. *Вопросы ономастики*, 14(2), с. 115–125. DOI: 10.15826/vopr_onom.2017.14.2.014.]
- Majtán, Milan. (1976). Základná slovenská toponomastická terminológia. In: Michal Blichá, Milan Majtán (eds.), *V. zasadanie Medzinárodnej komisie pre slovanskú onomastiku a V. slovenská onomastická konferencia (Prešov 3.–7. mája 1972). Zborník materiálov* (pp. 113–116). Bratislava: Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo.
- Majtán, Milan. (1979). Onomastické termíny podľa objektov pomenúvaných menami. *Kultúra slova*, 13, pp. 153–159.
- Majtán, Milan. (1989). Klasifikácia chrématonymie. In: Rudolf Šrámek, Ludvík Kuba (eds.), *Chrématonyma z hlediska teorie a praxe* (pp. 7–13). Brno: Onomastická komise ČSAV.
- Miodunka, Władysław. (1973). Konferencja Terminologiczna Komisji Onomastycznej Międzynarodowego Komitetu Slawistów. *Onomastica*, 18, pp. 372–375.
- Nimčuk, Vasil' Vasil'ovič. (1966). Ukraïns'ka onomastična terminologiâ (projekt). In: *Povido mlennâ Ukraïns'koï onomastičnoï komisiï. Vip. 1* (pp. 24–43). Kii'v: Naukova dumka. [Німчук, Василь Васильович. (1966). Українська ономастична термінологія (проект). У: *Повідомлення Української ономастичної комісії. Вип. 1* (с. 24–43). Київ: Наукова думка.]

- Nimčuk, Vasil' Vasil'ovič. (1968). Zmîni j dopovnennâ v spisku onomastičnih terminiv. In: *Povidomlennâ Ukraïns'koï onomastičnoï komisii. Vip. 7* (pp. 60–64). Kiïv: Naukova dumka. [Німчук, Василь Васильович. (1968). Зміни й доповнення в списку ономастичних термінів. У: *Повідомлення Української ономастичної комісії. Вип. 7* (с. 60–64). Київ: Наукова думка.]
- Odaloš, Pavol. (2017). K vývinu, vzniku a ďalšiemu profilovaniu slovenskej onomastickej terminológie. In: Renata Przybylska, Władysław Śliwiński (eds.), *Terminologia specjalistyczna w teorii i praktyce językoznawców słowiańskich* (pp. 277–293). Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Odaloš, Pavol. (2018). Tradícia a dynamika onomastickej terminológie a terminológia onomastických škôl. In: Urszula Bijak, Halszka Górný, Małgorzata Magda-Czekaj (eds.), *Onomastyka – neohumanistyka – nauki społeczne* (pp. 379–394). Kraków: Instytut Języka Polskiego PAN.
- Odaloš, Pavol. (2019). Sústava slovenskej onomastickej terminológie (vznik, existencia, variantné možnosti vývoja a štandardizácie). In: Alexandra Chomová, Jaromír Krško, Iveta Valentová (eds.), *Konvergenie a divergenciev propriálnej sfére. 20. slovenská onomastická konferencia. Banská Bystrica 26.–28. júna 2017. Zborník referátov* (pp. 53–70). Bratislava: Veda. Vydavateľstvo Slovenskej akadémie vied.
- Olivová-Nezbedová, Libuše. (1998). K hierarchii onomastických terminů podle objektů pojmenovaných vlastními jmény. *Acta onomastica*, 39, pp. 46–54.
- Petr, Jan. (1969). Lužickosrbská onomastická terminologie. *Zpravodaj Místopisné komise ČSAV*, 10, pp. 538–552.
- Podol'skaâ, Natal'â Vladimirovna, Superanskaâ, Aleksânda Vasil'evna. (1978, 1988). *Slovar' ruskoy onomastičeskoj terminologii*. Moskva: Nauka. [Подольская, Наталья Владимировна, Суперанская, Александра Васильевна. (1978, 1988). *Словарь русской ономастической терминологии*. Москва: Наука.]
- Putanec, Valentin. (1976). Esej o jezičnom znaku i onomastici te o antroponimiji u Hrvata. In: Valentin Putanec, Petar Šimunović (eds.), *Leksik prezimena Socijalističke Republike Hrvatske* (pp. V–XIV). Zagreb: Institut za jezik – Nakladni zavod Matice hrvatske.
- Razumov, Roman Viktorovič, Gorâev, Sergej Olegovič. (2019). Urbanonimičeskaâ terminologiâ: sistemy i problemy. *Naučnyj dialog*, 9, pp. 130–145. [Разумов, Роман Викторович, Горяев, Сергей Олегович. (2019). Урбанонимическая терминология: системы и проблемы. *Научный диалог*, 9, с. 130–145.]
- Rospond, Stanisław. (1956a). Onomastyka słowiańska. Część I: Osiągnięcia badawcze. *Onomastica*, 2, pp. 217–248.
- Rospond, Stanisław. (1956b). Onomastyka słowiańska. Część II: Postulaty metodologiczne. *Onomastica*, 3(1), pp. 93–115.
- Rospond, Stanisław. (1957). *Klasyfikacja strukturalno-gramatyczna słowiańskich nazw geograficznych*. Wrocław: PWN.
- Rutkowski, Mariusz. (2012). Onomastyka a metaonomastyka. In: Izabela Łuc, Małgorzata Podgórek (eds.), *W komunikacyjnej przestrzeni nazw własnych i pospolitych. Księga jubileuszowa dedykowana Profesorowi Robertowi Mrózkowi* (pp. 317–323). Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Rzetelska-Feleszko, Ewa, Cieślíkowa, Aleksandra (edited with the participation of Jerzy Duma). (2002–2003). *Słowiańska onomastyka. Encyklopedia*. Vol. 1–2. Warszawa–Kraków: Towarzystwo Naukowe Warszawskie.
- Rzetelska-Feleszko, Ewa. (1993). Polska terminologia onomastyczna. Problematyka. *Zeszyty Naukowe UG. Prace Językoznawcze*, 17–18, pp. 217–222.
- Siwiec, Adam. (2012). Klasyfikacja onomastyczna i jej podstawy terminologiczne na przykładzie nazw obiektów handlowych. In: Izabela Łuc, Małgorzata Podgórek (eds.), *W komunikacyjnej przestrzeni*

- nazw własnych i pospolitych. *Księga jubileuszowa dedykowana Profesorowi Robertowi Mrózkowi* (pp. 325–336). Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Škračić, Vladimir. (2011). *Toponomastička početnica. Osnovni pojmovi i metoda terenskih istraživanja*. Zadar: Sveučilište u Zadru.
- Słownik terminów używanych przy standaryzacji nazw geograficznych*. (2014). Transl. Marek Łukasik. Warszawa: Główny Urząd Geodezji i Kartografii. (Kadmon, Naftali (ed.). (2002). *Glossary of Terms for the Standardization of Geographical Names*. New York: United Nations).
- Šmilauer, Vladimír. (1960). Soustava českých místních jmen. In: Jan Svoboda, Vladimír Šmilauer et al. (eds.), *Místní jména v Čechách. Díl 5* (pp. 521–670). Praha: Československá akademie věd.
- Šmilauer, Vladimír. (1976). Třídění vlastních jmen (teze). In: Michal Blichá, Milan Majtán (eds.), *V. zasadanie Medzinárodnej komisie pre slovanskú onomastiku a V. slovenská onomastická konferencia (Prešov 3.–7. mája 1972)*. Zborník materiálov (pp. 109–111). Bratislava: Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo.
- Smith, Elsdon C. (1967). *Treasury of Name Lore: Sketches and Observations on the Names We Bear*. New York–Evanston–London: Harper & Row.
- Stalmaszczyk, Piotr, Fernández Moreno, Luis (eds.). (2016). *Philosophical Approaches to Proper Names*. Frankfurt am Main–Berlin–Bern–Bruxelles–New York–Oxford–Wien: Peter Lang.
- Suprun, Vasilij Ivanovič. (2011). Razmyšleniá nad onomastičeskou terminologiej. *Izvestiá Volgogradskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogičeskogo universiteta. Serii Pedagogičeskie nauki, Filologičeskie nauki, Social'no-ekonomičeskie nauki i iskusstvo*, 8(62), pp. 133–138. [Супрун, Василий Иванович. (2011). Размышления над ономастической терминологией. *Известия Волгоградского государственного педагогического университета. Серии Педагогические науки, Филологические науки, Социально-экономические науки и искусство*, 8(62), с. 133–138.]
- Svoboda, Jan. (1960). K slovanské onomastické terminologii. *Zpravodaj Mistopisné komise ČSAV*, 1, pp. 273–284 (under the same title also in (1963). *Slawische Namenforschung* (pp. 261–273). Berlin: Akademie–Verlag).
- Svoboda, Jan. (1961). Zpráva ze subkomise pro onomastickou terminologii. *Zpravodaj Mistopisné komise ČSAV*, 2, pp. 322–324.
- Svoboda, Jan, Šmilauer, Vladimír, Olivová-Nezbedová, Libuše, Oliva, Karel, Witkowski, Teodolius. (1973). Základní soustava a terminologie slovanské onomastiky. Grundsystem und Terminologie der slawischen Onomastik. *Zpravodaj Mistopisné komise ČSAV*, 14, pp. 1–280.
- Šrámek, Rudolf. (1999). *Úvod do obecné onomastiky*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.
- Šrámek, Rudolf. (2003). Tematizace slovanske onomastické terminologie. In: Maria Biolik (ed.), *Metodologia badań onomastycznych* (pp. 31–42). Olsztyn: Ośrodek Badań Naukowych im. Wojciecha Kętrzyńskiego w Olsztynie.
- Šrámek, Rudolf. (2008). K onomastické terminologii, zvláště slovanské (Termíny onymický kontext a onymické pole). *Acta onomastica*, 49(1), pp. 323–333.
- Šrámek, Rudolf, Knappová, Miloslava. (1996). Namen von Sachen (Chrematonymie) I, II. In: Ernst Eichler et al. (eds.), *Namenforschung. Name Studies. Les noms propres. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Onomastik. An International Handbook of Onomastics. Manuel international d'onomastique*. (pp. 1562–1567, 1567–1572). Vol. II. Berlin–New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Taszycki, Witold. (1946). *Słowańskie nazwy miejscowe. (Ustalenie podziału)*. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, Skł. gł. Księgarnia Gebethnera i Wolffa.
- Urbańczyk, Stanisław. (1986). Osnowen sistem i terminologija na slowenskata onomastika. Osnownaja sistemi i tierminologija slawianskoj onomastiki. Grundsystem und Terminologie der slawischen Onomastik. Red. B. Widojeski i komitet. Makedonska Akademija na Naukite i Umetnostite, Skopje 1983, p. 412. *Onomastica*, 31, pp. 195–200.
- Valentová, Iveta. (2017). Slovenská onomastická terminológia. In: Predrag Piper, Vladan Jovnović (eds.), *Slovenska terminologija danas* (pp. 277–288). Beograd: SANU. [Valentová, Iveta. (2017).

- Slovenská onomastická terminológia. В: Предраг Пипер, Владан Јовновић (ред.), *Словенска терминологија данас* (с. 277–288). Београд: САНУ.]
- Vasil'eva, Nataliâ Vladimirovna. (1998). Onymisch oder propriâl? Zu Internationalismen in der onomastischen Terminologie. *Namenkundliche Informationen*, 74, pp. 53–61.
- Vasil'eva, Nataliâ Vladimirovna. (2012). Tradicionnoe i novoe v ruskoj toponimičeskoj terminologii. In: Artur Gałkowski, Renata Gliwa (eds.), *Mikrotoponimia i makrotoponimia. Problematyka wstępna. Microtoponymy and Macrotoponymy. Preliminary Probleme* (pp. 117–126). Łódź: WUŁ. [Васильева, Наталия Владимировна. (2012). Традиционное и новое в русской топонимической терминологии. In: Artur Gałkowski, Renata Gliwa (eds.), *Mikrotoponimia i makrotoponimia. Problematyka wstępna. Microtoponymy and Macrotoponymy. Preliminary Probleme* (pp. 117–126). Łódź: WUŁ.]
- Vasil'eva, Nataliâ Vladimirovna. (2014). O koordinirovanii onomastičeskoj terminologii. *Vestnik Nižegorodskogo universiteta im. N.I. Lobačevskogo*, 2(1), pp. 373–377. <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/v/o-koordinirovanii-onomasticheskoj-terminologii> [Васильева, Наталия Владимировна. (2014). О координировании ономастической терминологии. *Вестник Нижегородского университета им. Н.И. Лобачевского*, 2(1), с. 373–377.]
- Videoski, Božidar (ed.). (1983). *Osnoven sistem i terminologija na slovenskata onomastika. Osnovnaâ sistema i terminologija slavânskoj onomastiki. Grundsystem und Terminologie der slawischen Onomastik*. Скопје: Македонска академија на науките и уметностите. [Видоески, Божидар (ред.). (1983). *Основен систем и терминологија на словенската ономастика. Основна система и терминологија славјанској ономастики. Grundsystem und Terminologie der slawischen Onomastik*. Скопје: Македонска академија на науките и уметностите.]
- Vuković, Siniša. (2007). Onomastička terminologija. Inventar termina i stratifikacija onomastike kao prilog teoriji imenoslovlja u cjelini. *Čakavska rič*, 35(1), pp. 139–185.
- Witkowski, Teodolius. (1964). *Grundbegriffe der Namenskunde*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Witkowski, Teodolius. (1966). Aus der Tätigkeit der Arbeitsgruppe für Namenforschung am Institut für Slawistik der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin im Jahre 1964. *Onomastica*, 11, pp. 397–401.
- Włoskiewicz, Wojciech. (2018). O pojęciach, systemach pojęciowych i terminologii onomastycznej. *Onomastica*, 62, pp. 73–98.
- Wolnicz-Pawłowska, Ewa. (2016). Terminologia onomastyczna w tradycji badawczej i praktyce normalizacyjnej. *Onomastica*, 60, pp. 37–46.
- Wolnicz-Pawłowska, Ewa. (2017). Problemy terminologiczne w działalności UNGEGN. In: Predrag Piper, Vladan Jovnović (eds.), *Slovenska terminologija danas* (pp. 277–288). Београд: САНУ. [Wolnicz-Pawłowska, Ewa. (2017). Problemy terminologiczne w działalności UNGEGN. В: Предраг Пипер, Владан Јовновић (ред.), *Словенска терминологија данас* (с. 277–288). Београд: САНУ.]
- Zgusta, Ladislav. (1995). Systematická terminologie onomastiky. *Acta onomastica*, 36, pp. 262–272.

ABSTRACT

The paper presents a review of the development of works in the Slavic area on onomastic terminology which constitute an integral part of Slavic onomastic studies on a local and global scale. The research method includes comparative analyses and assessment of the impact of historical and present Slavic onomastic terminology. The question of the study underlines the position that Slavic (Czech, Slovak, Polish, Russian, Balkan) onomasticians, who in many cases are also active in non-Slavic areas, such as German-speaking countries, have made an important contribution to the development of international concepts of onomastic terminology. The research material constitutes a proposal for

terminological approaches of selected onomastic schools and teams, active on a national, but also international scale, starting from the 1960s. In the 1970s, the former and current Czech-Slovakian onomastic school, the activities of the terminology subcommittee of the Onomastic Slavic Commission, the Russian onomastic school, the Croatian onomastic school, and many others were established. A critical look at some concepts and the need to merge the terminological and conceptual apparatus allows us to justify a renewed attempt to develop Slavic onomastic terminology. The result of the study is an assessment of the rank and impact of the most important achievements of individual schools and teams, so far published or designed in the form of inventory and system glossaries and theoretical descriptions. Nowadays, thematic and corpus concepts of onomastic terminology are promoted. Works according to this methodological key are carried out in Slovakia and in Poland. The paper is the first part of a wider study on the development of international works on onomastic terminology. The work is a contribution to the development of the theory of proper names.

Keywords: onomastic terminology, Slavic onomastic terminology, Slavic onomastics, the theory of proper names

ABSTRAKT

Celem artykułu jest przegląd prac w obszarze słowiańskim na temat terminologii onomastycznej, które stanowią integralną część badań onomastyki słowiańskiej w skali lokalnej i globalnej. Metoda badania uwzględnia zestawienie i skonfrontowanie oraz ocenę wpływu najważniejszych ujęć historycznych i współczesnych słowiańskiej terminologii onomastycznej. Pytanie badawcze podkreśla stanowisko, że ważny wkład w rozwój międzynarodowych koncepcji terminologii onomastycznej wnieśli onomaści słowiańscy (czescy, słowaccy, polscy, rosyjscy, bałkańscy), w wielu przypadkach aktywni także na obszarach niesłowiańskich, takich jak np. kraje niemieckojęzyczne. Materiał badawczy stanowią propozycje ujęć terminologicznych wybranych szkół i zespołów onomastycznych, aktywnych w skali krajowej, ale jednocześnie międzynarodowej, począwszy od lat 60. XX wieku, w tym przede wszystkim: dawnej i obecnej czesko-słowackiej szkoły onomastycznej, podkomisji terminologicznej Komisji Onomastyki Słowiańskiej, rosyjskiej szkoły onomastycznej, onomastów chorwackich. Krytyczne spojrzenie na niektóre koncepcje oraz potrzeba scalenia aparatu terminologiczno-pojęciowego pozwalają dziś uzasadnić ponowne próby opracowania słowiańskiej terminologii onomastycznej. Wynikiem badania jest ocena rangi i wpływu najważniejszych osiągnięć poszczególnych szkół i zespołów, dotąd publikowanych lub projektowanych w postaci glosariuszy inwentaryzacyjnych i systemowych oraz opisów teoretycznych. We wnioskach podkreślono, że obecnie promowane są koncepcje tematyczne i korpusowe terminologii onomastycznej. Prace według tego metodologicznego klucza prowadzone są na Słowacji i w Polsce. Artykuł jest pierwszą częścią szerszego studium na temat rozwoju międzynarodowej terminologii onomastycznej. Praca jest wkładem w rozwój teorii nazw własnych.

Słowa kluczowe: terminologia onomastyczna, słowiańska terminologia onomastyczna, onomastyka słowiańska, teoria nazw własnych