

УДК 811.161.2'373.2

doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.30970/vpl.2019.71.10386>

HOW TO STUDY MICROTOPYNYM?

Natalia YANITSKA-FALATIUK

PhD in Philology
e-mail: yanitska1987@gmail.com

The paper considers some possible perspectives of microtoponyms investigation, which offer an opportunity to disclose their linguistic, cultural, ethnopsychological, and social potential. The research also sought to get closer to the interdisciplinary study of microtoponyms, bridging the gap between onomastics and ethnology, culturology, psychology, sociology, etc.

Keywords: microtoponym, perspective, system-structural paradigm, discourse, ethnopsychological aspect, tourist discourse.

Problem set. Microtoponyms (flurnamen, place names) are the ubiquitous proper names of small-scale geospace elements. They arise in the process of conscious nomination, the purpose of which is the objects distinguishing, the allocation of functionally significant places, and the like. Their participation in the communicative process is necessary and irreplaceable because they help to avoid ambiguity and contribute to language economy [20: 356].

The versatility and authenticity of the database of more than 20,000 microtoponymic units, collected from 620 settlements of the central and eastern districts of Lviv region, jointly promote different aspects of research to identify the lingual and extra-lingual knowledge synthesized in these names. Therefore, **this study is aimed at** a brief outlining of the current and potential perspectives of microtoponymy analysis for the best decoding of knowledge embedded in their internal form.

Recent research and publications review. Ukrainian onomasts repeatedly dealt with the methods, viewpoints, and problems of the proper names exploration. Among them D. Buchko [13], S. Verbych [3], Yu. Karpenko [7], V. Luchyk [10] (studies in general onomastics), O. Karpenko [8] (cognitive onomastics), L. Beley [2], N. Kolesnyk [11] (literary and folklore onomastics), etc. However, microtoponyms are the specific proper names, unique in their semantic content, structure, derivational peculiarities, and functioning. Unlike other onyms, microtoponyms are dynamic, become archaic rapidly, and at the same time are almost not documented [1; 5; 12]. Therefore, it is necessary to develop an exclusive theoretical basis designed specifically for microtoponymic materials collection and subsequent complex multidimensional analysis. However, there is no systematic theoretical and methodological plan for describing microtoponyms. This investigation is **relevant** in an attempt to fill in some theoretical gap in research of microtoponymic units (on the example of microtoponymy of the central and eastern districts of Lviv region).

Material presentation. Structural-semantic study of the microtoponymic system focuses on the thing (*per se*), word, not on the subject generating it. It provides a lexical-semantic investigation of the underlying stems, elucidation of the derivational features, morphological analysis, etc. Most of the studies devoted to consideration of

microtoponymic units in Ukrainian onomastics were carried out precisely in this perspective. After all, the semantics of motivating lexemes and the derivational structure of microtoponyms allows revealing their essence. Semantics reflects individual properties of onyms; word formation is primarily common [9: 43].

Investigations on the semantic structure of microtoponyms prove that these units “contribute to the spatial and geographical language” [26: 266]. The study of the meaningful microtoponymic stems makes it possible to extract large lexico-thematic classes, which are often not found in dictionaries. These are

1) generic landscape terms (*Кимна//Купра* ‘slight elevation on the surface’ hill Bachiv Prm¹, *Куява//Куява* ‘steep hill’ wood Dibrivky Pst, *Льонд//Lond* ‘bank, land’ hump Sokilnyky Pst, *Макітра//Макітра* ‘wooded mountain’ Vilhovets Prm);

2) diminutive forms of names (*Міхасева// Міхасева* valley Novosilka Prm, *Павлунова Долина//Pavlynova Dolyna* valley Brodsky Mkl, *Марціна Гура//Martsyna Gura* hump Podorozhnie Zhdch);

3) surnames (*Гожів//Gozhiv* shrubbery Ustia Mkl);

4) nicknames (*Шкрабіїв Яр//Shkrabiiv Yar* ravine Bachiv Prm);

5) patterns of traditional adjectonyms (*Боринецький Ліс//Borynetskyi Lis* tract located next to the village Borynychy Zhdch), and the like.

Furthermore, this material is essential not only for onomastics or dialectology, but also for Ukrainian linguistics in general, e. g. for normalization of large number of ‘crank’ rules. For instance, attributes creation from the place names using the existing word-building laws is often artificial. Microtoponyms demonstrate the objective regularities of adjective creation due to their formation through traditional usage. Compare:

Зубрецький Ліс//Zubretskyi Lis (wood Solonka Pst) and *Зубрівський//Zubrivskyi* (wood Zhyrivka Zhdch). These microtoponyms are derived from a place name *Зубра//Zubra*.

Білецький Ліс//Biletskyi Lis (1) wood located next to the village Bilche Mkl, 2) wood located next to the village Bile Prm, 3) wood located next to the village Bilka Prm). In this sample, three individual microtoponyms-homonyms originated from different names of settlements.

Microtoponyms reflect the functioning of word-formation principles of lively speaking, in which clarity, transparency, simplicity in pronunciation (taking into account the law of language economy) is more important than any regularities. Therefore, the derivational ‘deflections’ occurring in the microtoponymic system are enshrined by the usage. They should not be questioned. After all, it is the *usus* (custom) that is before the establishment of the norm.

The morphological analysis of microtoponyms within the system-structural paradigm also demonstrates interesting results: there is a number of units with a verb component that are parts of the predicative center. It is a unique phenomenon for proper names, which goes beyond the limits of any lexicographical canons. For example, *Де Літак Впав// De Litak Vpov* ‘where the plane fell down’ field Molodynche Zhdch, *Де сі Анничка Втопила* ‘where Annychka drowned’ street Uhilnya Str. So the issue then: why do such names appear in microtoponymic space? However, the system-structural analysis of any linguistic phenomenon provides an answer to question *what the name is*, and not *why it is*. It is a planimetric reading only; it does not reflect the dynamic and dialectical

¹ *Кимна//Купра* is a microtoponym; ‘slight elevation on the surface’ – the semantics of its motivational base; *hill* – the geographical object (referent); *Bachiv Prm* – the settlement where microtoponym is attested.

connections of microtoponyms with a speaker and the nature that surrounds him. To understand cause-and-effect relationships, implications in microtoponymy, a researcher need to place a person into the center of cognition. Hence, the recipient will understand that onyms are not just depersonalized names of static objects with the indication of their principal traits according to various criteria. Microtoponyms are dynamic. Their occurrence is often a result of certain events. That is, static, at first sight, object or location implies an action, and, therefore, each name must be studied discursively.

The *functional-discursive aspect* of the study of microtoponyms provides the integration of proper names into the metaspace of discourse. From this point of view, microtoponyms are considered to be the elements of the communicative actions of communicants associated with the cognition, understanding, and presentation of the world by a speaker and the interpretation of the sender's (addresser's) linguistic picture of the world by the listener (addressee). Such a study not only makes it clear that microtoponyms are personalized but also shows their 'embeddedness' into life and the communicative activities of its bearers. They arise from discourse ('live' lingual space), function in it, and are tools of it. Discourse rejects them or force them out by replacing with other units. Discourse puts on them a lot of connotations and reflections of the world. Discourse modifies them beyond recognition and the inability to decode the meaning of the motivational bases.

Taking into consideration these findings is obligatory since the available today audiovisual facilities make it possible to describe the linguistic material, as well as documenting it directly in the process of generating it by a speaker. Therefore, the choice of informant and methods of place names collecting is a significant issue. At this stage, achievements of *sociolinguistics* are indispensable: sociolinguistics provides the connection of a word, a speaker and a recipient (informant). Thus, we compiled a set of microtoponyms of central and eastern districts of Lviv region by combining several sociolinguistic methods (questioning, interviewing, etc.). The informants were natives, who could claim the neighborhood as their 'natural habitat' [15: 269]. Age, profession, and level of education were not decisive. After all, the diversity of these social parameters later allowed observing the verbal 'behavior' of microtoponyms in discourse. For example, we noticed that people of younger and middle age tend to switch the language code – from dialect speech into literary language. Therefore, there are several variants of the same proper name: *За Рікою//За Рікою – За Ріков//За Ріков* 'behind the river'. In the discourse-interview, the speaker switched from one to another variant depending on the informant's behavior [18: 445].

Through the prism of discourse, the pragmatic zone of microtoponyms, which includes the realization of their emotive function and associative background is necessary to be considered. Such a study should take into account the cognitive component implying the disclosure of mental processes that accompany the emergence and functioning of microtoponymic units. It is also essential to consider microtoponyms as means of fundamental concepts verbalizing in the mental sphere of the ethnos, society, and personality. *Ethnolinguistic analysis* supports in explicating these meaningful ideas. The origins of ethnolinguistics reach V. von Humboldt's works, who called the language the involuntary emanation of a nation's spirit, the main manifestation of human spiritual power [22: 24]. Therefore, the ethnolinguistic paradigm involves the analysis of the proper names of geographical micro-objects as a fragment of the linguistic picture of the world, which is the result of the syncretic process of nomination through cognition of the world, its logical, sensual, and aesthetic perception. The national language is a kind of lingual modeling of the

culture, that is, the lingual and objective reality are isomorphic. Therefore, we have every reason to look for the social phenomena similarly modeled both in the structure of society and in language [4: 68]. Microtoponymic units better than other classes of onyms express human logical categories of thinking, the centuries-old experience of each nation, its mentality, axiological system, spiritual, practical guidelines, and the like. For example, microtoponyms of central and eastern districts of Lviv region

1) contain knowledge concerning the natural and geographical conditions of the ethnos formation (*Вукогора/Vysohora* ‘high mountain’ part of the village Zhuravnyky Pst);

2) reflect the agricultural type of Ukrainian mentality (*Рубань/Ruban* ‘logging’ wood Tatoryniv Hrd; *Теребіж/Terebizh* ‘a place cleaned of shrubs’ field Bukavyna Zhdch);

3) demonstrate the characteristics of the development of the crafts in Ukraine (*Рудка/Rudka* ‘mine’ valley Halychany Hrd; *Гута/Huta* ‘glass plant’ wood Kotoryny Zhdch);

4) represent the gender aspect of the life of the Ukrainian people (the clearly masculine nature of microtoponyms indicates a less active function of women in the field of agricultural work) [19: 472];

5) reflect the ethnic palette of Ukraine at different points of time (*Польське Село/Polske Selo* ‘Polish village’ part of the village Stodilky Hrd; *Німецька Долина/Nimetska Dolyna* ‘German valley’ valley Ladantsi Prm; *Унтервальден/Untervalde*n part of the village Pidhaychyky Zlch);

6) verbalize the crucial concepts related to Ukrainian beliefs (*Поле Святого Онуфрія/Pole Svyatoho Onufreia* ‘St. Onofre’s field’ fields Rozdil Mkl; *Чортіві Скали/Chortovi Skaly* ‘devil rocks’ hill Pidbirtsi Pst; *Йорданське/Yordanske* ‘Jordan’ well Pidhirtsi Str), etc.

These proper names are intangible monuments of a national culture. The proceedings of an international symposium *Geographical Names as Cultural Heritage* held in Seoul, South Korea, in 2014 inform: “Each place name has its own *raison d’être* in that it was created by name giver’s perception of identity of the place. All these identities have been formulated on the basis of cultures of each society; thus we would say every place name has elements of cultural heritage, in whatever form or context. What brought the cultural heritage issue to the fore was the realization of the United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names (UNGEGN) that geographical names with cultural heritage values should be protected from disappearing. Initiated by the focus on respecting diverse identities contained in geographical names, especially of indigenous, minority and regional language groups, interests have been extended to finding aspects of cultural heritage in every group of geographical names and dealing systematically with them in toponymic research and standardization” [21].

No less exciting is the *ethnopsychological aspect* of the microtoponyms exploration. For example, an attempt to replace the name of a specific concept with another, softer, name is a determinant of some microtoponyms conception. This phenomenon is due to the fear of certain physical and mental elements of being, or superstition. Therefore, these elements are taboo or sacred. The most taboo geolocation is cemeteries because of their relation to the semiotic system that encodes people’s ideas concerning death. For example, avoiding the direct nomination of death, the natives of the village of Zalisky Zhdch denominate a cemetery *В Соснах/V Sosnakh* ‘in the pines’. On the basis of this

microtoponym-euphemism, a phraseological unit *to go to the pines* arose. It means ‘to die soon’. Euphemization and subsequent phraseologization prompted the following microtoponyms occurrence in the Ukrainian language: *Говчків//Govchkiv* cemetery Mlynyska Zhdch, *За Польовим//Za Polovym* a part of the village with the cemetery PISOCHNA Mkl, *До Кулішки//Do Kulishky* ‘to Kulishka’ cemetery Remezivtsi Zlch), *До Майорка//Do Maiorka* ‘to Maiorko’ cemetery Zhyrivske Zhdch. These proper names acquire an ironic, even cynical, connotation in particular contexts.

Tabooization, like many other processes at the crossings of language and ethnopsychology, led to the emergence of a whole section of folk art – toponymic prose. It is a set of motives of oral folk prose, explaining the origin of the names of natural and artificially created geographical objects [17: 1]. Studying the specifics of microtoponymy within this area of folklore provides “valuable information for explaining ancient worldview, beliefs, aesthetic preferences of our ancestors, to reveal the relics of the demonology and mythology of the original Ukrainian ethnoculture” [15: 12]. For example, a productive microtoponym *Чорний Ліс//Chornyi Lis* ‘black wood’ obtained plenty of connotations precisely because of folk art: ‘the place where evil spirits dwell’, ‘the place where one might get lost’, ‘terrible winds blow there’, etc. Scientific etymology asserts this microtoponym came from a geographical term denoting a mingled wood. The folklore etymology allows extracting new and new layers of psycho-cultural knowledge.

Microtoponyms investigation in all of the mentioned viewpoints is viable in the space-time dimension:

- *Time (vertical) dimension*

The study of microtoponymy in the time dimension requires its interpretation in diachrony. The implementation of the diachronic approach in microtoponymic studies allows finding the genesis of the current state of the microtoponymicon, providing relevant *historical* data regarding archaic stems and affixes, ancient language phenomena, interlanguage connections, etc. [14: 3]. The diachronic microtoponymics, therefore, studies proper names that occurred in a particular diachronic section, traces the development and decline of particular models, their structural characteristics, variability, modification in time, and the like. The evolution of a language can be different in tempo and intensity [14: 177]. As for the microtoponymicon, its elements are notably dynamic and successively change at a considerable speed: a native speaker might trace two, three or even more alternations of the same name. Moreover, in microtoponymy, one can trace the name transformation (for example, *Поле за Риков//Pole za Rikov – За Риков//Za Rikov – Заріка//Zarika* ‘field behind the river’), its evolution, even without referring to historical sources. After all, microtoponyms are units of a spoken language. It confirms the assertion that “the germ of all changes is in speech: a certain number of people start these changes up before they reach universal use” [14: 125]. Thus, all the diachronic matters in language become such only through speech [14: 125], and completely static (synchronous) research of microtoponymic units is almost impossible due to their changeable nature.

- *Spatial (horizontal) dimension*

Microtoponymic units function in a limited space and nominate its elements; therefore, in the synchrony, the horizontal dimension of the microtoponyms investigation is remarkably relevant. Shablii O. viewed the proper names of micro-objects as linguistic and geographic units. In 1969, at the IV Republican Onomastic Conference in Kyiv, the scientist first asserted the notion of ‘primary microtoponymic area’ (PMTA) and outlined it as a limited micro-system that covers the land tenure of one or nearby settlements [16: 39–40]. In this area, he singled out such components as the core (microtoponyms of a

settlement) and the marginal zone (microtoponyms of the surrounding fields, meadows, woods, farms, water flows, means of communication, etc.). According to Shablii O., it is in the circumnuclear part of the marginal zone that the maximum saturation of microtoponyms is attested with a tendency to further reducing [16: 39–40].

The spatial dimension analysis of microtoponymic units provides for their area research. Microtoponyms are the result of the creativity of dialect speakers. Therefore, studying the spatial range of lexical semantics or structural types of microtoponym, using the cartographic method allows revealing the areas of interaction of individual dialects or languages, as well as the peculiarities of the extension of connotations and associations in genetically related proper names depending on cultural-historical circumstances. In Ukrainian onomastics, area research is the most practiced in oikonymy. West Slavic linguists actively begin to engage in mapping and determining the ranges of microtoponymic units [23]. A lot of microtoponyms, while not systematic, can still be found on online maps, in particular, on OpenStreetMap [24]. New technologies contribute to this. A *computer approach* to the study of microtoponym in modern information space is no less relevant. Zeldenrust D. [27] and other linguists point out that virtual access to the geoparameters of microtoponyms could give advance to new ways to explore these unique units.

Area research of microtoponyms introduces them to another discourse – *tourist*. In this regard, the transliteration of microtoponyms, included in tourist routes, and, consequently, to promotional materials in brochures, travel portals, websites, blogs, information and sightseeing materials of museums and the like, is necessary. Tourist discourse is intended to reveal the essence of microtoponym in a new way, focusing on their identity. Hence, it is required to select information for their description, to accurately translate this information, etc. All this is a crucial tool for the growth of the tourism industry in Ukraine. For example, the microtoponyms functioning in the village of Stilsko, Mykolaiv district, require detailed descriptions through the prism of tourist discourse: *Золоті Ворота//Zoloti Vorota* ‘golden gate’, *Залізна Брама//Zalizna Brama* ‘iron gate’, *Вежа//Vezha* ‘tower’, *Княжа Криниця//Kniazha Krynytsia* ‘princely well’. These units cherish the memory that this settlement was a large town of eastern Croats. A unique historical and cultural complex of the 9th-11th centuries, unparalleled in Europe, has been excavated here [25: 508].

Conclusions. Microtoponymicon is a unique language subsystem of symbols, which demands thorough study in multiple paradigms. Centered on the *word* system-structural paradigm provides for the fundamental understanding of microtoponyms. They are used to clarify the content of these names through the prism of different types of discourse:

- 1) regulatory (microtoponyms as elements of the *usus*, which is fundamental for the norm embodiment);
- 2) ethnic (microtoponym as a product of the ethnic group creativity);
- 3) ethno-psychic (microtoponym as a reflection of the psychic sphere of the people);
- 4) social (peculiarities of the microtoponyms functioning in society as an issue of social parameters; enlargement of the lingual system from *a speaker – word* to *a speaker – word – recipient*);
- 5) historical (microtoponyms are linguocultural signs of history, which reflect the historical process (extralingual) and diachronic changes in the language (intringual); thus, microtoponyms become objects of historical and historical linguistics researches);

6) area research of microtoponyms, virtual access to them in the modern media space open innovative ways for their investigation, in particular, in the tourism perspective (microtoponyms as elements of tourist routes and maps).

Perspectives of using research results. The viewpoints of microtoponyms investigation offered in this paper are not exhaustive. They can only help fill specific research lacunae and contribute to the search for a modern multi-focal space in the microtoponymic system of the national onomasticon.

List of abbreviations

Hrd – Horodotskyi district
Mkl – Mykolaivskyi district
Prm – Peremyshlianskyi district
Pst – Pustomytivskyi district
Str – Stryiskyi district
Zhdch – Zhydachivskyi district
Zlch – Zolochivskyi district

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНОЇ ЛІТЕРАТУРИ

1. *Баньої В.* Закарпатські мікротопоніми басейну річки Ужа як об'єкт лексикографічного опрацювання / В. Баньої // Сучасні проблеми мовознавства та літературознавства. – 2016. – Вип. 21. – С. 203–220.
2. *Белей Л. О.* Нова українська літературно-художня антропонімія : проблеми теорії та історії / Любомир Белей. – Ужгород, 2002. – 175 с.
3. *Вербич С.* Українська ономастика : перспективи розвитку / С. Вербич // Українська мова. – 2010. – № 3. – С. 73–80.
4. *Вихованець Р. І.* Мова і культура / Р. Вихованець, К. Г. Городенська, П. Ю. Гриценко та ін. – Київ : Наукова думка, 1986. – 184 с.
5. *Гаврилова Т. О.* Мезоніми у сфері мікротопонімії (на матеріалі говірок Черкащини) / Т. О. Гаврилова // *Studia Slavistica*. Ономастика. Топоніміка : зб. наук. пр. / [упоряд. і відп. ред. : С. Пахомова, Я. Джоганик]. – Ужгород : Вид-во Олександри Гаркуші, 2009. – Вип. 10. – С. 330–336.13
6. *Громко Т. В.* Семантичні особливості народних географічних термінів Центральної України (на матеріалі Кіровоградщини) : автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук : 10.02.01 / Т. В. Громко. – Кіровоград, 2000. – 18 с.
7. *Карпенко О. Ю.* Проблематика когнітивної ономастики / О. Ю. Карпенко. – Одеса : Астропринт, 2006. – 328 с.
8. *Карпенко Ю. О.* До проблеми футурологічної лінгвістики / Ю. О. Карпенко // Мовознавство. – 2004. – № 4. – С. 8–14.
9. *Карпенко Ю. О.* Топонімія Буковини / Ю. О. Карпенко. – Київ : Наукова думка, 1973.
10. *Лучик В.* Актуальні напрями української ономастики // Записки з ономастики. – 2011. – Вип. 14. – С. 126–130.
11. *Колесник Н.* Термінологічні суперечки в царині літературної ономастики і фольклорна ономастика / Наталія Колесник // Науковий вісник Ужгородського університету.. – 2011. – С. 122–127. – (Серія : Філологія. Соціальні комунікації ; вип. 24).
12. *Проць О. І.* Мікротопонімія півночі Львівської області : автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук : 10.02.01 / Оксана Ігорівна Проць. – Львів, 2011. – 19 с.

13. Словник української ономастичної термінології / уклад. Бучко Д. Г., Ткачова Н. В. – Харків : Ранок-НТ, 2012.
14. Сосюр Ф. де. Курс загальної лінгвістики / Фердинан де Сосюр. – Київ, 1998.
15. *Чорнопиский М.* Топонімічна фольклорна проза : специфіка і проблеми дослідження / Михайло Чорнопиский // Вісник Львівського університету. – 1999. – С. 7–13. – (Серія філологічна ; вип. 27).
16. *Шаблій О. І.* Питання просторово-географічного вивчення мікротопонімії / О. І. Шаблій // Тези IV Республікан. ономастичної конф. – Київ, 1969.24
17. *Шкляєва Н. В.* Народна топонімічна проза Західного Полісся : синхронічний аспект : дис. ... канд. філол. наук : 10.01.07 / Наталія Володимирівна Шкляєва. – Львів, 2005.
18. *Яніцька Н. Р.* Специфіка зміни мовних кодів у мікротопонімному дискурсі / Н. Р. Яніцька // Актуальні проблеми слов'янської філології / голов. ред. В. А. Зарва. – Бердянськ : БДПУ, 2010. – С. 445–453. – (Сер. : Лінгвістика і літературознавство ; вип. XXIII, ч. III).
19. *Яніцька Н. Р.* Жіночий іменник у мікротопонімії центральних та східних районів Львівщини / Н. Р. Яніцька // Вісник Львівського університету. – Львів, 2010. – С. 472–477. – (Серія філологічна; вип. 50).
20. *Coates R.* Properhood / R. Coates // *Language*. – 2008. – P. 356–382.
21. *Geographical Names as Cultural Heritage: Proceedings of the International Symposium on Toponymy (7–9 November 2014) / ed. by Sungjae Choo.* – Seoul : Kyung Hee University Press, 2015.
22. *Humboldt W.* On Language : On the Diversity of Human Language Construction and its Influence on the Mental Development of the Human Species / W. Humboldt. – Cambridge : CUP, 1988.
23. *Majtán M.* Lexika slovenských terénnych názvov. (História a perspektíva spracovania) / Milan Majtán // *Lexika slovenskej onymie : Zborník materiálů zo 17. slovenskej onomastickej konferencie (Trnava 12. – 14. 9. 2007) / Zostavili J. Hladký a I. Valentová.* – Bratislava : Veda, 2010. – S. 27–30.
24. *OpenStreetMap* [Electronic resource]. – Access mode : <https://www.openstreetmap.org/#map=6/48.537/31.168>
25. *Stulsko* // *Słownik geograficzny Królestwa Polskiego i innych krajów słowiańskich.* – Warszawa : Filip Sulimierski i Władysław Walewski, 1890. – T. XI : Sochaczew – Szlubowska Wola. – S. 508.
26. *Thériault M. A.* Ethnolinguistic Investigation Methodology in an Urban Context : Microtoponymic and Toponymic Surveys (Translation by Henri-Charles Brenner) / M. A. Thériault // *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science.* – Vol. 2. – No. 2 [Special Issue – January 2012]. – P. 266–275.
27. *Zeldenrust D.* DIMITO : Digitization of rural microtoponyms at the Meertens Instituut // *Humanities, Computers and Cultural Heritage Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences : Proceedings of the XVI international conference of the Association for History and Computing (14–17 September, 2005).* – Amsterdam : Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences, 2005. – P. 301–307.

REFERENCES

1. Banoi, V. (2016). Zakarpatski mikrotoponimy baseinu richky Uzha iak ob'iekt leksykohrafichnoho opratsiuvannia. In: *Suchasni problemy movoznavstva ta literaturoznavstva*, vyp. 21, 203–220.
2. Belei, L. O. (2002). *Nova ukrainska literaturno-khudozhnia antroponimia : problem teorii ta istorii*. Uzhhorod.
3. Verbych, S. (2010). Ukrainska onomastyka : perspektyvy rozvytku. *Ukrainska mova*, №3, 73–80.
4. Vykhoanets, R. I., Horodenska, K. H., Hrytsenko, P. Yu. ta in. (1986). *Mova i kultura*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.
5. Havrylova, T. O. (2009). Mezonimy u sferi mikrotoponimii (na materialy hovirok Cherkashchyny). In: *Studia Slavakistica. Onomastyka. Toponimika: zb. nauk. pr.* / [uporiad. i vidp. red.: S. Pakhomova, Ya. Dzhoganyk]. Uzhhorod: Vyd-vo Oleksandry Harkushi, vyp. 10, 330–336.
6. Hromko, T. V. (2000). *Semantychni osoblyvosti narodnykh heohrafichnykh terminiv Tsentralnoi Ukrainy (na materialy Kirovohradshchyny): avtoref. dys. ... kand. filol. nauk: 10.02.01*. Kirovohrad.
7. Karpenko, O. Yu. (2006). *Problematyka kohnityvnoi onomastyky*. Odesa Astroprint.
8. Karpenko, Yu. O. (2004). Do problemy futurolohichnoi linhvistyky. *Movoznavstvo*, № 4, 8–14.
9. Karpenko, Yu. O. (1973). *Toponimia Bukovyny*. Moskva.
10. Luchyuk, V. (2011). Aktualni napriamy ukrainskoi onomastyky. In: *Zapysky z onomastyky*, vyp. 14, 126–130.
11. Kolesnyk, N. (2011). Terminolohichni superechky v tsaryni literaturnoi onomastyky i folklorna onomastyka. In: *Naukovyi visnyk Uzhhorodskoho universytetu. Seria : Fililohia. Sotsialni komunikatsii*, vyp. 24, 122–127.
12. Prots, P. I. (2011). *Mikrotoponimia pivnochi Lvivskoi oblasti: avtoref. dys. ... kand. filol. nauk: 10.02.01*. Lviv.
13. *Slovyk ukrainskoi onomastychnoi terminolohii*. (2012). / uklad. Buchko D. H., Tkachova N. V. Kharkiv: Ranok-NT.
14. Sosiur, F. de. (1998). *Kurs zahalnoi linhvistyky*. Kyiv.
15. Chornopyskyi, M. (1999). Toponimichna folklorna proza : spetsyfika i problemy doslidzhennia. In: *Visnyk Lvivskoho un-tu. Ser. Filolohichna*, vyp. 27, 7–13.
16. Shablii, O. I. (1969). Pytannia prostorovo-heohrafichnoho vuvchennia mikrotoponimii. In: *Tezy IV Respublikan. onomastychnoi konf.* Kyiv.
17. Shkhaieva, N. V. (2005). *Narodna toponimichna proza Zahidnoho Polissia : synhronichni aspekt : avtoref. dys. ... kand. filol. nauk: 10.01.07*. Lviv.
18. Yanitska, N. R. (2010). Spetsyfika zminy movnykh kodiv u mikrotoponimichnomu diskursi. In: *Aktualni problemy slovianskoi filolohii. Ser. : Linhvistyka i literaturoznavstvo / holov. red. V. A. Zarva*. Berdiansk: BDPU, vyp. XXIII, ch. III, 445–453.
19. Yanitska, N. R. (2010). Zhinochyi imennyk u mikrotoponimii tsentralnykh ta shidnykh raioniv Lvivshchyny. In: *Visnyk Lvivskoho un-tu. Ser. Filolohichna*, Lviv, vyp. 50, 472–477.
20. Coates, R. (2008). Properhood. In: *Language*, 356–382.
21. *Geographical Names as Cultural Heritage: Proceedings of the International Symposium on Toponymy (7–9 November 2014)*. (2015). / ed. by Sungjae Choo. Seoul: Kyung Hee University Press.

22. Humboldt, W. (1988). *On Language : On the Diversity of Human Language Construction and its Influence on the Mental Development of the Human Species*. Cambridge: CUP.

23. Majtán, M. (2010). Lexika slovenských terénnych názvov. (História a perspektíva spracovania). In: *Lexika slovenskej onymie: Zborník materiálov zo 17. slovenskej onomastickej konferencie (Trnava 12. – 14. 9. 2007)* / Zostavili J. Hladký a I. Valentová. Bratislava: Veda, 27–30.

24. OpenStreetMap. Retrieved from <https://www.openstreetmap.org/#map=6/48.537/31.168>

25. Stulsko. (1890). In: *Słownik geograficzny Królestwa Polskiego i innych krajów słowiańskich*. Warszawa: Filip Sulimierski i Władysław Walewski, t. XI : Sochaczew – Szlubowska Wola, 508.

26. Thériault, M. A. Ethnolinguistic Investigation Methodology in an Urban Context : Microtoponymic and Toponymic Surveys (Translation by Henri-Charles Brenner). In: *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, vol. 2, No. 2 [Special Issue – January 2012], 266–275.

27. Zeldenrust, D. (2005). DIMITO: Digitization of rural microtoponyms at the Meertens Instituut. In: *Humanities, Computers and Cultural Heritage Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences: Proceedings of the XVI international conference of the Association for History and Computing (14–17 September, 2005)*. Amsterdam: Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences, 301–307.

ЯК ВИВЧАТИ МІКРОТОПОНІМ?

Наталія ЯНІЦЬКА-ФАЛАТІУК

кандидат філологічних наук
e-mail: yanitska1987@gmail.com

Мікротопонімікон – унікальна мовна субсистема знаків, що потребує докладного опрацювання в багатьох ракурсах. Системно-структурна парадигма дає фундаментальні знання про мікротопоніми. Однак це лише планіметричне прочитання власних назв, сфокусоване на слові. Воно не відображає динамічних і діалектичних зв'язків мікротопоніма з мовцем та довкіллям. Динамічність мікротопонімів, причинно-наслідкові зв'язки їхнього виникнення й функціонування, комунікативну значущість цих назв можна зрозуміти, поставивши в центр пізнання людину й застосувавши *функційно-дискурсний аналіз*. У такому ракурсі мікротопоніми є не лише назвами геолокацій, а інтегровані в метапростір дискурсу елементи мовленнєво-мисленнєвих дій комунікантів, пов'язані з пізнанням, осмисленням, презентацією світу мовцем та осмисленням мовної картини світу адресанта слухачем (адресатом). Вони виникають із «живого» лінгвопростору, функціонують у дискурсі та є його інструментами. Дискурс може архаїзувати чи модифікувати їх. Дискурс може нанизати на них безліч конотацій і рефлексій світовідчуження. Як елементи дискурсу мікротопоніми є одиниці входять в різні типи лінгвістичних та інтегративних кроснаукових розмов:

1) мікротопоніми – елементи узусу, що є фундаментальним для становлення норми, тому нормативно-регулятивна роль мікротопонімів актуальна для українського мовознавства;

2) мікротопоніми – продукт творчості етносу; це вводить їх в етнологічні й етнолінгвістичні студії;

3) мікротопоніми – відображення рис психічної сфери народу (номінація на апеліативному рівні є розгорнутим психічним процесом, що відображає пізнавальні можливості людини, її свідомість та самосвідомість; коли ж мовець надає об'єктові назву ще й на пропріальному рівні, тобто двічі вводить його абстрактний світ мовних знаків, то це поглиблює інтерес до психічного боку номінації);

4) функціонування мікротопоніма залежить від соціальної диференціації мовців, тому його суспільна сутність – важливий об'єкт соціолінгвістики;

5) мікротопоніми – лінгвокультурні знаки історії, відображають державний історичний процес (екстралінгвальний) та діахронні зміни в мові (інтралінгвальні); у такий спосіб мікротопоніми стають об'єктами вивчення історії й історичного мовознавства;

6) ареальне дослідження мікротопонімів, віртуальний доступ до них у сучасному медійному просторі вводить ці власні найменування в туристичний дискурс.

Запропоновані в цій статті ракурси дослідження мікротопонімів не є вичерпними. Вони лише можуть допомогти заповнити окремі дослідницькі лакуни та сприяти пошукам модерного багатофокусного простору в мікротопонімній системі національного ономастикону.

Ключові слова: мікротопонім, ракурс, системно-структурна парадигма, дискурс, етнопсихологічний аспект, туристичний дискурс.