



# Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW) KONINKLIJKE NEDERLANDSE AKADEMIE VAN WETENSCHAPPEN

**Milan Harvalík & Enzo Caffarelli (eds.) Onomastic terminology: an international survey**  
Gerritzen, D.

***published in***

RION: Rivista Italiana di Onomastica  
2007

***document version***

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication in KNAW Research Portal](#)

***citation for published version (APA)***

Gerritzen, D. (2007). Milan Harvalík & Enzo Caffarelli (eds.) Onomastic terminology: an international survey.  
*RION: Rivista Italiana di Onomastica*, XIII(1), 189, 196, 208, 214.

**General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the KNAW public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the KNAW public portal.

**Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

**E-mail address:**

[pure@knaw.nl](mailto:pure@knaw.nl)

RION vol. XIII • Anno XIII • n° 1  
primo semestre 2007

RIVISTA  
ITALIANA  
di  
ONOMASTICA

RION, XIII (2007), 1



SOCIETÀ EDITRICE ROMANA

R 250

# RION – Rivista Italiana di Onomastica

vol. XIII • n° 1 • anno XIII • primo semestre 2007

**Direttore:** ENZO CAFFARELLI

## Comitato scientifico:

RITA CAPRINI (Genova), PAOLO D'ACHILLE (Roma), DIETER KREMER (Trier),  
ANDRÉ LAPIERRE (Ottawa), OTTAVIO LURATI (Basel), CARLA MARCATO (Udine),  
PAOLO POCETTI (Roma), SERGIO RAFFAELLI (Roma),  
WOLFGANG SCHWEICKARD (Saarbrücken), LUCA SERIANNI (Roma)

## Collaboratori internazionali:

LAIMUTE BALODE (Riga)	ADRIAN KOOPMAN (Pietermaritzburg, S.A.)
ÇLIRIM BIDOLLARI (Tirana)	JAROMIR KRŠKO (Banská Bystrica)
ANA ISABEL BOULLÓN AGRELO (Santiago de Compostela)	ANNE-DIETLIND KRÜGER (Leipzig)
DUNJA BROZOVIĆ-RONČEVIĆ (Zagreb)	EDWIN D. LAWSON (Fredonia, NY)
EVA BRYLLA (Uppsala)	ZHONGHUA LI (Shandong, Cina)
ANA M <sup>a</sup> CANO GONZÁLEZ (Oviedo)	CHAO-CHI LIAO (Taipei)
EMILI CASANOVA i HERRERO (Valencia)	YOLANDA G. LÓPEZ-FRANCO (México)
ALEKSANDRA CIEŚLIKOWA (Kraków)	GIORGIO MARRAPODI (Saarbrücken)
RICHARD A. COATES (Bristol)	KAY MUHR (Belfast)
FRANS DEBRABANDERE (Brugge/Bruges)	WULF MÜLLER (Neuchâtel)
AARON DEMSKY (Ramat-Gan, Israele)	MARIANNE MULON (Paris)
ELWYS DE STEFANI (Basel)	WILHELM F. H. NICOLAISEN (Aberdeen)
MARIA VICENTINA DICK (São Paulo)	TEODOR OANĂ (Craiova)
LILJANA DIMITROVA-TODOROVA (Sofia)	PEETER PÄLL (Tallinn)
SHEILA M. EMBLETON (Toronto)	RITVA LIISA PITKÄNEN (Helsinki)
ZSUZSANNA FÁBIÁN (Budapest)	MARTINA PITZ (Lyon)
M <sup>a</sup> VALENTINA FERREIRA (Lisboa)	YAROSLAV REDKVA (Chernivtsi)
CONSUELO GARCÍA GALLARÍN (Madrid)	ROB RENTENAAR (København)
JEAN GERMAIN (Louvain-la-Neuve)	JENNIFER SCHERR (Bristol)
DOREEN GERRITZEN (Amsterdam)	SVAVAR SIGMUNDSSON (Garðabær, Islanda)
VIORICA GOICU (Timișoara)	VLADIMIR SKRACIĆ (Zadar)
MILAN HARVALÍK (Praha)	ALEKSANDRA V. SUPERANSKAJA (Mosca)
ISOLDE HAUSNER (Wien)	GÉRARD TAVERDET (Fontaine-lès-Dijon)
BOTOLV HELLELAND (Oslo)	DOMNIȚA TOMESCU (București)
FLAVIA HODGES (Sydney)	WILLY VAN LANGENDONCK (Leuven)
AKIKATSU KAGAMI (Nisshinshi)	STEFANO VASSERE (Bellinzona)
HENRIKE KNÖRR (Vitoria/Gasteiz)	PAUL VIDESOTT (Innsbruck)
	JOE ZAMMIT CIANTAR (Malta)

**Redazione:** c/o Enzo Caffarelli, via Tigrè 37, I-00199 Roma

T. +39.06.86219883 – Fax +39.06.85303074

E-mail: [ecafrion@tin.it](mailto:ecafrion@tin.it) – Web: [www.onomalab.eu/rion](http://www.onomalab.eu/rion)

**Amministrazione, diffusione e pubblicità:** Società Editrice Romana s.r.l.,

piazza Cola di Rienzo 85, I-00195 Roma – T. +39.06.36004654

Fax +39.06.36790123 – E-mail: [francesca.palli@editriceromana.it](mailto:francesca.palli@editriceromana.it)

Direttore responsabile: Giuseppe Caffarelli.

Finito di stampare nel mese di aprile 2007

presso la Società Tipografica Romana s.r.l.

via Carpi 19, I-00040 Pomezia (Roma).

# Onomastic terminology: an international survey / Terminologia onomastica: un'inchiesta internazionale

a cura di Milan Harvalík – Enzo Caffarelli (edited by)

ABSTRACT. *The current problems of terminology in the onomastic field can be briefly summarized as follow: a) the different interpretation and use of the same term by distinct scholars and schools; b) the inadequacy of certain terms which are widely used; c) the large use of newly created terms.*

*The survey investigates the different opinions on the perception of difficulties and on the possible solutions, both specific in relation to some contradictions, and methodological in order to reach a minimum agreement on the use of certain terms. Is it possible to reach a reasonable degree of homogeneity? Is it really useful and necessary? Does it make sense trying to go beyond terminological traditions rooted and consolidated in the various languages? What results can be expected from the work of codification which a group of qualified experts might produce?*

*The questions have been answered by 38 scholars representing in particular Austria, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Norway, Holland, Hungary, Poland, United Kingdom, Russia, Slovakia, Spain, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, Taiwan and Ukraine.*

## Introduzione

Per raggiungere la sua piena maturità una disciplina scientifica deve poter disporre di un linguaggio chiaro e condiviso. È questo il caso dell'onomastica? Negli ultimi decenni singoli autori e gruppi di studiosi si sono dedicati a proporre, in articoli e in volumi, rassegne di termini per indicare i "nomi dei nomi". Ciò è accaduto quasi sempre all'interno di un particolare dominio linguistico e con particolare vivacità nell'ambito slavistico.

Di un primo tentativo davvero internazionale di standardizzazione della terminologia onomastica, ma limitatamente alle questione dei nomi geografici, si è fatto carico l'ONU con l'UNGEGN (o GENUNG), ossia il Gruppo di esperti delle Nazioni Unite per i nomi geografici (*United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names*).

Nel marzo 2004, a Praga, il comitato direttivo dell'ICOS (*International Council of Onomastic Sciences*) ha promosso la formazione di una commissione, al momento informale, per considerare in modo serio i nodi problematici della terminologia onomastica e offrire un contributo, ancora da pianificare nel suo risultato finale, alla comunità scientifica. Di tale gruppo di lavoro è responsabile Milan Harvalík (Praga), vicepresidente ICOS e co-curatore dell'inchiesta che la «Rivista Italiana di Onomastica» propone nelle pagine che seguono.

ai nomi di persona è stata intitolata *Antroponomastical Personal Names/ Personennamen/ Anthroponomastique*; quella destinata ai nomi di luogo, *Toponomastical Geographical Names/ Geographische Namen/ Toponymie*.

Con questa inchiesta, la «Rivista Italiana di Onomastica» ha sondato le differenti opinioni sulle questioni terminologiche, sulla percezione delle difficoltà e sulle eventuali strade percorribili, sia specifiche rispetto ad alcune contraddizioni, sia metodologiche per tentare di raggiungere un accordo minimo sull'uso di alcuni termini. Vi hanno partecipato 38 studiosi di tutto il mondo, in rappresentanza di 26 nazioni, in particolare di Austria, Belgio, Bulgaria, Canada, Cechia, Danimarca, Estonia, Finlandia, Francia, Germania, Israele, Italia, Lettonia, Norvegia, Olanda, Polonia, Regno Unito, Russia, Slovacchia, Spagna, Sudafrica, Svezia, Svizzera, Taiwan, Ucraina e Ungheria.

È possibile, dunque, conseguire un ragionevole grado di omogeneità? È davvero utile e necessario? O è sufficiente prendere coscienza e comunque avere chiaro che la disomogeneità è in gran parte inevitabile ed eventualmente suggerire che in ogni studio pubblicato l'autore precisi e spieghi l'uso e il significato di alcuni termini, dando spazio a note meta-linguistiche?

Ha senso pensare di superare tradizioni terminologiche ormai radicate e consolidate nelle varie lingue? Quali risultati ci si può aspettare da una possibile – e certo non semplice – produzione “normativa” da parte di un gruppo di sia pur qualificati esperti? Potrebbe avere, un lavoro di questo tipo, almeno il vantaggio di incoraggiare la discussione e lo scambio di informazioni, e coinvolgere il maggior numero possibile di domini linguistici, anche quelli oggi considerati periferici e solo marginalmente caratterizzati da studi onomastici?

Abbiamo ritenuto utile raccogliere le opinioni di noti studiosi di onomastica. Tra curiosità, entusiasmi e scetticismi, hanno risposto all'invito della RION: Terhi Ainiala (Helsinki), Pierre-Henri Billy (Toulouse), Eva Brylla e Mats Wahlberg (Uppsala), Eva Buchi (Nancy), Ojārs Bušs (Rīga), Ana María Cano González (Oviedo/Uvieu), Rita Caprini (Genova), Vibeke Dalberg e Rob Rentenaar (København), Elwys De Stefani (Basel/Lyon), Friedhelm Debus (Kiel), Liljana Dimitrova-Todorova (Sofia), Zsuzsanna Fábrián (Budapest), Jean Germain (Louvain-la-Neuve), Doreen Gerritzen (Amsterdam), Albrecht Greule (Regensburg), Isolde Hausner (Wien), Botolv Helleland (Oslo), Naftali Kadmon (Tel Aviv), Volker Kohlheim (Bayreuth), Adrian Koopman (Pietermaritzburg-SA), Jaromír Krško (Banská Bystrica), Anne-Dietlind Krüger (Leipzig), André Lapierre (Ottawa), Chao-Chi Liao (Taipei), Ivan Lutterer (Praga), Giorgio Marrapodi (Saarbrücken/Bonn), Kay Muhr (Belfast), Gonzalo Navaza (Vigo), Peeter Päll (Tallinn), Yaroslav Redkva (Chernivtsi), Ewa Rzetelska-Feleszko (Warszawa), Minna Saarelna-Maunumaa (Helsinki), Aleksandra V. Superanskaya (Mosca), Willy Van Langendonck (Leuven), Natalia Vasilyeva (Mosca), Paul Videsott (Innsbruck/Bolzano).

Le domande poste erano cinque. Con la prima, abbiamo chiesto quale importanza assuma l'odierna mancanza di omogeneità tra studiosi nell'uso dei termini onoma-

stici. Con le due successive domande, abbiamo cercato di evidenziare quali siano gli ambiti onomastici e quali i singoli termini onomastici che possono creare maggiori problemi. Gli ultimi due interrogativi riguardano le possibili soluzioni a tali problemi: come realizzare una standardizzazione terminologica almeno parziale e di quale utilità potrebbero risultare delle linee guida proposte dall'*ICOS* o comunque da un qualificato gruppo di lavoro internazionale di studiosi.

Le risposte sono state formulate nelle lingue ufficiali dell'*ICOS* e/o della RION (italiano, francese, spagnolo, inglese e tedesco). A chiusura dell'inchiesta, la discussione conclusiva delle opinioni e delle proposte emerse è affidata a Milan Harvalík, che la direzione della RION ringrazia, insieme a tutti gli intervistati, per l'impegno e la passione con cui ha partecipato attivamente alla raccolta e alla elaborazione dei materiali.

ENZO CAFFARELLI

### 1. What is the impact of the absence of homogeneity in the use of codified onomastic terminology among scholars?

#### *Quale importanza assume l'odierna mancanza di omogeneità tra studiosi nell'uso dei termini onomastici?*

**Terhi AINIALA:** The absence of homogeneity in the use of codified onomastic terminology causes not only practical problems but also major scientific problems. It may reduce the reliability of the scientific data if the terminology appears to be incoherent or even unfamiliar. Also the comparability between separate studies becomes difficult if there exist major differences between the terminologies.

**Pierre-Henri BILLY:** Force est de constater que, si la traduction d'un terme d'une langue dans une autre n'implique pas nécessairement l'identité de sémantisme, un même terme dans une même langue n'a pas toujours le même sens selon les chercheurs du même pays. L'homogénéité ne paraît donc pas réalisable internationalement.

**Eva BRYLLA – Mats WAHLBERG:** We misinterpret terms used by other scholars. Onomasticians use different terms, which are often common to many languages, with different meanings according to the traditions of their own countries (also even different traditions in one and the same country); it is for instance very easy to presume that the English *byname*, German *Beiname* and Swedish *binamn* are used with the same meaning in England, Germany and Sweden. There is also reason to believe that different traditions have been established in different countries of how to translate their native terms into English. To try to codify the usage is therefore important.

Another problem is that onomasticians in every country tend to think that their own tradition is the best and the most correct one. It is of course not possible to change that, but all onomasticians must be more aware of the fact that different traditions exist.

Eva BUCHI: Assez importante: a) quelquefois on ne se comprend pas, ou mal (dialogues de sourds); b) certaines publications ne sont pas lues parce que considérées comme impénétrables.

Ojars BUŠS: It's clear that, if several different scientists onomasticians use the same term having understood it differently, communication between these onomasticians will be really hindered or even rendered impossible. There could even occur serious misunderstandings. Of course such a situation could potentially (and sometimes will) turn out to be a reason for delay in the progress of onomastics.

Ana María CANO GONZÁLEZ: La falta de homogeneidad terminológica puede plantear problemas de confusión o ambigüedad si a un mismo término se le dan significados distintos o si se utilizan términos diferentes para designar lo mismo; sobre todo teniendo en cuenta que las tradiciones culturales son o pueden ser diferentes.

Rita CAPRINI: Ritengo che bisognerebbe trovare i termini più semplici e usare quelli. Sono per principio contraria alle eccessive discussioni formali in questo campo. La formalizzazione (penso a quella introdotta dai logici) ha sempre nociuto a un vero studio dell'antroponimia, che secondo me è per definizione un campo di studi sfuocato. Questo per l'intersecarsi a tutti i livelli di elementi storici, contingenti – perfino mode – con fenomeni di lunga durata, che si trovano spesso a un livello inconscio. Si pensi per es. alla scelta del nome di un bambino appena nato: intervengono in chi sceglie meccanismi coscienti, evidenti, tra cui spesso l'ossequio a mode effimere, insieme a meccanismi profondi (come quello di "rifare" i morti). Considerato questo, sostenere come faceva Russell che "questo" bambino è un'indicazione altrettanto buona che "Giovanni" può essere formalmente più preciso, ma ci dice assai poco sull'uso dei nomi propri da parte dell'umanità (che si potrebbe definire come tale proprio per l'uso dei nomi propri, non si tratta di una questione marginale). Trovo in generale, però, che tra studiosi ci si capisca comunque; usare per lo stesso elemento onomastico l'etichetta *prénom* o *nome di battesimo* pone soltanto difficoltà formali, non sostanziali. L'onomastica europea è abbastanza omogenea, per cui ci si capisce benissimo. Per quanto riguarda i sistemi onomastici extra-europei (non di tipo occidentale, intendo), mi sembra in genere che studi approfonditi si siano sviluppati solo recentemente, per cui può darsi che in questo ambito sorgano per gli studiosi maggiori difficoltà terminologiche. Spesso i singoli studiosi sono particolarmente affezionato a un certo termine, e vorrebbero che tutti l'usassero. Ma in generale insistere in queste discussioni mi pare poco utile, considerando quanto ancora resta da fare per l'analisi del meccanismo della *nominatio*, in Europa e nel mondo.

Vibeke DALBERG – Rob RENTENAAR: Lack of homogeneity in the use of onomastic terminology can interfere with communication between scholars and may lead to an increase in the possibility of misinterpretations. Furthermore, we are afraid that the first question in this questionnaire contains a word, which could lead to misunderstanding or to different interpretations. What is meant by the word "codified" in the

phrasing "codified onomastic terminology"? The verb "to codify" can have a narrow meaning, 'to lay down in a set of rules or laws', as well as the broader one, 'to systematize'. In the first case the implication of the question might be that the final aim of the project is the enactment of an approved terminology, together with a ban on the use of any terminology which has not met the test. On the other hand the question can be interpreted in a more liberal way, which means that the idea behind the project is to make an inventory of terms used in onomastics everywhere in the world. In our opinion the following essential questions are actually missing in this questionnaire. What is the reason for the disorder in onomastic terminology, not only between different parts of the world, but even inside the same country or the same speech area? Why is the same term sometimes used for different concepts? Why do we often find different terms used for the same phenomenon? Why is it frequently possible to notice disagreement between the semantic content of a term and the phenomenon which it aims to describe? To find the right answers to these questions it would be necessary to analyze the relevant onomastic literature and to test the terminological consistency of the authors.

Elwys DE STEFANI: La mancanza di omogeneità non emerge soltanto dal fatto che in lingue diverse si usano termini diversi; spesso si osservano divergenze terminologiche anche all'interno della medesima lingua. Il problema minore – con cui si può convivere tranquillamente, anche se il linguaggio specialistico tende all'univocità – si esplica nell'uso di etichette terminologiche differenti per segnalare un determinato concetto onomastico: in italiano, ad esempio, si è soliti parlare di *nomi di luogo* e di *toponimi*, riferendosi al medesimo concetto di 'nome di un centro abitato'. Il problema maggiore risiede nelle differenze concettuali che spesso si trovano alla base delle diversità terminologiche: così, in contesti italiani *toponimo* viene usato anche come iperonimo che raggruppa i nomi che vanno a spazi geografici strutturati dall'uomo a fini pratici attraverso un'etichetta onimica (come *idronimi*, *odonimi*, *oronimi*, ecc.), mentre il significato di *nome di luogo* è più limitato. Questa difficoltà viene percepita soprattutto nel confronto tra tradizioni terminologiche di lingue diverse: se tra ricercatori italo-foni si è soliti parlare, ad esempio, di *macrotoponimi* e di *microtoponimi* – una distinzione quanto mai labile imperniata sul criterio della dimensione *macro* o *micro* del luogo denominato – tra ricercatori tedesco-foni, ad esempio, è invalsa l'abitudine di distinguere tra *Ortsnamen* 'nomi di insediamenti', *Flurnamen* 'nomi di zone inabitate' e *Wohnstättennamen* 'nomi di case, edifici abitati ecc.'. Sono stati assunti, insomma, criteri di differenziazione diversi da quelli correnti nella ricerca italo-fona. Questa divergenza può essere problematica in quanto, in certi casi, può portare a difficoltà di intercomprensione tra ricercatori che si muovono in tradizioni onomastiche distinte. Occorre tuttavia sottolineare che differenze di tal genere possono anche costituire un arricchimento, proprio perché permettono ai ricercatori di creare tassonomie scientifiche dissimili. Ogni tradizione onomastica categorizza in un modo molto specifico i dati linguistici.

**Friedhelm DEBUS:** Gründe für die unterschiedlichen Terminologien sind nach meiner Einschätzung die folgenden:

– Im Laufe der Forschungsgeschichte haben sich in den verschiedenen Sprachgebieten jeweils eigenständige Terminologien entwickelt und eingebürgert. Sie werden weiter verwendet, wiewohl teilweise international übliche Termini existieren, z.B. *Toponym* vs. *Ortsname*.

– Gegenüber den bestehenden Terminologien werden öfters weitere als vermeintlich bessere eingeführt, was freilich in der Regel zur Verwirrung beiträgt, weil dann alte und neue Termini weiter nebeneinander existieren.

– Bei der Terminologisierung neuer Forschungsergebnisse (z.B. im Bereich literarische Onomastik) liegt es wohl nahe, zunächst muttersprachliche Begriffe zu verwenden, weil diese das Gemeinte am besten ausdrücken.

– Es ist eine allgemein-menschliche Neigung, am Herkömmlichen festzuhalten.

**Liljana DIMITROVA-TODOROVA:** Die Notwendigkeit einer Vereinheitlichung bei der Anwendung einer kodifizierten onomastischen Terminologie, die eine Vorstellung von dem gegenwärtigen Zustand der Onomastik, ihrer Grundlagen und Methoden gestattet, ist von großer Bedeutung für die wissenschaftlichen Forschungen im Bereich der Onomastik, und zwar auf regionaler und auf internationaler Ebene. In der letzten Zeit werden aufgrund der raschen Entwicklung der onomastischen Wissenschaft in Hinblick auf ihre theoretische Verfeinerung zahlreiche neue Termini geschaffen; die Bedeutungen traditioneller Termini werden modifiziert.

In den unterschiedlichen onomastischen Schulen werden ein und dieselben Termini mit unterschiedlicher Bedeutung verwendet. Dies alles deutet auf die Notwendigkeit hin, ein neues internationales Wörterbuch der Onomastik zu verfassen, das ein einheitliches Terminologie-Korpus darstellt, das sich nicht nur an der gegenwärtigen Situation orientiert, sondern auch an der zukünftigen. Mit seiner Hilfe kann eine Vereinheitlichung der onomastischen Terminologie erreicht werden, eine Annäherung der terminologischen Systeme der einzelnen Länder, eine Vereinheitlichung der Auffassungen in Hinblick auf die Definitionen der einzelnen Termini.

**Zsuzsanna FABIÁN:** La mancanza di omogeneità obbliga gli studiosi a dare una definizione dei termini usati. Una certa omogeneità è quindi auspicabile per guadagnare tempo e spazio. Nello stesso tempo, ogni studioso dovrebbe avere la possibilità, della quale non può essere privata per nessun motivo, di lavorare autonomamente e quindi di poter coniare nuovi e forse migliori termini di altri o degli altri: la sua nuova soluzione terminologica potrebbe risultare quella "vincente". Un'eccessiva uniformità, peraltro neppure raggiungibile in modo completo, potrebbe diventare una zavorra per l'invenzione e la libertà scientifica.

**Jean GERMAIN:** Il y a bien sûr un double problème, celui interne à chaque langue et celui de la traduction/adaptation dans chaque langue majeure. Ce problème de ter-

minologie n'est pas propre à l'onomastique mais se retrouve, à des degrés divers, dans toutes les disciplines scientifiques.

**Doreen GERRITZEN:** First of all we have to distinguish between problems on a national and international level. In this context I would like to focus on the international dimension. However, it is important to point out that onomastic culture differs so much from country to country that many problems are caused by these differences and not by any absence of homogeneity in terminology. For a good understanding it is always important to be aware of possible national peculiarities when publishing for an international audience. I consider this aspect far more important than using the right terminology because in explaining the national situation the terminology used will inevitably be discussed at the same time.

**Albrecht GREULE:** Der internationale Austausch von Wissen und die wissenschaftliche Diskussion über Namen in verschiedenen Sprachgemeinschaften wird entscheidend behindert, ebenso der interdisziplinäre Austausch. Ferner wird die komparative Namenforschung erschwert.

**Isolde HAUSNER:** Various "onomastic schools" which in former times developed less cooperation.

**Botolv HELLELAND:** The aim of any science is to be as accurate as possible, and to reach that end it is of vital importance to have access to a terminology which covers the various items and processes of the science in question. Obviously name scholars, just like scholars in other fields, feel the need for an international terminology when they attempt to present scientific results and communicate with colleagues internationally. As far as onomastics is concerned there are many terms based on each individual language which are able to function in other languages when translated directly. However, to an increasing degree, partly as a result of intensified theoretical and methodological discussions in recent years, the lack of a codified onomastic terminology among scholars has to some extent hampered the exchange of ideas. Still I have the impression that some scholars don't see a codified terminology as being very important as they may be comfortable with using the traditional terms.

**Naftali KADMON:** If there is no uniformity of definition, different users of a single particular term sometimes use it to denote different things. Conversely, the same object is often addressed by different terms. This is true not only of laymen but also of scholars.

**Volker KOHLHEIM:** Vor allem Studienanfänger dürften Schwierigkeiten haben.

**Adrian KOOPMAN:** Even within a given community of onomastic scholars writing in a single language, there is often a lack of (specific) agreement about the use of certain terms. When scholars from different onomastic communities attempt to communicate, and especially when they do so coming from different language backgrounds

and have to rely on translations, this lack of homogeneity can and does lead to confusion. When such and such a scholar from such and such a country uses the term 'byname', which may well be a translation of a term used in the scholar's (non-English) home language, it could be what I refer to as a 'nickname' or what I refer to as a 'surname'.

**Jaromír KRŠKO:** The basic requirement for any term (in general) is that the specific term is in its particular area unambiguous (in its content). The partial separateness of various onomastic schools in the past has resulted in particular terms not being homogenous in their content, which makes communication among onomasticians more difficult (especially at international conferences). This ambiguity the content of terms is the biggest barrier in presenting the results of scientific research.

**Anne-Dietlind KRÜGER:** Im Studiengang deutsch-slavische Namenforschung an der Universität Leipzig tritt das Problem der Uneinheitlichkeit der namenkundlichen Terminologie besonders deutlich zu Tage. Hier wird Wissen über die deutsche und slavische Namenskunde vermittelt, die in ihren Abhandlungen sehr unterschiedliche Termini benutzen. So wird in russischen Veröffentlichungen sehr stark auf Termini griechischer Herkunft zurückgegriffen, die zum Teil in anderer Weise verwendet werden als im Deutschen (vgl. Onomastik im Sinne von Onymie).

**André LAPIERRE:** There are two major issues here. First, the absence of homogeneity of terminology in our discipline impacts negatively on the ability of scholars to promote scientific inquiry. Without a clear understanding and standardization of the terms we use, we simply cannot exchange ideas, discuss concepts and advance knowledge. Secondly, the absence of terminology specific to onomastics impacts negatively on our credibility as a stand-alone discipline or inter-discipline. Our relevance in the humanities and social sciences can be seriously challenged by other groups of scholars who actually do name studies within their own disciplines.

**Chao-chi LIAO:** Scholars seem to be fond of creating new terminology to show their creativity. After reading some articles, we feel they use different terms for the same concept. It also results from there existing minute differences between concepts. The third possibility is that scholars are generally better in their own native language than in English, the most popular world language. A term translated from English into the native language may then be back translated into a different English word.

**Ivan LUTTERER:** Only a perfect knowledge of "Wörter und Sachen" can surmount the absence of homogeneity of onomastic terminology.

**Giorgio MARRAPODI:** L'assenza di omogeneità nell'uso dei termini onomastici non ha molta importanza, se teniamo conto del fatto che la maggior parte degli studiosi di una nazione non si occupa di quel che succede nelle altre nazioni. Peraltro in certi casi la mancanza di omogeneità si risolve semplicemente nell'impossibilità strutturale di una lingua a tradurre termini usati in altre lingue: il tedesco *Wüstungsnamen*, che si

riferisce ai nomi di insediamenti non più esistenti o non più abitati come potrebbe essere tradotto convenientemente in una lingua romanza, evitando una lunga perifrasi? Il problema è più di forma che di sostanza: chi in Italia parlerà di questi toponimi dovrà rinunciare a un comodo termine e rifugiarsi in una meno comoda perifrasi del tipo "toponimi di insediamenti non più esistenti".

**Kay MUHR:** It makes the subject more complicated than need be (wasting energy unnecessarily). Of course one can learn all the variant terms, as in linguistics or philology, but there are always "false friends" – terms that suggest they mean things they don't – which lead even scholars into mistakes unawares.

It makes the subject less accessible to the general interested public. For instance, we used to use the term "hybrid" to classify place-names which include elements from more than one language, not trying to describe the process (which is most often one language incorporating what is already a "name" in another) but the end result. However the term "hybrid" has had the unfortunate effect of making people think it was quite normal for languages to get all mixed up. Now we try to explain more carefully when place-names indicate that one language must have borrowed a word from another, and when one language has adopted and re-used a name. This type we now call *ex nomine*, but this is Latin and too technical for most people!

**Gonzalo NAVAZA:** El empleo de términos precisos y homogéneos para referirse a cada uno de los conceptos específicos de un objeto o de los métodos con que se acomete su estudio es una condición necesaria de toda disciplina científica. La carencia de una terminología unánime y eficaz sólo puede conducir a la imprecisión y a la ambigüedad.

Algunos de los maiores problemas terminológicos con que nos enfrentamos no son específicamente onomásticos, sino que están presentes en otras disciplinas (lingüísticas, históricas, sociológicas...) imprescindibles en los estudios de onomástica. Otros muchos sí son problemas específicos del estudio de los nombres propios. En el ámbito cultural que centra mi interés (onomástica gallega e hispánica), sólo dos de las áreas objeto de la onomástica cuentan con una tradición científica bien consolidada (la toponimia y la antroponimia, casi exclusivamente desde la perspectiva de la lingüística histórica), y en todas las otras áreas o en diferentes enfoques de esos mismos objetos de estudio nos encontramos con problemas de fijación de conceptos o de uniformidad en el uso de los términos por parte de los investigadores.

**Peeter PÄLL:** The absence of agreed terminology to some extent hinders communication and discussion of name issues, as many ambiguous terms then need to be defined *ad hoc* (for any discussion). It is clear that terminology forms a vital part of the "common language" between scholars, and the vagueness of terms used is a problem in itself.

**Yaroslav REDKVA:** Onomastic science makes extensive use of specific terminology and has its own regularities and processes of development since gaining the status of a

separate branch of linguistics. Since in some areas there is no homogeneity in the use of onomastic terminology among scholars, cases of misunderstanding arise as some linguists confuse some terms. In my opinion, having a common standard will prevent such problems from occurring.

**Ewa RZETELSKA-FELESZKO:** As far as I understand, the inquiry is focused on the discrepancies existing inside international terminology. Firstly, there are different onomastic "schools" in individual countries (e.g. Czech, British) or "schools" comprising several countries in common (the Scandinavian school). Researchers use terminology that is accepted and settled in the literature of that particular school. Secondly, the issues of the researches are different on the international level; for example, some researchers are interested in historical onomastics, substrates and adstrates, other onomasticians deal with contemporary processes. This can lead also to differences in terminology. Thirdly, researchers usually use literature in their own language or other languages familiar to them (congress languages). There is a small group of researchers who use terminology only in their own language. There can be some differences between "North" and "South" Europe, which depend on which of the congress languages is more popular.

**Minna SAARELMA-MAUNUMAA:** First of all, the absence of homogeneity in the use of onomastic terminology gives the impression, both to outsiders and insiders, that onomastics is not a well developed branch of linguistics – which in my opinion is most unfortunate. In many countries, students of onomastics are sometimes even taught that as there is no real agreement on terminological matters in this field, scholars are free to develop their own terminologies for different purposes, on condition that they explain to their readers how they use these terms. It is clear that this attitude only leads to an increased absence of homogeneity in these areas. My personal impression is that many onomasticians seem to accept this state of affairs too easily – many of them most probably because they have had frustrating experiences of serious efforts in this field, either at a national or an international level.

**Aleksandra V. SUPERANSKAYA:** The absence of homogeneity in the use of codified onomastic terminology results in an absence of clarity in understanding both written onomastic texts and oral communications. There are several reasons for the lack of homogeneity in the usage of onomastic terms:

- a) There are some onomastic categories presented in some languages and cultures and not existing in some others, for ex., Russian *otchestva*, English *given names*, *name-dropper*, Catholic and Orthodox *agionyms*.
- b) The investigation of some onomastic categories is well developed in some countries and not developed in others.
- c) Each language segments reality in its own way; this results in similar words in the languages A and B having different meanings.
- d) The volumes of concepts connected with similar words in various languages do not coincide.

e) Each scientist regards the material from his or her own perspective and coins new terms according to his or her conception.

So the first thing to be done in any attempt to regulate terminology is to precisely define the concepts referring to this or that term and to give illustrative examples of the implication of terms.

**Willy VAN LANGENDONCK:** The absence of homogeneity is something you find all over the human sciences, also in linguistics. Terminology mostly depends on the concepts and views one holds. At the same time, I think a certain homogeneity would be welcome, also in onomastics. In a number of cases one can propose preferable terms, e.g., *toponymy* instead of *toponomastics* or *toponomy*, etc. We also need verbs like *proprialize*, *onymize* and *appellativize*. Personally, I distinguish between *proper name* and *proprial lemma*, or *proprio-appellative lemma*. (Theoretically, the latter is not the same as German *Gattungseigenname*, eigentlich ein Uding!).

**Natalia VASILYEVA:** Ich bin nicht sicher, ob ich die Frage richtig verstanden habe. Ich habe Schwierigkeiten mit dem Ausdruck *codified onomastic terminology*. Bedeutet das 'kodifiziert' oder nur 'systematisiert'? Das ist unklar. Systematisiert ist jede moderne Terminologie. Wenn die Terminologie kodifiziert ist, dann kann man nicht von der *absence of homogeneity* reden. Und dann: geht es um die Anwendung der Termini in einer Sprache oder in mehreren Sprachen?

Ich erlaube mir die Frage umzuformulieren und konzentriere mich auf die Ursache: *warum* es keine Homogenität in der Anwendung der onomastischen Terminologie gibt.

Es gibt m. E. zwei Gründe dafür, der eine ist mit dem wissenschaftlichen Denken verbunden, der andere hängt mit der Sprache zusammen. Der erste Grund besteht darin, dass Onomastik zu den Geisteswissenschaften gehört, die die Bezeichnung *soft sciences* bekamen, weil die begrifflichen Inhalte in diesen Wissenschaften im Vergleich mit den sog. *hard sciences* weniger präzise sind. Es ist auch bekannt, dass die Zahl der wissenschaftlichen Schulen in den Geisteswissenschaften viel größer ist, als in den anderen wissenschaftlichen Disziplinen. Das gilt auch für Onomastik, die als internationale Wissenschaft auch aus vielen nationalen Schulen besteht, die auf verschiedene Weise den Gegenstand gliedern und die Namenfelder klassifizieren. Der andere Grund, dass es keine Homogenität im Gebrauch der Terminologie gibt, ist mit der Sprache verbunden und besteht darin, dass die europäischen Sprachen zur Übernahme der onomastischen Internationalismen, i.e. Termini mit dem Grundelement *-onym*, nicht gleichermaßen geeignet sind. Manche Neologismen, die in einer Sprache normal klingen, sind für die anderen durch negative Assoziationen, Kakophonie usw. nicht akzeptierbar. Es ist also wichtig, die Frage zu beantworten, *warum* es keine Homogenität im Gebrauch der Terminologie gibt, weil wir dann dieses Fehlen nicht mehr pessimistisch zu betrachten brauchen: für die Onomastik liegt das ja in der Natur der Dinge. Die Frage, die nun logisch aus dieser Situation entsteht, klingt: wie können die Forscher sich verständigen?

**Paul VIDESOTT:** Il problema è direttamente proporzionale alla “internazionalità” dell’argomento e del pubblico lettore: minore nei lavori di taglio “pratico/monolingustico” (*konkret-einzelsprachlich*) (per es: “gli *ergonimi* nel dialetto rurale di X.Y”); maggiore invece nelle ricerche “teoriche/plurilinguistiche” (*theoretisch-übereinzelsprachlich*), per es: l’*ergonimo* tra appellativo e proprio nelle lingue romanze; massimo, infine, in lavori di tassonomia terminologica. Mentre in lavori del primo tipo (che tuttavia rappresentano – almeno numericamente – la grande maggioranza della produzione scientifica onomastica) per una corretta interpretazione dei risultati può essere sufficiente anche una comprensione solo intuitiva del significato del termine impiegato, nell’ultimo è indispensabile una definizione chiara e univoca, che tenga conto dell’impiego precedente nelle singole lingue e tradizioni scientifiche. È in questo tipo di lavori che una mancanza di omogeneità terminologica può creare seri problemi.

## 2. What are the spheres of onomastic research that create major problems? Quali sono gli ambiti onomastici che creano maggiori problemi?

**Terhi AINIALA:** In onomastic research, especially studies dealing with theoretical and methodological questions, major problems arise through the lack of a commonly used terminology. When looking at different branches among onomastics I see no difference between place names and personal name studies; in both fields there exist quite a confusion in terminological issues.

**Pierre-Henri BILLY:** Les linguistes créent de nouveaux termes et/ou de nouveaux sémantismes, par “nécessité”: encore faudrait-il pouvoir différencier nécessité et besoin langagier... D’autre part, la volonté de théoriser l’onomastique conduit à en théoriser la terminologie. Théorisation et traduction sont donc les problèmes majeurs d’une terminologie internationale.

**Eva BRYLLA – Mats WAHLBERG:** Personal names. The same term employed for different concepts. Different terms used for the same phenomenon. Disagreement between the semantic contents of the term and the phenomenon, which it intends to describe.

**Eva BUCHI:** Je ne vois pas de domaine particulier où le problème serait plus grave qu’ailleurs.

**Ojārs BUŠS:** There are difficulties in the using of the terminology in many spheres but, in my view, the biggest problems and misunderstandings are to be found in the general theory of onomastics and in the research of place-names.

**Rita CAPRINI:** L’antroponimia richiede allo studioso un’estrema attenzione e sensibilità storica e sociale. Però in questo campo mi sembra che si riescano a ottenere risultati qualitativamente e quantitativamente migliori, rispetto ad esempio agli studi toponomastici. Infatti, in un territorio come quello europeo fortemente antropizzato, e antro-

pizzato da millenni, con registrazione scritta di molti toponimi, i problemi sono infiniti. Ho cominciato i miei studi onomastici proprio dalla toponomastica, e mi trovo oggi ad avere più dubbi che sicurezze. Prendiamo ad es. un territorio come quello dell’Italia settentrionale, in cui la maggioranza dei nomi di luogo ci appaiono oggi opachi. I nostri sforzi di interpretazione sono nella maggioranza dei casi frustrati proprio dal fatto che le registrazioni antiche o medievali del toponimo (che dovrebbero quindi essere più vicine all’origine del toponimo stesso, e aiutarci nella sua interpretazione etimologica) risultano spesso, a un esame più serrato, null’altro che delle “interpretazioni” di chi scriveva (il notaio, per esempio), le cui ragioni ci risultano quasi sempre inaccessibili. Confesso che nel leggere proposte etimologiche di toponimi, anche formulate con la massima attenzione e padronanza degli strumenti linguistici e storici, mi devo spesso domandare se sia tutto vero o sia solo un’ipotesi buona come qualsiasi altra. Gli elementi a disposizione dello studioso sono sempre troppo pochi, o troppo ambigui...

**Vibeke DALBERG – Rob RENTENAAR:** Generally speaking, all spheres of onomastic research are faced with some major problems.

**Elwys DE STEFANI:** Le difficoltà evocate al primo punto si osservano in tutti i settori dell’onomastica. Forse l’ambito più problematico in questo senso è la toponomastica.

**Friedhelm DEBUS:** Mir scheint, dass im Bereich Namentheorie besondere Probleme auftreten. Hier sollte versucht werden, zu einheitlichen Terminologien zu kommen.

**Liljana DIMITROVA-TODOROVA:** Einer der onomastischen Forschungsbereiche, der im Bereich der slavischen Onomastik Probleme aufwirft, ist die Chrematonymie, die sich als Teilbereich der Onomastik in den zurückliegenden Jahrzehnten entwickelt hat, und für die noch immer keine langwährenden Traditionen bei der Erforschung von Eigennamen dieses onomastischen Zweiges zu verzeichnen sind. Unter dem Terminus *Chrematonymie* verstehen Wissenschaftler aus verschiedenen slavischen onomastischen Schulen etwas Unterschiedliches. Während die Wissenschaftler aus den westslavischen Ländern, gefolgt von ihren Kollegen aus den südslavischen Ländern, diesen Begriff weit gefasst auslegen, so verstehen die Wissenschaftler aus den ostslavischen Ländern unter Chrematonymie lediglich eine “Gesamtheit von Eigennamen von Dingen aus der materiellen Kultur”, da sie sich eng an die Bedeutung des Ausgangswortes, des griechischen Etymons *chrema* “Sache, Gegenstand” halten, und Bezeichnungen von Unternehmen, Behörden, Firmen u. ä. nicht in die Gruppe der Chrematonymie einschließen.

**Zsuzsanna FÁBIAN:** Gli ambiti che creano maggiori problemi sono forse quelli nuovi che nascono con la crescita dell’onomastica stessa. Può succedere che un nuovo ramo (per es. nomi dei mezzi di trasporto) nasca quasi contemporaneamente in due parti – e quindi lingue – diverse del mondo che saranno necessariamente differenti.

**Jean GERMAIN:** Le fait que l’onomastique est non seulement une science en tant que telle, avec ses méthodes et sa terminologie propre, mais aussi et presque surtout une

science aux confins de différentes disciplines majeures comme la linguistique, la philologie, l'histoire médiévale, la sociologie, la démographie, etc. Il y a donc conflit de plusieurs terminologies parallèles. A cela s'ajoutent les différences culturelles si l'on quitte le petit monde occidental; qu'est-ce qu'un nom de famille pour un Africain, qu'est-ce qu'un frère, un cousin pour un Africain?

**Doreen GERRITZEN:** A specific problem arises if there is no opportunity to use linguistic terminology. This means that there is a need for specific onomastic terminology. Of course, what we need depends on the name category under discussion.

**Albrecht GREULE:** Die größten Probleme schaffen die historisch-kulturell stark individuell geprägten einzelsprachlichen Systeme der Personennamen und die geographischen Namen.

**Isolde HAUSNER:** I can't see any problems, because all "schools" have built their own methodical and theoretical pattern and in this respect the terms used have their justification.

**Botolv HELLELAND:** At an early stage onomastic research used to be a national science where the main goal was to collect and investigate written and oral name material, primarily place-names and personal names, and publish it with comments and explanations. The need for an international terminology was not felt very strongly. This has changed over the years and today onomastic theoretical and methodological problems are discussed in various international contexts, for instance at international congresses. When publishing papers and works for international readers it is important that the terminology is understood. This applies to onomastics generally, but it is especially important when dealing with theoretical problems. It is also advantageous to use terms that are understood internationally when defining onomastic categories. UNGEGN has published a list of terms related to geographical names and this list should be consulted by *ICOS* and modified if necessary.

**Naftali KADMON:** I believe that most problems are related to literary onomastics, i.e. to terms appearing in general (more than in "professional") literature, because authors permit themselves extensive freedom in the use of language in general and of terms in particular.

**Volker KOHLHEIM:** Ich kann mich aufgrund eigener Forschungen nur auf den Bereich der Anthroponomastik beziehen. Hier ist das terminologische Chaos aber beträchtlich!

**Adrian KOOPMAN:** Toponymy is generally clearer than anthroponymy, I think, possibly because of the publications of bodies such as UNGEGN and scholars such as Kadmon, who have done much to standardize toponymic terminology. The same is not true of anthroponymy. In some of the lesser-touched areas of onomastics, such as literary onomastics and brand-names/marques, scholars are still creating their own terminology and standardization is a long way off.

**Jaromír KRŠKO:** The biggest problems are mainly to be found in the new sub-disciplines which arise with the natural development of scientific knowledge. These sub-disciplines should be presented in international onomastic journals together with their accompanying terms («RION», «Onoma» etc.)

**Anne-Dietlind KRÜGER:** Diese Frage ist schwierig zu beantworten, weil im Grunde alle Bereiche davon betroffen sind. Besonders auffällig erscheint es mir in der literarischen Onomastik, wo die deutsche Forschung eine eigene und damit auch andere Terminologie als die der slavischen Länder entwickelt hat (zum Beispiel ist in der russischen Namenforschung der Begriff *Poetonym* gebräuchlich, der im Deutschen völlig ungebräuchlich ist).

**André LAPIERRE:** The problem seems to be spread across the entire spectrum of onomastics. Some scholars do not even seem to be aware of the issue at hand. Recently at its annual meeting, a major onomastic society voted against a motion that would have required the editor of that society's journal to encourage the use of proper onomastic terminology!

**Ivan LUTTERER:** Different realities, different onomastic terms: e.g. *first name, given name, Christian name; rodné jméno, dívčí jméno* etc.

**Giorgio MARRAPODI:** Gli ambiti onomastici che creano maggiori problemi sono quelli dove la metodologia di analisi scientifica è rimasta a un livello talmente embrionale che sembra si possa fare a meno di una terminologia scientifica adeguata; per esempio, l'onimia popolare. O, al contrario, quegli ambiti dove la terminologia è così maniacalmente accurata che si è finito col perdere di vista l'obiettivo primario di una terminologia, ossia quello di servire alla descrizione agevole di fatti linguistici senza creare un sistema auto-poietico di formulazioni (per esempio l'onomastica di tradizione germanica).

**Kay MUHR:** Place-names from multilingual areas – whether the presence of several languages is historical or contemporary. As long as the languages have partisans (and scholars can be quite as partisan as those who live in the places!) there will be argument about the original language of the place-names and the relative importance or priority of the language within the place. Given that historical evidence tends to get lost over time, and minority languages are less likely to be recorded in writing than the number of speakers would suggest, the issues are impossible to resolve and may well have political implications.

**Gonzalo NAVAZA:** En todos los ámbitos se presentan problemas, pero voy a comentar un detalle que creo significativo. En el I Congreso Internacional de Onomástica Galega (2002), organizado por la Asociación Galega de Onomástica, una de las secciones llevaba el título de "Os outros nomes" ('Los otros nombres'). Las comunicaciones incluidas en esa sección se ocupaban de nombres de embarcaciones, nombres de vacas o de otros animales domésticos, nombres de establecimientos comerciales, nombres de estrellas y constelaciones, etc. En todas las comunicaciones presentadas, sin

excepción, se pusieron de manifiesto problemas terminológicos, sea como propuestas, sea como declaraciones de la necesidad de fijar una terminología, sea como aclaraciones o precisiones sobre la terminología empleada. Pero también en ámbitos de tradición más consolidada existen problemas semejantes.

**Peeter PÄLL:** Any spheres on the “edge” of our understanding of names might create problems, e.g. research into ethnonyms, business names, domain names, nomenclature terms, etc. If we were to take onomastics as a branch of lexicology then the delimitation of names might not be as problematic.

**Yaroslav REDKVA:** There are two definitions in Ukrainian onomastics that require differentiation from the point of view of definition: literary and folklore onomastics.

**Ewa RZETELSKA-FELESZKO:** I think that such spheres include especially researches focused on categories of proper names that are commonly distinguished, e.g. differences between chrematonyms, ideonyms, etc.

**Minna SAARELMA-MAUNUMAA:** As an anthroponymist, I have noticed many inconsistencies in the use of anthroponymic terms by scholars from different countries. It is clear that many of these can be explained by the differences in the anthroponymic systems in question, as well as by the different developments and traditions of anthroponymic research in different countries. It is also true that as long as people write about their research projects in their own language only, this does not cause any major problems – provided that there is an agreement on terminological matters in these languages. However, as scholars are nowadays expected to publish in other languages as well, they often face severe terminological problems. Having dealt with African onomastics myself, I have for example noticed how useless it is to apply Euro-Western onomastic terminology to African naming systems. Overall, the terminologies for African and other non-European anthroponymic systems are not as developed as one would hope. There is certainly a lot of work waiting to be done in this field.

**Aleksandra V. SUPERANSKAYA:** Major problems arise in those spheres of onomastic research which are advanced in some countries and are not touched upon in others. There are two ways of overcoming the difficulty:

- a) To coin new original terms in the languages where this or that terminological field is not developed;
- b) To borrow the whole system of developed notions and terms from languages where they are well elaborated into those languages which lack them.

There are some general onomastic terms underlying the whole system: *onym*, *onymisation*, *anthroponym*, *toponym* and some others. They must be used or should at least be understood in every country in spite of the fact that some native terms (*proper name*, *place-name* etc.) are preferable there. And there are many specific terms which are not required in some languages (Russian *patronym*, Polish *avonym*, Arabic *teknonym* etc.). Still these require to be understood by the representatives of other

countries. To avoid lack of clarity each author when preparing his or her work should give strict definitions of the terms he or she is using. A thorough investigation in any field usually brings about the creation of new terms.

**Willy VAN LANGENDONCK:** Maybe name theory is a difficult area. The term *name* itself is vague and ambiguous. But maybe, it could just be left like that; that could be handy... In the West, *proprial* is used while *onymic* is the Eastern term (though Richard Coates uses *onymic* as well). Personally, I don't wish to make such distinctions as *Namenforschung*, *Namenkunde* and *Namenstheorie* (à la Hansack). Where does “theory” end? (And how to translate this weird trichotomy into English or French?)

Do we need *onym* for *proper name/Eigennamen*? An important question is whether we should use terms derived from Greek, not only because young people don't know Greek any more, but also because they can create uncertainty and confusion. Why say *glottonym* instead of *language name*, etc.? Do we need to translate *year name*, *month name*, *day name*, etc.? I propose to use some names derived from Greek as secondary possibilities. Linguistic terms like *basic level category*, *denotation*, *connotation*, *reference (categorical, emotive, associative...)* meaning, *diminutive*, *augmentative*, etc. could be included.

**Natalia VASILYEVA:** Die Erforschung der neuen Gebiete der Onomastik – Namen, die mit dem sozialen, politischen, ökonomischen und kulturellen Leben verbunden sind (im Russischen gibt es eine spezielle Bezeichnung dafür: *die periphere Onomastik*). Diese Namen-Makroklasse ist prinzipiell offen, ist tief in den Bereich der Werbung eingebettet und braucht bei der Analyse nicht nur eine denotativbezogene Klassifizierung, sondern auch grundlegende pragmatische Verfahren.

**Paul VIDESOTT:** Gli àmbiti onomastici che creano maggiori problemi sono quelli meno standardizzati perché appartenenti a sottodiscipline onomastiche che si trovano ancora in stato di evoluzione/differenziazione.

### 3. What are the single onomastic terms that create major problems?

#### *E quali sono i singoli termini onomastici che creano maggiori problemi?*

**Terhi AINIALA:** In place name research the terms which cause the biggest problems are *micro-* and *macrotoponym*. While at least in Scandinavia these terms are defined regarding whether the group of people using the name in question is small or big, in some other countries the definitions have totally different premises. Also the terminology for the structure of place names and terms for some place name elements is unclear.

One major problem which also touches the categorization of names in the upper level is the term *other names*. In onomastics we are used to using this unclear and

unindependent term in relation to one particular name category. I consider this situation to be very unsatisfactory and also would like to encourage onomasticians to look for a better term. The solution would also require theoretical decisions to be taken about how to divide different kinds of names into different categories.

**Pierre-Henri BILLY:** Tout terme pose problème: si l'on pose la définition "Onomastique = science des noms propres", l'on se rend bien compte que, pour tout locuteur, chacun des trois termes ne revêt pas le même sémantisme. La difficulté est donc posée dès le terme premier de ce qui est à la base de nos études.

**Eva BRYLLA – Mats WAHLBERG:** The equivalents of the English *byname* (e.g. Swedish *binamn* and *tillnamn*) are used in Scandinavia in a sense that differs from English usage, which means that the English term is often misunderstood or perhaps used incorrectly. The use of the English terms *nickname*, *hypocoristic* are also confusing (perhaps even for English onomasticians). The English *field name*, *minor name* and German *Flurname* are also difficult to understand and use.

A very big problem is that English terms are widely used by non-English scholars in another sense than by native English scholars (or at least the meaning given in the ICOS terminology list). A great part of the existing onomastic literature is written in English by non-English speakers, who use the English terms with the meaning they have in their native languages.

**Eva BUCHI:** Ils sont assez nombreux. Par exemple on discute entre collègues pour savoir le sens exact de *microtoponymie*: 'nom d'un lieu non habité' ou 'nom d'un lieu qui ne forme pas une commune'...?

**Ojārs BUŠS:** I would name the 3 E's: *endonym*, *exonym*, *eponym*.

**Ana María CANO GONZÁLEZ:** Los términos de uso más frecuente. Los términos que se usan como sinónimos en unos casos y en otros no, incluso dentro de una misma lengua.

**Rita CAPRINI:** Ripeto: la terminologia non mi sembra il più grande problema degli studiosi di onomastica. Per es. chiamare il nome di battesimo *prenome* può essere una buona soluzione, che tiene conto del fatto che spesso battesimo non c'è stato o fatti simili. Ma guardiamoci dall'applicare meccanicamente il *politically correct* ai nostri studi: i veri problemi sono altri, a cominciare dalla scarsità delle forze degli studiosi (chi riesce a formare i futuri studiosi di onomastica nelle disastrose Università italiane?).

**Vibeke DALBERG – Rob RENTENAAR:** Unfortunately, most of the central terms that are used in onomastic research create problems, for example *name giving*, *name building*, *toponym*, *place name*, *Ortsname*, *personal name*, *forename*, *Christian name*, *family name*, *Nachname*, *by-name* etc.

**Elwys DE STEFANI:** Il termine che costituisce l'oggetto di studio dell'onomastica è tuttora molto discusso: il *nome (proprio)* italiano è affiancato dal tedesco (e slavo)

*Onym*. Alla luce delle tendenze recenti nel campo della semantica, risulta sempre più difficile riconoscere un valore "proprio" nelle unità lessicali che non esiteremmo a categorizzare come nomi propri. Tradizionalmente si è soliti affermare che il nome proprio è tale perché ha perso la sua funzione denotativa, ossia il significato (chi oggi si chiama *Bottero* non necessariamente fabbrica delle botti). La ricerca recente – ad esempio nel campo dell'analisi del discorso e dell'analisi conversazionale – tende a definire il senso non come un'entità statica veicolata dalla parola stessa, ma come il risultato di un lavoro collaborativo di negoziazione in cui sono impegnati gli interlocutori. L'onomastica – in particolare la ricerca sincronica sui nomi propri – non dovrebbe, a mio avviso, prescindere dalla ricerca che si sta svolgendo in questi campi.

A creare difficoltà di comprensione contribuiscono inoltre i termini relativamente recenti e, in genere, tutte le voci che vengono usate per significare delle realtà onimiche "periferiche". Quali sono, ad esempio, i criteri che permettono di differenziare tra *crematonimi*, *ergonimi*, *econimi* e *pragmatonimi*? E qual è l'utilità di disporre di un termine tecnico per indicare i 'nomi di atti diplomatici' (*attonimi*)?

**Friedhelm DEBUS:** Ein Hauptproblem stellt die terminologische Fassung der *Bedeutung* (meaning) in ihren Teilaspekten dar; ich habe dazu in meinem Pisa-Vortrag einen Vorschlag unterbreitet. Einzelne weitere Termini sind selbst auf nationaler Ebene nicht eindeutig (z.B. *Ortsname* in der deutschen Forschung).

**Liljana DIMITROVA-TODOROVA:** Größere Probleme bereiten Termini wie *Mikrotoponyme* und *Makrotoponyme*, *Chrematonyme*, *Ethnonyme*, *Diminutive* und *Hypokoristika*. Es bestehen auch einige Unklarheiten in Hinblick auf den Bedeutungsumfang einiger Termini, wie beispielsweise: Sind Wasser-Objekte, die sich auf dem Gebiet von Städten befinden, Urbanonyme – wie *Izvor* (die Quelle), *Ezeroto* (der See) etc., oder sind dies Hydronyme; oder auch: sind Fluss- und Wasser-Objekte im Gebirge Oronyme oder sind es Hydronyme?

**Zsuzsanna FÁBIÁN:** Una diversità nella terminologia è presente spesso a causa della differente classificazione onomastica che le singole lingue adoperano per tradizione. Per es. nell'italiano si hanno *idronimi* 'nomi di corsi d'acqua' e *limnonimi* 'nomi di laghi', ma non si ha un iperonimo per indicare i nomi di tutti i tipi di acque; nell'ungherese si ha invece solo *víznev* 'nome delle acque' ma non si ha nessun'altra partizione in gruppi iponimici minori. In tali casi non si tratta, in primo luogo, di introdurre nuovi termini, ma bisognerebbe dare un nuovo assetto a tutto il quadro concettuale tradizionale.

**Jean GERMAIN:** Il y en a certainement beaucoup. Quelques exemples: angl. *surname* 'nom de famille, cognome' qui n'est pas l'équivalent de fr. *surnom*, qu'on n'utilisera jamais dans le même sens (nom de famille officiel d'aujourd'hui); en français, un *lieu-dit* est-il un nom de lieu ou le lieu ainsi désigné?, etc.

**Albrecht GREULE:** Vergleiche dazu unsere Terminologie-Liste und die deutsche Übersetzung, z. B. deutsche *Flurname*.

**Botolv HELLELAND:** To my knowledge the term *place-name* sometimes seems to create problems in an international context, especially in French and German, as *nom de lieu* and *Ortsname* don't have exactly the same meaning as for instance in the Scandinavian languages (Norwegian *stadnamn/stedsnavn*, Danish *stednavn*, Swedish *ortnamn*). Probably *toponym* would be a more suitable term. However, most countries/languages have traditional terms which are familiar to their scholars. Probably most countries where there are active name-scholars have published lists on onomastic terminology on the basis of local tradition. Some scholars prefer their own traditional terms because they think that by doing so they can reach a broader audience at home.

**Naftali KADMON:** (a) very long terms such as *appellativisation*, *proprialisation*; (b) some terms originating in Greek or Latin for which easier or shorter English terms exist, e.g. *thalassonym* instead of *sea name*.

**Volker KOHLHEIM:** Im Bereich der Anthroponomastik:

Unterschiedlich wird bereits der Terminus *Personenname* verwendet: In der Regel für alle *Anthroponyme*, gelegentlich, z. B. im Handbuch *Namenarten und ihre Erforschung*, Hamburg 2004, nur für *Ruf-* bzw. *Vornamen*.

Im Deutschen ist unklar, was unter *Rufnamen* verstanden wird: Im Mittelalter bezeichnet der Terminus den *Einzelnamen*, in der Neuzeit denjenigen von mehreren *Vornamen*, mit dem jemand gerufen wird. Wieder eine andere Bedeutung hat der Terminus *roepnaam* im Niederländischen.

Sehr verwirrend ist auch, dass man im romanischen Sprachbereich den Vornamen oft als *Eigennamen* (franz. *nom propre*, span. *nombre propio*) bezeichnet. Dieser Terminus erscheint dann auch oft in der deutschsprachigen romanistischen Literatur, obwohl auf deutsch *Eigenname* im Allgemeinen das *nomen proprium* im Gegensatz zum *Appellativ* bezeichnet. Irreführend ist die Verwendung der Termini *patronymico* ('Patronym') und *onomástico* ('onomastisch', 'Namenstag') im Sinne von 'Vorname' im Spanischen.

Die Termini *Beiname* und *Übername* müssten präzisiert werden. *Beiname* wird heute einerseits für die (frühmittelalterlichen und späteren) charakterisierenden Zusätze zum Rufnamen bei Herrschern und anderen bekannten Personen (*Ludwig der Fromme*, *Karl der Kahle*, *Notker Labeo*) gebraucht. Andererseits wird dieser Terminus bei historischen Untersuchungen für alle ab dem 12. Jh. auftretenden Zusätze zum Rufnamen, die auf Abstammung, Herkunft, Wohnstätte, berufliche/amtliche Tätigkeit oder persönliche Merkmale des ersten Namensträgers hinweisen und die oft die Vorstufe erblicher Familiennamen darstellen, verwendet. Der Terminus *Übername* gilt in diesem Kontext den Zusätzen zum Rufnamen, die auf individuelle Merkmale und Eigenheiten des ersten Trägers anspielen. Hier fungiert *Übername* als eine Subkategorie der Kategorie *Beiname*. Für die Gegenwart wird *Übername* im Sinne von "inoffizieller Name" verwendet, d.h., er tritt an die Stelle des offiziellen Rufnamens, Familiennamens oder Gesamtnamens einer Person (vgl. WILFRIED SEIBICKE, *Die Personenamen im Deutschen*, Berlin/New York 1982: 205). Hierbei wird *Übername* als Oberbegriff für *Spitzname*, *Neckname*, *Spottname*, *Kosenamen* aufgefasst (vgl. SEIBICKE

1982: 18). – Der Terminus *Spitzname* sollte bei der Untersuchung von historischem Material nicht verwendet werden. – Präziser als der Terminus *mittelbarer Berufsname* ist der Terminus *Berufsübername*. Bei der Vergabe solcher Namen ging es nicht darum, eine neue indirekte Berufsbezeichnung zu prägen, sondern einen Menschen aufgrund eines Merkmals seiner beruflichen Tätigkeit zu charakterisieren.

Auch im Englischen herrscht Unklarheit. Während *surname* meist im Sinne von *Familienname* verwendet wird, ist für GOLD in einem Artikel in «Beiträge zur Namenforschung», 40 (2005) der *surname* die historische Vorstufe des *family name*, entspricht also dem *Beinamen*.

**Adrian KOOPMAN:** For me it is the terms *surname*, *nickname* and *byname*. And then there is absolutely no single standardized useful clear term for the personal name given by parents to a child at birth. *First name*, *forename* (*voornaam*), *Christian name* (?), *personal name* – all these have some problem with them.

**Jaromír KRŠKO:** It is not possible to name the terms that cause the biggest problems in the concrete. Every onomastician (or scientist) knows the terminology in his/her discipline and can compare different terms in other countries' systems as well. I see the problem as being in the ambiguity of the same onomastic terms in different languages. This problem is related especially to the different width of concept the term itself has. Then there is a shift in its content as well. Another problem arises from the fact that in particular onomastic schools there is different hierarchical arrangement of terms – e.g. in Slovak toponomastics the names of geographical objects in the area of a municipality are called *terrain names*, but also *areal names*, while in the past there was also used the term *microtoponyms*.

**Anne-Dietlind KRÜGER:** Diese Frage ist meines Erachtens nicht so einfach zu beantworten, weil sie mit der grundsätzlichen Entscheidung für eine auf der griechischen oder lateinischen oder einzelsprachlichen Sprachform basierenden Terminologie zusammenhängt. Gegenwärtig sind als Synonyme von "Name" bzw. "Eigenname", der lateinische Begriff *Proprium* (aus lat. *nomen proprium* 'Eigenname') und der Gräzismus *Onym* gebräuchlich. Das gilt auch für deren Ableitungen *proprial* und *onymisch*. Wenn bereits bei dem zentralen Terminus eine derartige Spleißung auftritt und vermittelt werden muß, so tritt dies natürlich auch bei allen Unterarten der *Namen*, *Eigennamen*, *Propria* bzw. *Onymen* zutage.

**André LAPIERRE:** There are several, but one that comes immediately to mind is the definition of *exonym* in toponymy. It has been discussed for more than twenty years and it appears that toponymists cannot agree on a common definition.

**Ivan LUTTERER:** *Oikonyms* x *anoikonyms*. With the expansion of the civilised world unsettled areas change into settled ones.

**Giorgio MARRAPODI:** I singoli termini onomastici che possono creare maggiori problemi sono quelli riferiti all'onimia popolare – vedi il tristo binomio italico *microto-*

*ponimo-macrotoponimo* – e quelli che sono strutturalmente marcati all'interno di una lingua (come l'esempio già ricordato di *Wüstungsnamen*).

Kay MUHR: I have mentioned "hybrid" and *ex nomine* above. The whole issue of administrative versus non-administrative place-names – the term *minor name* used for the latter here is counter-intuitive, especially for the public, since *minor names* can describe major natural features like mountains and lakes. *Personal name* is sometimes used loosely – is it just the individual's forename (*Christian name, given name*) or is it his/her surname or family origin as well?

Linguistically, we think there is a difficulty with the term *compound name*. Languages have and have had different ways of building word-elements into compounds, and in Irish Gaelic for example *creamhchoill* ('garlic-wood', written as one word, stress on *creamh*) is a compound while *coill chreamha* ('wood of [gen.] garlic', written as two words, stress on *chreamh*) is not. Adjectives can make "compounds" too, with the same rules regarding stress.

Gonzalo NAVAZA: Muchos son problemas universales de la ciencia onomástica, pero otros son sin duda problemas particulares de cada lengua o de su tradición científica. Por citar un ejemplo significativo dentro de los estudios de onomástica gallega y de la hispánica en general, diré que el propio ámbito que cuenta con una mayor y más sólida tradición científica, el de la toponimia, se denomina con un término ambiguo, pues se viene empleando la misma denominación (en español, portugués, galego, catalán...) tanto para referirse al objeto (los nombres de lugar) como a la disciplina que lo estudia, y las propuestas de emplear para esta segunda acepción un término diferente (v.g. *toponomástica*) tropiezan con el uso común.

Peeter PÄLL: It is obvious that the term (*proper*) *name* itself is the most difficult to define, as the definition involves fundamental understanding of the nature of names themselves. In anthroponomastics, it seems that all terms relating to *nicknames* – *by-names* are somewhat vague. In toponomastics terms relating to names of natural features (*field names, Flurnamen*) also need clarification as different languages here have traditional terms that cannot be easily compared.

Yaroslav REDKVA: There is no definite difference between *ergonyms* (< Greek ἐργον 'business, work, activity, function') – the names of any business unity of people: unions, corporations, institutions, organizations, entities) and *firmonyms* (< English *firm* in its narrower meaning, i.e. the names of commercial companies/firms of the type *advertising firm, manufacturing firm, business firm* but not legal or financial organizations). More and more often user names of electronic mail box are included as an object of onomastic study. In Ukrainian these are called Ukr. *логіноніми* (*loginonyms*) (English *logins, registered names*, the entry into an e-mail system, Polish, *e-nimy* (< Eng. electronic mail). These are technical terms (I call them *markers*), that are created by programmers and cannot be identifiers of a specific person (as e.g. anthroponyms: names, surnames, nicknames).

Confusing the terms of the Ukrainian word-forming morpheme *-ика* (*-ika*) (used to define the subfields of onomastics: Ukr. антропоніміка, *anthroponymics*, Ukr. гідроніміка, *hydronymics*, Ukr. ойконіміка, *oikonymics*), with the formant *-ія* (*-iya*) (proper names that are studied in one of the fields of onomastics): Ukr. антропонімія *anthroponymy*, Ukr. гідронімія *hydronymy*, Ukr. ойконімія *oikonymy*. This, in its turn, leads to increasing mistakes when coining new adjectives from these terms: instead of Ukr. гідронімічний (belonging to the science of hydronymics) we have Ukr. гідронічний (referring to the bodies of water), instead of Ukr. ойконічний (< *oikonym*) – Ukr. ойконічний (< *oikonymics*), etc. The onomastic term *зоонім* – the proper name (nickname) of an animal – was entered into a dictionary of linguistic terms and was wrongly defined as a common name for any species of animals.

Ewa RZETELSKA-FELESZKO: For example, the English equivalent of the German *Flurname*, Polish *nazwa terenowa* (i.e. 'field name') causes problems for me. In German and in Polish this term also includes meadows, marshes, woods and hills. In English the meaning of the term is narrower.

Minna SAARELMA-MAUNUMAA: A number of terms dealing with anthroponymic systems are very problematic. For example, the various terms referring to different kinds of bynames, which often look similar in meaning, may cover different concepts in different languages (in English: *nickname, call name, hypocorism, pet name, patronymic, surname, family name, last name*; in German: *Beiname, Rufname, Spottname, Kosenname, Spitzname, Patronymikon, Zuname, Familienname, Geschlechtsname*, etc.). In African onomastics, terms for other kinds of bynames have been created as well, e.g. *praise name, birth name* and *home name*, and these terms are often used differently by different scholars.

Aleksandra V. SUPERANSKAYA: To my mind, major problems are caused by the terms *chrematonym* and *brand-name*, because everybody uses them *ad libitum*. Russian scientists tend to divide the names of objects involved in the sphere of human activity into *idionyms* (connected with mental activity) and *pragmatonyms* (names of objects of practical implication). So *chrematonym* is a kind of a pragmatonym naming special items of material culture: musical instruments, weapons, gems, pieces made from native metals, brilliants etc., usually existing singly. Besides that we include in the class of pragmatonyms *porcionyms* (names of ships, planes and other means of communication), names of kinds and sorts of products, denotations of races and breeds of plants and animals received in the process of selection, trade-marks.

The denotations of all kinds of organizations, institutions, establishments, unions, societies etc. we regard as being *ergonyms*, because of the fact that the main ground for their formation is human activity, not place or value.

All of a sudden Russian journalists have begun to use the word *brand* in quite an odd way. They apply it to anything written in quotation marks: names of shops,

ships, teams, theatres, books, newspapers, performances, festivals etc. which we usually treat as *idionyms*, *poreionyms* or *ergonymys*.

Willy VAN LANGENDONCK: E.g., why use *econym* for trade and brand names while Greek *oikos* means 'house'. One might think that 'house names' are meant. And also, what to call house names themselves? *Chrematonym* is strange as well, and comprises names from the wastebasket, does it not? This is useless in my view. *Nickname* (*Beiname*, *bijnaam*, *sobriquet*) is a hard nut to crack! Personally, I use *byname* in English for *personal names* (= *anthroponyms*) that are not *first* or *family names* or *hypocoristics*. The English *surname* (Germ. *Zuname*) could be used for names added to the *first name* (i.e., *inheritable names*, *family names*, *byname*s). The British distinguish *first* from *Christian names*, etc. This could be a decision limited to the Anglo-Saxon world. Do *toponymy* include *hydronymy*? Such issues should be settled once and for all. Are we *onomasts* or *onomasticians*, *Namenkundler*, *Namenforscher* or *Onomastiker*?

Natalia VASILYEVA: Z. B. *Institutionsnamen*. Das ist der Fall, wenn schon die denotativbezogene Klassifikation Schwierigkeiten bringt, weil man in verschiedenen Sprachen und Gesellschaften unter *Institution* Verschiedenes versteht.

Paul VIDESOTT: I singoli termini onomastici che possono creare maggiori problemi sono quelli presenti in più lingue con significati leggermente diversi. Non creano invece problemi quelli presenti soltanto in una lingua con un significato ben preciso. In questo caso sarebbe addirittura auspicabile promuovere tali termini a "Fachbegriffe" internazionali (cfr. per es. l'impiego del termine *Flurname* in lavori di toponomastica italiani).

#### 4. How should the codification of onomastic terminology be realized, at least partially?

##### *Come si potrebbe realizzare nel settore una standardizzazione terminologica almeno parziale?*

Pierre-Henri BILLY: Une terminologie "internationale" ne peut approcher de la réalité que si: 1) elle est rédigée dans la langue qui l'emploie; 2) la traduction ne s'effectue pas sur le terme même mais sur son seul sémantisme. L'expérience menée par le Groupe de Terminologie de l'ICOS a montré qu'à un terme traduit correspond, dans la langue de traduction, un sémantisme différent de celui traduit. C'est là le principal apport des travaux réalisés.

Eva BUCHI: Organisation d'une consultation/réunion d'un "conseil de sages" lors d'un important congrès (par exemple ICOS) et par la suite, large diffusion des résultats de cette consultation.

Ojärs BUSS: We should continue to work with the terms, coined within the framework of the ICOS, following the first objective – to reach agreement over the interpre-

tation of the (100–150–200?) main terms of onomastics, an agreement that might be acceptable to the vast majority of onomasticians.

Ana María CANO GONZÁLEZ: Con un estudio de conjunto y comparado de la terminología utilizada en las diferentes lenguas o en las diferentes tradiciones culturales.

Rita CAPRINI: Mi sembra che in realtà ci capiamo tutti, che si dica *cognome* o *nom de famille*.

Vibeke DALBERG – Rob RENTENAAR: As long as onomasticians from different language areas show little interest in the work of colleagues from other areas, as is the case today, we fear that efforts to come to a more unified terminology will be mainly in vain.

Elwys DE STEFANI: Più che con un elenco di voci predefinite – che annullerebbe le differenze e sfumature concettuali dei vari strumentari terminologici – sarà il rigore scientifico dei ricercatori e la collaborazione tra studiosi radicati in tradizioni onomastiche diverse a portare a una standardizzazione terminologica.

Friedhelm DEBUS: Es wäre zweifellos sinnvoll, wenn Richtlinien für eine international verbindliche Terminologie entwickelt würden, wenigstens zunächst in Einzelbereichen. Hilfreich wäre auch, wenn es so etwas wie ein Handbuch gäbe, das die national unterschiedlichen Termini für denselben Gegenstand zusammenstellen würde: eine grosse Aufgabe!

Liljana DIMITROVA-TODOROVA: Das terminologische Wörterbuch der Onomastik dürfte nicht streng normativ sein, sondern es sollte einen informativen Empfehlungscharakter haben. In ihm können die Prinzipien für die Kodifizierung der Eigennamen festgelegt sein, so wie die kodifizierten Regeln bis zu einem bestimmten Grade in der Gegenwart bei der Verwendung der Termini bindend sein können. Das Ziel dieses Wörterbuchs ist es, eine Vereinheitlichung in der onomastischen Terminologie herbeizuführen. Die Schaffung einer vereinheitlichten internationalen Terminologie schließt die Verwendung lokaler Termini nicht aus, die mit dem Ziel verwendet werden, die Ausdrucksweise wissenschaftlicher Beiträge aufzulockern, oder mit dem Ziel, die onomastische Terminologie für die Leser populärwissenschaftlicher Publikationen mit onomastischer Problematik zugänglicher zu machen.

Zsuzsanna FÁBIÁN: Prima di tutto bisognerebbe operare una verifica dello *status* attuale: verificare la quantità e la qualità delle divergenze effettive, fattori che per ora avvertiamo solo istintivamente, in base alla nostra prassi quotidiana di studiosi di onomastica.

Il primo passo potrebbe essere la creazione di una raccolta multilingue – un vocabolario terminologico plurilingue – con tutti i termini onomastici in uso nelle lingue più usate, nelle lingue in cui l'attività onomastica è importante, e ancora, nelle lingue i parlanti della quale partecipano all'iniziativa. Il lavoro non dovrebbe essere né molto difficile né lungo, data l'esistenza di alcuni dizionari ed elenchi terminologici di questo tipo.

La redazione di un vocabolario multilingue dell'onomastica potrebbe essere basata su un approccio onomasiologico (per es: 'termine con il quale si designano le marche commerciali' > it: *marchionimo*, ungh. *márkanév*, ecc.). Nel vocabolario multilingue, che contribuirebbe di per sé a una certa unificazione della terminologia, apparirebbero molti sinonimi (parola internazionale-latineggiante e parola indigena) e vari usi "personali" anche all'interno della stessa lingua, tanti parallelismi tra le singole lingue ma anche numerose lacune. Il compito dei partecipanti all'iniziativa potrebbe essere per es. quello di formulare proposte per colmare le lacune dell'onomastica della propria lingua, in modo che vi sia concordanza con la maggioranza dei termini internazionali.

**Jean GERMAIN:** Réaliser d'abord une juxta des différentes terminologies dans les langues majeures, mais aussi à l'intérieur des langues elles-mêmes en partant des différents usages qui se reflètent dans les publications ou les divers index terminologiques. Mais c'est là un gros travail. Pour le français, voir désormais JEAN-LOUIS VAXELAIRE, *Les noms propres: une analyse lexicologique et historique*, Paris, Champion 2005 (Lexica: mots et dictionnaires, 14).

**Doreen GERRITZEN:** Onomastic scholars should be stimulated to produce (more) international publications, preferably written in English. If you regularly read and write in an international context the onomastic terminology will grow naturally.

**Albrecht GREULE:** Die onomastischen Termini sollten in einem Nachschlagewerk zusammengefasst werden, das vom Englischen ausgeht und von hieraus auf die Terminologie in möglichst vielen anderen Sprachen (Französisch, Spanisch, Deutsch, Italienisch) verweist.

**Isolde HAUSNER:** It would be helpful, perhaps, to establish a list with a concordance of the main terms used by the main "onomastic schools".

**Botolv HELLELAND:** In my opinion it is a good idea to establish a list based on Latin/Greek terms and then add the corresponding terms from other languages. Probably such a list would be most convenient if arranged in alphabetic order. Another less practical way of doing it would be to use a tree diagram radiating from *toponym*, *anthroponym* etc. Such a list would need to be translated into the different languages.

**Naftali KADMON:** The first problem: every language uses a different terminology. Therefore the first decision must be: what will be the basic language that will be used? After this has been decided upon, a list of terms must be prepared. Only a group (commission, working group) can compile a valid list, which must be based on literary research and surveys. The second stage (although it may be produced concurrently with the list itself) is the provision of the definitions; this requires discussion and, perhaps, compromises.

The second decision to be made is how to deal with other languages (if at all!). There exist two main possibilities, (a) to translate the terms from the basic language

into the other language, perhaps with some modifications. This approach was taken by the Working Group on Terminology of UNGEGN with regard to the six official languages of the United Nations. (b) Prepare an independent list of terms with their definitions for each individual language, which to me does not appear to be practical.

**Volker KOHLHEIM:** Man könnte eine Art Wörterbuch in verschiedenen Sprachen vorbereiten und es dann ausgewählten Namenkundlern zur Beurteilung via Internet schicken. Dieses Wörterbuch müsste auch auf der Homepage des ICOS zu finden sein, damit es für jeden zugänglich ist. Vielleicht genügt auch Letzteres.

**Adrian KOOPMAN:** Firstly, a single language (probably English, but not necessarily so) must be chosen, and onomastic terms from English and various other languages must be discussed, debated, and decided upon. Then the other (non-English) languages can draw from this.

**Jaromír KRŠKO:** The codification of onomastic terminology should be realised in a similar way to that used by J. Svoboda in the publication of *Základní soustava a terminologie slovanské onomastiky*, 1973 (The basic system and terminology of Slavonic onomastics). Next to each term there should be a definition of its content, its national variants/alternatives (in the Slavonic, Germanic and Romance languages) and strictly specified forms in all world languages. This terminological dictionary should be a part of all national onomastic guide books and should be obligatory for international conferences.

**Anne-Dietlind KRÜGER:** Die Tendenz, die in den letzten Publikationen offenbar wird, scheint in die Bevorzugung der griechischen Terminologie zu liegen. Die Termini werden dabei nach dem Muster *Anthroponym*, *anthroponymisch*, *Anthroponymie*, *Anthroponomastik*, *anthroponomastisch* gebildet. Möglicherweise bildet dieses Muster die Möglichkeit einer besseren internationalen Verständigung unter den Namenforschern. Andererseits dürfte unter den Studenten mit mangelhaften bzw. nicht vorhandenen Griechischkenntnissen sehr bald ein Problem auftreten, insbesondere bei selten behandelten *Onymarten* (vgl. *Koilonyme*).

**André LAPIERRE:** Through brain-storming, consultation and discussion. An ICOS Terminology Working Group, based on the same principles as the UNGEGN Working Group on Terminology, could elaborate a Glossary with examples relating to all areas of onomastics. Contributions from and consultations with the UNGEGN Working Group on Terminology should be considered as well. Use of proper terminology should be strongly encouraged by ICOS members.

**Ivan LUTTERER:** The codification of onomastic terminology could be partially realised among languages with common roots (Slavonic, etc.).

**Giorgio MARRAPODI:** Una standardizzazione almeno parziale già esiste. Per il resto non ne vedo la necessità, considerato che, una volta uniformati i termini, si comince-

rebbe a disquisire e a spaccare i capelli in quattro sull'oggetto che ciascun termine dovrebbe delimitare e definire. Forse sarebbe ora di cominciare a mettersi d'accordo sui contenuti dei termini. *Rem tene, verba sequuntur.*

**Kay MUHR:** Tabulate (with adequate definitions) all the terminology used in the different countries and possibly by different institutions dealing with place-names (e.g. maps may use different lettering for what the cartographers perceive as different types of name). This will probably have to be done thematically rather than alphabetically, so that the relationship between terms becomes evident. Then begin to compare these...

**Gonzalo NAVAZA:** El punto de partida puede ser cualquier lengua. Podría comenzarse con la elaboración de un vocabulario mínimo, donde cada término vaya acompañado de una definición exacta y precisa, y a partir de ahí establecer correspondencias unívocas con términos de cada una de las otras lenguas. Dado que la mayor parte de los términos serán cultismos, creados sobre bases latinas o griegas, conforme a la tradición científica universal, las correspondencias en las distintas lenguas constituirán casi siempre variantes de un mismo término, adaptadas en cada caso a las características morfológicas y fonéticas de la lengua correspondiente.

**Peeter PALL:** It would be useful to start with core terminology (as has already been done), and to keep the definitions of the most complicated terms (such as *name*) fairly short, allowing some variation in content and continued academic discussion on the exact meanings of the terms. Other, non-central terms could be added at a later stage, starting with those that cause the least controversy. Finally, terms from certain languages should be added that do not have clear counterparts in other languages, with thorough definitions, if possible.

**Yaroslav REDKVA:** The codification of onomastic terminology should be based on the classical languages – Greek and Latin.

Principles of codification: a) topicality (productivity of linguistic means that are stipulated by the necessity of expression by use of an appropriate term new onomastic meanings irrespective of the fact of whether the linguistic means are new or traditional, national or international); b) expediency (the use of the most optimal means of expressing onomastic notions – models, formants, derivational means, – that lie in the use of the most semantically comprehensive and economical methods of term formation: abbreviation, one-word terms and phrasal terms); c) analogousness (repetition of onomastic lexical, morphological, and derivational means to express analogous notions).

Criteria of codification: *one word terms* (enabling brevity); *international character* which is achieved by the use of Latin and Greek stems; *systematic character* of term structure (in closely related Slavic languages such as Ukrainian, Russian, and Polish this is achieved by the formation of the term (of one-, two-, or three stem terms) according to a certain model taking into account the systematic character of the struc-

ture of onomastic terms and using typical morphemes). The criterion of internationality would completely correspond to the principle of *analogousness*, for example, the international element *onym* (old Greek ὄνομα) is used in a number of Ukrainian composite terms which do not differ from the analogous common Slavic and non-Slavic terms.

**Ewa RZETELSKA-FELESZKO:** I am not sure if codification of international terminology is possible. In my opinion, researchers are interested more in the results and publication of their own researches than in adjusting their terms to a prescribed terminology. A consistent codification can be implemented only in one or several international journals (an enormous effort by their editors would be necessary). It would be also possible to attempt only a partial international codification: only the most important and most general terms would be codified.

**Minna SAARELMA-MAUNUMAA:** The work could be – and has already been – started by looking at the central onomastic terms used in the English language, which is today the most commonly used *lingua franca* in academic circles. After this, terminology groups in different countries could develop terminologies for their own languages following, whenever possible, the guidelines made for English onomastic terminology.

**Aleksandra V. SUPERANSKAYA:** The codification of onomastic terminology should be realized on the basis of previous experience. First of all InfoTerm should be mentioned. Some terminological work has already been undertaken by A. A. Reformatskiy and A. V. Isachenko.

It is impossible to achieve a terminological codification by means of prescriptions and prohibitions or by means of the letter for letter transferal of terms from one language to another (*adjective* in Language A = *adjective* in Language B; *appellative* = *appellative* etc.).

The denotate of a term is the concept it denotes. It is the harmonization of concepts in various languages that precedes the codification of terms. The more languages that are involved in the process the more difficult it is to come to a consensus.

I watched A. A. Reformatskiy working on Slavonic linguistic terminology together with Vlasta Straková. Every now and then he would comment that Czech or Polish use of certain terms did not coincide with the Russian practice. Sometimes representatives of various schools in the same country use the same terms in different senses (*phoneme* in Moscow and St Petersburg). It is only after a national codification of terms is achieved that we should start with the international codification of terms.

The practice of InfoTerm runs as follows. They prepare a terminological project in a particular branch of science or technique and they send it to experts in all the countries who are taking part in the elaboration of terminology. In our case it might be only anthroponyms or toponyms or general problems etc. because the total amount of terms used in onomastic science is too large to be done at once. Each term in such a project must have a strict definition and illustrative examples to be clear as what the

term is being applied to. It is necessary that the notions existing in some languages and cultures and not existing in others be noticed and defined in the projects.

After receiving all the various approvals and observations the staff responsible for the project would make the necessary corrections and supplements then send it off again to all the members for approval.

I took part in the elaboration of Slavonic onomastic terminology conducted for the first time by L. Olivová-Nezbedová and for the second time by B. Vidoeski. I elaborated the Russian part of the terminological material together with N. V. Podolskaya. We usually began with definitions. And it was only after the definitions appeared to be clear enough that the terms were accepted.

There are three ways of coining new terms: 1. To terminologize some national words or to form the terms out of national elements. 2. To borrow a term from another language. 3. To make terms from international (Greek and Latin) elements which are alien to all the modern languages and therefore common and universal.

The previous generation of onomasticians did a great amount of work in the field of onomastic terminology in the 60's and 70's. New concepts and terms arise in the process of investigation. Some improvements are therefore required. But we must not do away with the accepted and perfectly usable terms.

**Willy VAN LANGENDONCK:** In view of the steady evolution of theory, the codification would have to be very flexible and open, to be updated continually (online). Not every term should be standardized. We can leave open less frequent, or even certain national terminology, e.g. *first name* vs. *forename* vs. *Christian name* (see above). Note that it will not always be possible to find adequate translations (as in this case)!

**Natalia VASILYEVA:** Als die einzige Möglichkeit, die onomastische Terminologie mindestens zu harmonisieren (denn kodifizieren kann man die metasprachlichen Einheiten in den *soft sciences* kaum) sehe ich ein internationales multilinguales Nachschlagewerk. Als Makroprinzip des Aufbaus kann ein Thesaurus-Prinzip vorgeschlagen werden. Der Thesaurus als Typ des Wörterbuches bedeutet, dass der Wörterbuchartikel nicht nur aus dem Terminus als Stichwort und aus der Definition besteht, sondern auch die semantischen Verbindungen des Terminus-Stichwortes mit den anderen Termini präsentiert. Die Liste der semantischen Verbindungen soll eine für alle onomastischen Termini sein (nicht alle Punkte können ausgefüllt werden) und kann als tertium comparationis bei der Harmonisierung der Terminologie auftreten.

**Paul VIDESOTT:** Si potrebbe pensare a una sorta di dizionario elettronico sul modello di *Wikipedia*, con possibilità di discussione e di correzione. Una lista di corrispondenze dei termini più importanti nelle maggiori lingue di pubblicazione, che tenesse conto dell'utilizzo concreto di tali termini nelle differenti tradizioni scientifiche, sarebbe di grand'utilità. Come punto di partenza di tali liste potrebbero fungere i termini scientifici greci, perché "neutrali" e non connotati da un impiego specifico in una determinata tradizione scientifica.

**5. Would it be useful if ICOS, or some other qualified international group, proposes some guidelines towards the codification of onomastic terminology? If yes, under what conditions?**

***Potrebbero risultare utili delle linee guida proposte da ICOS o da un altro qualificato gruppo di lavoro internazionale di studiosi? Se sì, a quali condizioni?***

**Terhi AINIALA:** The present solution looks very good and useful to me. The terminology group which is doing its work as part of the ICOS seems to be able to establish a terminology with a list of key terms. The terminology list will be a list done co-operatively by members from many different countries. When the list is on the Internet it also will be easily accessible to many scholars. The biggest problem lies in the question of how to make different scholars aware of the list and even make them use it. At least the group members and other ICOS-board members should do their best to inform researchers in their own home countries about the terminology. Terminology should also be taken into consideration in teaching onomastics at least in the universities.

**Eva BRYLLA – Mats WAHLBERG:** The ICOS Terminology group should continue its work by sending out the preliminary list to native English onomasticians outside the group itself. The English list must be finished before the group continues with the German and French lists.

**Eva BUCHI:** Absolument! Je ne vois pas de conditions particulières.

**Ojars BUŠS:** ICOS is exactly that one "gremium" that can propose some guidelines as well as even prepare a kind of small, but monolingual terminological dictionary. Of course, one of the obligatory conditions for a lexicographical work is some kind of financial support (maybe as a national grant?) for the authors of such a dictionary.

**Ana María CANO GONZÁLEZ:** Sí. En el campo de la antroponimia, pienso que podría ser útil la estandarización realizada en el seno del proyecto *PatRom*. Habría que formar un grupo de trabajo en el que se integraran especialistas de diferentes lenguas o familias de lenguas que estuvieran dispuestos a trabajar y que contaran con tiempo y medios para hacerlo.

**Rita CAPRINI:** Se si finisse col mettere tutta la terminologia in inglese, certamente non mi sembrerebbe il caso. Esistono dei problemi, come l'esistenza di "falsi amici" nella terminologia onomastica europea. Ma in generale credo che la nostra produzione sia "consumata" soprattutto dai colleghi, che non avranno grossi problemi a capire. È curioso constatare come esista un pubblico non specialista molto interessato alla problematica onomastica. Anche in questo caso, però, i maggiori problemi non mi sembrano quelli terminologici.

**Vibeke DALBERG – Rob RENTENAAR:** Codification might lead to scholarly stagnation. We are therefore of the opinion that it would be more advantageous to concen-