

The Terminology of Name Studies (In Margine of Adrian Room's *Guide to the Language of Name Studies*)¹

Ladislav Zgusta

University of Illinois

The *Guide to the Language of Name Studies* is briefly reviewed and the terminological system presented there is compared with that of the earlier *Osnoven Sistem*. Observations are made on the terminology found in recent onomastic work, particularly that appearing in *Name Studies*.

The year 1996 saw the publication of a new book which attempts to codify and, to a large extent, even create the terminology of name studies. The work is Adrian Room's *Guide to the Language of Name Studies*. Its chronological predecessor is the East European *Osnoven Sistem (Basic System)*, published for the Commission for Slavic Onomastics in 1983. In addition, the period 1995-1996 brought the publication of the three volumes of *Name Studies* (Eichler, et al.), a work which illustrates the actual use of terminology in three West European languages (French, German, and English) by many students of names from different nations.

The present article is structured as follows: in [1] I review Adrian Room's book; in [2] I compare his terminological system and coinages with those of the *Osnoven Sistem*; in [3] I provide observations on the terminological usage of various name studies; and finally in [4] I conclude with some general reflections.²

[1] Most branches of scientific and scholarly activities have developed for their purposes terminologies that are largely based on Greek and Latin morphemes. The advantages of this approach are clear: these morphemes belong to no living language, hence they are international; and their original languages ([Classical] Greek and Latin) are dead, so purism cannot intervene so obstreperously as when new

expressions are coined from living languages. On the other hand, such terms, chiefly those of Greek origin, also entail difficulties of their own.

The terminology of name studies is burdened by an anomaly of Greek derivational phonology that causes a difficulty at the very heart of the terminological field: the Greek word for 'name' is *onoma*,³ but in some dialects *onyma*; and the form used in compounds is *-onymo-*.⁴ Hence, we find the Greek series *onoma* 'name', stem *onomat-*; *onomazein* 'to name', *onomastikos* 'belonging to names', (*techne*) *onomastike* 'the technique, or art, of giving names' (from which there is but a small step to modern *onomastics* 'the study of names', etc. On the other hand, the ancient adjectives *anonymos* 'without a name', *pseudonymos* 'with a false name' have been used in western languages since time immemorial with their modern meanings (which roughly coincide with the ancient ones). And since they have been frequently used, it is only natural that a series of derivations came into existence that have the form of these adjectives, rather than that of the noun *onoma*; hence *anthroponym*, *toponym*, 'name of a person', 'name of a place', and then *anthroponymia*, *toponymia* → *anthroponymy*, *toponymy*, as terms for collections of such names. And the studies of such names can be called by the same terms; or on the model of, say, *mathematics*, they could be and were called *anthroponymics*, *toponymics*. Or else one can choose *onomatology*, a term that has support in numerous coinages in other branches of scholarship. All these terms are represented in name studies written in various European languages; to assess the preferences of individual languages would serve no purpose in this connection. Our author chooses *onomastics* as the term for name studies in general; *anthroponymics*, *toponymics* (etc.) as the study of personal and place names (thus in spite of the discrepancy between the general term and the two more specific ones); *anthroponymy* and *toponymy* as the repertoires of personal and place names; *anthroponym*, *toponym* as individual such names; and hence *onym* as a proper name of any nature. (*Onym* is a modern abstraction from compounds such as *toponym*, not a coinage based on the dialectal Greek variant of the noun, viz. *onyma*.) However, *onoma* is admitted as an alternative term for *onym*. *Onomatology* is defined as 'an alternative term for *onomasiology*'; the latter term is taken as the study of the meaning of names or as the study of rules underlying the designation of objects. On the other hand, a person devoted to name studies is called an *onomastician*. (My favorite

conjecture is that both *linguistician*⁵ and *onomastician* are based on the unattractive model of *mortician*.) By contrast, personal names are studied by *anthroponymists* and placenames by *toponymists*. We thus see here one of the consequences of the Greek phonological anomaly.

The preceding paragraph illustrates Room's method: he suggests his preferred choices among existing, competing terms. However, sometimes his preference is not so clearly expressed. For instance, *allonym* is defined as an alternate name of any kind, with examples such as *Anthony/Antony*, *Cassius Clay/Muhammad Ali*, *New York City/The Big Apple*, *Great Britain/United Kingdom*, *France/Frankreich*, *Christmas/Noel* (the last name probably as used in English)—a broad variety of different types of names. There is a cross-reference to *parallel names*, defined as "unrelated names that refer to the same person or thing," with examples such as *Amenhotep/Akhenaton*, *Great Bear/Ursa Major*, *Marilyn Monroe/Norma Jean Mortensen*, etc. And there is the term *paronym*, "a name that has altered slightly in form from an earlier ...form," with examples such as *Clare/Clara*, etc. Obviously, these terms substantially overlap, without any intervention by the author, who proceeds here descriptively, not normatively, just as when he admits *onoma* as an alternative to *onym*.

A new term sometimes replaces an older one: *econym* (Greek *oikos* 'house' + *-onym*) is the name of a settlement, such as a town (*astionym* [Greek *asty* 'town']) or village (*comonym* [Greek *kome*, with long *-o-*, omega]). A book containing such placenames is called an *econymicon*, which replaces the term *gazetteer*, which is not listed at all. A parallel formation is suggested for *anthroponymicon*, a dictionary or list of personal names, and *zoonymicon* (Greek *zoon* 'animal'). The author here follows quite closely the Greek pattern of derivations such as *lexikon* (Greek *lexis* 'word') for dictionary. However, here we have a case of problematic polysemy of a suffix (viz. *-ikon*): in *lexikon* the meaning of the suffixed form is 'collection of words', whereas in *ethnikon* the derived form is not a 'collection of names of nations or tribes', but rather 'the name of the people inhabiting a particular place'. Room defines *ethnicon* as 'a name that is used identically for a place...and for the people who inhabit it' (e.g., *Latium/Latini*, *Venetia/Veneti*); but sometimes it may be an alternative for *ethnonym*, the name of a people, nation, tribe, race, etc. (note here the difference between *econymicon* and *ethnicon*). In Greek, the term *ethnikon* indicated a person's place or

region of origin (modern examples would be *Glaswegian*, *New Yorker*, or *Mid-Westerner*), but for this notion the author coins the term *cateconym* (Greek *kata*, preposition, *oiko-* 'house'). Here we hit a difficulty inherent in the Greek morphemes, both the suffix formants and the stems: in the same way as with morphemes in any other language, the Greek ones sometimes are, or seem to be, polysemous. For instance, *hodos* has always meant (and still does mean) 'way, highway, street'. The author defines the term *hodonym* as the name of a street or road *in a town*, thereby narrowing the meaning, but then goes on to say that *hodonyms* have many denominatives, among them 'alley, avenue, ...freeway, highway, ...turnpike'. Thus, the Greek polysemy comes back with a vengeance. It is alleviated by the coinage of *dromonym* (Greek *dromos* 'course'), which denotes a communication or transport route (Channel Tunnel, Northwest Passage, Route 66, Silk Road); this is a good term but it makes for some overlapping with the *hodonym* (cf. the examples).

The reverse predicament obtains when Greek does not offer a suitable morpheme. For instance, Greek (not unlike English) has no simple term for literature in general and *belles-lettres* in particular. Therefore, the author coins for fictional or literary names (e.g., Mr. Pickwick) the term *poetonym*. The Greek scholar will find nothing strange in this, because the author derives the term from the past participle *poietos* 'done, made, created' (from the verb *poiein*); however, there are colleagues among us who know other languages better than Greek and they may be puzzled, thinking the term refers to names of poets, or to poetic names, or something of that sort.

Such a lack of an appropriate morpheme greatly bedevils attempts to find a term to express the notion of the family name, because in Greek the word *oikos* or *oikia* covers the meanings of both the house or home, and the family (by metonymy, cf. 'the House of Windsor'). Room has reasonably circumvented the trouble spot by simply staying with *family name* or *surname*. It is undoubtedly a *metabasis eis allo genos*, if not indeed a flaw, to have these old-fashioned expressions amidst the maelstrom of boldly innovative creations; nevertheless, there is no good or easy way out. One could, e.g., try to keep *oiko-* for the sense 'house' and *oikio-* for 'family' (or vice versa); or one could reserve the modern spelling *eco-* for 'house' and keep *oiko-* for 'family'; but can the profession be expected to be disciplined enough to accept

and follow such a convention? Another option (not undertaken by our author, either) would be to create a hybrid word, in this case *familyonym* (on the pattern of German *Familiennamen*). Apart from the glaring (and at least to me, repulsive) discrepancy of the two parts of the compound, there is also the antiquarian's objection that in the Roman *familia*, the slaves were legal members of the family, whereas the modern domestic servants (insofar as they still exist in such places as India or the wealthier areas of California) are not; and there is the modern objection, namely, that there are families in which the spouses have different last names, with children collected in the course of various preceding marriages and divorces (or adopted) possibly adding to the diversity of surnames. The term *last name* is appropriate in many countries, but not in, e.g., Spain; for instance, if Sr. José María González and Sra. Felicianita Martínez de González have a son, Juan González y Martínez (Room 1996, 83-84), the family name is not simply the last one. In languages such as Hungarian, Chinese, and Korean, what we call the last name would be the first name; the order is reversed.

Once we have reserved *eco-* for inhabited places, we can continue specifying: *ecodomonym* (Greek *domos* 'house') 'building'. Why the *eco-* is necessary there is not quite clear since buildings typically are built for some kinds of habitation or human use. In any case, more specific types of houses can be denoted: e.g., the name of a jail is said to be an *eirgmonym* (Greek *eirgmos* 'prison'), and for church the term is *ecclesionym* (Greek *ekklesia* 'church'). On the other hand, there is also *aneconym* (Greek *an-* 'not'), 'the name of an uninhabited manmade place or structure'.

I shall now mention some interesting features of Room's terminology, selected more or less at random.

An *americonym* is 'an American name of any kind, especially a typical one'. This is an immensely productive pattern for our author: there are *anglonyms*, *franconyms*, *germanonyms*, *astronyms*, *cosmonyms*, etc.: names in England, in France, in Germany, of and on heavenly bodies, of regions of the universe, etc. Here belong also *arthuronyms*, names connected with the Arthurian legends. Some specific categories of astronyms are then *marsionyms*, *plutonyms*, *selenonyms*, etc.: names of 'natural objects' on Mars, Pluto, the moon. (All such objects are as yet uninhabited, so it is not necessary to specify that fact; but with the arrival of a permanent station on the moon, one will be compelled to

194 Names 46.3 (September 1998)

distinguish, I suspect, *ecodomoselenonyms* for inhabited houses on the Moon from *anecoselenonyms* for the uninhabited objects.)

Another productive series is *ailuronym*, *cynonym*, etc.: names of cats (Gk. *ailuros*), dogs (Gk. stem *kyno-*), etc.

Sometimes one must manipulate the Greek meaning a little or use a hybrid formation in order to get a suitable number of terms: *museonym* is derived from the modern word for 'museum', but the ultimate derivation is from Greek *mouseion* 'temple of Muses'. *Musonym* is derived from Greek *Mousa* 'Muse' but to get the meaning of 'musical composition' (e.g., *Eroica*, *Marseillaise*), one must restrict the activities of the original nine Muses to music only. And in the case of *musiconym* 'name of a musical group or orchestra', one can expect that Greek scholars will know that Greek *mousikos* means 'skilled in music, elegant, man of letters' and that they will understand the terminological meaning of the coinage "musical group." The situation in Greek is not always so convenient as in this case; hence, e.g., the necessity of creating *balletonym*, of obvious meaning.

Some of the Greek coinages have a funny side of their own, such that one is sorry not to get more of them: *sympaisonym* (Greek *sympaiein* 'to play together'), 'name of a team or club in any sport'; *syssitionym* (Greek *syssition* 'public mess, mess room'), name of a restaurant (*La Tour d'argent*, *Zu den drei Hussaren*, *l'Escargot*, etc.). The author translates the Greek word as 'dining room', but that is somewhat misleading: *syssition* was basically a Spartan institution; there communal meals for men were strongly encouraged, even enforced, to keep up the military spirit and prevent the encroachment of luxury and inanities. Along with these beauties, why not create yet another term, *sympoterionym*, for names of bars (Greek *sympotes* 'fellow drinker')?

An *anonym* (Greek *ana*, roughly 'back' as in *anaphora*) is a reversed name, e.g., the pseudonym *John Dralloc* instead of *John Collard*. But why not stick to the traditional *palindrome name*, which is good, even better, Greek?

Anemonym (Greek *anemos* 'wind') is defined as the name of a hurricane or a violent wind. Why not encompass, as well, under this term names of lesser winds like *Boreas*, *mistral*, *sirocco*, etc.?

Apronym (Engl. *apt*) is 'a semifacetious term coined by...Franklin P. Adams for an *anthroponym*' that expresses or describes the bearer's

profession, status, of physical traits; e.g., Will C. Starrs for an astronomer. But whence the *-r-* in the term (apparently it is not a misprint)? [A particularly repulsive coinage.] Some other such hybrid compounds are: *balletonym*, name of a ballet, *documentonym*, name of a document. Interesting is *personym*, said to be an alternate term for a *personal name*. The coinage of this compound allows one then to proceed to more specific terms, such as *anthopersonym* (Greek *anthos* 'flower'), e.g. Cherry, Daisy, Flora, even Florence, Laura, Olive, Fern; and *lithopersonym* (Greek *lithos* 'stone'), e.g. Beryl, Coral, Ruby. [The author specifies that he has in mind female names only, and mostly only forenames. Yet, given the fact that *Rubin*, e.g., is a frequent German surname, one can wonder whether it would not be well to distinguish *lithogyneconyms* (e.g., Beryl) from *lithoanthroponyms*, or to keep this latter term as a hyperonym for both men and women, and coin *lithoandronym* for men only.]

The term *astronautonym* exemplifies the fact that even a Greek scholar can be uncertain about morphemic boundaries: this term would seem to refer to the names of astronauts, but not so: that *naut-* must be taken as the Greek stem *nau-* 'ship', Lat. *nav-is* 'ship'. The term refers to the names of spaceships, such as *Galileo*, *Sputnik*, *Voyager*, etc.

Paponyms are defined as a special sort of throne name [but why not *thrononyms*, since *thronos* 'throne' is a good Greek word?] reserved for popes, such as John Paul II, Paul VI, etc. [In this context, the reader gets the information, clearly a *lapsus calami*, that in history only three popes were not Italian.]

A highly productive series is formed by use of the prefix *de-*; e.g., in *deanthroponymization* an anthroponym becomes a general noun (Mr. Diesel → diesel [fuel]); in *deethnonymization* an ethnonym becomes another name (Angles → England, Parisii → Paris). [Notice the difference between these two formally identical terms.] Generally, a *depropriative* is a name derived from another name (Alexander → Alexandria; Worcester → Wooster [anthroponym]); the process itself is called *transonymization*. On the other hand, there is also *detoponymization* (e.g., Jodhpur → jodhpurs [breeches], Madeira → madeira [wine]), or more generally, *deonymization* (Ampère → ampère, Labrador → labrador [breed of dog]). The opposite process is called *onymization* (rose → Rose).

The foregoing discussion, then, may suffice to characterize this terminological system.

[2] Sometime in the 1960s, some students of names in what was then Czechoslovakia and Eastern Germany (particularly in Leipzig), in Poland, and to some extent also in what was then the Soviet Union, started developing a similar terminological system. The most comprehensive treatment of this Eastern European system is offered in *Osnoven Sistem i Terminologija na Slovenskata Onomastika* (1983). The board of editors consisted of: F. Bezljaj (Ljubljana), M.V. Birylo (Minsk), V. Blanár (Bratislava), H. Jentsch (Budiszyn), M. Karaš (Cracow), V. Mihajlović (Novi Sad), V.V. Nimčuk (Kyiv), L. Nezbedová-Olivová & K. Oliva (Prague), N.V. Podolskaja & A.V. Superanskaja (Moscow), P. Šimunović (Zagreb), V. Šmilauer (Prague), B. Vidoeski (Skopje), T. Witkowski (Berlin), and J. Zaimov (Sofia). The terms in this work are listed in Czech, Slovak, Polish, Sorbian (=Lusatian), Russian, Ukrainian, Belorussian, Croato-Serbian, Slovene, Macedonian, Bulgarian, and German (in that order) and are defined and commented upon in Macedonian, Russian, and German. In this article, I shall quote these terms in their English forms, attested or supposed.

The basic difference between the two terminologies consists in the Eastern decision to refer to names-as-material by *onymy* 'the repertoire of names', and to its study by *onomastics*. These are then specified: *anthroponymy, anthroponomastics; toponymy, toponomastics; hydronymy, hydronomastics; oronymy, oronomastics* (Greek *oros* 'mountain'). Already at this high level we find discrepancy among the languages: while all the Slavic languages distinguish an *anthroponym* as a name for persons (John, Mary, Smith) from a *personal name* as the name of a single, individual person (Leonard Bloomfield), there is no distinction between these two notions in German, so that either term can be used in both cases.

Such discrepancies among the languages represented in the *Osnoven Sistem* and various aberrations from the 'majority vote' are listed in footnotes and annotations. Let us remark that such footnotes and commentaries that specify differences in the usage obtaining in one or more of the languages represented are quite frequent. For instance, *hodonym* <#2134> (in all the languages but Russian, which prefers *dromonym*) is defined as the name of a way, be it a street, square (but

not an athletic field), embankment, mole, motorway, important highway in the country, path (for pedestrians, cattle, or for other agrarian purposes), tunnel, ford, bridge, landing stage, ferry, railway, cable car line, etc. [There are slight differences in the wording of the definition in the three languages.] There are three supplementary remarks added to this item. First, we are told that the Russian term *dromonym* does not pertain to communications within a city. Second, in German the names of embankments, moles, ferries, and cable car lines are not considered *hodonyms* (but we are not told under which term those names would come). And third, the Macedonian text tells us that streets and squares within cities can be considered *urbanonyms*; the Russian text informs us likewise that streets and squares within a city can be considered *urbanonyms*, whereas the Russian term *godonym* [= *hodonym*] pertains to highways inside the city; and the German text tells us that names of streets and squares within cities and towns can be considered *Oikononyms*. [Needless to say, this kind of organization of the book is not exactly helpful for a quick reference.] For comparison, let us mention that for Room, an *urbanonym* is the name 'of any topographical object in a town or city', be it a district, street, park, building, bridge, church, etc.

One of the greatest areas of agreement between the two systems arises with the terms of the *de-* series: e.g., *deanthroponymization* <#11.12.2> is, broadly speaking, the same phenomenon in both systems, consisting in the loss of a word's character as a proper name (Ampère → ampère). The Eastern system seems to go to greater lengths by offering specific terms such as *deanthroponymic toponym* <#21.31.21.1>. [In Room's terminology this would be *deanthroponymous toponym*, for a placename derived from a personal name, e.g., Washington (person) → Washington (city).]

A difference in classification can be seen, e.g., when we compare Room's conception of *ideonyms*, names belonging to the imaginative, ideological, artistic and similar areas of human activity, *pragmatonyms* (Greek *pragma* 'deed, act, concrete thing'), names of objects that have a practical purpose, and *chrematonyms* (Greek *chrema* 'thing, object'), which are 'unique cultural objects of value', side by side with the corresponding portion of the Eastern system, in which a *chrematonym* is a highly comprehensive term, comprising names of any "result of human work which is not immovably anchored in the natural environment, such as (a) a phenomenon in society (e.g., a feast day), (b) a

societal institution, and (c) an object or product, the latter being either (aa) a single object (an object of art, bell, ship) or (bb) mass-produced objects (such as cars, bicycles, typewriters, cosmetic products, etc.)” <237>. An annotation to this entry informs us that in Russian the (brand) names of mass-produced objects are not counted as proper names, and that in German only the objects mentioned under (c)(aa) are considered *chrematonyms*, but that, on the other hand, not only results of human work belong under the scope of this term. [In various post-1983 Czech publications, brand names are covered by the term *serionyms*, while some other Czech scholars stick in this case to the term *pragmatonym*, but the later addition of other terms, such as *unikatonym* (Czech *unikát* = German *Unikat* ‘a unique object’), and the vacillating use of *chrematonym* have not clarified the matter.]

The foregoing may suffice to illustrate the character of the Eastern European system and show some of its similarities and differences when compared with Room’s conception. The *Osnoven Sistem* contains some 250-300 terms; Room’s book contains some 550-600 terms. We shall not go into a detailed discussion of how the Eastern system further developed after the publication of *Osnoven Sistem*.

[3] A perusal of the two sections above will have shown that the terminological usage and terminological suggestions of the two sources discussed are far from unified. However, there is even more variation in the terms used in name studies than that mentioned above. Given its long tradition, the practice of using Greek and Latin morphemes for coining scientific and scholarly terms is so natural and so compelling that some such terms arose in name studies on their own, so to speak, together with the development of linguistic terminology, without much concern on the part of the practitioners toward some unified normalizing effort. It is only natural that there are differences in the usage of various schools of thought and of individual scholars. If we proceed through the articles collected in *Name Studies*, we can easily observe such terminological divergences.⁶ Let me cite a few examples.

The term *exonym* (Greek *exo* ‘outside’) is found only in Room’s list, defined there as ‘the traditional form in one’s own language of a toponym in a foreign country and language’; e.g. *Cairo*, *Le Caire*, *Kair* (Russian) for the Arabic *al-qāhira*. Its opposite, *endonym* (Greek *endon* ‘inside’) is mentioned in neither list but is used not infrequently in the

literature. There is one problem with Room's definition: nobody will maintain that English is a foreign language in Ireland or in India, for in both countries it is well known and an official language; so are the English names *Dublin* (instead of *Baile Atha Cliath*) and *Benares* (instead of *Varanasi*) to be regarded as endonyms, or are they still exonyms, given the language difference and the history of the countries? For instance, Back (*Name Studies*, 1349) has the radical conception that all four names of Switzerland—*Schweiz*, *Suisse*, *Svizzera*, *Svizra*—are endonyms, because they belong to the four official languages of Switzerland. On the other hand, the three founding cantons, Uri, Schwyz, and Unterwalden were and are German-speaking, so only *Schweiz* would seem to be an endonym, the rest of the names counting as exonyms. In addition to this notional difference, there is also the alternative terminology, also mentioned in the *Osnoven Sistem*, of Witkowski (*Name Studies* #40), who uses the terms *autethnonym* (=endonym) and *allethnonym* (=exonym) contrastively (Greek *autos* 'self', *allos* 'other').

Bastardas (*Name Studies* #17) uses the term *hagiotoponymy* (Greek *hagios* 'saint') and Symeonides (*Name Studies* #103) the term *naotoponymy* (Greek *naos* 'temple') for placenames derived from names of churches. Neither Room nor the Eastern system includes either term; both systems, I think, would prefer one of the derivations with *de-*, perhaps something like *depatrocinial toponymy*, *patrocinium* being the usual (Latin) term for the relation of the church to its patron saint.

I mentioned above the various uses, ancient and modern, of the Greek term *ethnicon*. It is remarkable that it is a Greek scholar (Symeonides [*Name Studies* #103]), who uses the term in a sense both unknown to antiquity and new in modern times, namely, in reference to a personal name derived from the name of a nation (e.g., Mr. French).

A book containing placenames and possibly also various comments on them is called a *toponymicon* by Room, a *toponomasticon* by *Osnoven Sistem* <21.91.2>; these two terms are firmly anchored in the two respective systems. However, such a respected scholar as Nicolaisen (*Name Studies* #216) quite naturally goes with the general usage, in which a *toponymicon* is a repertoire of placenames, but an *onomasticon* a repertoire of names generally and there is no requirement that they be collected in the form of a book or any other sort of listing. While this

is a frequent usage, Bering (*Name Studies* #200) talks about “jüdische *Onomastik*” and obviously means the repertoire of Jewish names. In English, the term *onomatology* seems to be used relatively frequently with the meaning of name studies. Consequently, one is not surprised when Dorward (*Name Studies* #196) talks about “English *onomatology*” meaning quite clearly the repertoire of English names, or about a “distinct *onomatology*” meaning a distinct type of names, a group of them.

There are still more asymmetries in our terminology. For instance, *teknonymy* as used by Jones & Phillips (*Name Studies* #135) is not a repertoire of children’s names (Greek *teknon* ‘child’), but the naming principle by which the father gets the name of his son. The term *patronymy*, i.e., naming of the son from the name of the father, is quite frequent in English.

There is also a terminological system constructed by Walter Haas (Freiburg, Switzerland), which is parallel to structuralist linguistic terminology. Therefore, the invariant units are referred to by terms ending in *-eme* (just as in *phoneme*), whereas their variants are referred to by terms whose first morpheme is *allo-* (as in *allophone*). The primary term in the system is Latin *nomen* ‘name’. Consequently, for Kohlheim (*Name Studies* #189) the form *Johannes* is the *nomeme*, whereas its variants *Hans*, *Hannes*, *Hänsli*, etc. are *allonomes*. Again, the structuralist idea of the *archiphoneme* inspires the idea that the intersection of the ‘distinctive features’, i.e. of the identical parts of forms present in several variants such as *Sandro* and *Sandra*, should be called the *archinomeme*, in this case, *Sandr-*.

There is no limit to the creativity with which such terms can be coined. In 1997 Platen’s *Ökonomie. Zur Produktnamen-Linguistik im Europäischen Binnenmarkt* was published. No doubt the model for the form *Ökonymie*, *econymy*, was *Ökonomie*, *economy* (Greek *oikonomia* ‘management of the household or family, husbandry, management, economy’). The meaning of the term is explained by the subtitle: *Produktnamen* (= [brand] names of products). There are many such terms floating around in various name studies that are ultimately of homonymous nature.

The preceding discussion should suffice to illustrate, or at least to exemplify, how variegated the terminology of name studies really is.

[4] One must admit, it seems to me, that the two main purposes of any terminology, namely, unification of the area of research by representing the underlying system of classification, and enhancement of communication among scholars, have not yet been achieved. Whatever value one attaches to the individual terms or to the overall systems, one can hardly expect that the two goals will be reached soon.

Some of the reasons for this shortfall are clear: even the Greek morphemes allow different interpretations of their meaning or are positively polysemous, a situation which opens the possibility of variously configured overlappings and clashes of the meanings of the terms. Moreover, when we resort to Greek words that denote such broad, encompassing notions as *chrema*, *pragma*, and a number of others, no knowledge of Greek helps. And then, ultimately we reach a level of specificity where there are no suitable Greek (and sometimes no Latin) morphemes at hand, because of the modern developments in our culture. In some cases, Modern Greek could help, but not always. For instance, we have seen that there is no good term for the last (or family) name, or surname, or whatever term we try to endow with a cross-cultural validity; the Modern Greek term is *eponymo*, which we cannot use, since the term *eponym* is generally accepted as the term for either (1) the person (real or literary) after whom something has been named, or (2) the name derived from the name of such a famous person. This example shows at the same time how contradictory the meaning of the same term can be for different scholars; in sense (2) it would be better to use a term like *a name derived from an eponym* since the mere term *eponymous name* could remain ambiguous as to senses (1) and (2). If, however, morphemes from modern Latin are used, or even morphemes that are close to vernacular expressions (see above on *unikatonym*), a door is opened to even more variation.

Today fewer scholars know Greek than did those a generation or two ago; also names are now studied by scholars rooted in quite different cultures and linguistic traditions who may not know Greek at all. This situation, however, should not assume as much importance as one might be inclined to think: indeed, natural scientists the world over know even less Greek than we do, and yet many terms are continually being coined by them, frequently with the use of Greek and Latin morphemes, and these are accepted and employed by researchers in the individual branches of science. Perhaps they are more accustomed to the process since at least the days of Linné.

We have, however, not yet asked the question: is such a terminology really necessary for name studies?

The answer to that question cannot be simple. On the one hand, there is the natural tendency and urge to create an exact, unique terminology for one's research. There is also the link to linguistics, which is notorious for its constant creation of many new, and sometimes ephemeral, terms that differ from one school of thought to another.

On the other hand, it is an observable fact that one can write a highly technical text on names without any terminological extravaganza, simply in plain English (or French, or German, etc.) with only few generally known and accepted terms. There are many onomastic texts written in that style, in *Name Studies* and elsewhere. I shall name only one as an example for many: Gorrochategui's article (*Name Studies* #109) on Basque names. He uses expressions such as "a simple personal name," "a personal name plus cognomen," "a name plus indication of origin," "surnames of toponymical origin," etc. The article is as exact in its discussion as one could wish.

There is also the other face of name studies, the one oriented towards the general public, that ought to be considered. Readers are interested in names, but few laymen are willing to accept a large number of Greek and Latin terminological coinages. (The decline of general knowledge of the two classical languages looms larger here perhaps than among researchers.) Therefore, many colleagues will try not to alienate their readership with texts too difficult for them. Once one has acquired the habit (and the adroitness) of writing in "plain English," one will have the tendency to write technical texts in a similar style.

All these considerations strengthen my persuasion that a rapid spread of a highly technical, unified terminology of name studies is nothing we should expect to occur soon.

Notes

1. This review article is published in lieu of a review. For bibliographic details, cf. the References.
2. In Room's book, the terms are ordered alphabetically, so no citations are necessary; passages quoted from *Osnoven sistem* are cited in angle brackets <#> by the numbers of the systematic classification. Articles in *Name Studies* are cited by their numbers.

3. The Greek forms are quoted without their diacritics, which are not necessary for the purposes of this article.

4. The first *o-* in the Greek nouns is short, written with the omicron; the first *-o-* in the adjectival compounding form *-onymo-* is long, written with the omega. The letter ypsilon (or upsilon) that occurs in the dialectal form of the noun and in the adjectival form was pronounced in Athens up to the fifth century B.C. as [u] (high, back, rounded); the Romans became acquainted with its later pronunciation, which first lost the backness and then the roundedness: hence the modern words *myth*, *hybrid*, *cybernetics*, etc. However, at a number of universities, particularly in Great Britain, classical scholars have decided to return to the older pronunciation of Greek words (but not of Greek morphemes when they occur in modern terminologies), hence transcriptions (occurring in Room's book as well) like *muthos*, *hubris*, *onuma*.

5. Self-descriptive term preferred by some practitioners in order to distance themselves (as language scientists) from some "good linguists," as they are called, who know languages but not necessarily linguistics.

6. Terminological unification throughout all the articles in *Name Studies* was not and could not be considered by the editors as a possible task. However, problems of terminology were discussed in a comparative way in the last article, Zgusta (1996).

References

- Eichler, E., G. Hilty, H. Löffler, H. Steger, L. Zgusta, (eds.). 1995-1996. *Name Studies (Namenforschung/Name Studies/Les Noms Propres. Ein Internationales Handbuch zur Onomastik/An international Handbook of Onomastics/Manuel International d'Onomastique*, I-III. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Commission for Slavic Onomastics of the International Committee of Slavistic Scholars. 1983. *Osnoven Sistem i Terminologija na Slovenskata Onomastika/Osnovna Sistem i terminologija Slavjanskoj Onomastiki/Grundsystem und Terminologie der Slawischen Onomastik*. Skopje: Macedonian Academy of Arts and Sciences.
- Platen, Christoph. 1997. *Ökonomie. Zur Produktnamen-Linguistik im Europäischen Binnenmarkt*. Vol. 280 of the *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*.
- Room, Adrian. 1996. *An Alphabetical Guide to the Language of Name Studies*. Lanham, MD, and London: The Scarecrow Press.
- Zgusta, Ladislav. 1995 [1996]. Systematická Terminologie Onomastiky (A systematic Terminology of Name Studies). *Acta onomastica* 36: 262-272.
- _____. 1996. Names and their Study. Eichler, et al. #289.