
Formation of Place Names in Tatar

Rail R. Fahrutdinov¹, Ildar G.Akhmetzyanov², Almira K.Garaeva³

Abstract:

The relevance of this research is closely bound with the general tendency of linguistics in the attempt to reveal the human factor in the language, as the most valuable results of the research are found in comparison of the languages. The goal of this article is to find out the productivity of the place-naming affixes -lyk/-lek (-ly/-le) in Tatar and their equivalent in English.

The main approach of the research is interdisciplinary which requires the usage of such sciences as Geography, History, Linguistics, etc. The given article presents the results of historical and linguistic research that is intended to find out the structural peculiarities of Tatar and English place names.

The materials can be useful for linguists and historians to study the History of nations and the History of languages.

Keywords: Productive, Place-Naming Affix, Place-Names, Tatar, English.

¹Institute of International Relations, History and Oriental Studies, Kazan Federal University, Russia, RailRFahrutdinov@kpfu.ru

²Institute of International Relations, History and Oriental Studies, Kazan Federal University, Russia, ildar-rashit@yandex.ru

³Institute of International Relations, History and Oriental Studies, Kazan Federal University, Russia

1. Introduction

1.1 *The importance of the problem*

Today the modern linguistics is formed as anthropological, because the study of linguistic processes are in ongoing link with the communicative needs of people and suggests the consideration of the human factor, when the subject of speech is involved in the description of linguistic mechanisms. Modern linguistics does not only describe partial details of linguistic units, but pays more attention to the complex analysis of linguistic system in the connection with culture, mentality of the nation. The research in the field of linguistics conducted at the end of the XXth century allowed to come to conclusion that the language is not only connected with the culture, it comes out of it and expresses it. The language is also a tool for creation, development and storage of national culture and it is also a part of culture.

According to the figural expression of Vereschagin & Kostomarov (1990), the language is "*the true mirror of culture*". It reflects the life style, mentality, outlook, national character, set of values, types of social behavior, customs and traditions, habits, beliefs of the native speakers. The interest to know the meaning of place-names appeared in the earliest stages of civilization. As, even antique historians and geographers in their times tried to explain this or that place-name around the world, known to the ancient Greeks.

1.2 *Status of a problem*

Place-names are necessary for the society, as with their help a man could orientate in the surrounding world. One can't imagine modern world without place-names, otherwise all spheres of services are doomed to fail.

The relevance of this research is closely bound with the general tendency of linguistics in the attempt to reveal the human factor in the language, as the most valuable results of the research are found in comparison of the languages. Place-names contain various and valuable linguistic, ethnographic, historical and geographical information.

1.3 *The Research Hypothesis*

The given article presents the results of historical and linguistic research that is intended to find out the structural peculiarities of Tatar and English place names. Place-names are part of lexis of the language they belong to. They were and are formed according to the rules of that language. Formed in this or that historical period place-names preserved essential information about language, spiritual culture, way of life and other peculiar features of the people, who created them for centuries.

According to their structure, place-names give the opportunity to understand the role of affixes in the process of word formation, to know the productivity of this or that affix in the past, which are now not used as a word forming affix. Also the structural study of the place-names helps to find out the structure of that language, in which the place-names were formed, as place-names are different according to their structure.

As Molla-Zade (1979) stated “in the formation of the place-names are used such word forming means, part of which or their semantics might differ from those in the modern standard language, because some part of place-names being formed in the ancient times preserve the ancient linguistic peculiarities”.

Mostly place-names are passive lexis, but sometimes they form active part of lexis, as their main function is address function. Murzaev (1962) states that *“place-names are part of lexis. They actively or passively are included into the vocabulary of the language and therefore linguists have to study them. At the same time mostly, place-names are special, different from other words units, as we use place-names only as proper nouns, often as they don't have any lexical meaning. One can't put sign of equality between ordinary words, which we use to express the thoughts, notions, as a rule, which haven't got any tangible meaning and are responsible for instrumental purposes – to mark certain geographical object, form its “address” preserving only nominative function”*.

Baskakov (1979) points out that “the problem of morphological structure of the word is closely connected with the definition of the origin of the word, with the analysis of the word from the point of view of its lexical and grammatical meaning on the one hand, and with the determination of its constructive elements and their functions on the other”.

Structural analysis of place-names reveals the productivity of this or that affix in the past, which after a certain lapse of time stopped being used. But some affixes still function in the modern language. On this point of view place-names are some kind of storage of unique information on the structure of the language. Garipova (1998) writes that *“ways and means of place-name formation have their own unified norms and rules for each nation and language, as well as for groups of languages that are connected with the commonness of their origin”*.

2. Methodological framework

The article is intended to reveal structural peculiarities of Tatar and English place-names. It draws out the productivity of place-name forming affix -lyk/-lek (-ly/-le) in Tatar and their equivalent in English.

3. Results

In Tatar language the morphological way of forming new words is widely used. Tatar language has a number of word forming affixes, which are different according to their productivity and capability to form new words of different semantics.

Derivative place-names in Tatar are formed by adding an affix to the root of the word. But not all word forming affixes are used in the formation of place-names, only, as

Donidze (1971) mentions, special affixes. Special affixes can be considered as those which are used in the formation of place-names.

Podolskaya (1983) states that “standard bases (or roots) and standard formants at a certain stage of existence, combining with each other, forming numerous combinations, created the variety of lexical item in appellatives as well as in place-names and personal names”.

Word forming affix -lyk/lek (-ly/-le) has existed in Tatar from ancient times. In modern Tatar this affix is the most productive (Zakiev, 1998). After a certain lapse of time ancient affix -lyk/-lak/-luk as scientists noted separated into -lyk/-lek and -ly/-le (Zalyai, 2000).

Affix -ly/-le shows the possession, fertility or presence of plants, animals; forms adjectives with the meaning of presence, possession, which is indicated in the premise (Dmitriev, 1948; Sevortyan, 1966). As a noun forming affix -ly/-le is multivalent and used in the formation of simple and compound place-names. The rate of affix -ly/-le and its variants in the formation of hydronyms and place-names in general is rather high. So, Molchanova (1982) considers this affix as the main in the formation of place-names of Gorny Altai. However, all the meanings of the affix can't be used in the formation of place-names.

First of all, it is necessary to take into account the semantics of the root, which is followed by this affix:

- a) premise – the names of different animals and birds, plants and trees: Kamyshly (kamysh - reed), Zirekle, Chally, Naratly, Churtanly, Chebenle, Kigevenle, Yukale, etc.
- b) premise – nouns, denoting these or those peculiarities of the landscape. In this case, place-names, the meaning of which are characterized by the pointed-out peculiarities are formed: Tashly (tash - stone), Tomanly, Komly, etc.
- c) premise – noun; place-name denote the presence of this or that object: Buraly (bura - log), Chitanly, Chuprale.

Affix -ly/-le in these derived place-names denotes a great many homogeneous objects, has collective meaning, and this peculiarity relies on the bases of the above mentioned place-names formation. In the given examples the meaning of affix -ly/-le is close to the meaning of affix -lyk/-lek. It's important to mention that the semantic affinity of affix -ly/-le in the place-names with the affix -lyk/-lek is a natural result. This is a relic of one of the ancient peculiarities of the word forming means in Turkic languages. Affix -ly/-le in the ancient Turkic written monuments was used in the form of -lyg (Sevortyan, 1966). For example: “Kazgulyg buldy” – grief has come, “Omme Zhamil atlyg irde” – named Zhamil (Zalyai, 2000).

One word hydronyms with the determining affix -ly/-le originally had the form of determining word combination, such as Zhikanle kul', the term kul' (lake) in speech usually was omitted; so hydronimic meaning was obtained by the determining, more important in meaning part of proper name. In this way substantivisation of the words with the determining affix -ly/-le took place. This transitional moment was seen in the fact that very often the usage of the determinative (kul' - lake) in such hydronyms was optional. In spoken language there exist for example such variants of the same place-names: Zhikanle kul' – Zhikanle, Tashly yelga – Tashly. River names without determinatives kul' (lake), yelga (river) are typical one word affixal hydronyms, which were only the components (determinants) of the complex names.

Word forming affix -lyk/-lek indicates the presence of peculiar features, expressing the notion of accumulation, abundance, concentration of these or those objects in the territory: Tashlyk, Kaenlyk, Imanlek, etc.

It should be noted that this affix is widely used in the formation of place-names. Affix -lyk/-lek has several meanings. According to Garipova (1998), not all the meanings, used in modern Tatar language, are acceptable in the formation of place-names. Scherbak (1977) suggests that "affix -lyk/-lek is used in the formation of nouns from different names with the meaning of generality. Action nouns with this affix express procedurality or state (...). Nouns with this affix denote also the aggregate location of the objects and the objects".

Affix -lyk/-lek is found in such Tatar place names as Shomyrtlyk, Usaklyk, Tashlyk, Almalyk, etc.

Affix -lyk/-lek as a word forming tool is known in Turkic languages from ancient times. In modern Tatar language as in the other Turkic languages this affix is one of the most productive. And it's natural that this formant is widely used in the formation of hydronimic names. The number of hydronyms, formed with the affix -lyk/-lek is a bit less than the number of place-names with the affix -ly/-le.

Hydronyms basically are formed by adding affix -lyk/-lek to the names of different trees, plants and show the place full of these objects, for example, Tashlyk river (tash - stone), Kaenlyk river (kaen – birch tree), etc.

In the English toponymy there are names which can be marked as derived, that is, they contain the root and the place-name suffix (Oakleigh, Fordwich) or the root and place-name semiaffix (Clifford, Elmsted).

In English there are not so many word forming suffixes. The most productive suffix is -ing. English suffix -ing is used in the formation of verbal nouns denoting "the process, the action, and the state" (Akhmetzyanova, 1997).

In the dictionary by Mills (2003) the place-naming suffix -ing, linking particle -ing- denote “the place with a peculiar character; belonging to a place; connected with the territory, named after ...”. The examples of such place-names are Abington, Ablington, Addingham, Darlington, Reading, Stirling, Warrington, etc.

English place-names have the final elements, which go up to the appellatives – place-name terms. Such final elements are named toponymical suffixes.

Place names containing the names of trees are widespread in English, for example, Ashurst (ash – tree, hyrst – wooden hill), Dartington (dart – oak tree, -ing-, tun – village, dwelling), Dartmoor (dart – oak tree, mor - swampland); plants, for example, Ryedale (rye, dalr -valley), Reedham (reed, ham – village, dwelling); animals, for example, Yardley (Yardy – bear, leah – wood, woodland, valley). Also such place-names in English indicate to the location of geographical object, for example, Oxford (ford - waftage), Nottingham (ham – village, dwelling), Bamsley (lea - valley), etc. Perhaps, we can compare these place-nmes with Tatar names with affixes -ly/-le, -lyk/-lek.

4. Discussions

There were a great number of researches abroad and in Russia (Molchanova, 1982; Podolskaya, 1983 etc).

In the Renaissance period there was developed a theory, overturning the study of Plato about names. It was considered by English philosopher Hobbes (1926). He made a suggestion about randomness of materialization of names and about absence of any connection between name and object it denoted. He stated that “name is randomly chosen as a mark to create thoughts in our minds which are the same as our ideas. I consider the formation of names as a result of lawlessness ...” (Hobbes, 1926). A well-known English logician of the XIX century J.S. Mill (Rundell, 2007) followed this approach to the proper names. His speculations about the meaning of the word were the bases for many linguistic theories later.

As well as Hobbes (1926), J.S. Mill (Rundell, 2007) considered the proper names as a result of random choice. While comparing proper names and common names, J.S. Mill introduced the notion “connoting” and “non-connoting” names. The first term was used for the names denoting only characteristics of the object or only the object; the second one for the names denoting the subject and characteristics. Analyzing the nature of word from this point of view, he drew a conclusion that proper names do not connote and mean anything (Rundell, 2007).

Many scientists share the same point of you about the names, as they are the labels of the object without any lexical meaning. Among them, perhaps, it’s necessary to point out the name of outstanding linguist A. Gardiner (Ekwall, 1960), who worked out the theory of proper names. The main goal of his theory is to adapt the concept of J.S. Mills about connoting and non-connoting names to the general theory of semantic and

structural linguistics. Analyzing the proper names, A. Gardiner pointed out three classes of names. First, it's so called "embodied names", which are connected with the owner of the name. The second is "disembodied names", which exist in the language and are the source of study in the field of etymology, frequency and distribution of proper names. And, the third class is "partially disembodied names", which are mostly the fact of speech, but not of a language. These names, according to A. Gardiner, are the result of the usage of proper names in plural (Johns), or the usage of names as common names (Every country has its Babylon) (Ekwall, 1960).

The unified scientific system of Tatar names is presented in the works of G.F. Sattarov, M.I. Akhmetzyanov, F.G. Garipova (Akhmetzyanov, 2004).

5. Conclusion

However, the researches in this field are not enough to draw any kind of conclusions ahead of time, and require further, more profound analysis of linguists. According to the results of this article, we might draw a conclusion that in English and in Tatar there are enough place-naming suffixes. In Tatar, apart from English, there are appellatives or local geographic terms. In English they are considered as place-naming suffixes. But all analyzed suffixes serve one goal, they form place-names with the similar meaning in Tatar and in English as well.

6. Recommendations

The materials of this article can be recommended for use in modern practice of higher institutions as well as in the system of teacher training.

7. Acknowledgements

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

References:

- Akhmetzyanov, I.G. 2004. Historical and linguistic study of the Turko-Tatar geographical names in the Russian chronicles: IX - XVI centuries. PhD thesis. Kazan.
- Akhmetzyanova, G.R. 1997. A comparative study of complex-suffixing word-formation in English and Tatar. PhD abstract thesis. Kazan.
- Baskakov, N.A. 1979. Historical and typological morphology of Turkic languages (word structure and agglutination mechanism). Moscow.
- Dmitriev, N.K. 1948. Grammar of the Bashkir language. Moscow; Leningrad.
- Donidze, G.I. 1971. On the grammatical characteristics of the Turkic toponyms. *Onomastics of the Volga region*, 2, 122-126.
- Ekwall, E. (ed.) 1960. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names*, 4th ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Garipova, F.G. 1998. *Tatar hydronymy*. Kazan.

-
- Hobbes, T. 1926. Selected works, Vol. 1-2. Moscow.
- Mills, A.D. 2003. Dictionary of British Place Names. Oxford.
- Mola-Zade, S.M. 1979. Toponymy of the Azerbaijan northern regions. Baku.
- Molchanova, O.T. 1982. Structural types of Turkic toponyms of Gorny Altai. Saratov.
- Murzaev, E.M. 1962. The main directions of toponymic research. In: Principles of toponymy. Moscow.
- Podolskaya, N.V. 1983. Typical East Slavic toponyms. Word-forming analysis. Moscow.
- Rundell, M. (ed.) 2007. English dictionary for advanced learners. Oxford: Macmillan.
- Scherbak, A.M. 1977. Essays on the comparative morphology of Turkic languages (name). Leningrad.
- Sevortyan, E.V. 1966. Affixes of nominal word formation in the Azerbaijani language. Moscow.
- Vereschagin, E.M. & Kostomarov, V.G. 1990. Language and culture. Lingvostranovedenie in teaching Russian as a foreign language. Moscow.
- Zakiev, M.F.(ed.) 1998. Tatar Grammar, Vol. 1. Moscow: "Insan"; Kazan: "Fiker".
- Zalyai, L. 2000. Tatar telenen tarihi morfologiyase (Ocherklar). Kazan.