Iryna Haponienka

Belarusian State University, Minsk (Belarus)
Email: haponienka@bsu.by
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4082-447X

Transposition of Onomastic Elements of Slavic Languages into the Belarusian Language

Transpozycja elementów onomastycznych języków słowiańskich w języku białoruskim

Трансляцыя анамастычных элементаў славянскіх моў у беларускую мову

Abstract

In the article, the methods of transposition of onomastic units from Slavic languages into Belarusian are investigated. The relevance of this study is due to the investigation of the issues of transmission of proper names of one language by means of another against the background of the modern expansion of the processes of cultural and economic communication. When working on the topic, we proceeded from the assumption that presently the general principles of transposition of Slavic onyms in the Belarusian onomastic practice have been clearly defined, and the algorithms of their application to a specific language material are still under development. The applicability of the existing principles of interlingual transposition (translation, transcription, transliteration) to the onomastic vocabulary is shown, the objective difficulties of inclusion of the foreign onyms in the Belarusian language context are analyzed. The results of the work carried out by the Belarusian onomasts and state services on normalization and standardization of written registration of various types of Slavic onyms in the Belarusian language system were reviewed. The relevant normative documents regulating this sphere of onomastics were listed. The undeveloped aspects of the problem of Slavic-Belarusian onomastic contacts were analysed. This paper uses the descriptive, comparative, review-analytical methods, as well as the method of analogy. In conclusion, the performed analysis revealed the exceptional importance of the

regulation of the principles and rules of the Slavic-Belarusian transposition of onyms. Based on the results of the study, the main directions of promising activities in this area are suggested in the improvement of the existing normative documentation and the creation of new instructions that would cover all the Slavic languages and the maximum number of onymic varieties.

Keywords: interlanguage transposition, Belarusian language, Slavic languages, onim, onomastic standardization

Abstrakt

W artykule analizowane są sposoby transpozycji jednostek onomastycznych z języków słowiańskich do języka białoruskiego. Znaczenie takich badań jest związane z intensyfikacją problemów przeniesienia nazw własnych jednego języka za pomocą środków innego na tle współczesnego rozszerzenia procesów komunikacji kulturowej i ekonomicznej. Podczas pracy nad tematem autorka wychodziła z założenia, że obecnie w białoruskiej praktyce onomastycznej zostały wyraźnie określone ogólne zasady transponowania onimów słowiańskich, a algorytmy ich zastosowania do konkretnego materiału językowego znajdują się na razie w fazie opracowania. Przedstawiono przydatność dla leksyki onomastycznej istniejących zasad międzyjęzykowej transpozycji (tłumaczenie, transkrypcja, transliteracja), poddano analizie obiektywne trudności włączenia obcojęzycznych onimów w białoruski kontekst językowy. Dokonano przeglądu wyników prac przeprowadzonych przez onomastów białoruskich i służby państwowe, dotyczących normalizacji i standaryzacji pisemnego opracowania różnych rodzajów słowiańskich onimów w systemie języka białoruskiego. Wymienione zostały odpowiednie przepisy regulujące tę sferę onomastyki. Przeanalizowano nieopracowane aspekty problematyki słowiańsko-białoruskich kontaktów onomastycznych. W pracy wykorzystano metodę opisową, porównawczą, przeglądowo-analityczną oraz metodę analogii. W sumie analiza wykazała, jak istotne znaczenie ma uregulowanie zasad i reguł słowiańsko-białoruskiego przeniesienia onimów. Uwzględnienie wyników badań pozwala usytuować główne kierunki przyszłych działań w tej dziedzinie w obrębie doskonalenia obowiązującej normy w dokumentacji i tworzenia nowych instrukcji, które obejmowałyby wszystkie języki słowiańskie i maksymalną ilość wariantów onimicznych.

Słowa kluczowe: transpozycja międzyjęzykowa, język białoruski, języki słowiańskie, onim, standaryzacja onomastyczna

Анатацыя

У артыкуле даследаваны спосабы трансляцыі анамастычных адзінак са славянскіх моў у беларускую мову. Актуальнасць такога даследавання абумоўлена абвастрэннем пытанняў перадачы ўласных імёнаў адной мовы сродкамі другой на фоне сучаснага пашырэння працэсаў культурнай і эканамічнай камунікацыі. У ходзе працы над тэмай мы зыходзілі з меркавання, што на сённяшні дзень у беларускай анамастычнай практыцы дакладна вызначаны агульныя прынцыпы трансляцыі славянскіх онімаў, а алгарытмы іх прымянення да канкрэтнага моўнага матэрыялу пакуль знаходзяцца на стадыі распрацоўкі. Паказана магчымасць прымянення да анамастычнай лексікі існуючых прынцыпаў

міжмоўнай трансляцыі (пераклад, транскрыпцыя, транслітарацыя), прааналізаваны аб'ектыўныя складанасці пры ўключэнні іншамоўных онімаў у беларускі моўны кантэкст. Зроблены агляд вынікаў праведзенай беларускімі анамастамі і дзяржаўнымі службамі работы па нармалізацыі і стандартызацыі пісьмовага афармлення розных відаў славянскіх онімаў у сістэме беларускай мовы. Пералічаны адпаведныя нарматыўныя дакументы, якія рэгулююць гэтую сферу анамастыкі. Разгледжаны нераспрацаваныя аспекты праблемы славянска-беларускіх анамастычных кантактаў. У рабоце прымяняліся апісальны, супастаўляльны, аглядна-аналітычны метады, а таксама метад аналогіі. У цэлым аналіз паказаў выключную важнасць урэгулявання прынцыпаў і правіл славянска-беларускай трансляцыі онімаў. Зыходзячы з вынікаў даследавання, асноўныя кірункі перспектыўнай дзейнасці ў гэтай галіне бачацца ва ўдасканаленні дзеючай нарматыўнай дакументацыі і стварэнні новых інструкцый, якія б ахоплівалі ўсе славянскія мовы і максімальную колькасць онімных разўнавіднасцей.

Ключавыя словы: міжмоўная трансляцыя, беларуская мова, славянскія мовы, онім, анамастычная стандартызацыя

Proper names do not only function in the system of one language, but are also actively transferred from one language to another, in particular in the process of translation (regular or artistic). In the modern world and widening the processes of economic and cultural communication, the problems of transferring proper names from one language to another are significantly exacerbated for a number of reasons: a) proper names according to the qualitative indicators in any language significantly prevail over common ones; b) proper names are culturally marked units; c) in the vast majority of cases, the proper name has only one referent and, accordingly, directly contributes to the function of identification; d) the spread of computer technology for the interlingual translation of onyms has increased the requirements for the uniqueness and accuracy of the transference of proper names, because the computer does not perceive ambiguity (Paramonova, 2007, p. 61).

1. The problem of depicting onyms in translation contexts, although quite carefully developed in theory, in practice does not always deserve the necessary attention. The specificity of a proper name in the field of translation is often significantly underestimated. According to Dzmitry Ermolovich, a researcher on the inclusion of onomastic units in the translation text**,**

> Both in the secondary and higher education, there is a difficult 'tradition' to overcome: the linguistic properties and principles of the transference of proper names are very poorly studied even in the higher scientific institutions that train specialists in foreign languages. It is believed that proper names are 'translated' as if by themselves, automatically, quite formally. This formal approach results in many mistakes, misunderstandings, inaccuracies when translating texts and using foreign names and titles. On the other hand, on the contrary, the absolute 'accuracy' leads to the appearance of difficult to pronounce, discordant or meaningless names and titles (Ermolovich, 2001, p. 3).

Even the procedure of transition of proper names from one language to another does not have an unambiguous term. This is associated with the concepts of *translation, transference, transmission*, etc. Some of these terms are unacceptable. So, the translation in the direct (common) sense can't be applied to proper names. This operation is permissible only if we mean a translation at the phonemes (graphemes) level (Shidlovsky, 1978, pp. 5–7), but it seems to us that even in the context of onyms the term "translation" is not very successful. Other terms (*transference, transmission)* look too generalised and do not reflect the full specifics of the process. In our opinion, the most appropriate term is *transposition* in the following sense: symmetrical data transformation of one language system, taking into account the system features of another language system. I will use it as a key term.

2. In the practice of interlingual translation, the following principles are applied: *translation* (in the classical sense of the term), *transliteration* and *transcription.*

The classical translation ('according to the dictionary'), which is 'mostly based on lexical and, in part, grammatical multilingual equivalents' (Reformatskij, 1972, p. 312), in most cases cannot be applied to the situation with proper names. In this approach, the translator focuses primarily on the appellate meaning. And in the case of onyms it is important to maintain not only and not so much correspondence of this kind, but not to violate the inclusion of onyms in certain series, based on certain models (although there is a limited range of situations where traditional translation can not be categorically denied).

Transliteration (preservation of the graphic constancy of the borrowed onym) and **transcription** (reflection of its orthoepic form) – are operations in some sense polar to translation. These principles differently implement the well-known translation formula 'to preserve the originality of a foreign language and the norms of the native language'. Translation seeks to make 'foreign' as much as possible 'own', and transliteration and transcription seek to preserve 'foreign' by means of 'one's own' (Reformatskij, 1972, p. 312). The principles of transcription and transliteration are more consistent with the specifics of proper names. However, in their 'pure form' it is impossible to apply them in full sequence: neither transcription nor transliteration can perfectly perform the function of transposition of onyms. For example, the principle of graphical similarity is difficult to maintain due to differences in the composition of the graphemes in contact languages. The principle of phonetic similarity is also objectively limited by the inconsistency of the phoneme system of the donor language and the recipient language, as well as the presence of traditional spellings that contradict the basic transcription algorithm.

Although proper names 'are on the lower border of the meaning, many elements of the word disappear, but it is still a word, not just an acoustic phenomenon of nature' (Tomashevsky, 1972, p. 252). The name is usually stylistically or semantically colored and associated with the center of its functioning, which should be preserved when applying the name to a foreign language system. Hence, neither transliteration in the form of a simple change of typesetting (such as *Shakespeare – Схакэспэарэ*), nor a purely phonetic method of transcription (for example, Russian *Орёл* [the name of the

city - translator's note] in European languages is more appropriate to transfer as Orel, rather than Ariol).

In the name, as well as in the word in general, different aspects of speech activity are correlated. It is impossible to isolate sound (orthoepic) and orthographic components in the process of assimilation of nomenclature units in foreign language systems. It is more logical 'to take into account both for the original and for the transfer of the relationship between writing and pronunciation, to take into account the combinatorial meanings of the letters, ie. by means of one orthography to transfer the system of another orthography' (Tomashevsky, 1972, p. 259). It is this spelling approach to transposition of proper names from language to language that is welcomed by many onomastics.

Apparently, the problem of fundamental approaches to the transposition of proper names has not yet been solved and is in a state of active scientific discussion.

3. If we talk about the specifics of the transposition of foreign onomastic elements into Belarusian, it should be noted that the common principles require some adjustments. Given the peculiarities of the Belarusian orthography (quite 'aggressive'), direct transliteration and transcription are almost impossible. Belarusian orthography, which is largely focused on the peculiarities of lively Belarusian pronunciation, does not help to preserve the original phonetics of a foreign name and in some cases does not allow its letter by letter transference (yes, it is impossible to transliterate directly, for example, the name *London* or *Одеса* [*Odessa*] in Belarusian as *Лондон* and *Одэса* since the rule of obligatory display of akanne in writing forces to transfer the unstressed *о* in a reduced form through *а* – *Лондан, Адэса*). The most acceptable and practically the only possible is the application of the principle of practical transcription, when the main tendency is to transfer the sound of a foreign name, but in writing it is subject to some adjustment in accordance with the Belarusian orthography.

Thus, for objective reasons, the inclusion of foreign onomastic units into the Belarusian text in practice causes a number of problems. Slavic onyms in this sense are no exception. Despite the fact that the Slavic languages are related, after the disintegration of the Proto-Slavic language community each specific Slavic language system has formed distinctive features, the presence of which at the present stage creates a significant barrier to the transition of proper names from one system to another (Paramonova, 2008, p. 225).

4. In Belarusian linguistics, the specifics of interlingual transposition of Slavic onyms are in the focus of such researchers as Ivan Luchyc-Fedarèc (Lučyc-Fedarèc, 1985) (studied Czech and Slovak proper names in the Belarusian context), Grygory Klusav (Klûsov, 1982), Palina Sushkevich (Suškevič, 2011), Nadezhda Nikitina (Nikitina, 2016) (explore Russian-Belarusian parallels in the field of onomastics), Anna Mezenka (Mezenka, 1993; Mezenko, 1990; Mezenko, 2017) (formulated the principles of transferring names of intra-city objects from closely related Belarusian and Russian languages; covers the problems of standardization of Belarusian onomastics in the situation of Belarusian-Russian bilingualism), Anna Paramonova (Paramonova,

2007; Paramonova, 2008) (considers the peculiarities of the transmission of Polish onyms into the Belarusian language), Volga Mickevich (Mìckevìč, 2015; Mìckevìč, 2017a; Mìckevìč, 2017b) (develops issues of transference of names of geographical objects of Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia, and Herzegovina into Belarusian), Igor Kapylov (Kapyloŭ, 2010; Kapyloŭ, 2013; Kapyloŭ, 2018) (analyzes the features of the functioning of Belarusian place names in the situation of Belarusian-Russian state bilingualism, as well as the general features of the transfer of Slavic toponyms to the Belarusian language) and others.

It is impossible to cover all aspects of this problem within one publication. First of all, because the relations at the onomastic level of each Slavic language with the Belarusian language are objectively characterized by their own specifics. Secondly, 'the class of onomastic vocabulary is dissimilar. Many categories of names [proper – I.G]… were formed and function differently in the language, have different character of connection with common names and, accordingly, features in the transition from one language to another' (Paramonova, 2007, p. 62).

In the article, based on the material of two main onym classes – toponyms and anthroponyms – I will try to review the practical achievements of the Slavic-Belarusian onomastic translation in the linguisti and normative aspects, as well as outline unresolved issues and possible ways to solve them.

For the present, some work has been done to stabilize and standardize the transfer of only one of the groups of foreign proper names into the Belarusian language – geographical names. At the initiative of the State Property Committee of the Republic of Belarus and RUE 'Belkartografiya' a number of so-called technical codes have been created, which regulate the transfer to the Belarusian language of geographical names of territories bordering Belarus. From Slavic countries, this list includes geographical names of Poland, Ukraine, and Russia. The principles and rules of their transposition into the Belarusian language are set forth in the following normative documents: STC (State Technical Code) 177-2009 *Geographical Names: Methods and Rules of Translation of Geographical Names and Terms of Ukraine into Belarusian* (Tèhnìčny kodèks…, 2009); STC 236-2010 *Geographical Names: Methods and Rules of Translation of Geographical Names and Terms of the Republic of Poland into Belarusian* (Tèhnìčny kodèks…, 2010); GCRR (Geodetic and Cartographic Rules and Regulations) 13-012-2011 *Technical Guidelines on Translation of Names of Geographical Objects from Belarusian into Russian* (Tehničeskaâ instrukciâ…, 2011). The Institute of Linguistics of the National Academy of Sciences of Belarus has prepared a technical code for the transfer of names of the Czech Republic, but it has not yet passed the codification procedure. Normative documents concerning the transfer of geographical objects of Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina to the Belarusian language are being prepared (see previous developments in the articles: Mìckevìč, 2015, Mìckevìč, 2017a; Mìckevìč, 2017b). Extremely valuable practical material is presented in Igor Kopylov's report *Slavic Toponymicon: Specifics and Features of the Transition to the Belarusian Language* (at the XVI International Congress of Slavists, 2018), which outlines the ways

of transferring toponyms of a number of Slavic languages to the Belarusian language: East Slavic (Russian, Ukrainian), West Slavic (Polish, Czech, Slovak, Upper Lusatia), South Slavic (Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian, Montenegrin, Bulgarian, Macedonian, Slovenian) (Kapyloŭ, 2018). In addition, the instruction texts are presented in the publication *Foreign Names in the Belarusian Text: Reference Book*, which was compiled in 2011 by Belarusian linguist Dmitry Savko for the needs, as indicated on the cover, 'International Documentation of the Language Service of Belsat TV'. The guide provides algorithms for transposition of Bulgarian, Macedonian, Polish, Croatian and Czech proper names into Belarusian. The Croatian language manual is also suitable, according to the author, for the transfer of names from Bosnian, Serbian (in the version with Latin graphics) and Montenegrin languages (Saŭka, 2011).

In the preface to these technical codes, it is quite correctly stated that the rules of transposition of Slavic toponyms are mainly formed according to the principle of transliteration (although, it should be noted, it would be more appropriate to use the term 'practical transcription'), namely:

- geographical names are transferred to the Belarusian language based on their official spelling in the corresponding foreign language;
- dialect features of foreign-language geographical names are reflected in the transfer to the Belarusian language only if they are fixed in the official national toponymic forms;
- in the absence of direct unambiguous graphic equivalents of foreign and Belarusian letters, the peculiarities of the authentic pronunciation of the name are taken into account (for example, this applies to letters to denote specific Polish nasal vowels *ę* and *ą*);
- transliteration of borrowed geographical names is carried out in such a way that the design of the transliterated name does not contradict the spelling principles of the modern Belarusian language. The following features of the Belarusian orthography are taken into account in the process of transfer of foreign toponyms: hardness of the sibilant, [р] and [ц] of the original; partial akanne, namely the transition from [o] to [a]; transition from [y] to [ў]. In order to preserve the original form of the name as much as possible, the following Belarusian features are not reflected: dzekanne and cekanne (non-reflection of dzekanne and cekanne in transliteration is achieved by writing after *д*, *т* only non-softening vowels *э*, *ы*, *а*, *о*, *у*); yakanne (unstressed [e] in transliterated names is transmitted only through hard vowel *э*); partial akanne, namely the transition from [e] to [a]; occurrence of added sounds before the initial ones [o], [y] (in the words of foreign origin the preservation of the unstressed *э* and the absence of added sounds are allowed by the rules of Belarusian orthography);
- exceptions to the transfer rules are geographical names, which have traditionally been fixed in another form in East Slavic cartography, encyclopedias and other official written publications (for example, Polish *Кракаў*, not *Кракуў*, *Лодзь*,

not *Лудзь, Беласток,* not *Бялыстак, Аўгустоў,* not *Аўгустуў* etc.; Ukrainian *Кіеў,* not *Кыіў, Львоў,* not *Львіў, Харкаў,* not *Харкіў* etc.).

According to the norms of the existing documents, when transferring Slavic onyms into the Belarusian context, the transfer of geographical names by literal translation is completely excluded, which is, of course, is quite reasonable: for example, Polish *Krasne – Краснэ,* not *Чырвонае, Bohatery – Багатэры,* not *Героі, Wspólne – Вспульнэ,* not *Сумеснае* or *Супольнае, Niedźwiedź – Недзведзь,* not *Мядзведзь, Wieprz – Вепж,* not *Вепр* or *Дзік, Dziurówki – Дзюруўкі,* not *Дзіраўкі,* etc.; Croatian *Veliki Barjak – Вэлыкі Бар'як,* not *Вялікі Бар'як, Sridnji Otok – Срыдні Отак,* not *Сярэдні Отак, Sveti Kuzam – Свэты Кузам,* not *Святы Кузам*; Russian *Железнодорожны – Жалезнадарожны,* not *Чыгуначны, Родник – Раднік,* not *Крыніца.*

With regard to Russian names in the mentioned *Technical Guidelines* (Tehničeskaâ instrukciâ…,2011) it is separately specified that the names of ideological content are not subject to translation (*Победа – Пабеда,* not *Перамога, Октябрь – Акцябр,* not *Кастрычнік, Звезда – Звязда,* not *Зорка, Первомайский – Первамайскі,* not *Першамайскі*), as well as the names with the component of *красн-,* which originated in ancient times, when the adjective *красный* (*red*) had the meaning of 'прыгожы, прыўкрасны' ['beautiful'], and are relict (*Краснополье – Краснаполле,* not *Чырвонаполле, Красная Слобода – Красная Слабада,* not *Чырвоная Слабада*). According to the current norms, it is also not allowed to change the structural and grammatical design of geographical names: Polish *Przedmieście – Пшэдмесце,* not *Прадмесце, Boratyńszczyzna – Баратыньшчызна,* not *Баратыньшчына, Czyste – Чыстэ,* not *Чыстае, Małotice – Маламіцэ,* not *Маламіцы*; Russian *Корнюшкин Застéнок – Карнюшкін Засценак,* not *Карнюшкаў Засценак, Тетерино – Цяцерына,* not *Цяцерын*; Croatian *Gornja Vežica – Горня Вэжыца,* not *Горная Вэжыца, Braščine – Брашчынэ,* not *Брашчыны*; Czech *Hostinné – Госціннэ,* not *Гасціннае, Bystřice – Быстршыцэ,* not *Быстршыцы.*

The main approaches to the interlingual transfer of toponyms are summarized in the above-mentioned report by I. Kopylov:

1. The interlingual transmission of proper geographical names should take into account the national-linguistic affiliation and system-structural organization of the toponymy of the donor language (non-Slavic) and ensure uniformity of its transmission by graphic means of the recipient language (Belarusian), consistently reflecting the specifics of its phonetic orthography (by transmitting such phenomena as dzekanne, tsekanne, partial akanne, hardness of sibilants, *р* and primordial *ц*, transition from *в* into *ў*, etc.).

2. When establishing interlingual non-Slavic-Belarusian toponymic equivalents, the priority belongs to the external (sound or graphic) form of toponyms, which is important for the identification of geographical objects.

3. The leading principles focused on the transfer of the external form of non-Slavic toponyms are: phonetic, phonological, orthographic, graphic. The best ways of interlanguage transmission are transliteration and *practical transcription* (Kapyloŭ, 2018).

5. The existing codes and reference books, of course, make a significant contribution to solving the problem of Slavic-Belarusian interlanguage transposition. But, first of all, the rules proposed in them do not cover all Slavic languages. Secondly, they still do not remove absolutely all practical questions.

Thus, the Technical *Code Geographical Names: Methods and Rules of Translation of Geographical Names and Terms of the Republic of Poland into Belarusian* (Tèhnìčny kodèks…, 2010) declares that 'complex names are transmitted together, separately or separated by a hyphen, depending on the Polish spelling. The hyphen in translation equivalents is used only in cases when it is used in the Polish name' (par. 8.3.1.). But in practice there is no single approach to writing Polish names together, separately, and separated by a hyphen. This is due to the fact that in the Belarusian and Polish languages similar names in some cases are composed according to different principles. For example, Polish names consisting of a noun and a dependent adjective of the type *Stare-Buczyce*, are usually written separately in the Belarusian language – *Старыя Бучыцы* (for details see: Gaponenka, 2016). Since many points of inconsistency between the Polish and Belarusian rules are not specified in the instructions, similar and even completely identical in structure Polish names in the Belarusian context are often given quite arbitrarily: *Беласток-Фабрычны, Юхнавец-Дольны,* but *Бельск Падляскі*; *Кшывавежба, Добравода,* but *Новы Двур, Юшкаў-Груд*; *Красныбур,* but *Незнаны-Бур*; *Валоскаволя, Сухаволя,* but *Нова Воля.* The name with two hyphens – *Чарна-Весь-Касцельна* (Polish: *Czarna Wieś Kościelna*) looks especially strange.

When designing Russian names, instructional requirements are often simply ignored. Thus, on the map *Republic of Belarus* issued by RUE 'Belkartografiya' in 2014 in Russia we find clearly translated names *Першамайскі, Чырв. Знамя* (but *Красная Гара*), *Вялікія Шчарбінічы, Вял. Топаль, Мікалаеўка.*

And in the practice of using the Technical Code *Geographical Names: Methods and Rules of Translation of Geographical Names and Terms of Ukraine into Belarusian* (Tèhnìčny kodèks…, 2009) it turned out that the list of traditional writings that do not meet the general requirements of the code requires significant addition. To date, the document contains only 15 such names: *Азовське морэ – Азоўскае мора* (according to the rules *Азоўскэ мора*), *Глухів – Глухаў* (according to the rules *Глухіў*), *Дніпро – Дняпро* (according to the rules *Дніпро*), *Дніпропетрівськ – Днепрапятроўск* (according to the rules *Дніпрапэтрыўск*), *Запоріжжя –Запарожжа* (according to the rules *Запарыжжа*), *Івано-Франківськ – Івана-Франкоўск* (according to the rules *Івана-Франкіўск*), *Київ – Кіеў* (according to the rules *Кыіў*), *Кривий Ріг – Крывы Рог* (according to the rules *Крывы Рыг*), *Львів – Львоў* (according to the rules *Львіў*), *Макіївка – Макееўка* (according to the rules *Макіïўка*), *Могилів-Подільський – Магілёў-Падольскі* (according to the rules *Магыліў-Падзільскі*), *Харків – Харкаў* (according to the rules *Харкіў*), *Чернігів – Чарнігаў* (according to the rules *Чэрнігіў*), *Чорне морэ – Чорнае мора* (according to the rules *Чорнэ мора*), *Шевченко – Шаўчэнка* (according to the rules *Шэўчэнка*). For example, the names of district cities and other large localities would be quite appropriate in this list.

6. In the field of anthroponymy, the issues of transposition of Slavic onyms into the Belarusian language remain practically unregulated.

6.1. Among them, for example, the question of the transfer of the *names of wives and daughters* from some Slavic languages. So, if a Czech has the surname *Hašek*, then his wife or daughter, who allegedly 'belong'to him, are written in the Czech language *Hašekowa*. How to convey such forms in the Belarusian text remains unresolved. Some researchers believe that in this case the ending *-ова*, just a morphological indicator of the proper form of the surname. The main surname is *Hašek*, so in translation this form should be the only legal one for all family members. The suffix *-ова* in this opinion is considered simply a grammatical feature that should not be transferred to the translated text. There is also the opposite opinion that the female names on *-ова* are passport forms and they should be saved when translating. The rules for transposition of Slavic (Polish, Czech, Ukrainian) surnames with national 'labels' such as *Яблоньска* (Polish), *Яблонска* (Czech), *Яблонська* (Ukrainian) have not been established yet.

The principle of translation is considered a priori unacceptable, especially if we are talking about surnames. So, the Russian *Тулупов* does not become *Кажухов* in the Belarusian language, and the Polish *Skawronek* – *Жаўрук*. The situation is somewhat different with personal names (in the narrow sense of the word). Since Slavic languages have a related origin and many common original canonical forms, it is sometimes considered possible to replace Slavic names with their national equivalents in their interlingual transposition: *Дора – Даша, Жіван – Віталь, Ката – Каця, Зося – Соф'я, Стэфан – Сцяпан, Ежы – Юрый* and so on. In the Belarusian language, such substitutions regularly occur when Russian names are written in the Belarusian text. As a tribute to the onomastic tradition, a number of Russian names are subject to Belarussification in the Belarusian language system, and Belarusian names in the Russian design are subject to Russification. As a result, the following mutual transitions are observed: *Николай ↔ Мікалай* (or *Мікола), Григорий ↔ Рыгор, Екатерина ↔ Кацярына, Анастасия ↔ Настасся, Анатолий ↔ Анатоль, Филипп ↔ Піліп, Аркадий ↔ Аркадзь, Арсений ↔ Арсен, Евгений ↔ Яўген, Афанасий ↔ Апанас, Василий ↔ Васіль, Виталий ↔ Віталь, Геннадий ↔ Генадзь* and others (by the way, in the case of names from other languages, this principle does not work: *Michael* does not become *Міхаіл, Joan – Іван, José – Іосіф* or *Язэп*, and *Дмитро Підручний* is not renamed as *Зміцер Падручны*).

The practice of searching for their interlanguage matches cannot be considered satisfactory, in accordance with the onomastic law, although such Russian-Belarusian and Belarusian-Russian nomenclatural parallels have become commonplace in the minds of native speakers and have even gained lexicographic fixation (see, for example, (Zavalnûk and Ramancèvìč, 2017) and other similar publications). As a result of such transformations, the name completely loses its national identity, and sometimes the identification of a person may be violated, which in the situation of Belarusian-Russian official bilingualism may even have legal consequences. Alexander Reformatsky, quoting well-known Slavic researchers Pyotr Dmitriev and Herman Safronov, gives

an illustrative example of the absurd situations that the consistent application of this approach can lead to: for example, the Serbian linguist *Пэра Джорджэвіч (Pera Dzhordzhevich)* can turn into *Пётр Георгіевіч (Pyotr Georgievich)*, and such a form is unlikely evaluated by Serbian speakers (Reformatskij, 1972, p. 330). The practice of rewriting many foreign names exists, for example, among the Czechs (*Фрыдрых Вялікі – Бедржых Вялікі (Frederick the Great)*, *Жанна д'Арк – Іаганка з Арку (*Jeanne d'Arc). However, researchers believe that this practice should not be a model, but a warning to translators who want to make a 'cultural' translation (Reformatsky, 1972, p. 329).

6.2. Questions arise not only in writing, but also in the *declension* of Slavic anthroponyms, in particular Polish surnames on *-ski / -cki*. There is a significant difference in written practice in this area. For example, in one of the issues of the newspaper 'Zvyazda' for 2016 (the article 'Дыяс? Дзіяз? Дзіяс!' ('Dyas? Dziyaz? Diaz!') there are many similar examples. Let's quote:

> In the Belarusian language, surnames in *-cki*, which denote a Polish man, are usually declined: *прэзентацыяновай кнігі Януша* **Вішнеўскага**, *партыя Яраслава* **Качыньскага**. However, when it comes to emigrants or heirs of Slavic surnames, surnames are not declined: *Улады Польшчы адмовілі ЗША ў экстрадыцыі Рамана* **Паланскі** (http://zviazda.by/be, 02.11.2014); *Таму пры ўсёй павазе да лонданцаў і Лукаша* **Падольскі** *гэты гол на 70 % Свэна Моена і на 30% гульцоў Баварыі і Ноера* (http: by.tribuna.com, 12.03.2014).
>
> The lack of declension can extend to other male surnames ending in -i (*-ы*). So, in the comments to the match between BATE and Roma, Pavel Baranov does not decline the name of the Pole, the goalkeeper of the Italian club Roma: *«Мяч не пераходзіць у вароты* **Шчэнсны***»*) («Беларусь 2», 09.12.2015). Commentator Uladzimir Navitsky uses this surname similarly. But in the Polish media these names are declined: *Na ławce znajdzie się miejsce dla weterana Lukasa* **Podolskiego**… http://www.rp.pl, 02.09.2015). *Trener Rudi Garciaza straconą bramkę skrytykował Wojciecha* **Szczęsnego]** (http://www.rp.pl, 01.11.2015). Since structurally and semantically Polish male surnames on *-скі/-цкі, -i(ы)* are identical to Belarusian ones, they can be declined (except, probably, in cases of loss of Slavic family and social ties). For example, the Belarusian roots of the famous Canadian hockey player *Уэн Грэцкі* became known only in recent years. In all media for a long time his name has not been declined (see. *Zvâzda*, 2016).

A similar situation, according to the author of the article, is observed with female surnames of this type:

> Women's Polish surnames have recently been given with a monosyllabic ending, for example, in literary magazines: *Марыянна Паўлоўска, Вольга Лаліч-Кравіцка, Віслава Шымборска*, but there are traditional forms with a two-syllable ending: *Марыя Складоўская-Кюры, Марыя Канапніцкая*. With the similarity of Polish and Belarusian surnames, it is obvious that the exact phonetic transfer - *Эва Ліпска*, not *Ева Ліпская*, reflects better the national specificity of the name. At the same time, female Polish surnames in the media are

declined: *Віславе* **Шымборскай** *было 88 гадоў*, which creates a kind of paradigm, where the monosyllabic ending is used in the nominative case, and the two-syllable ending in the indirect declension. Female surnames with the masculine formant *-cki* are definitely not declined: *бацька Монікі Лявінскі, з Настассяй Кінскі* (see. *Zvâzda*, 2016).

It should be noted that the suggestions of the author of the cited article on ways to eliminate inconsistencies in the declension of Polish surnames of this type look quite rational.

7. It is clear why such questions about spelling and changing words remain open. The main task of spelling and grammar is to settle the transfer in writing and the declension of the native appellate vocabulary. The spelling of foreign proper names does not refer to 'nuclear' orthograms. But bringing order to this peripheral field is a very important presentation task. The ability of the language system to adapt consistently 'foreign' elements (especially onyms, which act not only as a linguistic fact, but also a kind of social signs and documentary units) – is a clear indication of its level of development and viability.

The creation of special normative codes, guidelines and reference books, which would regulate the writing of borrowed toponyms and anthroponyms for individual languages or groups of languages, could radically solve the problem of normalization of foreign (Slavic in particular) proper names. After all, in fact, the actual written design of such units is more a matter of adaptation than spelling. Universal spelling principles are not likely to be found here, and an individual approach is needed to colloquial onyms.

7.1. In some cases, the rules of existing codes can be extended to other onomastic material. Thus, I will try to show possible ways of transferring Slavic, in particular Ukrainian, personal names into Belarusian on the example of names of famous Ukrainians using the above-mentioned Technical Code *Geographical Names: Methods and Rules of Translation of Geographical Names and Terms of Ukraine into Belarusian* (Tèhnìčny kodèks…, 2009) as a reference document. If you consistently apply the principles of transliteration and the rules for transmitting Ukrainian proper names proposed in the Technical Code for geographical names, the following relative forms are obtained: Ukrainian *Ле́ся Украї́нка* – Belarusian *Лэся Украінка, Олекса́ндр Канди́ба (Оле́сь) – Алэксандр Кандыба (Алэсь), Григо́рій Чупри́нка (Грицько́ Чупри́нка) – Грыгоры́ Чупрынка (Грыцько Чупрынка), Михайло Драй-Хма́ра – Мыхайла Драй-Хмара, Мико́ла Кулі́ш – Мыкола Куліш, Архíп Тесле́нко – Архып Тэслэнка, Винниче́нко Володи́мир – Выннычэнка Валадымыр, Валер'ян (Валеріян) Петро́вич Підмоги́льний – Валэр'ян (Валэрыян) Пэтровіч Підмагыльный, Оста́п Ви́шня – Астап Вышня, О́льга Юлiа́нiвна Кобиля́нська – Вольга Юлiанiўна Кабылянска* and others.

I must assume that this instructive approach is generally correct with regard to Ukrainian surnames. The situation with personal names and patronymics is more complicated. In transliterated form, they look somewhat unnatural (such as *Стэпан*

or *Сэмэнавіч*). In my opinion, it would be logical to design these components in Belarusian in a more familiar form for Belarusians (*Сцяпан*, *Сямёнавіч*). Deviation from the basic principle in such cases can be motivated at least according to tradition. The tradition should be taken into account in the case of the names of famous people: the name of *Миха́йло Миха́йлович Коцюби́нський* according to the Code should look like *Мыхайла Мыхайлавіч Кацюбынскі*, but, probably, it is worth leaving the form *Кацюбінск*, which has already been established in translation practice.

7.2. It requires a lot of work of specialists in the field of both Belarusian and foreign languages to fully normalize the spelling of this lexical layer. It is advisable to continue creating separate working groups that will develop principles and rules for transferring names from particular languages to Belarusian, and publish regional reference books based on the results of work of such groups (such as *Proper names of West Slavic Languages in the Belarusian Transfer*). A situation where 'an interested person learning a foreign language cannot find a reference to one or another proper name … in any of the dictionary reference books' and 'proper names remain a kind of terra incognita, access to which is blocked by our lexicographers' (Navìckì, 2002, p. 81), requires that all developments should eventually be combined into a consolidated dictionary of the most commonly used foreign geographical names and personal names.

It is necessary to continue working in the direction of the preparation of instructional codes, using the existing above-mentioned developments of scientists. And then there is hope that this important scientific and practical problem will be successfully solved. Not only ordinary users of the language are interested in this, but also public administration bodies, transport and communication institutions, science, education, culture, press, television and other state structures. In addition, optimizing the written program in this presentation sector will increase the prestige of the Belarusian language.

Translated into English by Marharyta Svirydava

References

Ermolovič, Dmitrij. (2001). *Imena sobstvennye na styke âzykov i kul'tur*. Moskva: R. Valent. [Ермолович, Дмитрий. (2001). *Имена собственные на стыке языков и культур*. Москва: Р. Валент].

Gaponenka, Ìryna. (2016). *Da pytannâ ab peradačy pol'skìh taponìmaj pa-belarusku: skladanyâ ì sastajnyâ najmennì*. In: Ìryna Bagdanovìč, Maryna Svìstunova (eds.). *Belaruska-pol'skìâ mojnyâ, lìtaraturnyâ, gìstaryčnyâ ì kul'turnyâ suvâzì: zb. art.* (pp. 58–63). Minsk: BDU (Biełarusika = Albaruthenica; Book 37). [Гапоненка, Ірына. (2016). *Да пытання аб перадачы польскіх тапонімаў па-беларуску: складаныя і састаўныя найменні*. У: Ірына Багдановіч, Марына Свістунова (рэд.). *Беларуска-польскія*

моўныя, літаратурныя, гістарычныя і культурныя сувязі: зб. арт. (с. 58–63). Мінск: БДУ (Беларусіка = Albaruthenica; Кн. 37)].

Kapyloŭ, Ìgar. (2010). *Prablema ŭnarmavannâ nazvaй vulìc gorada Mìnska*. In: *Belaruskaâ anamastyka. Gìstoryâ ì sučasnasc'*: matèryâly mìžnar. navuk. kanf., Mìnsk, 20 krasavìka 2010 g. (pp. 295–300). Mìnsk: Prava ì èkanomìka. [Капылоў, Ігар. (2010). *Праблема ўнар-маванння назваў вуліц горада Мінска*. У: *Беларуская анамастыка. Гісторыя і сучаснас-ць*: матэрыялы міжнар. навук. канф., Мінск, 20 красавіка 2010 г. (с. 295–300). Мінск: Права і эканоміка].

Kapyloŭ, Ìgar. (2013). *Narmatyйna-pravavaâ baza mìžmoйnaj peradačy belaruskaj, ruskaj, pol'skaj tapanìmìì*. In: Ganna Mezenka (ed.). *Belaruska-ruska-pol'skae supastaŭlâl'nae movaznaйstva, lìtaraturaznaйstva, kul'turalogìâ: zb. navuk. art.* (pp. 229–233). Vìcebsk: VDU ìmâ P. M. Mašèrava. [Капылоў, Ігар. (2013). *Нарматыўна-прававая база міжмоўнай перадачы беларускай, рускай, польскай тапанімii*. У: Ганна Мезенка (рэд.). *Беларуска-руска-польскае супастаўляльнае мовазнаўства, літаратуразнаўства, культуралогія*: зб. навук. арт. (с. 229–233). Віцебск: ВДУ імя П. М. Машэрава].

Kapyloŭ, Ìgar. (2018). *Slavânskì tapanìmìkon: specyfikaì asablìvascì peradačy na belaruskuŭ movu. Daklad na XVI Mìžnarodnym z`ezdze slavìstaŭ (Bâlgrad, 20–27 žnìŭnâ 2018 g.)*. Mìnsk: Prava ì èkanomìka. [Капылоў, Ігар. (2018). *Славянскі тапанімікон: спецыфіка і асаблівасці перадачы на беларускую мову. Даклад на XVI Міжнародным з'ездзе славістаў (Бялград, 20–27 жніўня 2018 г.)*. Мінск: Права і эканоміка].

Klûsov, Grigorij. (1982). Belorussko-russkie paraleli v peredače lìčnyh imen. In: *Russkij âzyk: mežved. sb.*, 2, pp. 38–57. [Клюсов, Григорий. (1982). Белорусско-русские паралели в передаче личных имен. В: *Русский язык*: межвед. сб., 2, с. 38–57].

Lučyc-Fedarèc, Ìvan. (1985). Ab napìsannì čèšskìh ì slavackìh ulasnyh ìmën pa-belarusku. *Belaruskaâ lìngvìstyka*, 27, pp. 55–62. [Лучыц-Федарэц, Іван. (1985). Аб напісанні чэшскіх і славацкіх уласных імён па-беларуску. *Беларуская лінгвістыка,* 27, с. 55–62].

Mezenka, Ganna. (1993). Ruskaâ peradača nazvaŭ unutrygaradskìh ab`ektaŭ Belarusì. *Belaruskaâ lìngvìstyka*, 42, pp. 45–51. [Мезенка, Ганна. (1993). Руская перадача назваў унутрыгарадскіх аб'ектаў Беларусі. *Беларуская лінгвістыка,* 42, с. 45–51].

Mezenko, Anna (1990). Nekotorye voprosy russkoj peredači belorusskih urbanonimov. In: Zìnaìda Danìl'čyk, Maryâ Kanûškevìč (eds.). *Vykladanne belaruskaj ì ruskaj moй u vyšèjšyh navučal'nyh ustanovah BSSR: tèz. dakl. ì pavedaml. rèsp. navuk.-metad. kanf. (Grodna, 20–23 lìstapada 1990 g. (pp. 20–22)*. Grodna: GrDU. [Мезенко, Анна. (1990). Некоторые вопросы русской передачи белорусских урбанонимов. У: Зінаіда Данільчык, Марыя Канюшкевіч (рэд.) і інш. *Выкладанне беларускай і рускай моў у вышэйшых навучальных установах БССР: тэз. дакл. і паведамл. рэсп. навук.-метад. канф. (Гродна, 20–23 лістапада 1990 г. (с. 20–22)*. Гродна: ГрДу].

Mezenko, Anna. (2017). Gosudarstvennoe belorussko-russkoe dvuâzyčie i problemy normalizacii belorusskoj onomastiki. *Vestnik Rossijskogo universiteta družby narodov*, serìâ: *Voprosy obrazovaniâ: âzyki i special'nost'*, 2(14), pp. 199–204. [Мезенко, Анна. (2017). Государственное белорусско-русское двуязычие и проблемы нормализации

белорусской ономастики. *Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов, серия "Вопросы образования: языки и специальность"*, 2(14), с. 199–204].

Mìckevìč, Vol′ga. (2015). Problema peradačy nazvaŭ geagrafìčnyh ab`ektaŭ Serbìì na belaruskuû movu. In: *Belaruskaâ mova ŭ XXI stagoddzì: asnoŭnyâ tèndèncyì razvìccâ (da 80-goddzâ Akadèmìka A. Ì. Padlužnag*a): zb. matèr. Mìžnar. navuk. kanf. (Mìnsk, 28–29 kastryčnìka 2015 g.) (pp. 237–244). Mìnsk: Prava ì èkanomìka. [Міцкевіч, Вольга. (2015). Праблема перадачы назваў геаграфічных аб'ектаў Сербіі на беларускую мову. У: *Беларуская мова ў XXI стагоддзі: асноўныя тэндэнцыі развіцця (да 80-годдзя акадэміка А.І. Падлужнага): зб. матэр. Міжнар. навук. канф. (Мінск, 28–29 кастрычніка 2015 г.)* (с. 237–244). Мінск: Права і эканоміка].

Mìckevìč, Vol′ga. (2017a). Problema peradačy nazvaŭ geagrafìčnyh ab`ektaŭ Bosnìì ì Gercagavìny na belaruskuû movu. In: *Mìžnarodnyâ Šamâkìnskìâ čytannì „Pìs'mennìk – asoba – čas": zb. matèr.* (pp. 147–150). Mazyr: MDPU ìmâ Ì. P. Šamâkìna. [Міцкевіч, Вольга. (2017a). Праблема перадачы назваў геаграфічных аб'ектаў Босніі і Герцагавіны на беларускую мову. У: *Міжнародныя Шамякінскія чытанні „Пісьменнік – асоба – час": зб. матэр.* (с. 147–150). Мазыр: МДПУ імя І. П. Шамякіна].

Mìckevìč, Vol′ga. (2017b). Problema peradačy nazvaŭ geagrafìčnyhab`ektaŭ Čarnagoryì na belaruskuû movu. *Mova ì kul'tura*, 20(3), pp. 132–139. [Міцкевіч, Вольга. (2017b). Праблема перадачы назваў геаграфічных аб'ектаў Чарнагоры на беларускую мову. *Мова і культура*, 20(3), с. 132–139].

Navìckì, Mìkola. (2002). Nâmeckìâ najmennì ŭ belaruskaj move: problemy perakladu. *Rodnae slova*, 10, pp. 79–82. [Навіцкі, Мікола. (2002). Нямецкія найменні ў беларускай мове: праблемы перакладу. *Роднае слова*, 10, с. 79–82].

Nikitina, Nadežda. (2016). Ob osobennostâh peredači toponimov pri avtorskom perevode s belorusskogo na russkij. In: *Slavânskie âzyki: sistemno-opisatel'nyj i sociokul'turnyj aspekty issledovaniâ. Mater. VII mеždunar. naučno-metod. konf. Brest, 26–27 noâbrâ 2016 g.* Issue 1 (pp. 217–220). Brest: BrGU imeni A. S. Puškina. [Никитина, Надежда. (2016). Об особенностях передачи топонимов при авторском переводе с белорусского на русский. В: *Славянские языки: системно-описательный и социокультурный аспекты исследования: сб науч. трудов VII междунар. науч. конф. Брест, 26–27 ноября 2016 г.* Ч. 1 (с. 217–220). Брест: БрГУ имени А.С. Пушкина].

Paramonova, Anna. (2007). Imena sobstvennye v aspekte mеž″âzykovoj kommunikacii. *Vescì BDPU, series 1: Pedagogìka. Psìhalogìâ. Fìlalogìâ*, 4(54), pp. 61–65. [Парамонова, Анна. (2007). Имена собственные в аспекте межъязыковой коммуникации. *Весці БДПУ, серыя 1. Педагогіка. Псіхалогія. Філалогія*, 4(54), с. 61–65].

Paramonova, Anna. (2008). Vzaimodejstvie fonetičeskih i grafičeskih sistem ishodnogo i prinimaûŝego âzykov v processe peredači onomastičeskogo materiala. In: *Slavânskie âzyki: sistemno-opisatel'nyj i sociokul'turnyj aspekty issledovaniâ. Mater. III mеždunar. naučno-metod. konf. Brest, 22–23 noâbrâ 2007 g.* (pp. 225–228). Brest: BrGU imeni A. S. Puškina. [Парамонова, Анна. (2008). Взаимодействие фонетических и графических систем исходного и принимающего языков в процессе передачи ономастического материала. В: *Славянские языки: системно-описательный и социокультурный*

аспекты исследования. Матер. III международ. научно-метод. конф. Брест, 22–23 ноября 2007 г. (с. 225–228). Брест: БрГУ имени А. С. Пушкина].

Reformatskij, Aleksandr. (1972). Perevod ili transkripciâ. In: *Vostočnoslavânskaâ onomastika*. (pp. 311–333). Moskva: Nauka. [Реформатский, Александр. (1972). Перевод или транскрипция. В: *Восточнославянская ономастика*. (с. 311–333). Москва: Наука].

Saŭka, Zmìcer. (2011). *Ìnšamoйnyâ najmennì ŭ belaruskìm tèksce*. Mensk: u âkascì nutranoj dakumentacyi Moŭnae služby tèlekanalu 'Belsat']. [Саўка, Зміцер. (2011). *Іншамоўныя найменні ў беларускім тэксце*. Менск: у якасці нутраной дакументацыі Моўнае службы тэлеканалу ,Белсат'].

Šidlovskij, Adam. (1978). *Lingvističeskie problemy perevoda na belorusskij âzyk*. Minsk: Vyšèjšaâ škola. [Шидловский, Адам. (1978). *Лингвистические проблемы перевода на белорусский язык*. Минск: Вышэйшая школа].

Suškevič, Polina. (2011). *Antroponimy v povesti V. Bykova ,Oblava' na russkij âzyk*. In: *Âzyk i socium: mater. IX meždunar. nauč. konf. Minsk, 3–4 dekabrâ 2010 g*. Part 3 (pp. 208–211). Minsk: RIVŠ. [Сушкевич, Полина. (2011). *Антропонимы в повести В. Быкова ,Облава' на русский язык*. В: Язык и социум: *матер. IX международ. науч. конф. Минск, 3–4 декабря 2010 г.* Ч. 3 (с. 208–211). Минск: РИВШ].

Tehničeskaâ instrukciâ po peredače naimenovanij geografičeskih ob"ektov s russkogo âzyka na belorusskij âzyk. (GKNP 13-012-2011). (2011). [*Техническая инструкция по передаче наименований географических объектов с русского языка на белорусский язык. (ГКНП 13-012-2011)*]. Taken from: http://www.tnpa.by/#!/FileText/367134/269363 (accessed: 15.05.2019).

Tèhnìčny kodèks ustanoŭlenaj praktykì. Geagrafičnyâ nazvy. Sposaby ì pravìly peradačy geagrafičnyh nazvaй ì tèrmìnaй Ukraìny na belaruskuŭ movu (TKP 177-2009). (2009). [*Тэхнічны кодэкс устаноўленай практыкі. Геаграфічныя назвы. Спосабы і правілы перадачы геаграфічных назваў і тэрмінаў Украіны на беларускую мову (ТКП 177-2009)*]. Taken from: http://www.tnpa.by/#!/FileText/323688/226163 (accessed: 10.05.2019).

Tèhnìčny kodèks ustanoŭlenaj praktykì. Geagrafičnyâ nazvy. Sposaby ì pravìly peradačy geagrafičnyh nazvaй ì tèrmìnaй Rèspublìkì Pol'šča na belaruskuŭ movu (TKP 236-2010). (2010). [*Тэхнічны кодэкс устаноўленай практыкі. Геаграфічныя назвы. Спосабы і правілы перадачы геаграфічных назваў і тэрмінаў Рэспублікі Польшча на беларускую мову (ТКП 236-2010)*]. Taken from: http://www.tnpa.by/#!/FileText/340955/243332 (accessed: 10.05.2019).

Tomaševskij, Boris. (1972). Russkaâ peredača francuzskih imën. In: *Vostočnoslavânskaâ onomastika*. (pp. 251–311). Moskva: Nauka. [Томашевский, Борис. (1972). Русская передача французских имён. В: *Восточнославянская ономастика*. (с. 251–311). Москва: Наука].

Zaval'nûk, Uladzìslaŭ; Ramancèvìč, Valâncìna. (2017). *Sloŭnìk asabovyh ulasnyh ìmën*. Mìnsk: Narodnaâ asveta. [Завальнюк, Уладзіслаў; Раманцэвіч, Валянціна. (2017). *Слоўнік асабовых уласных імён*. Мінск: Народная асвета].

Zvâzda (2016). [*Звязда*]. Taken from: http://zviazda.by/be/news/20160419/1461032254-dyyas-dziyaz-dziyas (accessed: 19.04.2016).

Article submission date: 29 October 2019