The oikonymic landscape is a complex linguistic-historical multi-component system which we can analyze via a stratigraphic method that is based on the research of an oikonymic phenomenon or process in chronological sequence. Geographical names are specific linguistic units, which, in addition to lingual and temporal, have territorial parameters. Areas, identified as a result of mapping, turn to a special onomastic text. Arealogy, stratigraphy and the oikonymic landscape are connected by one concept – space, and a chart respectively, which provides visualization of the phenomenon spreading (area) in diachrony (stratigraphy) across the determined territory (landscape) (Kupchyns’ka, 2016, p. 3).

The oikonymic landscape is a set of all processes that take place in a determined area during the respective historic period. The main factors of the oikonymic landscape functioning are as follows: natural environment, social-historical conditions, tendencies, and principles of locus nomination within the limits of the analyzed chronological level, appellative and anthroponymic facts recorded in oikonomy, anthropogenic processes, etc.

Every oikonymic landscape is unique in terms of space and time. If some particular area has been explored for ten centuries, for example, it allows us to determine the typological features of diachronic landscapes and follow their dynamics, i.e. quantitative (and much more!) changes, that happen due to intra lingual and extra lingual factors, but do not lead to the qualitative alteration of the landscape structure.
There may be reversible and irreversible changes in the oikonymic landscape. It is caused by the stability threshold of every landscape, that is, by the ability to preserve its qualitative and quantitative parameters under the influence of linguistic, natural, and anthropogenic factors.

Due to irreversible (qualitative) changes in the configuration and content of the landscape, the restructuring, in other words, development or evolution of the structure, takes place.

Onymic landscapes may be systematized and classified according to different parameters, namely, their origin, structure, dynamics, types of names, their derivational base, etc.

In modern linguistics, temporal and territorial characteristics of linguistic phenomena are widely used, especially in onomastics, and oikonymics, in particular. Such interest to chronological and areal dimensions is caused by the specificity of the object of research, as an oikonym (a place name) is the result of the long-lasting process of formation on a particular area and under particular social-historical and natural conditions, that is why oikonymics has to use the methods of research which are used not only in linguistics but in history and geography as well. Stratigraphy presupposes the analysis of oikonymic data in three aspects: areal, chronological, and statistical ones. The chronology of one separate place name or of a set of geographical names is a complex system, caused by numerous factors, namely, the history of formants forming, beginning with the appellative level; the structure and semantic content of the derivational base of geographical names; extra lingual factors that greatly influence emergence of the respective sets of oikonyms that depend on historical and social processes (Kupchyns’ka, 2016, p. 3).

The onymic areal is a part of the oikonymic landscape and it may represent various features of proper names: their models (types) according to certain characteristics (for example, word-formation), and the derivational base of proper nouns according to their origin, structure, etc. In terms of synchrony, the areal visualizes modern processes of a certain onymic phenomenon. Concerning diachrony, it intersects with stratigraphy, which provides a diachronic realization of the geography of specific processes in proper names. Areas of some phenomenon, which has been represented for ten centuries, make it possible to retrace its evolution.

Oikonymy is a specific set of vocabulary formed during a specific historical period on the respective territory. An oikonym as a name of a geographical object has a territorial parameter in addition to linguistic and temporal ones. Therefore, toponymic research is impossible without cartography. Proper nouns of certain types embrace the respective territory forming areas (with the nucleus, periphery, isoglosses, etc.). Defining geographical names areas according to the formant principle makes it possible to identify and reconstruct not only the linguistic, but
the historical phenomena as well. Oikonyms, selected from written records, have been localized and marked on the map chart. An oikonomic map chart represents separate phenomena, included in this class of proper nouns (map charts are made taking into account various parameters: formants of toponyms (-уи, -уха, -ив and similar ones), the origin of the derivational base of proper nouns, semantics of the roots of oikonyms derivational base, etc.).

Oikonymy of respective types is analyzed according to chronology, borrowed from historical sources. Chronology of archaic types of geographical names contributes to the research of various historical phenomena. Isoglosses of oikonomic objects concentration points frequently overlap with areas of some archeological cultures and ethnic tribal groups. This overlapping on some territories tells about the historical unity of these facts tracing back to the early Slavonic community. If there is no overlapping like this, it may confirm an asynchrony of linguistic and ethnic phenomena, which appeared as the result of different historical epochs. According to temporal and spatial coordinates of the analyzed oikonyms, the respective grounds for the preliminary reconstruction of the main cluster of population, migration processes, ancient ways, etc. have been created.

Chronology of proper nouns, as well as their geography, is conventional as it is based on written sources only. Fixed names have been saved in different ways in different territories of Ukraine, in some periods and in some regions of Ukraine they do not exist, the attempts to find sources which contain the analyzed names have been unsuccessful for some territories. For the 20th–21st-centuries research, historical sources have been replaced by reference books.

Intersection points of arealogy, stratigraphy and the oikonomic landscape are, speaking figuratively, those points on the map which form the areal of a certain onymic phenomenon in diachrony.

To visualize it we will analyze oikonyms ending in *-j- at the level of the 15th century, which are one of the oldest types of geographical names in the Slavonic territories. These archaic names have been the subject-matter of scientific research in Slavonic onomastics (Nieckula, 1965; Bezlaj, 1967; Zaimov, 1973; Rospond, 1983; Kupčins’kij, 2011; Zaliznăk, 2004; Raďo, 2004; Kuchyns’ka, 2016), but still there exist many problems connected to chronology of oikonyms ending in *-j- in Ukrainian territory.

Geographical names ending in *-j- (derived from adjectives) inherited the possessive suffix *-jo/- *-ijo- from the Indo-European language. This suffix used to be productive and gave the meaning of possession to the adjectives which corresponded to the Genitive case in the Greek language. It formed adjectives pointing at individual, not collective possession (Meje, 2001, pp. 286–287).
The marker of oikonymic type archaism is a derivative base of the geographical name which contains binomial proper names. If an oikonym contains an archaic Slavonic composite in its stem (reduced variants and forms with affixes are possible) which is represented not only in the Ukrainian onomastycon, but also at the all-Slavonic level, it means that the geographical name belongs to an oikonymic archaism. Analysis of the 15th-century period allowed us to find 134 newly authenticated names ending in -*j-. Among them are a large number of names connected to composites:

a) full composites: Жизномир (Ternopil oblast, 1457) < *Жизномир (<Жизн) (*Zhyznomir (< Zhyzn (compare Dobrožizn [Svoboda, 1964, p. 93] + Мир (Myr) (compare Bolemir, Vojmir [Svoboda, 1964, pp. 79–81]). Хотимир (Ivano-Frankivsk oblast, 1443) < *Хотимир (<Хоть *Khotymyr (< Khot’ (compare Chotibor, Chotibud [Svoboda, 1964, p. 76] + Мир (Myr) (compare Bolemir, Vojmir [Svoboda 1964, pp. 79–81]). Dobrohost (Halych, 1466) < *Доброгост (< Добр(a) *Dobrohost (< Dobr(a) (compare Radohost [Svoboda 1964, p. 83], Dobromir, Dobromil [Svoboda 1964, p. 74] + Dobrigost [SSNO I/III, pp. 485–495]). Добровір (Lviv oblast, 1465) < *Добровір (<Добр (< Dobr (compare Dobrodziej, Dobrigost, Dobronièga [SSNO I/III, pp. 485–495], Dobrêmil [Svoboda, 1964, p. 74] + Твор (Tvor) (compare Tvořirad, Netvor [Svoboda 1964, p. 90]). Станимир (Lviv oblast, 1435) < *Станимир (< Стан (<Станymyr (< Stan (compare Stanimir, Stanislav, Nestan (Sv., 86) + Мир (Myr) (compare Bolemir, Vojmir [Svoboda 1964, pp. 79–81]). Милолюбъ (Kyiv, 1497) < *Милолюб (<Мил (*Myloliub (< Myl (compare Přĕmil, Bohumil, Radomil [Svoboda, 1964, p. 79] + Люб (L’ub) (compare Rozlub, Nel’ub, Nel’ubec [Svoboda, 1964, p. 78]). Гостомель (Kyiv oblast, 1440) < *Гостомел (< Гост (<Hostomel (< Host (compare Radhost [Svoboda, 1964, p. 83] + Мел? (Mel?). Malogoszcz (Lviv oblast, 1433) < *Малогост (< Мал (<Malohost (< Mal (compare Malomir, Malhost, Malomysl [Svoboda, 1964, p. 78] + Гост Host (compare Gościslaw, Gościrad [SSNO II/I, pp. 178–181]). Невір (Volyn oblast, 1444) < *Невір (< Не (<Nevir (< Ne (compare Nemir, Nedamir [Svoboda, 1964, p. 81] + Бір (Vir) (compare Neverice [Svoboda, 1964, p. 98]). Несвіч (Volyn oblast, second half of the 15th century) < *Несвіт (< Не (<Nesvit (< Ne (compare Nemir, Nedamir [Svoboda 1964: 81] + Світ Svit (compare Světibor, Světislav [Svoboda, 1964, p. 88]). Перелишь (Volyn, second half of the 15th century) < *Перелих (< Пере (<Perelykh (< Pere (compare Peresud [Demčuk, 1988, p. 95] + Лих (Lykh) (Lykhodid [Hudaš and Demčuk, 1991, p. 29]). Перерісьль (Ivano-Frankivsk oblast, 1436) < *Перерісль (< Пере (<Pererisl (< Pere (compare Peresud [Demčuk, 1988, p. 95] + Рі(o)сл (Ri(o)sl) (compare Rostislav [Svoboda, 1964, p. 84]). Вороніж (Sumy oblast, the 15th century) < *Вороніг (< Вор(o) *Vorinih (< Vor(o) (compare Vorotislav [Svoboda, 1964, p. 92] + Ніг Nih (compare Mironěha, Něžata [Svoboda, 1964,
Озденіж (Volyn oblast, 1452) < *Озденіг (< O + Zd(e)?) (compare Sdobar [Svoboda, 1964, p. 84] + Ніг (Nih) (compare Mironěha, Něžata [Svoboda, 1964, p. 82]). Перемишель (Khmelnytsky oblast, 1455) < *Перемисл (< Pere *Перемysl (<Pere (compare Peresud [Demčuk, 1988, p. 95] + Мисл (Mysl) (compare Boldomysl, Drahomysl, Zamysl, Mylsibor, Krasomysl [Svoboda, 1964, p. 81]). Драгомишль (Lviv oblast, 1497) < *Дрогомисл (< D(o) рoс *Drohomysl (< D(o)roh (compare Dramalim, Drahbar [Svoboda 1964, p. 263] + Мисл Mysl (compare Boldomysl, Drahomysl, Zamysl [Svoboda, 1964, p. 81]). Здомишель (Volyn, 1405) < *Здомисл (< Zdo? *Zdomysl (< Zdo? (compare Sdobor [Svoboda, 1964, p. 84] + Мисл Mysl) (compare Boldomysl, Drahomysl, Zamysl [Svoboda, 1964, p. 81]). Szelobor (Halych, 1485) < *Ж(ш)елобор (< Жель? + Бор) (*Zh(sh)elobar (< Zhel? + Bor (compare, Bořislav, Radbor, Želibor [Svoboda, 1964, p. 71]). Домаборь (Halych Land, 1433) < *Домабор (< Doma (compare Domahost, Domamir, Domamysl [Svoboda, 1964, p. 74–75] + Бор (Bor) (compare Blažibor, Bolesbor, Pomobor, Přežibor, Želibor [Svoboda, 1964, p. 71]). Уріж (Lviv oblast, 1437) < *Урі(о)д (< U + Rod (*Uri(o) d (< U+Rod (compare Rodoslav [Svoboda, 1964, p. 96]). Домажир (Lviv oblast, 1474) < *Домажир (< Doma + Жир (*Domazhyr (< Doma+Zhyr (compare Domahost, Domamir, Domamysl [Svoboda, 1964, pp. 74–75], Mojžir, Nedažir [Svoboda, 1964, p. 93]). Остобіж (Lviv oblast, 1462) < *Остобіг (< O + сто(?) *Ostobih (< O+sto(?) (compare Ostoj [Svoboda, 1964, p. 86]) + Bo(i)h (compare Bogdal, Bohuchval, Bohomil, Bohural, Bohuslav, Bohovlad, Svojboh [Svoboda, 1964, p. 70; Malec, 1971, p. 66–67]). Чаниж (Lviv oblast, 1453) < *Чаних (< Cha *Chanyh (< Cha (compare Čabud [Svoboda, 1964, p. 73] + Ніг (Nih) (compare Mironěha, Něžata [Sv., p. 82]). Увебо́сь (Lutsk, 1453) < *Увегост (< Uвег? + Гост *Uvehost (< Uve? + Host (compare Gosćinik, Gosćislaw, Gosćirad [SSNO II/I, pp. 178–181])

b) reduced composites: Люча (Ivano-Frankivsk oblast, 1448) < *Лют *Liut (compare Lutohor, Lutorad [Svoboda, 1964, p. 78])

c) reduced composites with suffixes: Радомль (Kremenets, 1488) < *Радом *Radom (< Rad (compare Radhost, Radislav, Domarad [Svoboda, 1964, p. 83] + om [om]). Раделич (Medenychi – Drohobych, 1443) < *Раделич(к) (< Rad *Radelech(y) (< Rad (compare Radhost, Radislav, Domarad [Svoboda, 1964, p. 83] + el + уk [+ el + yk]). Радич (Lviv oblast, 1456) < *Радич(к) (< Rad *Radjich(y) (< Rad (compare Radhost, Radislav, Domarad [Svoboda, 1964, p. 83] + уk (+ yk)). Dobrcze (Halych Land, 1454) < *Добрцех (< Добр (*Dobrete (< Dobr (compare Dobrodziej, Dobrigost, Dobroniegą [SSNO I/III, 485–495], Dobrěmil [Svoboda, 1964, p. 74] + ель (el’)). Lubosch (Halychyna, 1497) < *Любоха (< Люб *Lubokha (< L’ub (compare Rozlub, Nel’ub, Nel’ubec [Svoboda, 1964, p. 78])
Among the names derived from composites there are the ones which are represented at an all-Slavonic level (Хотимир (Ivano-Frankivsk oblast, 1443) < *Хотимир (< Хоть (*Khotymyr (< Khot '(compare Chotibor, Chotibud [Svoboda, 1964, p. 76] + Мир (+ Myr) (compare Bolemir, Vojmir [Svoboda, 1964, pp. 79–81]), but also there are those parts of which are difficult to identify in modern proper names (Гостомель (Kyiv oblast, 1440) < *Гостомел (< Гост (*Hostomel (< Host (compare Radohost [Svoboda, 1964, p. 83] + Мел? (Mel?). Only one geographical name contains a reduced form derived from a composite, but there are many names which reflect an adaptation of such reduced forms taking suffixes (Станиля (Lviv oblast, 1439) < *Станил(о) (< Стан (*Stanyl(o) (< Stan (compare Stanimir, Stanislav, Nestan [Svoboda, 1964, p. 86] + ил(о) [yl(o)]).

Binominal names originate from the Indo-European language (compare Toporova, 1996). They belong to the most ancient anthroponymic layer, on the basis of which other types of Slavonic autochthonous names have been formed (Milewski, 1961; Palacký, 1832; Seliševa, 1948; Železnâk, 1969; Demčuk, 1988).

Among newly authenticated oikonyms (place-names) in the 15th century there are the ones, for which anthroponyms derived from appellatives constitute their derivational base: Більче (Lviv oblast, 1433) < *Білець (*Bilets). Бірче (Lviv oblast, 1490) < *Бирець (*Birets). Вохуць (Halych, 1458) < *Богась (*Bohais). Буковць (Halychyna, 1499) < *Буковець (*Bukovets). Гумінець (Lviv – Sknyliv, 1455) < *Гуменець (*Humenets). Доброздечь (Halych, 1452) < *Доброздовець (*Dobrovodets). Дубовець (Halychyna, 1441) < *Дубовець (*Dubovets). Кунць (Halych, 1461) < *Кунця (*Kunitsia). Купче (Lviv oblast, 1470) < *Купець (*Cupets). Пнівець (Nadvirna, Halych Land, 1454) < *Пнівець (*Pnivets). Рубич (Lviv Land, 1436) < *Рубець (*Rybets). Рогірче (Lviv oblast, 1469) < *Рогіречь (*Rozhirets). Страж (Lviv oblast, 1416) < *Страдець (*Stradets). Стрилечь (Ivano-Frankivsk oblast, 1440), Стрилечь (Lviv – Peremyshl, 1437) < *Стрилечь (*Strilets). Угерець (Lviv oblast, 1436) < *Угерець (*Uherets). Черче (Ivano-Frankivsk oblast, 1437) < *Черець (*Cherecs). Швець (Halych Land, 1464) < *Швець (*Shvets). Явче
(Ivano-Frankivsk oblast, 1423) < *Явець (*Yavets). Більче (Rivne oblast, 1490) < *Білець (*Bilets). Вівче (Zhytomyr oblast, 1444) < *Вівець (*Vivets). Долотче (Ostroh, 1465) < *Долотець (*Dolotets). Пальче (Volyn oblast, 1496) < *Палець (*Palets). Сокільча (Zhytomyr oblast, 1471) < *Сокілець (*Sokilets). Губча (Khmelnytsky oblast, 1491) < *Губець (*Hubets). Зеленче (Khmelnytsky oblast, 1493) < *Зеленець (*Zelenets). Івча (Vinnysia oblast, 1493) < *Івець (*Ivets). Кормильча (Khmelnytsky oblast, 1402) < *Кормілець (*Kormylets). Кривче Нижне (Ternopil oblast, 1480), Кривче (Ternopil oblast, 1480) < *Кривець (*Kryvets). Poteremcze (Podillia, 1493) < *Потеремець (*Poteremets). Турильче (Ternopil oblast, 1458) < *Турилець (*Turylets). The majority of reproduced proper names exist in modern Ukrainian anthroponymicon, unlike proper nouns derived from composites.

Geographical names of the 15th century ending in *-j- were formed from borrowed proper names of people: Данильче (Ivano-Frankivsk oblast, 1475) < *Данильче < Данило (*Danylche < Danylo). Jancza (Halychyna, 1457) < *Янця < Ян / Іван (*Yanets < Yan / Ivan). Михальче (Ivano-Frankivsk oblast, 1439) < *Михалець < Михайло (*Mykhalets < Mykhailo). Lescze (Halychyna, 1483) < *Леська < Олександр (*Les’ka < Oleksandra). Олеша (Ivano-Frankivsk oblast, 1441), Олеша (Ternopil oblast, 1438) < *Олеха < Олександр / Ольга (*Olekha < Oleksandra / Olha). There are not so many of them, but they confirm the adaptation processes of canonical Christian names to the Ukrainian language.

Scholars claim that geographical names ending in *-j- appeared due to various social-historical conditions, but, in fact, ancestral communities gave a boost to the development of collective ownership first and to private individual ownership later, which contributed to the more active formation of oikonyms of such type. As far as it is known, the Eastern Slavonic ancestral system came to an end during the first two centuries AD. In the 6th century, feudal and class-based relations started to appear, therefore we may claim that the 4th–6th centuries were a favourable period for the active formation and functioning of geographical names ending in *-j- in terms of all social-historical parameters. Class-based relations promoted the development of private individual ownership which supported spreading of place names-possessives, that clearly pointed out who the land, the mansion or the village belonged to (Kupchyns'ka, 2016, p. 123).

The Ukrainian areal of possessive oikonymy ending in *-j- represents the fact that this type of names refers to Slavonic archaisms. The Ukrainian areal of oikonymy ending in *-j- is a part of all-Slavonic one. During the documented period, the Ukrainian zone of this total areal has not changed. Names ending in *-j- are common in western, north-western, northern, and north-eastern parts of Ukraine and these are the territories of the earliest Slavonic settlements.
In the 15th century (see the Map Chart) the largest amount of newly-authenticated names ending in *-y- was found in the Western part of the areal, in Podnistrovya, in particular (Barassch (Halych, 1465), Бариш (Ternopil oblast, 1439), Більче (Lviv oblast, 1433), Бірче (Lviv oblast, 1490), Вохыече (Halych, 1458), Борисха (Halychyna, 1439), Брише (Lviv oblast, 1464), Броньовеце (Halychyna, 1452), Буковцеве (Halychyna, 1499), Варяж (Lviv oblast, 1419), Велдіж (Ivano-Frankivsk oblast, 1469), Велиць (Halych, 1465), Вескрзеньцеве (Halych, 1461), Вівла (Halych, 1462), Влосць (Peremyshl – Drohobych, 1443), Воноща (Drohobych oblast, 1425), Галич (Ternopil oblast, 1490), Голоеча (Ternopil oblast, 1445), Гумієнчизе (Lviv – Sknyliv, 1455), Данильчизе (Ivano-Frankivsk oblast, 1475), Довброводциье (Halych, 1452), Доброхост (Halych, 1466), Добратвір (Lviv oblast, 1465), Добрцье (Halych Land, 1454), Домаборть (Halych Land, 1433), Домажир (Lviv oblast, 1474), Дрогомишль (Lviv oblast, 1497), Друнйовеце (Halych, 1465), Дубовеце (Halychyna, 1441), Дуковеце (Halych, 1466), Зеблорби (Бережани, 1440), Калуш (Ivano-Frankivsk oblast, 1437), Кимир (Lviv oblast, 1456), Княжизе (Ivano-Frankivsk oblast, 1469), Княжизе (Lviv oblast, 1488), Коропуч (Lviv oblast, 1441), Сунцьце (Halych, 1461), Купче (Lviv oblast, 1470), Куткір (Lviv oblast, 1475), Леданцзье (Halychyna, 1475), Лесчизе (Halychyna, 1483), Лубочі (Halychyna, 1497), Любішча (Ivano-Frankivsk oblast, 1416), Любіша (Lviv oblast, 1411), Люча (Ivano-Frankivsk oblast, 1448), Малогощць (Lviv, 1433), Михальчизе (Ivano-Frankivsk oblast, 1439), Наварія (Lviv oblast, 1493), Олеша (Ivano-Frankivsk oblast, 1441), Остобіж (Lviv oblast, 1462), Перерісь (Ivano-Frankivsk oblast, 1436), Підбуж (Lviv oblast, 1400), Пітріч (Lviv – Крылос – Halych, 1487), Пнівеце (Надвирна, Halych Land, 1454), Пржевроцье (Halych, 1452), Раделіч (Medenychi-Drohobych, 1443), Радич (Lviv oblast, 1456), Рыйбціч (Lviv oblast, 1436), Розгірче (Lviv oblast, 1469), Руданцзье (Lviv Land, 1486), Созань (Drohobych oblast, 1480), Сокаль (Lviv oblast, 1423), Сокіл (Lviv oblast, 1455), Соколя (Lviv oblast, 1449), Станіля (Lviv oblast, 1439), Станимир (Lviv oblast, 1435), Стрідча (Lviv oblast, 1416), Стрільчі (Lviv – Peremyshl, 1437), Стрільчизе (Ivano-Frankivsk oblast, 1440), Тумір (Ivano-Frankivsk oblast, 1443), Туричі (Lviv oblast, 1444), Турич (Lviv oblast, 1456), Турич Мала (Ivano-Frankivsk oblast, 1475), Убрець (Lviv oblast, 1436), Уріж (Lviv oblast, 1437), Хотимир (Ivano-Frankivsk oblast, 1443), Цетуля (Lviv oblast, 1457), Цитуля (Lviv oblast, 1460), Чаниж (Lviv oblast, 1476), Черче (Ivano-Frankivsk oblast, 1437), Сцежце (Halych Land, 1464), Сцелоборо (Halych, 1485), Явче (Ivano-Frankivsk oblast, 1423), Янцза (Halychyna, 1457) and in Volyn Більче (Rivne oblast, 1490), Вильгор (Lutsk county (povit), 1484), Вівче (Zhytomyr oblast, 1444), Долотче (Ostrog, 1465), Забороль (Volyn oblast, 1489), Забороль (Rivne oblast, 1489), Здомишель
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(Volyn oblast, 1405), Клевань (Rivne oblast, 1458), Lahodowl (Volyn, 1493), Литовеж (Volyn oblast, 1434), Невір (Volyn oblast, 1444), Несвіч (Volyn oblast, second half of the 15th century), Озденіж (Volyn oblast, 1452), Пальче (Volyn oblast, 1496), Певжа (Rivne oblast, 1490), Перемишель (Volyn, second half of the 15th century), Радомль (Kremenets, 1455), Ридомиль (Khmelnytsky oblast, 1458), Ридомиль (Ternopil oblast, 1430), Рудомль (Volyn, Kremenets, 1449), Русивель (Rivne oblast, 1494), Сокільча (Zhytomyr oblast, 1471), Соловье (Lutsk, 1476), Тараж Новий (Ternopil oblast, 1463), Увегощъ (Lutsk, 1453), Якстребль [Volyn, 1449]). During this period several centers were formed: 1) Sokal’ – Volodymyr-Volyn’s’ky – Luts’k; 2) Dubno – Kremenets’; 3) Ostroh – Rivne – Hoshcha; 5) Iziaslav; 6) Potelych – Zhovkva – Bus’k; 7) Nemyriv – Yavoriv – Sudova Vyshnia; 8) Horodok – Lviv – Mykolyav; 9) Dobromyl’ – Sambir – Drohobych; Zhydachiv – Khodoriv – Rohatyn; 10) Nadvirna – Tlumach; 11) Kosiv – Horodenka – Kitsman’.

The Podillia part of the areal separated out: (Бариш (Ternopil oblast, 1439), Більче-Золоте (Ternopil oblast, 1436), Губча (Khmelnitsky oblast, 1491), Жизномір (Ternopil oblast, 1457), Збриж (Khmelnitsky oblast, 1494), Зеленче (Khmelnitsky oblast, 1493), Івча ([Vinnytsia oblast, 1493], Климащ (Proskuriv, 1493), Книжке (modern name – Kniazhpil, 1493), Кормильча (Khmelnitsky oblast, 1402), Кривче (Ternopil oblast, 1480), Кривче Нижнє (Ternopil oblast, 1480), Олеша (Ternopil oblast, 1438), Poteremcze (Podillia, 1493), Тараж Старий (Ternopil oblast, 1463), Турільче (Ternopil oblast, 1458), Кіцмань [Chernivtsi oblast, 1497]), that is located close to the Middle Transnistria, the majority of newly-authenticated names concentrated in the left basins of the Dnister.

In the 15th century some new names appeared in the Kyiv center and the Left Bank center (Басань Нова (Chernihiv oblast, 1400), Вороніж (Sumy oblast, 15th century), Гостомель (Kyiv oblast, 1440), Милолюбъ (Kyiv, 1497), Тоганче (Kyiv, 1494), Хальча (Kyiv oblast, 1475), Хотімля [Kharkiv oblast, 1499]).

So, arealogy, stratigraphy and the oikonymic landscape are connected by one concept – space, i.e. the spreading of a certain phenomenon (in our research these are names of the 15th century ending in *-j-), visualized on the map chart, which fixes the spreading of the phenomenon (the area of the oikonyms (place-names) of the 15th century ending in *-j- in diachrony (or at some chronological stage – the 15th century (stratigraphy) on the territory of Ukraine (the partial landscape, as the names ending in *j- are only a small part of the general oikonymic landscape). It is the map chart that confirms the areal of oikonyms at one of the stratigraphy chronological stages within territorial boundaries of the oikonymic landscape (see the map chart).

Translated into English by Diana Kalishchuk
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The purpose of the article is to reveal the interconnection of the three close linguistic concepts: arealogy, stratigraphy and the oikonymic landscape. The tasks, due to the purpose, were as follows: 1) to describe the theoretical background of arealogy, stratigraphy, and the oikonymic landscape; 2) to analyze oikonyms (place names) of the 15th century ending in *-jь to illustrate theoretical points. The reference base for the analysis is the diachronic oikonymic material of Ukraine. In the article, the empirical and descriptive methods have been used, which means referring to the little-known oikonymic reference material – the historical-comparative method of onyms analysis. The stratigraphic method involves quantitative characteristics, space localization of geographical names, determining the chronology of oikonyms. By means of the cartographic method the areal of oikonyms (place names) of the 15th century ending in *-jь has been studied. So, arealogy, stratigraphy and the oikonymic landscape are connected by one concept – space, i.e. spreading of some phenomenon (in our research these are names of the 15th century ending in *-jь) visualized on the map chart, which records spreading of the phenomenon (the areal of oikonyms (place names) of the 15th century ending in *-jь in diachrony (or at some chronological stage – the 15th century (stratigraphy) on the territory of Ukraine; partial landscape, as names ending in *-jь are only a small part of the general oikonymic landscape). It is the map-chart that confirms the areal of oikonyms at one of the chronological stages of stratigraphy within territorial boundaries of the oikonymic landscapes (see the map chart).

Keywords: arealogy, stratigraphy, oikonymic landscape, onyms, proper nouns

ABSTRAKT

Celem artykułu jest ujawnienie powiązania trzech bliskich pojęć językowych: arealogii, stratygrafii i krajobrazu ojkonimicznego. Zadania, ze względu na ich cel, były następujące: 1) opisać teoretyczne podstawy arealogii, stratygrafii i krajobrazu ojkonimicznego; 2) dokonać analizy ojkonimów (nazw miejscowych) z XV wieku kończących się na *-jь w celu zilustrowania punktów teoretycznych.
Podstawą analizy był diachroniczny materiał ojkonimiczny Ukrainy. W artykule wykorzystano metody empiryczne i opisowe, co oznacało odwołanie się do mało znanego ojkonimicznego materiału odniesienia – zastosowano historyczną metodę porównawczą analizy rzeczowników właściwych. Metoda stratygraficzna objęła charakterystykę ilościową, lokalizację przestrzenną nazw geograficznych oraz określenie chronologii ojkonimów. Za pomocą metody kartograficznej zbadano grupę ojkonimów z XV wieku kończących się na *-j-. Tak więc arealogia, stratygrafia i pejzaż ojkonimiczny połączone są jedną koncepcją – przestrzenią, tj. rozprzestrzenianie się jakiegoś zjawiska (w naszych badaniach są to nazwy z XV w. kończące się na *-j-) jest wizualizowane na mapie topologicznej, która rejestruje rozprzestrzenianie się zjawiska (areal ojkonimów (nazw miejscowych) z XV wieku kończących się na *-j-) w diachronii (lub na pewnym etapie chronologicznym – XV wiek (stratygrafia) na terytorium Ukrainy; krajobraz częściowy, gdyż nazwy kończące się na *-j- to tylko niewielka część ogólnego krajobrazu ojkonimicznego). To właśnie mapa topologiczna potwierdza obszar ojkonimów (nazw miejscowych) na jednym z chronologicznych etapów stratygrafii w granicach terytorialnych krajobrazów ojkonimicznych (patrz mapa topologiczna).

Słowa kluczowe: arealogia, stratygrafia, krajobraz ojkonimiczny, onimy, nazwy własne
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