LINGUISTIC FEATURES OF NATURAL ATTRACTION TOPONYMS IN LONDON

Le Thi Minh Thao[1], Le Van Thanh[1], Hoang Thi Hoa[1]
Email: thaolmt@hou.edu.vn, ORCID: 0009-0001-2475-9367

Received: 05/08/2025. Revised: 05/02/2026. Accepted: 23/02/2026
DOI: 10.59266/houjs.2026.1138

Abstract: *Despite extensive scholarship on English toponymy, the names of natural attractions in London represent a distinct and under-researched category. This article analyzes the linguistic characteristics of the names of 115 natural attractions in London, which can be regarded as historical and cultural artifacts. Employing a qualitative approach, the study aims to investigate the etylogical origins, morphological structures, and semantic features of the place names of these natural attractions in London. The findings reveal that Old English accounts for 60% of the names, while Norman French and Modern English together comprise 31.3%. From a morphological perspective, more than 90% of the names are compounds following the pattern [Modifier + Common Noun]. Semantically, expressions of ownership and social structure (35.7%) constitute the dominant meaning group, followed by topographical descriptions (24.3%). Overall, the results indicate that the names of London's natural tourist sites serve a historiographical function and can be regarded as a form of social archive of the environment and geography, documenting the transition from folk-based descriptive naming practices to ideological and commemorative naming that reflects the historical transformation of a modern metropolis.*

Keywords: *toponymy, onomastics, London natural attractions, linguistic analysis, place names, urban landscape*

I. Introduction

Place names, or toponyms, function as far more than simple geographical labels for orientation; they are profound linguistic and cultural artifacts where history, power, and identity converge. The act of naming is never neutral. Naming represents a fundamental exercise in asserting control, converting abstract, undifferentiated space into a realm characterized by human meaning and experience. Cultural geographers have posited that language serves as a mechanism in toponymic inscription, a process through which landscapes are imbued with narratives, memories, and ideologies, often legitimizing certain histories while marginalizing or obliterating others (Rose-Redwood et al., 2017).

Consequently, the examination of toponymy provides a distinctive and essential framework for analyzing the relationships among language, society, and topography. It demonstrates not only what communities understand

[1] Hanoi Open University, Hanoi, Vietnam

about their surrounding environments but also how they engage with, contest, and commemorate their representations of those spaces through the ostensibly innocuous act of naming.

London, with its history spanning more than two millennia as a center of settlement, trade, and power, represents an exceptional site for toponymic study. The city possesses a multilingual landscape that functions as a palimpsest on a grand scale, with layers demonstrating influences from Celtic, Roman, Anglo-Saxon, Norse, and Norman French contributions to the development of Modern English (Coates, 2018). This stratification, however, represents not mere passive superposition but rather a dynamic historical account of interactions, conflicts, and cultural assimilation. Successive wars, conquests, and demographic shifts have resulted in an intricate amalgamation of names with multiple crystalline strata, where nomenclature from various epochs coexists in proximity.

Thus, examination of these names facilitates exploration of diachronic language evolution and the progression of social structures. Hough (2016) characterizes them as "linguistic fossils", yet they preserve more than merely archaic vocabulary. These toponyms encode the DNA of the city's social structure, economy, and diverse legal systems, revealing the complexity of its historical development.

II. Theoretical framework and literature review

2.1. Toponymy as cultural practice

Toponymy, the study of place names, occupies a crucial interdisciplinary space connecting linguistics, geography, history, and anthropology. Contemporary toponymic research has evolved beyond simple etymological cataloging to embrace critical perspectives on power, memory, and landscape (Alderman & Inwood, 2013). Critical toponymy examines how naming practices reflect and perpetuate social hierarchies, ideologies, and power structures.

Rose-Redwood et al. (2010) argue that place naming constitutes a form of spatial governmentality, whereby authorities use nomenclature to organize, categorize, and ultimately control urban space and populations. This perspective, drawing from Foucauldian concepts, illuminates how toponyms serve administrative, political, and ideological functions beyond mere geographical reference.

However, as Kearns and Berg (2002) demonstrate, naming is not solely a top-down process. Vernacular or folk naming practices emerge from everyday lived experiences and frequently resist or subvert official nomenclature. This dialectic between official and vernacular naming proves particularly relevant for natural landscape features, which often retain ancient, descriptive names rooted in agricultural and subsistence practices predating formal administrative structures.

2.2. English toponymic studies

English place-name studies possess a distinguished scholarly tradition dating to the early 20th century with the establishment of the English Place-Name Society (EPNS) in 1923. Foundational work by scholars like Ekwall (1960) and subsequent comprehensive county-by-county surveys have created an extensive corpus of etymological research. Gelling and Cole's (2000) seminal work on landscape terms in Anglo-Saxon charter boundaries revolutionized the understanding of how Old English speakers conceptualized and categorized their environment.

For London specifically, Mills's (2010) dictionary represents an authoritative reference, providing etymologies for thousands of names across Greater London. However, as Coates (2018) notes, London's toponymic landscape presents unique challenges due to its exceptional linguistic diversity, urban transformation, and the frequent loss or corruption of early forms through centuries of use and reinterpretation.

Recent research has begun examining specific thematic categories within London's nomenclature. Ekwall's (1954) early work identified patterns in London street names, while more recent studies have explored commemorative naming practices (Azaryahu, 2011), the politics of renaming (Light, 2004), and the toponymic imprint of immigration. However, systematic linguistic analysis of natural attraction names as a distinct corpus remains underexplored.

2.3. Morphological patterns in English toponymy

English place names exhibit characteristic morphological structures reflecting historical word-formation processes. The most productive pattern involves compound formation, typically following a [Specific + Generic] model where a specific element (often a personal name, descriptor, or previous place name) combines with a generic element indicating place type (Field, 1993).

Common Old English generics include *tūn* (farmstead, estate), *hām* (homestead, village), *lēah* (wood, clearing), and *feld* (open land). These generics evolved semantically over time; *tūn*, for instance, developed from indicating a fenced enclosure to denoting a farmstead and eventually a town (Gelling, 1984). Understanding these semantic shifts proves crucial for the accurate interpretation of modern place names.

Norman French influence introduced new generics and naming patterns, particularly for elite and ecclesiastical landscapes. Terms like park (enclosed hunting ground), forest (royal hunting preserve), and warren (rabbit breeding ground) reflect feudal land management systems (Schama, 1995). Modern English naming, particularly from the 18th century onward, introduced commemorative practices, naming features after monarchs, nobility, and public figures, marking a fundamental shift in naming motivation from descriptive to honorific.

2.4. Semantic fields in landscape toponymy

Toponymic semantics concerns the meanings encoded in place names and the conceptual categories or semantic fields they represent. Gelling and Cole (2000) identified several primary semantic domains in Anglo-Saxon landscape terms: topography (hills, valleys, water features), vegetation (trees, plants), fauna, land use (agriculture, settlement types), and ownership.

Room (1988) emphasizes that semantic interpretation must account for both transparent and opaque meanings. Some names retain clear descriptive content (e.g., *Blackheath* describing heath vegetation), while others have become semantically opaque through linguistic change, requiring etymological analysis to recover original meanings.

Stewart's (1970) classical typology of American place names distinguishes descriptive names (referring to physical features), associative names (commemorating persons or events),

incident names (marking historical occurrences), and possessive names (indicating ownership). While developed for American contexts, this framework offers useful analytical categories applicable to English toponymy.

For urban natural spaces specifically, semantic analysis can reveal changing cultural attitudes toward nature. The shift from utilitarian, agricultural descriptors to aesthetic, recreational, and commemorative names reflects broader transformations in landscape values accompanying urbanization and the emergence of modern environmentalism (Thomas, 1983; Williams, 1973).

III. Methodology

3.1. Research design

This study employed a qualitative research methodology best suited to interpretive analysis of linguistic data within historical contexts. The approach combined principles from historical linguistics, onomastics, and corpus linguistics, drawing upon established methodologies in English place-name studies (Field, 1993) while incorporating contemporary theoretical perspectives from critical toponymy (Berg & Vuolteenaho, 2009).

The research design adopted a systematic, tripartite analytical framework examining: (1) etymological origins, (2) morphological structures, and (3) semantic significance. This structure aligns with standard practices in toponymic analysis while ensuring comprehensive treatment of the linguistic dimensions of the corpus.

3.2. Corpus construction

The foundation of this study comprises a purpose-built corpus of 115 official names of designated natural attractions within Greater London's administrative boundaries. Sites were systematically selected from authoritative environmental and public databases, the Greenspace Information for Greater London (GiGL) database, Natural England's inventory of designated sites, and official registers of The Royal Parks and the City of London Corporation, ensuring the corpus is both verifiable and representative.

The dataset reflects London's green and blue infrastructure diversity, encompassing Royal Parks (n=8, 7%), Major Parks, Commons, and Heaths (n=33, 28.7%), Hills and Viewpoints (n=12, 10.4%), Woods and Forests (n=21, 18.3%), and Rivers, Wetlands, and Waterbodies (n=20, 17.4%). This diversity allows identification of overarching linguistic patterns while remaining sensitive to potential variations in naming conventions across specific geographies or historical periods.

3.3. Data collection and analysis procedures

For each toponym, etymological origins of constituent elements were traced using authoritative reference works, including Mills's (2010) Dictionary of London Place Names, Ekwall's (1960) Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names, and specialized scholarly publications from the EPNS. The goal was not merely to assign a single origin language but to deconstruct each name into its constituent morphemes and trace their individual etymological histories, accounting for hybrid forms combining elements from different linguistic strata.

Toponyms were classified according to their word-formation structure: simple (single morpheme), compound

(two or more free morphemes), derived (involving affixation), or phrasal (multi-word structures with grammatical function words). For compounds, the dominant category, the internal structure was further analyzed, identifying the *generic* element (indicating place type) and the *specific* element (providing additional description).

Each toponym was coded according to its primary semantic field or meaning domain. Following Gelling and Cole's (2000) framework, primary categories included: Topography/Physical Description, Flora/Fauna, Land Use/ Function, Ownership/Social Structure, and Commemorative. Some names required assignment to multiple categories, in which case primary and secondary semantic motivations were distinguished based on etymological evidence and historical context.

IV. Findings and discussion

4.1. Etymological analysis: a multilayered linguistic landscape

The etymological analysis reveals that London's natural attraction toponymy constitutes a multilayered linguistic palimpsest, with Old English forming the dominant foundation.

Table 1. Distribution of toponyms by primary etymological origin

Linguistic Origin	Number	Percentage	Examples
Old English	69	60.0%	Hampstead, Ealing, Fulham, Brockwell, Oxleas, Norwood
Modern English	36	31.3%	Victoria Park, The Green Park, Crystal Palace Park
Norman French	5	4.3%	Richmond Park, Tooting Bec, Lesnes Abbey
Celtic	3	2.6%	Wandsworth Common, Dartford Heath
Other/Hybrid	2	1.7%	Multiple linguistic elements

The predominance of Old English origins (60%) establishes a pre-urban, agrarian toponymic framework. Names like Hampstead (OE hām-stede "homestead"), Ealing (OE tribal name Gillingas "people of Gilla"), and Fulham (OE Fugla hām "homestead of birds/ fowlers") reflect Anglo-Saxon settlement patterns and agricultural practices. These names often preserve linguistic features extinct in Modern English, functioning as time capsules capturing vocabulary, phonology, and even social structures of communities that named these landscapes over a millennium ago.

The substantial Modern English layer (31.3%) marks a fundamental shift in naming practices. Names like Victoria Park, Regent's Park, and Crystal Palace Park are not descriptive but commemorative, honoring monarchs, regents, and significant events. This reflects the transition from vernacular, bottom-up naming rooted in landscape perception to top-down, ideological naming by authorities, characteristic of modernity's spatial governmentality (Rose-Redwood et al., 2010).

Norman French influence, though numerically modest (4.3%), carries significant cultural weight. Names like Richmond (Norman French "rich mount") and elements like bec (stream) in Tooting Bec represent the Norman conquest's linguistic and social imprint, particularly in elite landscapes like royal parks and ecclesiastical properties.

The marginal Celtic presence (2.6%), primarily preserved in river names like Wandle and Darent, demonstrates the depth of London's linguistic history. Celtic river names frequently survive

linguistic transitions because rivers, as fundamental landscape features, maintain naming continuity even as the surrounding population's language changes (Nicolaisen, 1976).

The etymological stratification revealed in this analysis reflects broader sociolinguistic patterns in English toponymy. The Anglo-Saxon conquest of Britain in the 5th-7th centuries established Old English as the dominant language of settlement and landscape naming. Unlike the Roman occupation, which left relatively few toponymic traces beyond major urban centers, the Anglo-Saxon settlement fundamentally reshaped the toponymic landscape. The high proportion of Old English names in the corpus demonstrates that even within a heavily urbanized and multicultural modern metropolis, the Anglo-Saxon linguistic substrate persists as the foundational layer of landscape nomenclature. This persistence is particularly remarkable given that London has experienced continuous demographic, linguistic, and cultural change for over 1,500 years.

The relatively small but culturally significant Norman French layer requires careful interpretation. While only 4.3% of names show direct Norman French etymology, the influence of Norman French on English place-naming practices extends beyond simple word counts. The Norman Conquest introduced new administrative systems, land tenure arrangements, and elite cultural practices that profoundly affected landscape organization and nomenclature. Terms like *park* and *forest* entered English via Norman French, carrying specific legal and social meanings tied to feudal hunting rights and royal prerogatives. These terms were not mere descriptors but legal designations with significant implications for land use, access rights, and social hierarchy. A *forest*, in medieval legal terminology, was not simply a wooded area but land under special royal jurisdiction subject to forest law. Similarly, a *park* designated an enclosed hunting ground, typically associated with manor houses or royal residences. The presence of these Norman French elements in natural attraction names thus serves as a linguistic marker of elite landscape appropriation and the imposition of feudal land management systems.

4.2. Morphological analysis: the compound as naming blueprint

Morphological analysis reveals remarkable structural consistency, with compound formation overwhelmingly dominant.

Table 2. Distribution of toponyms by morphological structure

Structure	Number	Percentage	Examples
Compound	104	90.4%	Hampstead Heath, Clapham Common, Oxleas Wood
Simple	6	5.2%	Blackheath, Mitcham
Phrasal	3	2.6%	Harrow on the Hill
Derived (Affixal)	2	1.7%	Ealing, Tooting

The compound structure's dominance (90.4%) reflects English toponymy's fundamental naming grammar. The productive [Specific + Generic] pattern, where a specific element (descriptor, personal name, or previous place name) combines with a generic element (indicating place type) has served as the primary naming template for centuries.

Analysis of generic elements reveals the most frequent Old English landscape terms:

Table 3. Common old English generics in the corpus

Generic	OE Form	Meaning	Frequency	Examples
tun	tūn	Farmstead, estate	10	Acton, Kensington, Kempton
ham	hām	Homestead, village	8	Hampstead, Peckham, Streatham
leah	lēah	Wood, clearing	6	Bentley Priory, Kenley Common
dun	dūn	Hill	6	Wimbledon, Morden, Coulsdon
feld	feld	Open land	5	Mayfield, Enfield

These generics reveal how Anglo-Saxon speakers categorized their landscape. The *tūn* > *hām* > *feld* hierarchy reflects settlement patterns from enclosed farmsteads to villages to open agricultural land. The frequency of *lēah* (wood/clearing) in a heavily urbanized context preserves memory of London's once-wooded character.

Detailed examination of individual toponyms further illustrates these morphological principles. Consider *Hampstead Heath*, a compound following the classic [Specific + Generic] pattern. *Hampstead* itself is a compound (OE hām-stede, literally home-place or homestead), which then serves as the specific element in the larger compound with *Heath* (OE hæth, "uncultivated land with characteristic vegetation"). This creates a hierarchical compound structure in which an earlier compound is embedded as a component in a later, larger compound. Such recursive compounding demonstrates the productivity and flexibility of the [Specific + Generic] pattern, allowing speakers to create increasingly complex and precise place descriptions while maintaining a consistent structural template.

The morphological simplicity conceals semantic complexity. While the structure remains consistent, the relationship between specific and generic elements varies considerably. In some cases, the specific element locates the feature ("Clapham Common" - the common belonging to/near Clapham). In others, it describes a characteristic ("Blackheath" - heath with dark-colored vegetation). In yet others, it indicates ownership or association ("Kensington Gardens" - gardens associated with Kensington Palace). This semantic flexibility within a fixed morphological template exemplifies the cognitive efficiency of the [Specific + Generic] pattern: it provides a stable, predictable structure while accommodating diverse semantic relationships and naming motivations.

Modern English compounds follow the same [Specific + Generic] template, but with generic elements shifting from agricultural terms (tūn, feld) to recreational designations (Park, Gardens, Green), a semantic change more fully discussed in Section 4.4.

4.3. Semantic analysis: from description to commemoration

Semantic analysis identifies five primary meaning domains, revealing significant patterns in historical naming motivations.

Table 4. Distribution of toponyms by primary semantic field

Semantic Field	Number	Percentage	Examples
Ownership/Social Structure	41	35.7%	Kensington, Gunnersbury, Tooting Bec, Monken Hadley Common
Topography/Description	28	24.3%	Blackheath, Morden, Primrose Hill, Blythe Hill Fields

Semantic Field	Number	Percentage	Examples
Commemorative	20	17.4%	Victoria Park, Regent's Park, Gladstone Park, Alexandra Park
Flora/Fauna	15	13.0%	Acton, Dulwich, Wormwood Scrubs, Oxleas Wood, Finchley
Land use/Function	11	9.6%	Mitcham Common, Peckham Rye, Lea Valley

The predominance of Ownership/ Social Structure names (35.7%) proves particularly significant. Names incorporating personal names (Kensington from OE Cynesige "royal victory"), tribal affiliations (Ealing from Gillingas), and institutional ownership markers (Monken "monks", Tooting Bec from Bec Abbey) encode social hierarchies and power structures. These names often originated as estate designations, where land ownership determined community identity.

This semantic pattern reflects feudal and manorial systems in which land tenure organized society. The name Gunnersbury, for instance, derives from OE Gunnhildr (a Scandinavian woman's name) + burh (fortified place), suggesting Danish settlement and female property ownership, revealing both ethnic diversity and women's legal standing in early medieval London.

Topographical/Descriptive names (24.3%) represent the most transparent semantic category, directly referencing landscape features. Blackheath describes dark-colored heath vegetation; Primrose Hill likely references floral coverage; Morden derives from OE *mōr-dūn moor hill*. These names exemplify folk-geography, encoding vernacular environmental knowledge and demonstrating how communities cognitively mapped landscapes through salient features.

The Commemorative category (17.4%), entirely Modern English, marks the fundamental semantic shift accompanying modernity. These names honor monarchs (Victoria Park, Alexandra Park), regents (Regent's Park), politicians (Gladstone Park), and significant events. This naming practice reflects centralized authority's increasing control over public space and the emergence of parks as civic institutions expressing national and civic identity (Conway, 1991).

The relatively modest Flora/ Fauna representation (13.0%) might seem counterintuitive for natural spaces, yet reflects that prioritized social and economic over ecological information. Names like Acton (OE āc-tūn "oak farmstead") reference vegetation but emphasize agricultural utility rather than botanical diversity.

4.4. Diachronic patterns and interpretive synthesis

Integrating etymological, morphological, and semantic findings clear diachronic patterns reflecting London's historical transformation. The data demonstrates a fundamental transition in toponymic practice across three historical periods:

Pre-Norman period (pre-1066): Characterized by Old English dominance, simple compound structures, and semantic focus on ownership, topography, and land use. Names emerge organically from agricultural communities, encoding practical landscape knowledge. The naming process is vernacular, bottom-up, and functionally descriptive.

Medieval-early modern period (1066-1700): Marked by Norman French influence, particularly in elite landscapes (royal parks, ecclesiastical estates). Maintaining compound structures but introducing new generics (park, forest)

reflecting feudal hunting rights and land management. Semantic emphasis on ownership intensifies under the manorial system.

Modern period (post-1700): Dramatic semantic shift toward commemorative naming, particularly accelerating in the Victorian era with systematic park creation. Modern English becomes dominant for new designations. Morphological structures remain largely compound but with radically different semantic content. Naming becomes top-down, ideological, and honorific rather than descriptive.

This transition reflects broader societal transformations. Pre-modern names encoded the lived experience of landscape as a productive resource and settlement site. Modern names reflect landscapes reconceptualized as amenity space, sites of recreation, civic pride, and national identity. The shift from *Hampstead Heath* (descriptive: homestead's heath) to *Victoria Park* (commemorative: honoring the queen) epitomizes this transformation.

The toponymic evidence also illuminates changing environmental values and human-nature relationships across historical periods. Pre-modern names, with their emphasis on ownership, topography, and economic utility, reflect a worldview in which nature was primarily valued for its productive capacity and resources. Names like *Oxleas Wood* (wood where oxen graze) or *Peckham Rye* (rye fields of Peckham) encode an instrumental relationship with the landscape, where natural features are conceptualized primarily in terms of agricultural utility and resource extraction. This utilitarian perspective aligns with pre-industrial economic systems based on subsistence agriculture, where survival depended directly on land productivity.

The emergence of commemorative naming in the modern period signals a fundamental reconceptualization of urban natural spaces. Victorian park creation, motivated by concerns about public health, social order, and civic improvement, transformed previously agricultural or waste lands into designed recreational landscapes. The practice of naming these new parks after monarchs, politicians, and national figures reflects their function as instruments of civic pride and national identity construction. Parks became spaces for the performance of citizenship, social mixing (within class boundaries), and the inculcation of approved values and behaviors. The toponymic shift from descriptive to commemorative thus marks not merely a change in naming fashion but a profound transformation in the social meaning and function of urban nature.

Contemporary perspectives on urban green space, emphasizing ecological value, biodiversity conservation, ecosystem services, and psychological well-being, represent yet another conceptual shift, one largely post-dating the corpus analyzed here. Future research might investigate whether 21st-century naming practices for newly designated urban natural areas reflect these emerging environmental values, potentially marking a third wave of toponymic practice distinct from both pre-modern descriptive naming and modern commemorative naming.

Moreover, the persistence of Old English names in heavily urbanized contexts reveals toponymic stickiness. Even as landscapes transformed from agricultural to urban, names preserved linguistic and cultural memory. Epping Forest, though now a recreational amenity, maintains its OE name from Ēppinga (tribal group), connecting contemporary

Londoners to Anglo-Saxon predecessors who first named this landscape over a millennium ago.

V. Conclusion

This analysis of 115 London natural attraction toponyms reveals three key patterns. Etymologically, Old English dominates (60%), overlain by Norman French (4.3%) and Modern English (31.3%) layers. Morphologically, compound formation predominates (90.4%) following the [Specific + Generic] pattern. Semantically, ownership and social structure constitute the primary naming motivation (35.7%), followed by topographical description (24.3%) and commemorative practices (17.4%).

These dimensions together reveal a fundamental diachronic shift from vernacular, descriptive, bottom-up naming rooted in agricultural land use to ideological, commemorative, top-down naming reflecting urban modernity, marking a transition in how Londoners relate to natural spaces, from productive landscapes to civic amenity sites.

As a distinct corpus, natural attraction toponyms occupy an intermediate position between frequently changing urban street names and largely stable rural settlement names, maintaining ancient foundations while incorporating modern commemorative practices. Practically, understanding toponymic history enhances heritage management, public appreciation of natural spaces, and informed conservation decisions.

Future research could examine vernacular folk toponymy alongside official nomenclature and pursue interdisciplinary collaboration with historical ecologists and archaeologists to more fully realize toponymy's potential as a socio-environmental archive.

References

Alderman, D. H., & Inwood, J. (2013). Street naming and the politics of belonging: Spatial injustices in the toponymic commemoration of Martin Luther King Jr. *Social & Cultural Geography*, *14*(2), 211-233. https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2012.754488.

Azaryahu, M. (2011). The critical turn and beyond: The case of commemorative street naming. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, *10*(1), 28-33.

Berg, L. D., & Vuolteenaho, J. (Eds.). (2009). *Critical toponymies: The contested politics of place naming*. Ashgate Publishing.

Coates, R. (2018). Two lost place-names in the west Midlands: Gaia in Lichfield and The Gay in Shrewsbury. *Journal of the English Place-Name Society*, *51*, 55-65.

Conway, H. (1991). *People's parks: The design and development of Victorian parks in Britain*. Cambridge University Press.

Ekwall, E. (1954). *Street-names of the City of London*. Clarendon Press.

Ekwall, E. (1960). *The concise Oxford dictionary of English place-names* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Field, J. (1993). *A history of English field-names*. Longman.

Gelling, M. (1984). *Place-names in the landscape*. J. M. Dent & Sons.

Gelling, M., & Cole, A. (2000). *The landscape of place-names*. Shaun Tyas.

Hough, C. (Ed.). (2016). *The Oxford handbook of names and naming*. Oxford University Press.

Kearns, R., & Berg, L. (2002). Proclaiming place: Towards a geography of place name pronunciation. *Social & Cultural Geography*, *3*(3), 283-302. https://doi.org/10.1080/1464936022000003532.

Light, D. (2004). Street names in Bucharest, 1990-1997: Exploring the modern historical geographies of post-socialist change. *Journal of Historical Geography*, *30*(1), 154-172. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-7488(02)00102-0.

Le, T. M. T., & Phạm, T. N. (2026). Modern naming trends in Vietnam: A sociolinguistic study of gender and culture. *Onomástica desde América Latina*, *7*(1), 1-46. https://doi.org/10.48075/odal.v7i1.35445.

Le, T. M. T., & Hoang, T. B. (2026). A linguistic analysis of administrative place names in Ba Dinh District, Hanoi, Vietnam. *International Journal of Language, Linguistics, Literature and Culture*, *5*(1). https://doi.org/10.59009/ijlllc.2026.0175.

Mills, A. D. (2010). *A dictionary of London place names* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Nicolaisen, W. F. H. (1976). *Scottish place-names: Their study and significance*. B. T. Batsford.

Radding, L., & Western, J. (2010). What's in a name? Linguistics, geography, and toponyms. *Geographical Review*, *100*(3), 394-412. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1931-0846.2010.00043.x.

Room, A. (1988). *A dictionary of place-name origins*. Routledge.

Rose-Redwood, R., Alderman, D., & Azaryahu, M. (2010). Geographies of toponymic inscription: New directions in critical place-name studies. *Progress in Human Geography*, *34*(4), 453-470. https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132509351042.

Rose-Redwood, R., Alderman, D., & Azaryahu, M. (Eds.). (2017). *The political life of urban streetscapes: Naming, politics, and place*. Routledge.

Schama, S. (1995). *Landscape and memory*. Alfred A. Knopf.

Stewart, G. R. (1970). *American place-names: A concise and selective dictionary for the continental United States of America*. Oxford University Press.

Thomas, K. (1983). *Man and the natural world: Changing attitudes in England 1500-1800*. Allen Lane.

Williams, R. (1973). *The country and the city*. Chatto & Windus.

ĐẶC ĐIỂM NGÔN NGỮ CỦA ĐỊA ĐIỂM DU LỊCH TỰ NHIÊN Ở LONDON

Lê Thị Minh Thảo[1], Lê Văn Thanh[1], Hoàng Thị Hoa[1]

Tóm tắt: *Mặc dù đã có nhiều nghiên cứu về địa danh ở Anh, tuy nhiên tên địa điểm du lịch tự nhiên ở Luân Đôn vẫn là một phạm trù riêng biệt và còn hạn chế trong các nghiên cứu. Bài viết này phân tích đặc điểm ngôn ngữ trong tên của 115 địa điểm du lịch tự nhiên ở Luân Đôn có thể coi là những hiện vật lịch sử và văn hóa. Dựa trên phương pháp định tính, nghiên cứu nhằm mục đích khảo sát nguồn gốc từ nguyên, cấu trúc hình thái và ngữ nghĩa trong tên địa điểm du lịch tự nhiên ở Luân Đôn. Kết quả nghiên cứu cho thấy tiếng Anh cổ chiếm 60% trong các tên gọi, và tiếng Pháp Norman và tiếng Anh hiện đại chiếm 31,3%. Về mặt hình thái, hơn 90% là từ ghép tuân theo mô hình [Đặc điểm + Danh từ chung]. Về mặt ngữ nghĩa, thể hiện sự sở hữu và cấu trúc xã hội (35,7%) là nhóm nghĩa chính, tiếp theo là mô tả địa hình (24,3%). Kết quả nghiên cứu cho thấy tên của các địa điểm du lịch tự nhiên của Luân Đôn có chức năng ghi chép lịch sử và được coi như kho lưu trữ xã hội về môi trường, địa lý, phản ánh sự chuyển dịch từ phương thức đặt tên mang tính mô tả, xuất phát từ thực tiễn dân gian, sang phương thức đặt tên mang tính kỷ niệm, tư tưởng, phản chiếu quá trình biến đổi lịch sử của một đô thị hiện đại.*

Từ khóa: *địa danh học, danh xưng học, London, điểm tham quan tự nhiên, phân tích ngôn ngữ học, tên địa danh, cảnh quan đô thị*

[1] Trường Đại học Mở Hà Nội, Hà Nội, Việt Nam