

**Olga S. Poptsova**✉, **Tatiana V. Sheremeta**  
**Perm Institute of the Federal Penal Service**  
**Perm, Russian Federation**  
olya.olga-olga71@yandex.ru

## **Specifics of service dogs' naming**

### **Abstract**

The aim of the study was to analyze the specifics of assigning nicknames to service dogs in the cynological service of the Russian Federation penitentiary system. The focus was made on methods and principles for service dogs naming in 2019–2021. The study used empirical method (data collection and analysis) and theoretical method (data classification). As a result, 1247 dog names were classified into 15 main categories by meaning. It was established that the most frequent way was the use of anthroponyms that accounted for 28.23% of the total set of nicknames studied. Less frequent was the use of toponyms, oikonoms, urbanonyms (11.55%) and fiktonyms (11.47%). Least of all, puppies and dogs were given nicknames classified as cosmonyms and astronoms (1.76%) and as geological terms (1.92%). Nicknames whose identification with any of the suggested groups was impossible were put in a separate category (2.17%). As for word-building patterns, borrowings, metaphorization, suffixation and compounding were mainly used. The main principles of choosing a nickname for a service dog turned out its sonority and beauty; traditional folk nicknames, and nicknames of a derogatory nature, dissonant, belonging to criminal jargon were not found.

**Keywords:** onomastics, zoonym, nickname, kinonym, naming principle, origin category, word-building pattern

© Poptsova O. S., Sheremeta T. V. 2022

**For citation:** Poptsova, O. S., Sheremeta, T. V. (2022). Spetsifika prisvoeniya klichek sluzhebnyh sobakam [Specifics of service dogs' naming]. *Teoreticheskaya i prikladnaya lingvistika* [Theoretical and Applied Linguistics], 8 (1), 153–164. [https://doi.org/10.22250/24107190\\_2022\\_8\\_1\\_153](https://doi.org/10.22250/24107190_2022_8_1_153)