



Tourism sites naming in Ciletuh geopark: Toponymic and morphological studies

Eva Tuckyta Sari Sujatna*, Kasno Pamungkas†, Heriyanto†

Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Universitas Padjadjaran, Jatinangor- Sumedang 45363, Indonesia

Article Info

Article history:

Received 27 September 2019

Revised 11 December 2019

Accepted 12 December 2019

Available online 22 February 2021

Keywords:

Ciletuh geopark,
comonyms,
hydronym,
oronyms,
tourism sites naming

Abstract

This article attempts to show the correlation of tourism sites naming to Toponymy and Morphology. It tries to describe the types of toponym and the word formation in tourism sites naming in Ciletuh geopark, Jawa Barat, Indonesia. The method employed in this research is descriptive qualitative method. The data are collected, analyzed, and described related to toponymic and morphological analyses. It is reported that the tourism sites naming in Ciletuh geopark has two different types of toponyms; they are names of natural object or macronyms with hydronyms (14 tourism sites naming) and oronyms (5 tourism sites naming) and names of manmade object or regionyms with comonyms (1 tourism site naming). Related to the word formation, from hydronyms is found blending (3 tourism sites naming), coinage (9 tourism sites naming), and compounding (2 tourism sites naming) while from oronyms is found coinage (3 tourism sites naming) and words from names (2 tourism sites naming). In the names of manmade object or regionyms, there is only one datum that represents comonyms.

© 2021 Kasetsart University.

Introduction

Tourism plays an important role since it can be considered as a main revenue source for a country. As the main revenue source, tourism can impact some aspects of life in a country. In line with the argument, it has been recognized that tourism can have an impact on economic activity (Dwyer, Forsyth, & Spurr, 2004). Tourism is also as a service industry, it plays an important role in the development of many countries and has been expanding significantly in recent years (Chaisumpunsakul & Pholphirul, 2018). Tourism has a close relation to communication, especially, the communication between tourists and local people. Today, tourism has greatly developed and there are a number of new tourism sites. It is reported that

the Minister of Tourism of the Republic of Indonesia announced that the number of international tourists from 2014 to 2018 increased every year. The increasing number of international tourists has a positive impact on the income of the country and contributes to the prosperity of Indonesian's citizens since tourism in Indonesia is one of the most important sectors.

Indonesia is one of the ten countries in the world that has a large area of forest. According to the Ministry of Environment and Forestry, in 2015, Indonesia had about 128 million hectare of forest including conservation forest (27.4 million hectares), protected forest (29.7 million hectares), limited production forest (26.8 million hectares), production forest (29.3 million hectares), and forest that can be converted (12.9 million hectares). Some of the forest areas have beautiful natural scenery and are potential to increase the number of tourism sites in Indonesia. The tourism sites will not be interesting if they are not advertised or promoted effectively to the people, both local and international. The government and local people should pay more attention to this, since communication has an important role in increasing the number of tourists.

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: eva.tuckyta@unpad.ac.id (E. T. S. Sujatna).

† Co-first authors.

E-mail address: kasno.pamungkas@unpad.ac.id (K. Pamungkas),

E-mail address: heriyanto@unpad.ac.id (Heriyanto).

As Sujatna, Pamungkas, and Heriyanto (2019) argued, basic knowledge of language of promotion is needed to communicate the tourism sites. It means that language experts, or linguists, have an important job in educating the local people and promoting tourism sites.

Jawa Barat is one of thirty four provinces and the most populated province in Indonesia. It has eighteen regencies and nine cities in line with (Sujatna, Heriyanto, & Pamungkas, 2016), where every regency or city has its own tourism sites. Jawa Barat has a good prospect in tourism since it has various tourism sites, of which Ciletuh geopark is one. Ciletuh geopark is a part of Sukabumi regency. In 2018, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) included Ciletuh geopark into one of the twelve UNESCO Global Geopark (UGG) and since then Ciletuh geopark has had its name changed to Ciletuh—Palabuhanratu UNESCO Global Geopark (CPUGGp). Ciletuh is one of the four UGG in Indonesia and the only one in Jawa Barat province. Therefore, its existence has become one of the tourism focuses in Indonesia. Three main components of UGG certification should include the following criteria; namely, education and research, economy impact of the geopark and social empowerment. Hence, this research regarding Ciletuh as a UGG has an academic and research impact in relation to toponym study, that gives information to people about naming process and meaning of the tourism sites in Ciletuh. Ciletuh is one of the geoparks under the supervision of Universitas Padjadjaran Geopark Studies Center, therefore it is chosen as the object of this research. This research not only presents the cultural perspective of Ciletuh Geopark but also strengthens the academic studies of Ciletuh Geopark to support the Ciletuh revalidation as UGG.

There is very limited research on Linguistics for tourism since some of the researchers still do not realize the phenomena of collaborating between linguistics and tourism. It is argued by Dann (1996 cited in Hallett & Kaplan-Weinger, 2010) that language of tourism will increasingly become a language of cyberspace. It is clear that language of tourism needs more attention from linguists. Discourse, communication and tourism could be analyzed based on critical discourse analysis related to cultural differences to differentiate the intercultural communication between hosts and travelers or between local people and tourists (Jaworski & Pritchard, 2005). The book which is entitled “Official Tourism Websites: A Discourse Analysis Perspective” discussed the spread and the rising influence of technology on the language or discourse of tourism on the worldwide web (Hallett & Kaplan-Weinger, 2010). In another opinion, heritage and the naming of places have the potential to locate and to bind people, both geographically and historically (Whelan, 2011), while Shoval (2013) did research showing that the place-naming has an intimate relationship between people and territory. The role of language is not only in critical discourse analysis but also from the using of language, such as, the names of tourism objects, tourism slogans and promotional texts, which are realized in word, phrase, clause and sentence (Sujatna et al., 2019). Through the name of the tourism object or tourism sites naming, readers or listeners will be interested in finding or visiting the tourism object, which is why language plays an

important role in increasing the number of tourists. On the other hand, it will be difficult for tourists to imagine or be curious about tourism sites if they have no name or identity. The names or identities of the tourism sites are important; both local and international tourists can easily access the information since they have names or identities.

Literature Review

Toponymy and Morphology

Toponymy and geographical names are close. The word toponymy is derived from Greek words τόπος (τόπος) meaning ‘place’ and ὄνομα (ὄνομα) meaning ‘name’ (Sujatna et al., 2016). Toponymy concerns geographical names and names relate to Linguistics. It is in line with an article entitled “The Relationship between Toponymy and Linguistics” (Poenuarugirigan, 2013).

An article first published in 1954 was released online in 2013. The article was published in the journal “Names” and was entitled “A classification of place names”. It reported that the “naming-process” recognizes nine main toponym types; they are descriptive names, possessive names, incident names, commemorative names, euphemistic names, manufactured names, shift names, folk etymologies, and mistake names (Stewart, 1954). Sixteen years later (1970), Stewart (1954) (cited in Urazmetova & Shamsutdinova, 2017) classified them into ten different categories, namely; descriptive names and compass-point names, the names that describe and characterize the object’s quality or its location; associative names (names that evoke associations with different objects); incident names (names from an event associated with a person, Stewart also refers to this group for acts of God, calendar names, animal names, names of human actions, names from feelings, names from sayings); possessive names (names originated from some idea of ownership); commemorative names (names given in memory or in honor of outstanding people and names for abstract virtues); commendatory names (names given by some attractive peculiarities of a geographical object); folk etymologies (names with false etymology); manufactured names (names which have been consciously constructed of fragments of other words, or names from initials, by reversals of letters or syllables, or in other ways); mistake names (names appeared from a mistake made in the transmission from one language to another, either from inaccurate hearing of what was said, or because of faulty rendering of the sounds in writing); shift names (names which have been moved from one location to another).

To classify the kinds of toponymy that consider the intra- and extra linguistic principles, (Urazmetova & Shamsutdinova, 2017) offered eleven types of toponymy applied into the data as described in the following: (1) Parametric characteristics of an object involves the division of place names into *macrotoponymy* and *microtoponymy*. It offered *hypertoponymy* (names of the continents, oceans, countries), *macrotoponymy* (major regions, states, capitals, mountain ranges, major seas, rivers, islands), *regionymy* (names of cities, areas, rivers, mountains of regional significance) and *microtoponymy* (names of small objects in some localities known only to a

limited circle of people); (2) Ontological characteristics of an object are characterized by worldwide orderliness and uniformity. It was stated that the classification is based on a) names of natural objects and b) names of manmade objects. The names of natural objects include hydronyms, oronyms, drymonyms and insulonyms; (3) This type is based on the lexico-semantic or thematic group: *Anthropotonyms*, *Topotonyms*, *Ethnotonyms*, *Zootonyms*, *Phytotonyms*, *Ergotonyms*; (4) Etymological characteristics of place names depend on their origin, toponyms are subdivided into: Native place names, Borrowed American toponym, and Hybrid place names present; (5) Motivational characteristics of place-names or the clarity of their inner form presupposes two groups of geographical names: motivated toponyms with clear inner form and non-motivated toponyms with vague obscure semantics, the meaning of which is impossible to decipher; (6) Chronological characteristics of place names is the division between the archaic; (7) Structural characteristics of toponyms differentiates simple, compound, and complex; (8) Toponymic polysemy place-names are subdivided into one geographical object (or ideal toponyms), multi-object toponyms, and empty toponyms; (9) Degree of toponymic nomination place-names are divided into primary and non-primary; (10) Variety of toponymic nomination is differentiated into primary toponymic nomination presenting an actual toponym and secondary nomination, the toponymic nickname, acting as an alternative name. Other opinions are argued by some scholars that toponyms belong to language and the language is the subject of linguistics (Tichelaar, 2002) and toponyms (place names) represent language units denoting elements of topographic environment (Urazmetova & Shamsutdinova, 2017). They also argued that the lexical system of a particular nation is involved in the geographical names, and the fundamental laws of the language and it functions in speech in accordance with its basic rules and traditions formed the geographical names. Another scholar discussing geographical names was Jett (1997), cited in (Sujatna et al., 2016) who did his research in the Canyon de Chelly Navajo of Arizona. He reported that Navajo place-names are translatable and literally descriptive, commemorative, and personal names. Later (Malpas, 1999) also mentioned that place is distinguished from mere location through being understood as a matter of the human response to physical surroundings or locations. It is also supported by the argumentation that naming deals with a system of symbols in culture (Prihadi, 2015). Relating to tourism, place-naming plays an important role especially when promoting tourism sites. By having the place-naming, it is hoped to have the information about the place before tourists visit the sites. As (Eriksen, 2012) argued, the etymology or origin of a particular place name, gives it emotional or cognitive significance on the basis of personal knowledge or experiences. People from different professional backgrounds may be allured to some kind of study of geographical names (Tichelaar, 2002). Therefore, it is necessary for people who have authority in giving geographical names to have a basic knowledge of linguistics. This is necessary since the geographical names will represent the sites. Clear information of geographical names will help make tourists more interested in having the information or even visiting the sites.

To differentiate the types of place-names, such could be done by identifying the elements found in the names, of which there are two very important elements (Poenu-Girigan, 2013). He argued (1) The generic element refers to the form of relief, hydrographic or orthographic phenomenon: hill, mountain, plain, river and so on, and (2) The specific element through which geographical reality is distinguished (by description and by reference to a person or a social-historical fact: *High Hill*.

Linguistics as the science of language is learnt by people who study language as the symbol of their experience. By using a language, people can communicate with one to another. Language as the main tool of communication cannot be separated from thought and action since language also has an important function as a carrier of culture and identity (Windt-Val, 2012). Language as the expression of someone's thought could be understood, for example, as is in names. It is in line with the argumentation that place names play an important role on a regional and national level too, and name changes may create strong feelings among large groups of people, especially in multi-ethnic areas (Helleland, 2012).

Naming is adjacent to Toponymy, which is related to linguistics. Linguistics concerns analyzing language form, language meaning, and language in context. In linguistics, the subject that relates to naming closely, is word formation. Word formation, sometimes called word structure, is part of morphology. Word formation concerns the process of how the words formed or were made (Dawson & Phelan, 2016). They offered affixation, compounding, reduplication, alternation, and suppletion as the morphological process to form words. Earlier, (Fromkin, Rodman, & Hyams, 2011) classified word formation into ten different processes as described in the following (1) Derivational: This process is adding affix(es) either prefix or suffix to the morpheme as in *boy* + *-ish* becomes *boyish* (Noun to Adjective); (2) Inflectional: This process is *-s* third-person singular present in *She wait-s* at home; (3) Suppletion: this process is adding affix(es) to a word. There are exceptions like *child/ children*, replacing the uninflected form with another word; (4) Back formation: This process is in reverse: it adapts an existing word by removing its affix, usually a suffix, such as the verbs *hawk*, *stoke*, *swindle*, and *edit*. All verbs came into the language as back-formations—they are from *hawker*, *stoker*, *swindler*, and *editor*; (5) Compound: This process involves two or more words being joined to form a new compound word as in *bittersweet* (adjective + adjective) or *headstrong* (noun + adjective). (6) Coinage: Some words may be created outright to fit some purposes. This is the process of a new word which is either deliberately or accidentally created. The advertising industry has added many words to English, such as brands of a product, for instance, *Aqua*. *Aqua* is a brand of packaged water in cups, bottles, or gallon containers. In Indonesia, people usually call packaged water *Aqua*, even though the brand may not be *Aqua*; (7) Words from Names or Eponym: These are words that have originated from proper names or eponyms. Some of them are of the many creative ways that the vocabulary of a language expands; the word *watt*, for instance, means a unit of power which is taken from James Watt; (8) Blends: This process is similar to compounds. They are

produced by combining two words, but some parts of the words that are combined are deleted; the word *Smog*, is taken from the combination of *smoke* + *fog*; 9) Reduced Words: There are two types of reduced words; clipping and acronym. Clippings are the abbreviations of longer words into shorter ones, such as *Prof.* for *Professor*. Acronyms are derived from the initials of several words *UNESCO* which is from United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization; 10) Borrowing or Loan Words: These are words which are borrowed from other languages and become new words of its language. Borrowing happens when one language adds a word or morpheme from another language to its own lexicon. It happens in situations of language contact; the speakers of different languages regularly interact with one another especially where there are many bilingual or multilingual speakers. An example of a word of borrowing or loan word is *orang utan*, which is taken from Bahasa Indonesia.

Tourism Sites in Ciletuh Geopark, Jawa Barat, Indonesia

Indonesia is an archipelago and has many beautiful natural sites. Indonesia has 40 geoheritages, five of which are recognized by UNESCO. The five geoheritages recognized by UNESCO are (1) Danau Toba di Pulau Samosir, Sumatera Utara; (2) Gunung Rinjani, Nusa Tenggara Barat; (3) Gunung Batur, Bali; (4) Geopark Nasional Ciletuh- Palabuhanratu, Jawa Barat; and (5) Gunung Sewu, Yogyakarta. Ciletuh Geopark is located in Sukabumi regency, Jawa Barat, Indonesia. In 2018, UNESCO has included Ciletuh Geopark as one of the twelve UNESCO Global Geopark (UGG). To be a UGG, Ciletuh geopark met three main important requirements; namely, rich of geodiversity, biodiversity, and culture diversity.

In Ciletuh geoarea, there are some tourism sites based on geoheritage, bioheritage and culture. Among the existing tourism sites, nineteen are taken as the data of this research; namely, *Pantai Ujung Genteng*, *Muara Cipanarikan*, *Bukit Teletubbies*, *Pantai Cimaja*, *Pantai pangumbahan*, *Pantai Palangpang*, *Puncak Darma*, *Puncak Tugu*, *Bukit Panenjoan*, *Puncak Gebang*, *Kasepuhan Ciptagelar*, *Curug Puncak Manik*, *Curug Awang*, *Air Terjun Cimarunjung*, *Curug Cigangsa*, *Curug Cikaso*, *Curug Sodong*, *Curug Larangan*, and *Curug Cikanteh*. All the chosen names of the tourism sites, including the name of Ciletuh, are obtained as the data which are categorized as toponymy classification and the word formation of each.

Methodology

This research employed descriptive qualitative method. The researchers describe the condition and the phenomenon without arguing right or wrong emphasis in the study. They tried to give a description of the toponym and the word formation of the tourism sites naming in Ciletuh geopark (Nunan, 1992).

The data obtained are the names of tourism sites in Ciletuh geopark, Jawa Barat, Indonesia. Ciletuh geopark tourism sites naming was selected as the object of this research since it is one of UNESCO Global Geopark. Ciletuh geopark is a place

that is rich in tourism sites, which are being promoted as the international tourism sites of Jawa Barat Indonesia. Indonesia is well known as a country that is rich in tourism sites including nature, history, culinary, and traditional village, especially in Bali. Ciletuh geopark has various nature tourism sites such as beach, hill, waterfall, and a traditional village, which are potential as further international tourism sites after Bali. The data were in the form of tourism site names. They were analysed based on the types of toponymy and the word formation.

Results and Discussion

Data obtained in this research are 20 tourism sites naming in Ciletuh geopark, Jawa Barat, Indonesia as described in Table 1.

Table 1 Tourism Sites Naming and Tourism Sites Object

No	Tourism Sites Naming	Tourism Sites Object
1	Ciletuh	Geopark
2	Pantai Ujung Genteng	Beach
3	Muara Cipanarikan	Beach
4	Pantai Cimaja	Beach
5	Pantai Pangumbahan	Beach
6	Pantai Palangpang	Beach
7	Puncak Darma	Hill
8	Puncak Tugu	Hill
9	Bukit Teletubbies	Hill
10	Bukit Panenjoan	Hill
11	Puncak Gebang	Hill
12	Kasepuhan Ciptagelar	Traditional Village
13	Curug Puncak Manik	Waterfalls
14	Curug Awang	Waterfalls
15	Air Terjun Cimarunjung	Waterfalls
16	Curug Cigangsa	Waterfalls
17	Curug Cikaso	Waterfalls
18	Curug Sodong	Waterfalls
19	Curug Larangan	Waterfalls
20	Curug Cikanteh	Waterfalls

The tourism site objects from the 20 chosen tourism sites, vary. There are eight waterfalls, five beaches, five hills, a geopark, and a traditional village. The data describe that the water object is dominant and includes both waterfalls and beaches. The classification of the data refers to Urazmetova and Shamsutdinova's classification. They classified them into 1) names of natural object and 2) names of manmade object. The name for natural objects is macrotoponym, while the name for manmade objects is regionym. Besides the toponym classification, the data were also analysed based on the word formation that refers to Fromkin et al.'s classification.

Names of Natural Object or Macrotoponyms

From 20 tourism sites naming, related to toponymy classification, there are 19 as the names of natural object, or macrotoponyms. They are divided into two different subtypes; hydronyms and oronyms.

Hydronyms

Hydronyms, as the major number of subtypes found, related to the names of water objects. From the 19 names of natural objects, or macrotoponyms, there are 14 with three different types of word formation as described in Table 2.

Table 2 describes tourism sites naming with three blending, nine coinage, and two compounding. The word Ciletuh, as the name of geopark is a blending since it comes from Basa Sunda as the local language in Jawa Barat, *Cai* ‘water’ + *leuteuk* ‘muddy’ + *kiruh* ‘dirty’ = Ciletuh ‘muddy water’. Another blending found in the data is Cikanteh as a name of waterfalls. It comes from the local language, *Cai* ‘water’ + *kanteh* ‘yarn’ = Cikanteh ‘water looks like yarn’. The last tourism site naming in hydronyms is Cigangsa. The word Cigangsa is categorized into blending since the word is taken from *Cai* ‘water’ + *Gangsa* (the name of an elder in this village) = Cigangsa.

Table 2 Tourism Sites Naming as Hydronyms and Its Word Formation

Name of Toponyms	Tourism Sites Naming	Word Formation
Hydronyms	Ciletuh	Blending
	Cikanteh	
	Cigangsa	
	Pantai Cimaja	Coinage
	Pantai Pangumbahan	
	Pantai Palangpang	
	Air Terjun Cimarunjung	
	Curug Cikaso	
	Curug Sodong	
	Curug Awang	
	Curug Larangan	
	Muara Cipanarikan	
	Pantai Ujung Genteng	
	Curug Puncak Manik	

Besides blending, the second morphological process found in hydronyms is coinage and it is the dominant process. Coinage is the process of the new word which is either deliberately or accidentally created as seen in tourism sites naming. Based on the coinage process, the names of *Cimaja* ‘names of beach in Cimaja village’, *Pangumbahan* is taken from Basa Sunda *tempat kukumbah* (in Bahasa Indonesia meaning ‘*tempat membersihkan dengan air*’) in English meaning ‘the place for cleaning, using water’, *palangpang* ‘a name of area in Sukabumi’, *Cimarunjung* ‘a name of village in Sukabumi’, *Cikaso* ‘a name of river (Cikaso river) as the source of the waterfalls’, *Sodong* is taken from Basa Sunda *gorowong* or *guha* ‘hollow or having a hole or empty or cave’, *Awang* ‘in the sky’ since the waterfall height is about 50 meters and the width 60 meters, *Larangan* ‘forbidden’, *Cipanarikan* ‘a name of beach’.

Compounding is the last of the morphological process found in hydronyms data. Compounding is a morphological process by combining two or more words into one compounding word or phrase as seen in *Pantai Ujung Genteng* and *Curug Puncak Manik*. Morphologically, the name of

Ujung Genteng is composed from local language, Basa Sunda, ‘end of the roof’ while the compounding *Puncak Manik* is composed from the words *puncak* and *manik*. Related to the myth, the word *Manik* is taken from the name of Prabu Siliwangi’s wife, *Kentring Manik* who visited the waterfalls. The compounding *Puncak Manik* means ‘the peak of Manik’.

Oronyms

The second type of natural object, or macrotoponyms, is oronyms. Oronym relates to the names of relief elements (mountains, headlands, hills, hillocks, hollows). From the 19 as natural object, or macrotoponyms, five tourism sites naming are categorized into oronyms since they are hills, as described in Table 1.

The tourism sites naming which are categorized into oronyms with two different word formation are described in Table 3.

Table 3 describes the Oronyms with coinage and words from names as word formations. The first coinage of the tourism site naming is *Puncak Tugu* ‘the peak of the monument’ since the height of *Puncak Tugu* is about 300–500 m above sea level. The second one is *Panenjoan*; it is taken from Basa Sunda meaning ‘a place to see’ so *Bukit Panenjoan* is a hill as a place to see the beautiful natural scenery. The last coinage in oronyms is *Puncak Gebang* ‘a name of hill’. Besides coinage, the tourism sites naming as oronyms is words from names. There are two tourism sites naming found; they are *Bukit Teletubbies* and *Puncak Darma* as described in Table 3. The word *Teletubbies* is taken from British pre-school children’s television series created by Ragdoll Production in 1997–2001. *Teletubbies* has a big belly since the hill looks like the belly of the *Teletubbies*, so everybody calls the hill *Teletubbies*. *Puncak Darma* is formed from words from names that are *Puncak* ‘the peak’ and *Darma* ‘God of justice’.

Table 3 Tourism Sites Naming as Oronyms and Its Word Formation

Name of Toponyms	Tourism Sites Naming	Word Formation
Oronyms	Puncak Tugu	Coinage
	Bukit Panenjoan	
	Puncak Gebang	
	Bukit Teletubbies	Words from Names
	Puncak Darma	

Names of Manmade Object or Regionyms

Names of manmade object is one of the classifications by Sherbak, 2012, or regionyms by Muryasov, 2015, besides the names of natural object, or macrotoponyms. The names of manmade object, or regionyms, found in the tourism site naming shows only one, which is *Kasepuhan Ciptagelar*. It is classified into the names of manmade object, or regionyms, since it refers to the names of rural settlements, or comonyms, as part of the names of manmade object. *Kasepuhan Ciptagelar* is a Sundanese traditional village, since the year 1368. Related

to word formation, the tourism site naming *Kasepuhan Ciptagelar* is a coinage since the new word is either deliberately or accidentally created as seen in tourism sites naming. Based on the coinage process, the names of *Ciptagelar* in Bahasa Indonesia are *terbuka* or *pasrah* meaning 'open or surrender'. The words *terbuka* or *pasrah* related to the moment in 2001 when they got a command from their ancestors to move from their old village called Simarasa to the new village called Simaresmi and the leader of the village, Abah Anom, named it as *Ciptagelar*.

Conclusion

From the data analyzed, two main things can be concluded. Related to the tourism sites naming in Ciletuh geopark, Jawa Barat, Indonesia, there are two different types of toponyms; they are names of natural object, or macronyms, and names of manmade object, or regionyms. The subtypes of names of natural object, or macronyms, are hydronyms and oronyms, while the name of manmade object, or regionyms, is comonyms.

Related to the word formation found in the names of natural object, or macronyms, the tourism site naming in hydronyms are blending, coinage, and compounding while in oronyms are coinage and words from names. In the names of manmade object, or regionyms, there is only one datum that represents comonyms and the word formation found is coinage.

This study is a preliminary research since the toponymy study is an introduction to discuss the naming of the tourism sites as one of the branding elements of Ciletuh geopark. Doing research of each geopark tourism sites naming in Indonesia is important. It is not only to investigate their uniqueness in each area but also to help promoting each geopark in Indonesia based on academic perspective through this qualified journal publication.

Conflict of Interest

There is no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgment

Big gratitude is conveyed to the Rector of Universitas Padjadjaran, Indonesia who has facilitated the process of the research until this paper is published.

References

- Chaisumpunsakul, W., & Pholphirul, P. (2018). Does international trade promote international tourism demand? Evidence from Thailand's trading partners. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Science*, 39(3), 393–400. doi: 10.1016/j.kjss.2017.06.007
- Dann, G. M. S. (1996). *The language of tourism: A sociolinguistic perspective*. Wallingford, UK: CAB International.
- Dawson, H. C., & Phelan, M. (Eds.). (2016). *Language files: Materials for an introduction to language and linguistics* (Twelveth). Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University Press.
- Dwyer, L., Forsyth, P., & Spurr, R. (2004). Evaluating tourism's economic effects: New and old approaches. *Tourism Management*, 25, 307–317.
- Eriksen, T. H. (2012). Place names in multicultural societies. *Oslo Studies in Language*, 4(2), 71–80. Retrieved from <http://www.journals.uio.no/osla>
- Fromkin, V., Rodman, R., & Hyams, N. (2011). *An introduction to language* (9th ed.). Canada: Nelso Education Ltd.
- Hallett, R. W., & Kaplan-Weinger, J. (2010). *Official tourism websites: A discourse analysis perspective*. Clevedon, UK: Channel View Publications.
- Helleland, B. (2012). Place names and identities. *Oslo Studies in Language*, 4(2), 95–116.
- Jaworski, A., & Pritchard, A. (2005). *Discourse, communication, and tourism*. Toronto, Canada: Chanel View Publication.
- Malpas, J. E. (1999). *Place and experience*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, D. (1992). *Research methods in language learning*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Poenaru-Girigan, O.-M. (2013). The relationship between toponymy and linguistics. *Anadiss*, 8(15), 154–166.
- Prihadi. (2015). The linguistic structure of toponym system in hamlet/villages of Yogyakarta special province (Anthropolinguistic study). *European Journal of Engineering and Technology*, 1(3), 1–16.
- Shoval, N. (2013). Street-naming, tourism development, and cultural conflict: The case the old city, Acre/Akko/Akka. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographer*, 38(4), 612–626.
- Stewart, G. R. (1954). A classification of place names. *Names: A Journal of Onomastics*, 2(1), 1–13.
- Sujatna, E. T. S., Heriyanto, & Pamungkas, K. (2016). Place-naming of tourism destinations in Jawa Barat: A toponymy study. *IJASOS- International E-Journal of Advances in Social Sciences*, 2(5), 471–476. doi: 10.18769/ijasos.78535
- Sujatna, E. T. S., Pamungkas, K., & Heriyanto. (2019). Names as branding on nature tourism destinations in Pangandaran, Jawa Barat, Indonesia: A linguistic perspective. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 29(2), 803–814.
- Tichelaar, T. (2002). *Toponymy and language*. Paper presented at the DGSD-UNGEEN Toponymy Course Enschede/Frankfurt am Main, Frankfurt, Germany. Retrieved from http://lazarus.elte.hu/cet/modules/toponymy-2012/_HtmlModules/_Documents/D09/documents/D09-01_Tichelaar.pdf
- Urazmetova, A. V., & Shamsutdinova, J. K. (2017). Principles of place names classification. *XLinguae*, 10(4), 26–33.
- Whelan, Y. (2011). (Inter) national naming: Heritage, conflict, diaspora. *ACME: An International e-Journal for Critical Geographies*, 10(1), 7–12.
- Windt-Val, B. (2012). Personal names and identity in literary contexts. *Oslo Studies in Language*, 4(2), 273–284.