

INSTITUTE OF THE LITHUANIAN LANGUAGE

---

Pavel SKORUPA

VILNIUS COUNTY  
TOPONYMS AS SIGNS  
OF NATIONAL AND  
CULTURAL IDENTITY

---

Study

---



Vilnius

---

2021

---

Mokslo studija apsvaistyta Lietuvių kalbos instituto Baltų kalbų ir vardyno tyrimų centro 2021 m. gruodžio 21 d. posėdyje (protokolas Nr. 8.) ir patvirtinta išleisti Lietuvių kalbos instituto Mokslo tarybos 2021 m. gruodžio 29 d. posėdyje (protokolas Nr. MT-11).

Recenzentės:

prof. habil. dr. Rūta PETRAUSKAITĖ (Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas)

dr. philol. Sanda RAPA (Latvijos universitetas, Latvių kalbos institutas)

Leidinio bibliografinė informacija pateikiama  
Lietuvos nacionalinės Martyno Mažvydo bibliotekos  
Nacionalinės bibliografijos duomenų banke (NBDB).

ISBN 978-609-411-306-2

DOI [doi.org/10.35321/e-pub.18.vilnius-county-toponyms](https://doi.org/10.35321/e-pub.18.vilnius-county-toponyms)

© Pavel Skorupa, 2021

© Lietuvių kalbos institutas, 2021

# CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION ... 4

1. THE CONCEPT OF NATIONAL (ETHNIC) AND CULTURAL IDENTITY ... 6

2. THE ROLE OF TOPONYMS AS LANGUAGE SIGNS IN  
CULTURAL AND ETHNIC IDENTITY NARRATIVE ... 9

2.1. Toponyms as the Linguistic-Cultural Aspect of Identity ... 9

2.2. Toponyms as Footprints of a Nation's History ... 11

2.3. Vilnius County: A General Historical and Cultural Overview ... 12

3. TOPONYM SOURCES AND RESEARCH METHODS ... 16

4. THE LAYER OF NATIONAL AND CULTURAL  
IDENTITY IN THE SEMANTICS OF TOPONYMS ... 22

4.1. Toponyms Reflecting Topographical Relief Features ... 24

4.2. Toponyms Reflecting Flora ... 30

4.3. Toponyms Reflecting Fauna ... 35

4.4. Toponyms Reflecting Cultural Realia ... 39

4.5. Toponyms Reflecting Nation's Historical Facts and Circumstances ... 42

4.6. Toponyms Reflecting People ... 48

5. FINAL REMARKS ... 52

CONCLUSIONS ... 55

SUMMARY IN LITHUANIAN ... 57

TOPONYM SOURCES ... 60

REFERENCES ... 62

ABBREVIATIONS ... 72

TOPONYM INDEX ... 73

## INTRODUCTION

Any nation, as a separate ethnic group, forms and exists in the history of mankind as a complex and permanent social entity influenced by its unique internal ties, such as common territory, language, behavioral patterns, customs, religion, self-perception, etc. that have been developing over a long period. The history of a nation and the daily values cherished by a community play an important role in shaping the ethnic (national) identity. Every nation or ethnic community leaves its footprint in history in the form of various relics, testimonies, and symbols. Toponyms may undoubtedly be considered the (un)written testimonies and even symbols as they are an integral part of the life and history of the man and the nation, as well as a significant component of identity. The national-cultural component in the semantic structure of the toponym itself indicates its national identity, reflects the historical, territorial, and natural-geographical features of human life (Gataullin, Fatykhova 2018: 217; Khokhlova, Zamorshchikova, Filipova 2018: 276). Thus, we believe, that toponyms are an important source of information about peoples and ethnic communities, the areas in which they live, their culture, everyday life, language, historical events, landscape characteristics in the past and present. In many cases the analysis of place names helps to get information about a particular country or region: 1) the category of place, 2) the position of the named objects in space, 3) qualitative characteristics of the named object (evaluation, smell, color, shape, size, etc.), 4) vegetation (typical flora), 5) animal life (fauna), 6) the type of territory and its physiography, 7) hydrology, 8) soil, 9) economics (e. g., farming, hunting, etc.), 10) history, ethnonyms, man and society (place names refer to certain historical events, personalities, etc.), 11) places of worship.

Although studies of toponyms, including the whole onomasticon of any nation, are primarily the object of linguistic research, these studies are linked to many other sciences, such as cognitive linguistics, anthropology, ethnolinguistics, etc. The current study is an attempt to analyze the semantics of the selected present-day Vilnius County toponymy (both settlement and non-settlement names, esp. hydronyms) to identify both national resp. ethnic and cultural meanings encoded in them. This also leads to the complexity and novelty of the current study, as Vilnius County toponyms resp. hydronyms and oikonyms have not yet been studied through the prism of national, ethnic, and cultural identity.

To realize the core aim of the research, the following analytical and empirical tasks have been set concerning the research object:

- 1) to define the concepts of national resp. ethnic and cultural identity and to distinguish the key identity-forming factors;
- 2) to discuss the role of language (contacts) in the cultural and national identity narrative and to highlight the role of toponyms as linguistic units in its formation;
- 3) to analyze the substrate of ethnic and cultural identity in the semantics of the selected present-day Vilnius County toponyms.

Toponyms (both settlement and non-settlement names) for the current study were collected from several electronic, printed and manuscript sources, including, but not limited to road signs, historical and modern maps, municipal websites, official documents, catalogues, and archives of the Institute of the Lithuanian Language Research Center of Baltic Languages and Onomastics. The analysis is based on both traditional and Cognitive Onomastics research theories and methodology.

The study consists of five chapters and conclusions. The first chapter is focused on the concepts and aspects of national resp. ethnic and cultural identity. The second chapter presents the overview of the role of toponyms as language signs in cultural and ethnic identity narrative, i.e., the linguistic-cultural aspect of toponyms in identity shaping and their relation to the nation's history. In the third chapter, the toponym sources and key terminology are outlined, and the research methodology is shaped. The fourth chapter presents the analysis and categorization of the selected present-day Vilnius County toponyms, disclosing the layer of national and cultural identity in their semantics. The fifth chapter presents some final remarks and the generalization of the key ideas.

The research was carried out at the Research Center of Baltic Languages and Onomastics of the Institute of the Lithuanian Language under the supervision of the academic advisor, a full member of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences Prof. Dr. Habil. Grasilda Blažienė, whose support and priceless advice the author sincerely appreciates. The author is also grateful to the reviewers – Prof. habil. dr. Rūta Petrauskaitė (Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania) and Dr. philol. Sanda Rapa (Latvian Language Institute of the University of Latvia, Latvia) – for their invaluable, constructive comments that added much to the improvement of this work.

## 1. THE CONCEPT OF NATIONAL (ETHNIC) AND CULTURAL IDENTITY

Ethnic and cultural identities are inseparable from each other. Ethnos does not exist without its own culture. On the other hand, culture cannot be abandoned when dealing with ethnic subjects, as it is the cumulative deposit of various experiences and beliefs, values and attitudes, knowledge and meanings, hierarchies, religion, understanding about the material and immaterial world, concepts of the universe, as well as material objects and possessions acquired in the course of generations. Each ethnic community has its cultural characteristics that are relevant to local contexts and are defined historically.

Talking about ethnic identity, according to Wsevolod W. Isajiw (1993: 410), one should start from the concept of an ethnic group. The scholar defines the ethnic group as “a community-type group of people who share the same culture or to descendants of such people who may not share this culture but who identify themselves with this ancestral group” (Isajiw 1993: 411). This concept is primary and is related to ethnicity, which should be considered a collective phenomenon. The researcher distinguishes the following external and internal aspects of ethnicity, ethnic group, and ethnic identity related to observed cultural and social behavior: speaking the ethnic language and practicing ethnic traditions; belonging to personal ethnic networks; participation in an ethnic institutional, voluntary organization, events; images, as well as ideas, attitudes and feelings common to an ethnic group (Isajiw 1993: 413).

Valeriy Atshkasov (1999: 52) argues that ethnicity and ethnic (national) identity are determined by objective factors, i.e., territory, language, religion, state, home, religion, traditions materialized in culture, and basic models of everyday behaviour, aesthetic and ethical norms, etc. These factors, in a subjective form, perform the function of a symbol or marker of ethnic identity that allows distinguishing one’s ethnic (national) community “we/us” from others – “they/them”. Ethnic identity is closely related to the concept of national identity, which occurs when a person perceives the commonality of culture, history, a language with a certain group of people (Petkova 2005: 44). Often small nations and/or national minorities that do not have their states combine their regional ethnic identity with a much broader national identity related to the political nation resp. state. This leads to the “dual” identities, which are especially

evident in assimilated state borders. As “nation” and “national identity” encompass territorial, economic, and cultural unity through language, religion, traditions, etc., they are broader concepts than “nationality”. Therefore, for instance, in the case of Lithuania, “nation” is defined by the ethnonym “Lithuanians”. Meanwhile, nationality is the concept of determining the unity of origin, i.e., belonging to an ethnic group. Consequently, a Pole or Russian, or any other member of ethnic minorities, who live in Lithuania, will never be Lithuanian by nationality, but they may belong to the Lithuanian nation.

When it comes to ethnicity and ethnic identity, one should bear in mind cultural factors that shape it, i.e., the cultural identity of an ethnic group. Culture is understood in the traditional anthropological sense as a phenomenon encompassing the whole way of life. Isajiw claims that: “culture does not necessarily mean simply a set of distinct everyday customs<...>[, but rather] refers to a unique historical group experience. Culture is in essence a system of encoding such experience into a set of symbolic patterns. It does not matter how different the elements of one culture are from another culture. A distinct culture is a manifestation of a group’s distinct historical experience. Its product is a sense of unique peoplehood” (Isajiw 1993: 411). Thus, cultural identity is belonging to a certain cultural community.

Cultural identity is a complex, multifaceted concept that encompasses many elements. As maintained in Donna Starks et al. (2005: 2196), one’s identity (national, ethnic, cultural) “involves a classification and categorization of the world around us which includes physical attributes, customs, cultural items and beliefs as well as language”. Language is an important aspect of the formation of cultural and national identity. It is not only a means of verbal communication but also a tool to shape the personality, to determine thinking, mentality, worldview, religion, behavior, lifestyle, value system, and national character of its speakers. In addition, language promotes social integrity and acts as a mechanism for the inclusion and exclusion of others (Soleimani 2017: 2). From their birth, a person grows and develops under the influence of language, assimilating the language encoded culture, worldview, the model of cultural perception, and norms of behaviour. Verbal forms of self-expression determine not only the behavior of an individual, generation, group of people, or nation but also how they are perceived by members of other ethnic groups and cultures. Cultural differences are especially noticeable when interacting with people who speak another language.

Pierre Bourdieu (1991: 220–221) considers language (words, dialect, accent) mental representations of regional or ethnic identity, i.e., symbols accommodating cultural meanings. It may be claimed that language may be viewed as a distinctive sign of a nation that helps to shape national identity, highlighting the distinctiveness or uniqueness of the national culture. In other words, a language may be considered a sign or symbol of nations and cultures. Such symbols are related to origin through the place of origin and thus draw symbolic boundaries between “insiders” and “strangers”. The image of a “stranger” sets a boundary or points to a boundary zone on either side of which identities are formed (Bourdieu 1991: 222). This brings in another aspect of the formation of both ethnic and cultural identity: the territory or place of residence, as living in a certain region or area causes the feeling of attachment to it.

To sum up, ethnicity or ethnic resp. national identity is determined both by objective factors, such as territory, language, religion, state, traditions, material culture, basic patterns of daily behavior, aesthetic and ethical norms, etc., and subjective factors or symbols based on the opposition “we-they” and promote a sense of belonging to one’s community sharing common origins and history, ideas about “mother tongue”, “native land”, etc. Whereas cultural identity refers to a person’s belonging to a particular culture, which is realized through categorization of the environment through aspects, such as customs and traditions, cultural values, beliefs, and language. Language is a distinctive symbol of nations resp. cultures, perhaps the most important factor in shaping culture and cultural identity, determining the national character, and consolidating society.



## 2. THE ROLE OF TOPONYMS AS LANGUAGE SIGNS IN CULTURAL AND ETHNIC IDENTITY NARRATIVE

As mentioned above, language is not just a starting point for or a mediator of verbal communication. It is also closely related to perception and search for causes. Language does not only name entities but gives them meaning by placing them in a context. According to Aloyzas Gudavičius (2009: 85), the national specificity of word meanings is determined by the connections of the named object or phenomenon with the whole material and spiritual life of the nation, word-evoked associations, and images. This means that names of (in)tangible world objects or phenomena, such as birds, trees, household objects, or abstract, ephemeral phenomena of the spiritual world, will evoke different associations in the Lithuanian consciousness that will be related to certain traditions or customs, activities, relationships with other people, seasons, time of day, etc. Such associations will usually necessarily be different from the associations raised by the consciousness of representatives of other nationalities.

Through language, each community captures its perception of life resp. the reality establishes and restores values, which in turn promotes unity and acts as a mechanism for inclusion and exclusion, i.e., unites or separates people. Sara Soleimani (2017: 1) emphasizes the relationship between language and history, arguing that history is extremely important because it influences modern life and thinking through traditions, historical holidays, and holidays that are significant to the state and nation. Language and history contribute to the integrity of society and are a key factor in cultural influence, as they both are interrelated – on the one hand, history is conveyed through language, on the other hand, language develops throughout the history of a nation and changes depending on historical events.

### 2.1. Toponyms as the Linguistic-Cultural Aspect of Identity

Toponyms, like any other proper names or any other word, are a part of any language and have a grammatical structure and meaning (semantics), as they exist in human consciousness, i.e., in the mental lexicon (Karpenko, Golubenko 2015: 286). People use names to refer to persons, animals, buildings, forests, fields, rivers, mountains, roads, ponds, countries, cities, villages, etc. Being an integral part of language, toponyms

resp. toponyms are also inseparable from both the individual and the community speaking that language. Toponyms perform not only a referential function, i.e., refer to a particular object, but also convey the cognitive, emotional, cultural, and social dimension of a place. The semantic and etymological analysis of toponyms makes it possible to trace their history, esp. in the case of settlements, as place names convey a wealth of information about the nature, culture, and people of a given area.

Place names and places “resonate with meanings. Besides the place names’ function as indicators of specific localities, they also carry implications that people sense and decipher proceeding from their duties, background, and inspirations” (Alasli 2019: 6). This means that place names do both: denote a certain place and convey the characteristics resp. meanings associated with that place, relating both to certain individuals and social groups.

Paul Woodman (2014: 8) claims that people’s desire to name places stems from the need to give them an identity, as this helps people to organize their lives, social structure, which is practically impossible to happen in an unnamed area. This means that toponyms help to preserve both individual and societal historical memory, which is always associated with a particular area, locality. By denominating a place, people give it an identity. Further, the scholar elaborates on the idea that giving the place a name resp. identity, that name can itself become the source of a person’s identity and thus the relationship between toponymy and identity becomes a two-way process. Toponyms not only refer to a particular object in both the real and the imaginary world but are symbols that indicate the relationship between the user of a name and the object being named. For instance, when people live in a certain area (environment), knowing the names of that area establishes a close connection with it. Without knowing place names, their meanings, a personal connection with that place is impossible. According to Woodman, for instance, there is a strong connection between a toponym and a personal name, esp. in the Arab world, where toponyms strongly influence the identity of personal names, as: “It is common for a toponym – usually the name of the birthplace – to provide the final component of a person’s name” (Woodman 2014: 18). Thus, one of the characteristics of toponyms is their ability to create a sense of belonging to a particular place, i.e., a person feels a part of a certain place by being there or when they were born there.

## 2.2. Toponyms as Footprints of a Nation's History

The interrelation of onyms resp. toponyms and identity have been explored in many disciplines. Many onomasticians (Jurkštas 1985; Vanagas 1970, 1981a, 1988; Rutkowski 2011; Dacewicz, Abramowicz 2001; Dobrić 2010; Sjöblom 2011; Bölcke 2014; Slíz 2017; Sviderskienė 2016, 2017; and others) believe that names, and esp. toponyms, are not only linguistic but also geographical, historical, anthropological, ethnographic, etc. source of knowledge. It can be argued that toponyms are linguistic formations that both define an identifiable object and establish a close connection among the person resp. community, the identifiable object, and the name.

Toponyms, esp. hydronyms, are the oldest part of the cultural heritage and are “the uncut diamonds of the onomasticon” (Förstemann 1863: 31). Jürgen Udolph claims (2004: 328–329) that “river and lake names are often particularly old” and due to the size of the water bodies (esp. bigger/longer rivers of 100 km and more) they name, these names are far deeper rooted and are familiar in local languages than the names of settlements with 10 or 20 homesteads. Toponyms are orally passed down from generation to generation for hundreds or even thousands of years and esp. in the areas where they originated. Therefore, according to Wilhelm Leibniz (1881: 31), toponyms, esp. hydronyms, that date back to ancient times best reflect the ancient language and the ancient inhabitants. Being reflections of ancient times, toponyms are an important part of human cultural heritage<sup>1</sup>, because the Earth itself speaks to us through toponyms, i.e., through city, village, river, lake, swamp, forest, mountain, and other names (Būga 1961: 491).

Being a cultural heritage of any language, toponyms tell us about the history of places, regions, countries. Some toponyms, esp. oikonyms, are sometimes associated with certain historical events and/or people and, therefore, written or oral narratives resp. “myths” are created about them. Consequently, through the ability to “read” the history written in toponyms, echoes of the past can be heard, which strengthens a person's sense of belonging to a certain place or country. Toponyms themselves can be used to (re)create the historical landscape of the nation and may be examined

---

<sup>1</sup> See UNGENG Resolutions: VIII/9, 2002: Geographical names as cultural heritage; IX/4, 2007: Geographical names as intangible cultural heritage; etc.

as a material of a great linguistic, cultural and historical value, which reflects the development of countries, nations, nationalities, thinking, as well as the perception of reality. Besides hydronyms, which are considered the oldest historical monuments of nations, there are much newer, younger monuments – names of most settlements, cities, streets, roads, fields, and other larger or smaller topo-objects that form the intangible heritage of a nation. Thus, the analysis of the etymology of toponyms, their linguistic, historical, cultural motivation, may help to reveal the terrain features, flora, the fauna of the area under investigation and may lead to certain discoveries in historical-cultural realia (social environment objects, phenomena, etc.) of a particular area or nation. This way place names build bridges between the present and the past, facilitating our understanding about what motivated the emergence of a particular place name indicating where people settled and what they did.

### 2.3. Vilnius County: A General Historical and Cultural Overview

It is not easy to examine the national aspect in toponyms from the perspective of traditional onomastics<sup>2</sup>, as this requires the identification of national connotations of toponyms. The role of the toponym in the formation of national identity is revealed by the analysis of the origin and meaning of the toponym (Saparov 2003: 195). Before diving into the analysis of the selected toponyms, which in our opinion, testify to certain aspects of the national identity and cultural diversity of Vilnius County, it is worth briefly reviewing the influence of the geopolitical and cultural situation on the development of Lithuanian toponymy from the historical perspective.

Today, there is no doubt that the onomasticon of any nation is not purely national. There is no larger nation that has not experienced any influence from linguistic, cultural, economic communication with neighboring nations and the historical-political development of the state. The land of the surviving Baltic languages (Lithuanian and Latvian) is now a small territory. Lithuania for a long time was surrounded by its immediate neighbors: Slavs (Belarussians, Poles, Russians),

---

<sup>2</sup> Under the term “traditional onomastics” we understand the etymological, typological and structural studies of proper names, which sometimes also include the analysis of the semantic aspect of onyms, According to Terhi Ainiola and Jan-Ola (2017: 3): “<...> onomastics traditionally has largely focused on the etymology and typology of names”.

Germans, Finno-Ugrians<sup>3</sup>. Moreover, Lithuania's historic lands as well as the present territory have long been home to representatives of various ethnic groups and cultures, who have left their footprint in the Lithuanian language, culture, and other spheres of life, including Lithuanian proper names. With the introduction of Christianity (1251–1387) (cf., Muldoon 1997: 137–140, Vitkus 2001: 42–43, Zinkevičius 2011: 193ff.) and later the establishment of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (created after the Union of Lublin in 1569 and formally known as the Crown of the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania), names of foreign origin entered the Lithuanian anthroponymy and toponymy. Many Lithuanian proper names were impinged by Slavic languages, esp. Polish (Jurkštas 1985: 25–26, Zinkevičius 2011: 237ff.). During that period, the Lithuanian nobility often focused on Poland and other countries and often gave their places of residence names brought from abroad. The Polonization of the Lithuanian onomasticon continued for several centuries and was especially pronounced in Vilnius Region in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> c. when the region was annexed by Poland and was known as Wilno Voivodeship. After the dissolution of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth Lithuania fell under the Russian Empire rule (1795–1918) and the process of Russification started and continued during the Soviet period (1944–1990). It is believed that during the period when Lithuania was fully under the Russian Empire, later, partially under the Polish influences (the annexation of Vilnius lands), and, eventually, for half of the century was occupied by the Soviet regime, toponyms of clear, explicit semantics suffered most as they were translated into Polish and later into Russian. Lithuanian place names of other regions were also

---

3 Kazimieras Būga was probably the first to state that the ancient Lithuanians had contacts with the ancient Finns and, no doubt, with the Latvians, Slavs and other nations. Lithuanian contacts with the Finno-Ugric etc. (Finnish, Livonian, Estonian etc.) languages and cultures are not only traced in words of Lithuanian origin (see Būga 1961: 493–496), but also in Lithuanian hydronyms of Finno-Ugric origin, e.g., the two potamonyms *Kivė* are most probably of the Finnish origins and are derived from Finn. *kivi* 'stone', or the name of the lake and the corresponding name of the river *Jarà* may be derived from Finn. *järvi* 'lake' (Vanagas 1988: 86, 88). Also, the ancient Lithuanians had contacts with the Latvians, whom Būga (1961: 551; 737–738) originates from the lands of the present Vilnius region. This is evidenced by some Latvian toponyms that were brought by Latvian ancestors to the present-day Latvia, e.g., the Latvian toponym *Gaujiņu purvs* is derived from the Lithuanian river *the Gaujà*, or Lv. *the Neriņš* is derived from Lith. *the Neris* (Vanagas 1988: 5). The contacts of ancient Lithuanians with the Slavs are also evidenced by toponyms, e.g., *Vilija* and *Šumskas* originate from the ancient Volhynian *Велья* and *Шюмьскъ* (Būga 1961: 503).

Slavicized, Germanized, but remained healthier because they had the basis of the functioning Lithuanian language (cf. Jurkštas 1985: 5–7; 37–38, Zinkevičius 2011: 247ff.). Currently, the aspect of language and cultural contacts in Lithuanian onomastic research is addressed in the works of Laimutis Bilkis (2020a, 2020b), Grasilda Blažienė (2020, 2018, 2013, 2011, etc.)<sup>4</sup>, Kazimieras Garšva (2020a, 2020b, 2019, 1999, 1993, etc.), Darius Ivoška (2020a, 2020b, 2019a, 2019b, 2018, 2016), Dalia Kiseliūnaitė (2020) and others.

The result of centuries-long contacts are toponyms of non-Lithuanian origin, esp. Slavic (Belarussian, Polish, Russian), in the present-day Vilnius County that covers a big part (about one-third) of the interwar Western Vilnius Region, the territory in present-day Lithuania and Belarus that was originally inhabited by ethnic Baltic tribes. The fact that the Balts populated the territories well to the east and south-east of present-day Lithuania is evidenced in the works of Būga<sup>5</sup>, Zinkevičius (2011) as well as other onomasticians and linguists, and is verified by the archaeological research, cf. works of Eugenijus Jovaiša (2012, 2014, 2016, 2020a, 2020b, etc.) and other scholars.

Currently, Vilnius County<sup>6</sup> marks the cultural and linguistic periphery inhabited by Lithuanians and rather big Slavic ethnic groups. In 2011, 23% of Vilnius County's population were Poles, 10% were Russians, 3% were Belarussians (LSD 2013 2). Throughout history, the numbers of the representatives of the mentioned ethnicities fluctuated significantly. The result of the centuries-long contacts and long-term multilingualism of the local population as well as a long, magnificent, and often turbulent history of this land among other things is a small number of still functioning

---

4 Also see Bilkis *et al.* 2019: *Grasilda Blažienė – bibliografja*. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.

5 In the territory of the present-day Belarus, there is a significant layer of Baltic toponyms, esp. hydronyms; also, certain aspects of the material culture, language, certain customs and beliefs can be traced. By far the biggest trace of the Balts in Belarus are toponyms as there are more Baltic (Lithuanian) names on the Belarussian border than those of Belarussian origins (see Būga 1961: 493–550).

6 Vilnius County consists of 6 district municipalities, 1 municipality and 1 city municipality: Elektrėnai Municipality (El), Šalčininkai District Municipality (Šlčn D), Širvintos District Municipality (Šr D), Švenčionys District Municipality (Švčn D), Trakai District Municipality (Trak D), Ukmergė District Municipality (Ukm D), Vilnius City Municipality (V C), and Vilnius District Municipality (V D).

toponyms of Slavic origin<sup>7</sup> (the most telling examples are presented in the sections of Chapter 4 along with toponyms that are autochthonous legacies, i.e., names of Baltic resp. Lithuanian origin). During the research 150 toponyms (12 potamonyms, 10 limnonyms, 128 oikonoms) of Slavic origin were identified in the corpus of 5126 currently officially functioning potamonyms, limnonyms, and oikonoms in Vilnius County. These non-autochthonous toponyms make only 2,92% of all the toponyms in the corpus.

---

7 The entirety of names that reflect language contacts are presented in our forthcoming article “Footprints of Language Contacts in the Present-Day Vilnius County Hydronyms and Oikonoms: The Impact of Slavic Languages on Lithuanian Toponymy” (see Skorupa 2021b).

### 3. TOPONYM SOURCES AND RESEARCH METHODS

The investigation is based on toponyms – proper names of the geographical objects, both settlement, and non-settlement names – and the actual data collected from several modern **electronic, printed and manuscript (archival) sources**: 1) Vilnius County municipalities' websites; 2) electronic catalogues<sup>8</sup>; 3) modern and historical (interactive) maps<sup>9</sup>; 4) scientific research on onomastics, etymology, history, etc.; 5) lexicographic sources (see References and Sources); 6) archival materials<sup>10</sup>. These materials complement each other, help to derive and substantiate sound etymological (including toponym motivation) versions, and form the basis of the research. Toponyms are investigated both synchronically and diachronically.

5126 place names currently officially functioning in the present-day Vilnius County were collected by the author in the period from 2018 to 2020. The corpus comprises 3900 settlement (city, town, village, railway stations with a settlement) names, 718 lake names, 362 river names (including streams), and 146 pond names. In the current study, each analyzed toponym is accompanied by references to the named objects (in subscript) and precise location, followed by the oldest form of the name (with the indication of the source) available to the author at the time of writing.

---

8 esp. Gamtos katalogas. Lietuvos vandens telkiniai (hereinafter, GK; <http://ezerai.vilnius21.lt/>).

9 The Rivers, Lakes and Ponds Cadaster of the Republic of Lithuania (Lith. Lietuvos Respublikos upių, ežerų ir tvenkinių kadastras; <https://uetk.am.lt>; hereinafter, UETK); Geoportal web site (hereinafter, GP; <https://www.geoportal.lt>); the Russian Empire Map 1872 (hereinafter, REM1872; <https://mapire.eu/en/map/russia-1872/>).

10 The Catalogue of Lithuanian Place Names Written from the Living Language (hereinafter, LKIVK) of the Research Center of Baltic Languages and Onomastics at the Institute of the Lithuanian Language. LKIVK contains about 600 000 Lithuanian place names, which Kazimieras Būga began to collect in the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> c. After the scholar's death, the State Archaeological Commission under the Ministry of Education and the Commission of Surnames and Place Names under the Ministry of the Interior proceeded with the work of collecting proper names from the living language (Alminauskis 1934). Later, the work was continued by the Toponymy Group (the Institute of the Lithuanian Language and Literature). The filing of the Lithuanian proper names was completed in the 1980's (Maciejauskienė 2002: 56–64). Today, the Catalogue serves the basis for the publication of the “Dictionary of Lithuanian Place Names” (Maciejauskienė 2001: 29ff.; 2002a: 102–117): the first, second, and third volumes of the dictionary were issued in 2008, 2014, and 2018, respectively. LKIVK serves a unique source for toponymy research.



In case there has been a certain change in the form of the analyzed name, all the available forms of the toponym are listed. The location and older forms are given in parenthesis. Only the current forms of analyzed toponyms are italicized, and, where possible, stressed.

All the toponyms analyzed in the current study make only a small part of the collected place names and are used for the illustration and reflection of the core aim and objectives of the current study in an attempt to identify the aspects of both national resp. ethnic and cultural meanings encoded in toponyms. Moreover, we believe, these aspects may only be traced in the toponyms with more or less transparent etymologies. Therefore, other names from the corpus will not be included in this work and will remain the object of research in the author's forthcoming dissertation, articles, conference reports, and other works.

The analysis is based on the integration of traditional and Cognitive Onomastics **scientific-theoretical research principles and methodologies** developed by Lithuanian and foreign onomasticians and linguists. The linguistic research and the identification of the composition of Vilnius County toponyms are based on works of Kazimieras Būga (1958, 1959, 1961), Aleksandras Vanagas (1970, 1981a, 1981b, 1988, 1996), Jonas Jurkštas (1985), Zigmas Zinkevičius (2007, 2008, 2012), Marija Razmukaitė (1998, 2002, 2003), Dalia Sviderskienė (2006a, 2006b, 2007, 2016, 2017), and others. Because toponyms are the result of human linguistic activities, they were once explicit and easy to associate with the generic words they were derived from (Vanagas 1970, 1988). Thus, the analysis of toponyms can provide valuable insights into the past of nations, their territories, ancestry; the species of extinct animals and plants and their distribution areas; about past landscape features, places of worship, etc. (Vanagas 1988: 5-6). To determine the origins and motivation of the selected toponyms, the structural-grammatical classification of water names (Vanagas 1970: 21-27) and the semantic classification of hydronyms (Vanagas 1981b: 19-120; 1988: 51-65) are applied in the current study. It is believed that both Vanagas' classifications can be easily applied to the study of all classes of toponyms (not just hydronyms).

Dalia Sviderskienė (2016, 2017) touched upon a cognitive aspect in the research of the regional Lithuanian toponymy's motivation. With reference to the semantic classification of hydronyms proposed by Vanagas (1981b, 1988), Sviderskienė categorizes the analyzed helonyms resp. toponyms into both explicit and obscure

motivation names, as well as into names that have multiple (interpreted) motivations, classifying toponyms of explicit motivation according to 1) properties of the objects (i.e. animal and plant names; physiographic features (bottom features, shape, function, spatial position or configuration), color; demonological motivation; water quality (viscosity, liquidity, substances in water), the physical state of the water); 2) relationship to other objects (i.e., possessivity and place motivation, environmental motivation); 3) the relationship with the person (belongingness, historical-cultural relations; names of anthroponymic origin); 4) situation or event-motivated toponyms; 5) micro-system<sup>11</sup> motivated toponyms (Sviderskienė 2016: 247–257). The analysis of obscure motivation toponyms is often aggravated by: 1) the lexical character of the base (root, or first component of the name) and its belonging to the appellative or anthroponymic class is not quite clear; 2) polysemy of the reference word (motivation can be interpreted by several meanings of the reference word); 3) lexemes of the same expression (form) with different meanings; 4) metaphoricity; 5) semantics of a complex nature (words in different languages can evoke different associations); 6) implicit assessment (usually associated with negative experiences, etc.) (ibid. 258–263).

The works of foreign scholars dedicated to the research of toponym semantics and linguistic motivation also have to be mentioned. These include, but are not limited to research carried out by Maria Biolik (1989), who dealt with the semantics of hydronyms; Laimutė Balode, who analyzed the semantics of hydronyms of taste (Balode 1993) and metaphorical Latvian hydronyms (Balode 2012); Russian researchers Irena Khokhlova, Lyudmila Zamorshchikova and Victoria Filipova (2018), who used methods of cognitive matrix modeling and statistical analysis, historical and geographical reconstruction to explain the motivation of Central Yakutian toponyms.

Since the emergence of toponyms, their main natural function has been the indication of a place (address), i.e., they were meant to provide information about the object itself and its relationship with other objects. Therefore, the representatives of

---

<sup>11</sup> The concept of micro-system in toponymy relates to place names that exist inside and are bound by the borders of a certain territory. Such toponyms correlate with each other, reflecting the relativity of the location of the objects they designate. This concept is often used in the studies of regional toponymy and oppositions in regional toponymy (cf. Korepanova 1973; Štěpán 2009; Ahundova 2011; Tkachenko, 2003, 2013, 2014; Sviderskienė 2016; Ilchenko and Isachuk 2016; Stachowski 2018; Gataullin and Fatykhova 2018, and others).

many onomastic schools have been paying attention to the plethora of toponyms based on antonymic relationships and binary oppositions in different toponymic classes. The insights into colour symbolism in hydronyms were made by Aleksandra Superanskaja (1970); the motivation of toponym oppositions based on the correlation “upper-lower” were explored by Vera Kondrashina (1980); the psycholinguistic basis of binary oppositions in toponymy was analyzed by Gjulshen Ahundova (2011); the attempt to explain the origins of color oppositions with reference to mythopoetic symbolism, ethnocultural information, and identification of (ethnic) worldviews in toponymy was made by Gulnur Kh. Bukharova *et al.* (2016); both structural and semantic features of “coloured” toponyms, their polysemy and functions in both language, culture, and the national worldview were scrutinized by Ravil Gataullin and Lija Fatykhova (2018). The role of semantic binary oppositions in the formation of oikonyms and the development of the toponymic system was emphasized by Anna Korepanova (1973); Yevgeniy Tkachenko (2003, 2013, 2014) analyzed the structural-linguistic features of toponymic antonyms and metonymic relationships between different toponymic classes; structural and grammatical (antonymic) binominal settlement names were studied by Irina Hontsa (2014); binary oppositions and their structure were studied by Irina Ilchenko and Nastasiya Isachuk (2016); Kamil Stachowski (2018) explored differentiating markers (esp. qualifying adjectives of colour) in oppositions in various classes of toponyms and attempted to trace the ancient system of color symbolism<sup>12</sup>; Pavel Štěpán (2009) provided his insights into the antonymic semantic relationship in toponymy and pointed out both syntactic and semantic features of the opposition-forming elements. Toponym oppositions are characteristic of most Slavic and other territories. We believe, such nomination patterns are not only of great importance in the designation of geographical objects in Lithuanian territories but also play a key role in the formation of the national onomasticon, as such formal and semantic sequences of toponyms are formed taking into consideration both linguistic and extra-linguistic conditions in the area under investigation and may facilitate the identification of many motivating factors (geographical, linguistic, social, historical, etc.) that had led to the

---

<sup>12</sup> This system is believed to resemble Chinese and Turkish colour systems, which supposedly motivated the emergence of Slavic-origin onyms such as *White Russia*, *Black Russia*, and *Red Russia*.

origins of toponyms and may help to establish the principles of the nomination of toponymic units.

Onyms resp. toponyms belong to the lexical level of the language, therefore, it is important to discuss the meaning of the proper name issues. The particular attention to the problem of the meaning of onyms is paid by Willy Van Langendonck (2007, 2013, 2016, 2017), Richard Coates (2006, 2012, 2015, 2016), Antii Leino (2005, 2007), Paula Sjöblom (2011), Tehri Ainiala, Minna Saarelma, Paula Sjöblom (2016); the conceptualization of onyms is explored by Elena Karpenko and Lidiya Golubenko (2015), Olga Andriuschchenko, Gulnara Sujunova and Sofja Tkachiuk (2015). The problems of name categorization and prototyping were addressed in the works of Joana Szerszunowicz (2010), Paula Sjöblom (2011), Andrea Bölcskei (2014), and others. Silvio Brendler (2006, 2008, 2012, 2016) explored the problem of the origin and identity of names, emphasizing the issue of identity as an important factor in the study of Onomastics. The origin and identity of names as well as the cultural and social motivation of anthroponyms were studied by Andrea Bölcskei (2014) and Mariann Slíz (2017).

Cognitive Semantics theories make it possible to look at the Lithuanian proper names in terms of conceptual metaphor and metonymy. The theory of conceptual metaphor (CMT), developed by George Lakoff, Mark Johnson 2003 (1980), Zoltan Kövecses 2002, is one of the most established and recognized parts of Cognitive Semantics. The problem of conceptual metaphors in Onomastics are addressed by Nikola Dobrić (2010), Mariusz Rutkowski (2011), Katalina Reszegi (2012), Aunga Solomon (2018), and others. It was also observed that metonymy is not a rare phenomenon among proper names (Chaikina, Monzikova, Varnikova 2004; Bába 2011; Reszegi 2012; Thachenko 2013; Van Langendonck, Van de Velde 2016; Van Langendonck 2017). Two types of metonymic relationships are emerging in Onomastics research: first, the use of geographical names (geographical nomenclatural terms) for the nomination of topographic objects; second, the use of the existing toponyms for the nomination of other toponymic objects by the principle of analogy.

The analysis of present-day Vilnius County toponyms under the framework of the CMT can help understand their linguistic, cultural, social, historical, etc. motivation. Therefore, the aforementioned semantic classification of hydronyms by Vanagas will be applied in part, considering unmotivated toponyms as motivated by principles of

conceptual metaphor and metonymy. Toponym (sub)classes are analyzed according to the concepts that motivated their origin, based on the conceptual metaphor model<sup>13</sup>, i.e., transfer of cognitive traits (concepts) from one domain to another (from appellatives to onyms): source domain (appellative) → conceptual structure (cognitive trait) → target domain (onym) (see Lakoff, Johnson 2003 (1980), Kövecses 2002, Dobrić 2010). The transfer of semantic and conceptual structures from one conceptual domain to another is of great importance for the creation of onymic prototypes: transferring the meaning of an appellative to an onym, or using a place name to designate a person. Moreover, it is noteworthy that the analysis of onyms under the framework of conceptual metaphor is not an etymological analysis but rather an attempt to determine how the conceptual structure of words has motivated and still motivates their creation (Dobrić 2010: 139–141).

The following terms of Greek origin are used to maintain **the terminology system**<sup>14</sup>: *hydronym* – water body name (*potamonym* – river name; *limnonym* – lake/pond name); *oikonym* – settlement name; *toponym* – place name (sometimes used in a restricted sense of inhabited places)<sup>15</sup>. Also, the following terms were used: *anthroponym* – a person’s name, esp. surname; *phitolexeme* – a common name for a species of a plant; *zoolexeme* – a common name for a species of an animal.

---

<sup>13</sup> Note: the term ‘metaphor’ in Cognitive Linguistics theory differs from the stylistic tool used in Literature. In Cognitive Linguistics, metaphor refers to a semantic concept that reflects images that exist in human consciousness. And the process of metaphORIZATION is based on the transfer of the meaning from the conceptual domain of the source to the target domain (Dobrić 2010: 138). Cf. Metaphors in the theory of traditional linguistics refer to the juxtaposition of unrelated meanings based on the similarity of some of their properties (Vaitkevičiūtė 2007: 705).

<sup>14</sup> Cf.: the International Council of Onomastic Sciences (ICOS) Onomastic Terminology and ICOS lists of Onomastic Terms at <https://icosweb.net/publications/onomastic-terminology/>; Подольская Наталия В. 1978: *Словарь русской ономастической терминологии*. Москва: Наука.

<sup>15</sup> Cf.: ICOS OT. We will use this term in its broader sense as a name of any geographical object, including but not limited to hydronyms, oikonoms, etc.

## 4. THE LAYER OF NATIONAL AND CULTURAL IDENTITY IN THE SEMANTICS OF TOPONYMS

Toponyms are social symbols of belonging to a certain group and the more common names resp. toponyms there are, the stronger is the bond within the group. National and cultural identity is always related to a certain place, and the analysis of toponyms facilitates understanding the formation of identity through the prism of a place, as “place names hold the power of constructing social identities” through place identity and attachment to the place (Alasli 2019: 1–2). Knowledge of places and their names create a spirit of community, promotes a sense of belonging to a certain nation, as place names are a very important part of everyday life, language, individual and collective memory, as well as individual and collective identity. Arseny Saparov (2003: 179) claims that: “place-names are some of the most durable of national symbols. They can outlive most material artifacts of civilization. The material components of the cultural landscape may disappear or be destroyed, the civilization that created them may also disappear but its place-names will most probably survive”. Therefore, toponyms are considered to be the most important symbols and features of national and territorial identity. Saparov believes that nations and/or ethnic groups are very sensitive to the preservation of their national landscape, especially when they manage to preserve their identity as a nation. And often it is only the national onomasticon resp. toponymy testifies that a certain territory belongs to a particular nation, as “most definitions of any ethnic community – tribe, nationality, nation necessarily mention the common living space of that ethnic group” (Saparov 2003: 179). National toponymy is formed in the native language of people living inside the boundaries of these common spaces resp. territories. Therefore, it is not surprising that toponyms are related to ideologies, especially when states use them as instruments for preserving the unity and uniqueness of the nation: to strengthen the moral right to live in a certain territory, to protect one’s land from neighboring states’ claims to it (Saparov 2003: 180).

Since toponyms hardly ever change, they can be considered a kind of social agreement. In the living language, such agreement is reflected in the use of the dialectical forms of place names. Often, residents of a certain area do not use the official forms of place names (indicated on road signs, maps, municipal websites; in official documents, etc.). For example, in the official sources of Vilnius County, as well as in other parts of

Lithuania, numbers<sup>16</sup> are used as differentiating markers (hereinafter, DMs) to make a distinction between identical place names, as in limnonyms *Bražuōlės tvenkinỹs* × *Bražuōlės I tvenkinỹs* × *Bražuōlės II tvenkinỹs* (Bražuolė v, Trak D; the Bražuolė stream)<sup>17</sup>, *Šalčininkų I tvenkinỹs* × *Šalčininkų II tvenkinỹs* (the Šalčia, Šalčininkai tn, Šlčn D)<sup>18</sup>, *Viesų I tvenkinỹs* × *Viesų II tvenkinỹs* × *Viesų III tvenkinỹs* (Senosios Viesos v, the Viesa, Šr D)<sup>19,20</sup>. The same can also be observed in the official forms of oikonyms, cf.:

- 
- 16 The use of numbers in place names, esp. oikonyms, with the identical derivational lexemes is characteristic of the nomination patterns already since the 19<sup>th</sup> c. (cf. Tkachenko 2013, REM1872), and has become rather frequent since the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> c. (Štěpán 2009: 915).
- 17 *Bražuōlės* pond is located in the northern part of Bražuolė settlement and was formed after damming the B-2 stream (the Bražuolė trib.) 0,43 km from its inflow into *Bražuōlės I* pond, which was formed by damming the Bražuolė (the Neris trib.). *Bražuōlės II* was formed by damming an unnamed stream (the Bražuolė trib.). All three pond names are Gen. case derivatives and are motivated by their location on or in the vicinity of the Bražuolė stream or Bražuolė village, thus, expressing the concept of possessivity and place: *Bražuōlės tvenkinỹs*, *Bražuōlės I tvenkinỹs*, *Bražuōlės II tvenkinỹs* ← *Bražuōl-ės* ← the pond on the Bražuolė/ in the vicinity of Bražuolė village. The number serves the DM of the identical names. The potamonym Bražuolė (REM1872 Rus. р. Бражала) is most probably Lith. Suf *-uolė* that is used to derive names of property/characteristic holders (cf. DLKG 116) derivative from Lith. *bražėti* ‘to scratch, sniff’ and *bražuoti* ‘shave, scrape’ (LKŽe) (cf. Vanagas 1981a: 70) and may be motivated by the scratching, scraping sounds the river makes (Vanagas 1981b: 114), conveying the concept of sound: Lith. *bražėti*, *bražuoti* + *-uolė* → the river that makes scratching, scraping sounds → the *Bražuolė*. The oikonym *Bražuolė* (REM1872 Rus. Брожалы) is motivated by its location on the stream Bražuolė and is a metonymic transposition of the potamonym and expressess the concept of possessivity (this is obvious from the historic name of the village): Bražuolė ← the settlement on the Bražuolė stream.
- 18 These two ponds in the center of *Šalčininkai* tn that form an opposition based on the use of number as post-modifier. The two water bodies are of artificial nature and were formed by damming *the Šalčia*. Their names are the Gen. case derivatives, expressed by the Lith. inflection *-ų*, from the oikonym *Šalčininkai*. Therefore, both pond names express the relationships of possessivity and origins: *Šalčininkų I tvenkinỹs*, *Šalčininkų II tvenkinỹs* ← the pond in *Šalčininkai*. The number serves the DM of the identical names.
- 19 *Viesų I tvenkinỹs*, *Viesų II tvenkinỹs* are located in Senosios Viėsoš; *Viesų III tvenkinỹs* is located outside the village. All the ponds were formed by damming the Viesa (the Širvinta trib.). pond names are Gen. case derivatives from the oikonym *Viėsos* and are motivated by their location in the named village, thus, expressing the concept of possessivity and place: *Viesų I tvenkinỹs*, *Viesų II tvenkinỹs*, *Viesų III tvenkinỹs* ← (Senųjū) *Vies-ų* ← the pond in/in the vicinity of Senosios Viesos village. The number serves the DM of the identical names.
- 20 The third component of each name Lith. *tvenkinỹs* ‘pond’ indicates the geographical object that is named.

*Alėšiškės I<sub>v</sub>* (Trak D; GSD 1974 639 *Alėšiškės<sub>v</sub>*, GI1905 314 з. Олешиски, REM1872 Rus. з. Алеишска) × *Alėšiškės II* (Trak D)<sup>21</sup>, or *Nemenčinė<sub>tn</sub>* (V D; GSD1974 745 *Nemenčinė<sub>tn</sub>*, REM1872 Rus. м. Нѣменчинѣ) × *Nemenčinė II* (V D)<sup>22</sup>, etc. It should be noted that numbers are not used by the locals. Thus, for instance, the villages *Alėšiškės I* and *Alėšiškės II* are both referred to as *Alėšiškės* in the living language.

Vilnius County toponyms may be considered historical monuments that reflect a long, magnificent, and often turbulent history of this land, as they are affected not only by the cultural periphery – the interaction of different indigenous cultures and languages – but also by the long-term multilingualism of the local population. The author's insights on the footprints of national resp. ethnic and cultural identity in the semantics of the selected toponyms are presented in the sections of this chapter.

#### 4.1. Toponyms Reflecting Topographical Relief Features

Most of Vilnius County toponyms emerged from and were motivated by characteristics of the areas, i.e., topographical relief features, they denote. Below are several examples from the hydronymy and oikonymy of the region that conceptualize its lowlands/plains (sometimes swampy lands and bogs) and uplands, i.e., the hilly nature of the terrain. Such features are reflected in a relatively small part of hydronyms (only 25 limnonyms out of the total number of 718 lake names, and 14 potamonyms out of 362 river names) and oikonyms (51 out of 3900 settlement names) now functioning in Vilnius region.

21 The first component of the oikonym *Alėšiškės* is Lith. Suf *-iškės* derivative from the PN of Christian origin (cf. Razmukaitė 1998: 85), most probably from anthroponym Lith. *Aleša* ← Bel. *Олеша: Алексей*, Pol. *Olesza* (cf. Biryła 1966: 24–25, PDB). Therefore, it may be claimed that the settlement name is a metonymic transposition: *Alėšiškės* ← *Aleš-a* + *-iškės* ← the settlement belonging to/established by *Aleša*. The DMs *I* and *II* in both oikonyms are a much recent addition: in the GI1905 314, 24 stedings (homesteads) with the name *Олешиски* are listed. Most probably by the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> c. the majority of these settlements have been either eliminated or reformed into settlements now known as *Alėšiškės I<sub>v</sub>* and *Alėšiškės II<sub>v</sub>*. The DMs were added to differentiate two (re)formed settlements with homogeneous names.

22 *Nemenčinė* is a Lith. Suf *-inė* (an adjective derivational Suf for actions, their results or places of action (see Ambrazas 1993: 63, 95–96, 214ff.)) derived oikonym from the *Nemenčią* (the Neris trib.). Thus, the oikonyms are the metonymic transposition of the concept of place motivated by the potonym *Nemenčią*: *Nemenčinė (II)* ← a settlement on *the Nemenčią* ← *the Nemenčią*.



#### 4.1.1. Toponyms Motivated by Marshy or Swampy Lands

These features of the topographic relief of Vilnius region territories are conceptualized in such hydronyms as *Keřnavas* (Šlčn D; REM1872 Rus. Оз.[epo] Кернове). This limnonym is of Baltic origin (Vanagas 1981a: 153) and is derived from Lith. *keřnavė* ‘a viscous place in meadows, forests’ (LKŽe) and may also be related to Lith. *kernà* ‘a thicket, a place where something is grown up into a pile’ (LKŽe). The name may have been motivated by the physiographic features of the areas around the lake. The shores of this water body are low and swampy, while the lake itself lies in Kernavas upland swamp. The name obviously presents a metonymic transposition of the concept of a swamp around the lake that has created a viscous area with dense vegetation: Lith. *pėlkė* / *keřnavė* (a swamp) → a swamp/swampy place → *Keřnavas*. The river *Kernavė* (the Visinčia trib., Šlčn D; REM1872 Rus. Реч.[ка] Керновка) that flows from lake *Keřnavas* through Rūdninkai forest near Kernavas swamp could have been similarly motivated, as the potamonym is obviously derived from the superior hydronym, i.e., *Keřnavas* by means of Lith. Suf *-avė* (cf. Vanagas 1970: 104) and may be considered a metonymic transposition of the limnonym.

A similar meaning reflecting the swampy lowlands is conveyed by the potamonym *Kirėė* (lake Asveja, V D), which is obviously of Baltic origin and is Lith. *f sg* inflection *-ė* derivative from and related to Lith. *kirėa* ‘water-washed tree or shrub roots on the river bank’, ‘bushy, wet place’, ‘place with fallen trees, scrap’ (LKŽe), cf. Prus. *kirno* ‘a bush’ (Vanagas 1981a: 158). The stream flows through a very marshy area, esp. swampy are the upper and lower reaches: Palobinėš swamp, Tumonių Balos swamp, Vaitkūnų I swamp, and Šaltupio swamp are the biggest. Therefore, the potamonym may belong to the group of hydronyms describing the area around them and is a metonymic transposition of the concept of a bushy wetland: Lith. *kirė-a* + *-ė* → the stream in the bushy, overgrown wetland → the *Kirėė*.

#### 4.1.2. Toponyms Motivated by Hilly Nature of the Area

The components of some compound settlement names can be used to learn about the natural elevations or lowlands they are located in. This most often is expressed by the correlation of either simple or pronominal qualitative adjectives indicating the relative vertical position of the topo-objects in space, cf. the correlation *áukštas* ‘high’ – *žėmas* ‘low’ expressed by toponyms modified by the contraposition of *m*

s *aukštasis* ‘high’ – *žemasis* ‘low’ or *m pl aukštieji* ‘the high; higher’ – *žemieji* ‘the low; lower’. This is especially obvious in several oikonym oppositions<sup>23</sup>, cf. the first component in the oikonyms: *Aukštieji Semeniukai* (Trak D; GSD1974 648 *Aukštieji Semeniukai*, GI1905 341 Rus. д. Семенюки-Горные, REM1872 Rus. Сойзе Мал. [ые]), which is located at 130 MSL in the hills above the Vilsa and the Neris valleys, and *Žemieji Semeniukai* (Trak D; GSD1974 649 *Žemieji Semeniukai*, GI1905 341 Rus. д. Семенюки-Дольние, REM1872 Rus. Сойзе Бол. [ьшие]), located at 110 MSL at the hill foot in the valley of the Vilsa stream, 0,5 km away from *Aukštieji Semeniukai*<sup>24</sup>; or the second component in the limnonyms *Nėvardas Áukštas* (V D), located at 164 MSL, on the natural elevation (plato), and *Nėvardas Žėmas* (V D), located at 157 MSL, in the Vilkiškių Swamp, at the hill foot 0,08 km to the south from *Nėvardas Áukštas*<sup>25</sup>.

The hilly nature of the County’s topographic relief is especially obvious in oikonyms based on the correlation of Lith. *kalninis* ‘of the mountains/hills’ – Lith.

- 
- 23 To check the meaning and motivation of these opposition forming elements the extralinguistic data resp. geographical information, esp. the named object’s relation to the neighbouring object (hills, valleys, rivers) and its position above the sea level (MSL – meters above sea level. In the current research, this information was obtained using object elevation measurement tools available on GP and UETK websites) was considered. Of course, it is unlikely that at the time of nomination the information about the position of the object above the sea level was known. People most probably simply considered the position of the object in relation to other neighbouring object in the specific location, regarding the relief of the given area.
- 24 The second component *Semeniukai* in both oikonyms is most probably of anthroponymic origin derived by means of Lith. Suf *-iuk-* from either Lith. *Sē-menas*, *Sē-me-nas*, *Semēnis* (Zinkevičius 2008: 114, 132, 239) or Slav. *Sem-en-iuk/Sem-en-iukas* (Zinkevičius 2012: 269) ← Heb. Simeon. Thus, the second component of the oikonyms may be motivated by the concept of possessivity: (*Aukštieji*, *Žemieji*) *Semeniukai* → the settlement belonging to/established by *Sē-menas*, *Sē-me-nas*, *Semēnis*, *Sem-en-iuk/Sem-en-iukas*.
- 25 The component *Nėvardas* in both names is a negative Lith. Pref *ne-* derivative most probably from the base *vard-*, which according to Vanagas (1981a: 362), has to be related with the hydronyms with bases *verd-* and *vird-*. Vanagas (ibid.) believes that all of them comprise three variants of etymologically single root – *vard-*, *verd-* and *vird-*. Such hydronyms can be derived from Lith. *verdėnė*, *verdėnis* ‘a spring, source’ (LKŽe), *virdūklis* ‘a spring, whirlpool’ (LKŽe) ← Lith. *virti* (*vérdá*, *vìrė*) or *veřstis* ‘to popple or bounce from dungeons (about a source)’ (LKŽe). Thus, linguistic-cognitive motivation of the names *Nėvardas Áukštas* and *Nėvardas Žėmas* may be interpreted as a metaphoric transposition of the concept of a spring/source: Lith. *ne* + *vařdas* (*verdėnis*, *verdūklis*) → the body of water that is not a spring, source → *Nėvardas* (*Áukštas* and *Žėmas*). These are the only hydronyms in Vilnius County the differentiating markers (Lith. *áukštas* ‘high’ – *žėmas* ‘low’) of which indicate to their actual vertical position in space. *Nėvardas Áukštas* being positioned somewhat higher in space.

*klōninis / klōninis* ‘of the valleys’ (← Lith. nomenclature terms *klōnis / klōnis* ‘a valley, dip, lowland, ravine’ and *kálnas* ‘a high natural ground elevation; hill, mountain’ (LKŽe)) expressed by toponyms modified by the contraposition of *m pl kalniniai* ‘of the mountains/hills’ – Lith. *klōniniai* ‘of the valleys’ as in oikonyms *Jagėlonys* (El; GSD1974 202 Kalniniai Jagėlonys<sub>v</sub>, GI1905 339 Rus. з. Ягеляны-Горные, REM1872 Rus. Ягеляны Гурные), located at 135 MSL, in the hills above the Spengla valley, and *Klōniniai Jagėlonys* (El; GSD1974 202 Klōniniai Jagėlonys<sub>v</sub>, GI1905 339 Rus. д.[еревня] Ягеляны-Дальние, REM1872 Rus. Ягеляны), located at 121 MSL, at the hill foot in the Spengla valley, 0,6 km northwest of *Jagėlonys*<sup>26</sup>; or *Kalniniai Mijaugonys* (El; GSD1974 210 Kalniniai Mijaugonys<sub>v</sub>, GI1905 324 Rus. д. Милейганы-Горные, REM1872 Rus. Милейганы гурные), located at 92 MSL in the valley downstream the Prakusa, and *Klōniniai Mijaugonys* (El; GSD1974 202 Klōniniai Mijaugonys<sub>v</sub>, GI1905 324 Rus. д. Милейганы-Дольние, REM1872 Rus. Дальн.[ие] Милейганы)<sup>27</sup>, located at 121 MSL up the Prakusa stream; etc. It is observed in toponymy studies that these distinguishing adjectives in place names, esp. in oikonymy, usually indicate either 1) the position of the named object in relation to the river flow with the meaning either “located in the lower part of the river”, i.e., downstream – close to the mouth of the river, or “located in the upper part of the river”, i.e., upstream – close to the source of the river, or 2) the location of the object on the hill/mountain, or at the foot of the hill/mountain (cf. Kondrashina 1980, Tkachenko 2013, Ilchenko, Isachuk 2016). In either case, such oppositions are typical to the mountainous areas neighbouring

26 The component *Jagėlonys* is most probably of anthroponymic origin derived by means of a Lith. Suf *-onys* from Lith. *Jagėla* (→ Lith. *Jógėlas (Jāgėlas, Jagėlas), Jagėlonis*) (Zinkevičius 2008: 208, 347). Thus, the oikonym may be motivated by the concept of possessivity: (*Klōniniai*) *Jagėlonys* → the settlement belonging to/established by *Jagėlonis* ← *Jagėla*.

27 The component *Mijaugonys* is most probably of anthroponymic origin derived by means of a Lith. Suf *-onys* from the blending of two anthroponyms Lith. *Migōnis* (which relates to the spiritual qualities and was derived from Lith. *miėgas* (sleep) ‘physiological state of rest, when many physiological processes are weakened and consciousness is not fully or partially affected’ (LKŽe; cf. Zinkevičius 2008: 584)) and Lith. *Jauga (Jaugà), Jaugas* (Zinkevičius 2008: 310) → *\*Mijaugonis, \*Mijaugas*. Thus, the oikonym may be motivated by the concept of possessivity: (*Kalniniai, Klōniniai*) *Mijaugonys* → the settlement belonging to/established by *\*Mijaugonis, \*Mijaugas*. The form written in REM1872 Rus. Милейганы may relate the oikonym to old Lith. double-stemmed anthroponym *Milagaĩnis / Mìl-a-gainas* (Zinkevičius 2008: 88, 115, 221).

lowlands and convey certain information about the relief of a given area.<sup>28</sup> The zero-marker of the unmodified names in oppositional pairs based on both simple and pronominal adjectives can be easily retrieved from the context of such oppositions.<sup>29</sup>

In some cases, the combination of the name components point to the settlement's position on a certain natural elevation, cf. several settlement names: *Antākalnis* (Ukm D; GSD1974 666 *Antakalnis<sub>v</sub>*, KGS1903 68 Rus. з., д. Антокольцы, REM1872 Rus. Антокольце) × *Antākalnis I* (Ukm D; GSD1974 672 *Antakalnis I<sub>v</sub>*, KGS1903 68 Rus. стор. Антоколь 1, REM1872 Rus. Госп. д. Антоколь) × *Antākalnis II* (Ukm D; GSD1974 672 *Antakalnis II<sub>v</sub>*, KGS1903 68 Rus. з. Антоколь 2, REM1872 Rus. Ф.[ольварк] Антоколь) × *Antākalnis III* (Ukm D; GSD1974 672 *Antakalnis III<sub>v</sub>*, REM1872 Rus. Ф.[ольварк] Антоколь Тавьяны) in opposition, as well as *Antākalnis<sub>stead</sub>* (El; GI1905 312 Rus. з. Антоколь, REM1872 Rus. Антоколь), *Antākalnis<sub>v</sub>* (Trak D; REM1872 Rus. Антоколь), and many more settlements of the same name across Lithuania are the Lith. Pref *ant-* derivatives from Lith. *kálnas* (a mountain/hill) 'a high ground elevation' (LKŽe). The Pref *ant-* 'on/atop' derivatives denote a place in itself on (above) an object designated by a reference noun (Ambrazas *et al.* 1994: 146). In this case, the designating noun is the Lith. nomenclature term *kálnas*. The Lith. inflection *-is* is used to derive masculine gender nouns (cf. Ambrazas *et al.* 1994: 113 ff.). Therefore, the above oikonyms express the concept of a settlement (place) on/atop the hill: *ant(a)- + kaln- + -is* (on/atop+hill) → the settlement on the hill/mountain → *Antākalnis (I, II, III)*.

\*\*\*

There is also a rather big group of hydronyms and oikonyms that partly disclose certain information about the topographic relief of Vilnius County and form certain

28 The analysis has shown that the qualitative simple and pronominal adjectives in the following oikonyms are motivated by the location (position) of the settlements and the modifying adjectives convey the following meanings: 1) Lith. *aukštàsis/aukštíjeji* 'high' ('upper') – "located on the hill/mountain", Lith. *žemàsis, žemíjeji* 'low' ('lower') – "located at the foot of the hill/mountain"; 2) Lith. *aukštàsis/aukštíjeji* 'high' ('upper') – "located in the upper part of the river (upstream)", Lith. *žemàsis, žemíjeji* 'low' ('lower') – "located in the lower part of the river (downstream)"; 3) Lith. *kalnìniai* – "located on the hill/mountain", Lith. *klōnìniai* – "located in the valley".

29 Other oppositions of such type and the analysis of their semantics are described in Pavel Skorupa (2021a: 262–269).

toponymic micro-systems. One of the examples could be rivers *the Kenà* (the Vilnia trib., V D; REM1872 Rus. Р.[ека] Кѣна), *the Mažóji Kenà* (the Merkys trib., V D, Šlčn D) and *the Kenėlė* (*Kinėlė*) (the Kena trib., V D). These river names create two oppositions: *the Kenà* × *the Mažóji Kenà*; *the Kenà* × *the Kenėlė*. The river *Kenà* gave name to several settlements (see below). *The Kenėlė* is the Lith. DIM Suf *-ėlė* derivative from the superior potamonym *Kenà*. The sources of *the Kenà* and *the Mažóji Kenà* are 6,6 km away from one another and both rivers flow in the opposite directions. *The Mažóji Kenà* is the name made by the principle of analogy from *the Kenà*, as the opposition of the former with qualificational adjective *māžas* (-à) (small) ‘of small dimensions; spare, sparse; slight, weak; less important’ (LKŽe). Vanagas (1981a: 156) claimed that the name *Kenà* is derived from Lith. *kinė* ‘a raised place in a meadow, bog, or in water’ or ‘roots of trees and shrubs on the river bank (in water)’ (LKŽe); also, from Lith. *kinis* ‘a crust on the water; slough, marsh’ or ‘a small island in a river or lake; the area of the slough, marsh’ (LKŽe). Therefore, the motivation for the name is quite confusing and can be interpreted in several ways as a transposition of the following concepts: *kinė* → a place (river (valley)) overgrown with trees and shrubs → the (*Mažóji*) *Kenà* (and the *Kinėlė*); or *kinis* → a crust on the water; a slough, marsh → the (*Mažóji*) *Kenà* (and the *Kinėlė*).

Several settlements are related to the above-mentioned potamonyms that create a certain micro-system: village *Kenà* (*Kinė*) (Kalveliai eld, V D; GI1905 67 Rus. д. Кѣна, REM1872 Rus. м.[естечко] Кѣна), village *Kenà* (Rukainiai eld, V D; GI1905 62 Rus. з. Кѣна), village *Pakenė* (Kalveliai eld, V D; GI1905 82 Rus. селение при ст.[анции] Кѣна), and the railway station with the settlement *Pakenė* (Kalveliai eld, V D; GI1905 82 Rus. ст. Кѣна), as well as village *Užùkenė* (*Užùkinė*) (Rukainiai eld, V D; REM1872 Rus. д. ЗаКѣнцы). The village *Kenà* (*Kinė*) is located on the road Vilnius-Šumskas, near the railroad from Vilnius to Minsk, on both banks of *the Kenà* (approx. 1 km upstream *the Kenà* from its confluence with the Vilnia). The oikonym is motivated by the location of the village on the named river and is a transposition of the potamonym to settlement’s name: *Kenà* (*Kinė*) ← the settlement on *the Kenà*.

*Pakenė* and the railroad station of the same name are located on the right bank of the *Kenà* approx. 1,5 km to the west of *Kenà* (*Kinė*) on opposite sides of the railroad from Vilnius to Minsk. It may be claimed that both oikonyms are motivated by both the river and village *Kenà* (*Kinė*) they are located close to, which is indicated by Lith. Pref *pa-* that expresses the concept of belonging (location): *Pakenė<sub>v</sub>* / *Pakenė<sub>RS</sub>* ← the settlement below/near *Kenà* ← *pa-* + *Kenà* (*Kinė*). Alternatively, *Pakenė<sub>v</sub>* / *Pakenė<sub>RS</sub>* could indicate the place on/near the river *Kenà*, but still expressing the concept of horizontal position in space: *Pakenė<sub>v</sub>* / *Pakenė<sub>RS</sub>* ← the settlement on/near the river *Kenà* ← *the Kenà*. *Kenà* and *Užūkenė* (Rukainiai eld.), are located approx. 11 km from the village *Kenà* (*Kinė*), on the opposite banks upstream the *Kenà*, 3 km away from each other. As seen from the historical sources, the village *Kenà* is a younger settlement than the village analyzed above. Most probably it was established by people who have moved from *Kenà* (*Kinė*), hence its name created by analogy, but still is motivated by its location close to the river and a relatively close distance to the village *Kenà* (*Kinė*). *Užūkenė* is Lith. Pref *už(u)-* derivative from the oikonym *Kenà*.<sup>30</sup>

#### 4.2. Toponyms Reflecting Flora

Through the Lithuanian language, toponyms of the Baltic resp. Lithuanian origin reflect nature, the lush vegetation, the rich and boundless sea of green forests characteristic of these lands. This category of toponyms includes both oikonyms and hydronyms that are

---

<sup>30</sup> Considering the distance (approx. 10 km) between the settlements *Pakenė* and *Užūkenė*, they make a complete grammatical opposition based on Lith Pref *pa-* and *už(u)-* that serve the differentiating markers to the homogenous base lexemes *-kenė*. In Lithuanian Pref *už(u)-* denotes the place behind the entity indicated by the reference word. Also, this prefix is used to derive words that denote the back and/or the edge of the entity being referred to by the reference noun or another entity behind it (DLKG 146). This means that the Lith. Pref *už(u)-* derived toponyms indicate the place behind, beyond, or outside the place/object indicated by the base of the toponym. Thus, the oikonym *Užūkenė* is most likely the conceptualization of 1) the place (settlement) beyond *the Kenà* river, or 2) the place (settlement) outside the settlement *Kenà*. On the other hand, judging from the composition of the historical form Rus. *Закънуы*, which has the Rus. Suf morpheme *-(e)y-* (most probably a plural from the colloquial Rus. \**закънеу* that could refer to a person living beyond *the Kenà*). When added to a noun root, the Rus. Suf *-(e)y-* forms a colloquial version of the noun with the diminutive or indifference, dismissiveness, or unimportance. Thus, at least from the historical perspective, the oikonym Rus. *Закънуы* (→ *Užūkenė*) additionally could have been emotionally coloured.

motivated by tree species, terrestrial and aquatic plant species, and forest types. Some of the examples of such place names are presented in the respective sub-sections below.

#### 4.2.1. Toponyms Motivated by Tree Species

This group contains a rather big number of place names in the classes of hydronyms and oikonyms, the most vivid examples, cf. the following:

*The Ažuoluona* (the P-1 stream trib., Ukm D) is a Lith. Suf *-uona*<sup>31</sup> derivative from Lith. *ąžuolas* ‘a large tree which bears acorns and typically has lobed deciduous leaves (Quercus)’ (LKŽe) (cf. Vanagas 1981a: 54–55). Therefore, the potamonym may be analyzed as a transposition of the concept of the terrain overgrown with oak trees to the river flowing across it.

Several potamonyms refer to the birch forest. These include, but are not limited to the following rivers and streams: the *Béržė* (the Rudamina trib., V D), the *Béržė* (the Širvinta trib., Šr D), the *Béržė* (the Šalčia trib., Šlčn D), the *Beržuōlė* (the Strėva trib., El D), the *Beržūnà* or the *Beržuonà*<sup>32</sup> (the Šalčia trib., Šlčn D, Belarus), the *Beržėlis* (the Gauja trib., Šlčn D; REM1872 Rus. P.[ечка] Березинка). All of these potamonyms, according to Vanagas (1981b: 13–14), have a common base Lith. *berž-*, which etymologically is associated with the phitolexeme Lith. *béržas* (birch) ‘the slender hardy tree which has thin peeling bark and bears catkins (Betula)’ (LKŽe), nevertheless, their meanings are different. Cf. the following: 1) The diminutive Lith. Suf *-elis* in the name *Beržėlis* indicated the size of the stream. The *Beržėlis* is indeed a small stream of only 7 km not far away from Dieveniškės (Šlčn D). The potamonym might have been motivated by the concept of size and could have been emotionally coloured by the concept of tenderness, amiability by transferring the properties of a small, thin birch to a stream: Lith. *beržėlis* → a delicate, small birch tree → the *Beržėlis*. 2) The *Béržė* may be related to and derived from Lith. *béržė* ‘birch forest, birch

31 Lith. Suf *-uon-* as well as *-ūn-a*, according to Saulius Ambrazas (1993: 149–150; 150–152) are used to derive names for agents (action doers) that possess a certain quality.

32 The modern maps have both names: *the Beržūnà* and *the Beržuonà*. The river is named *the Beržūnà* from its source in Šalčininkai District to the border with Belarus; In Belarus, it is known as Bel. *Березина/Бярэзіна*; and a small section of it (about 1 km) from the Lithuanian-Belarusian border up to the point of its confluence with the Šalčia near Šalčininkai the river is called *the Beržuonà*. There are several rivers with similar names (*Березина/Бярэзіна*) in the territory of Belarus (Grodno and Minsk regions).

grove' (LKŽe) and thus could be motivated by the name of the place meaning the set of objects and the transposition of the concept of a birch grove into the potamonym: Lith. *béržė* → a birch forest/grove → the *Béržė*. 3) The *Beržūnà* is a Lith. Suf *-ūna* derivative (alternatively, the *Beržuonà* ← *bérž-* + Suf *-uona*). Thus, the potamonym *Beržūnà/Beržuonà* might reflect the quality characteristic of the terrain the river flows across, i.e., the terrain covered with birch grove(s). 4) The *Beržuōlė* is a Lith. Suf *-uolis*, *-ė* derivative, which indicates the external quality of the object (see Ambrazas *et al.* 1994: 117). Thus, the potamonym may indicate to the place, which is "birchen", i.e., resembling or characteristic of birch, or resembling the wood of birch trees.

The name of the *Klevà* (the Gauja trib., Šlčn D; REM1872 Rus. Клева), the greatest part of which is in present Belarus (Bel. Клява / Клева) and only a small section is in Lithuania, is derived from Lith. *klėvas* 'the tree or shrub with lobed leaves, winged fruits, and colourful autumn foliage (Acer)' (LKŽe) (Būga 1961: 527; Vanagas 1970: 59; 1981a: 159). The potamonym may have been motivated by maple trees in the areas adjacent to the river by the transposition of the concept of the territory overgrown with maple trees into the river name: Lith. *klėvas* → the river in the vicinity of which there is a big concentration of maple trees → the *Klevà*.

Among oikonyms motivated by tree species, the following two names are derived by Pol. Suf *-ówka* could be mentioned: *Osinuvkà<sub>v</sub>* (Šr D, GSD1974 582 *Osinuvka<sub>v</sub>*) and *Sasnuvkà<sub>stead</sub>* (Šr D, GSD1974 582 *Sasnuvka<sub>stead</sub>*). The oikonym *Osinuvkà<sub>v</sub>* is obviously related to and is derived from Pol. *osina* 'aspen; scrub or thickets of aspen' (WSJPe) and is motivated by the settlement's location by the area overgrown with aspen. Thus, the name is the conceptualization of the settlement located by the aspen thickets: Pol. *osina* + *-ówka* (*-uvka*) → the settlement by the aspen thickets → *Osinuvkà<sub>v</sub>*. A similar conceptualization of the settlement, as a place by the thickets of a certain kind of trees, is observed in the oikonym *Sasnuvkà*, which is related to and derived from Bel. *сасна* / Pol. *sosna* 'pine', cf. Rus. *сосна* (Skarnik.by, WSJPe, SRYAe). The settlement is located by the pine forest and is a transposition of the phitolexeme into the oikonym: Bel. *сасна* / Pol. *sosna* + *-ówka* (*-uvka*) → the settlement by the pine forest → *Sasnuvkà*.

#### 4.2.2. Toponyms Motivated by Terrestrial and Aquatic Plants Species

These names present the transposition of the concept of the plant species typical to the region. This can be observed mainly among hydronyms, cf. the following:



The potamonym *Asiūklė* (Žalesėlis lake, V D) is probably derived from Lith. *asiūklis* (horsetail, snake grass, puzzle grass) ‘the spore plant of the horsetail family with small succulent leaves, rhizome (*Equisetum*)’ (LKŽe) (cf. Vanagas 1970: 62, 67; Vanagas 1981a: 49) and is motivated by the thickets of this plant in the territories adjacent to the stream it names: Lith. *asiūkl-is* + *-ė* → the river in the territories overgrown with horsetail → the *Asiūklė*.

The stream name *Krienùkė* (the Parija trib., Ukm D) is obviously related to Lith. *kriėnas* (horseradish) ‘the plant of the cruciferous family, the roots and underground part of the stem of which is thickened, fleshy (*Armoracia*)’ (LKŽe) (cf. Vanagas 1981a: 165) and most probably is motivated by the root vegetable species that may be found in the vicinity of the stream: Lith. *kriėn-as* + *-uk-ė* → a stream in the vicinity of which horseradish may be found → the *Krienùkė*.

Names of lakes *Luknà* (Trak D), *Luknėlis* (Švėn D), as well as streams the *Luknà* (the Merkys trib., Trak D), the *Luknėlė* (the Žeimena trib., Švėn D, lake Baltas)<sup>33</sup> are derived from Lith. *lùknė*, *lùgnė* (water-lily/pond lily) ‘the aquatic plant of the fescue family (*Nuphar*)’ (LKŽe) (cf. Vanagas 1981a: 197) and conceptualize the water bodies that are the habitat of the plant species that motivated their name: Lith. *lùkn-ė* + *-a/-elis/-elė* → the lake/stream in which water-lilies grow → *Luknà*, *Luknėlis*, the *Luknà*, the *Luknėlė*.

#### 4.2.3. Toponyms Motivated by Forest Type

This group includes several oikonyms motivated by the type of forest the settlements they name are located by. These oikonyms convey the settlements’ relation to other objects (place motivation or environmental motivation, i.e., they express the concept of possessivity or belonging to the place, location). A few examples in this class could be names of Slavic origin, such as the Pol. Suf *-ówka* derived oikonyms *Boruvkà*<sub>stead</sub> (Švėn D, GI1905 295 Rus. д. Боровая), which is related to Bel. бop / Pol. bór / Rus. бop ‘large, dense, old coniferous forest’ (Skarnik.by, WSJPe, SRYAe), *Dambuvkà*<sub>v</sub> (Šr D, GSD1974 579 Dambuvka<sub>v</sub>, GI1905 78 Rus. одн. Дембовка) and *Dembuvkà*<sub>v</sub> (Šr D, GSD1974, GI1905 78 Rus. з. Дембовка) that are related to Pol. *dębówka* ‘oak grove’ (WSJPe), as well as the settlement name *Gajuvkà*<sub>stead</sub> (V D, GSD1974 748 Gajuvka<sub>stead</sub>),

<sup>33</sup> The segment of the river between lake *Baltas* and lake *Luknėlis* is called the *Baltėlė*.

which is related to Bel. *zaiŭ* / Pol. *gaj* ‘small forest’ (Skarnik.by, WSJPe). The mentioned oikonyms are the conceptualization and transposition of the forest types (and the nomenclature terms) into the names of settlements located by the respective forests.

The forest types are also conceptualized in hydronyms, cf. the following lake names: *Šilinis* (Sariai eld, Švnč D; Melagėnų forest, west of Sarai) and *Pāšilinis* (Sariai eld, Švnč D; 0,42 km to the west of *Šilinis*). The limnonym *Šilinis* may be related to and derived from Lith. *šilas* ‘a coniferous wood’ (LKŽe) by means of Lith. Suf *-inis* (also, cf. Vanagas 1970: 161; 1981a: 331) (→ Lith. *šilinis*, *-ė* ‘the one in the coniferous forest’ (LKŽe)<sup>34</sup>), and, thus, the name was motivated by the water body’s location and expresses the relationship of possessivity (belonging to/located in a certain place): Lith. *šilinis* → the lake in the forest → *Šilinis*, which also may be a metonymic transposition of the nomenclature term Lith. *šilas* into the name. Due to *Pāšilinis*’ relatively close proximity to lake *Šilinis*, the limnonym may be considered a Lith. Pref *pa-* derivative from *Šilinis*. However, *Pāšilinis* may have originated from Lith. *pašilė* ‘a place by the forest’ (LKŽe) ← Lith. *šilas* (also, cf. Vanagas 1970: 164). Thus, the limnonym may reflect the conceptualization of the lake’s position either in relation to lake *Šilinis*, or the forest it is located in/close to<sup>35</sup>: 1) *pa-* + *Šilinis* → the lake near lake *Šilinis* → *Pāšilinis*; 2) Lith. *pašilinis*, *-ė* → located near the forest → *Pāšilinis*.

\*\*\*

It is noteworthy that certain plants, esp. tree species that have motivated the hydronyms and oikonyms of the Vilnius County as well as many similar names across Lithuania have had a special value in the beliefs and worldview of the ancient Balts resp. Lithuanians as well as other cultures. The birch, oak, maple, and other leafy and coniferous trees have long been considered the embodiment of vitality, growth, fertility, vegetative power, tranquility, etc.; the ancients also believed that these trees

<sup>34</sup> Lith. Suf *-inis*, *-ė* derived adjectives, among other meanings, refer to objects that exist in the place/location, indicated by the base lexeme (cf. DLKG 211).

<sup>35</sup> Vanagas (1970: 218–221) also asserts that the Lith. Pref *pa-* derivatives from other prefix derivatives are all used metaphorically, as they are derived to denote a place along/by another place. Later, the name of that place was transferred to a hydronym (or other toponym class). This applies to hydronyms (and, we believe, to other toponyms) of both clear and obscure derivation. Also, it is often difficult to decide whether the name is a primary or secondary name.

have been dwellings of many deities and the spirits of the dead (Dundulienė 2008: 55–74). All the above potamonyms are without a doubt semantically motivated by plant names and are derived from phytalexemes of Lithuanian origin. These toponyms refer not only to individual species of trees, but also to the concentration of these species in the territories adjacent to the rivers, lakes, and settlements they denote. Overall, the concept of flora served as the motivation for 58 oikonyms, 7 limnonyms, 14 potamonyms now functioning in Vilnius County with only several examples presented in this study.

### 4.3. Toponyms Reflecting Fauna

The fauna characteristic of the region, as well as of Lithuania, is reflected mostly in toponyms motivated by animal, bird, and fish species. Some of the most etymologically clear examples are presented in the sections below.

#### 4.3.1. Toponyms Motivated by Animal Species

The name of the *Elna* stream (the Neris trib., V D) is most probably derived from a Lith. zoolexeme *ėlnias* (also, *álnis*, *ėlnis*) (deer) ‘the hoofed grazing or browsing animal, with branched bony antlers that are shed annually and typically borne only by the male (Cervus)’ (LKŽe), but can as well be a derivative from the base *al-* (Lith. *alėti* ‘to flow, run’) (Vanagas 1981a: 40). The potamonym, therefore, 1) may have indicated the place where deers grazed: Lith. *ėln-ias* + *-a* → the river in the vicinity of which deers graze → the *Elna*, or 2) could have been a metaphorical name that highlighted the quick flow of the river, which could have been as fast as a deer: Lith. *ėln-ias* + *-a* → the river that flows as fast as deer → the *Elna*.

The potamonym *Kiaunà* (the Žeimena trib., Ign D, Švčn D) is highly likely derived from Lith. *kiáunė*, *kiaunė* ‘the predatory precious beast: a wood marten (*Martes martes*) and domestic marten (*Martes foina*)’ (LKŽe) (cf. Vanagas 1981a: 155). The river flows through Labanoras forests. The river is very winding; there are many fast-flowing and shallow sections. The river name may have been either 1) the conceptualization of the river flow, which could have been compared to the fast and agile forest animal – marten: Lith. *kiáun-ė* + *-a* → the river the flow of which is fast as marten’s moves → the *Kiaunà*; or 2) the conceptualization of the place (river) the vicinities of which are

rich in martens: Lith. *kiáun-ė* + *-a* → the river the vicinities of which are rich in martens → the *Kiaunà*. It is noteworthy that in the past marten fur was very valuable.

The *Lokỹs* (the Neris trib., Jon D, Ukm D) stream name is related to Lith. *lokỹs* ‘a big beast with long hair and wide paws, a bear (*Ursus*)’ (LKŽe) (cf. Vanagas 1981a: 195). Most of the river’s course lies in Kaušankos and Bareišių forests. Most probably the potamonym is the conceptualization of the place, where bears could be encountered with: Lith. *lokỹs* → the river in the vicinity of which bears dwell → the *Lokỹs*.

The *Turė* (the Verseka trib., Šlčn D; REM1872 P.[ечка] Турейка) and the *Taurijà* (the Vilnia trib., V D; REM1872 Rus. P. Таурия) may be related to Lith. *taũras* (Lith. *tũras*, *turas* ← Pol. *tur*) ‘an extinct species of the wild large cattle (*Bos primigenius*)’ (LKŽe). Although, according to Vanagas (1981a: 342, 350), the origins of the last two potamonyms are not very clear, one may assume that these names are related to Lith. *taũras* (*tũras*, *turas*), which in ancient times could have lived by these rivers. These two potamonyms could have been the characteristics of the strong currents of the respective rivers: Lith. *taũras* (*tũras*, *turas*) → wild, strong, powerful → the *Turė* / the *Taurijà*. The mentioned potamonyms the *Turė*/the *Taurijà* and many similar potamonyms may have perpetuated the animal that, on the other hand, may have had a deeper, symbolic meaning. According to Rimantas Balsys (2016), many peoples, including Indo-European nations, considered the bull, ox, or bison the zoomorphic representation of the deity of the harvest that was associated with the Sun, the Sky, thunderstorm, and rain. The oxen (horned) deities were also known to Lithuanians and Prussians by various names. It is also not a coincidence that the bull, bison, or ox is depicted in the coats of arms of Lithuanian nobility, in the seals and coats of arms of Lithuanian cities, as the bison (Lith. *taũras*) symbolizes nobility, strength, the care of the weak, while the bull (ox) is the symbol of diligence, patience, agriculture, and wisdom. These symbolic meanings correlate with still popular, persistent beliefs about the links of these animals to nobility, militancy, and fertility (Balsys 2016: 5–12).

#### 4.3.2. Toponyms Motivated by Bird Species

Such toponyms may be still found in the territories of Vilnius County and across Lithuania. To mention just a few names, cf. the following:

The *Geřvinė* (the Žižma trib., Šlčn D, Belarus: Bel. Гервиня) ← Lith. *gėrvė*, *gėrvė* ‘a large, long-beaked and long-legged swamp bird (*Grus Grus*)’ (LKŽe) (cf. Vanagas

1981a: 114), or from Lith. *geřvinas* ‘crane male’ (LKŽe) and may be a Lith. Suf *-inē*<sup>36</sup>. Due to the polysemy of its base, the potamonym, on the one hand, may be interpreted as a ‘place where the crane lives’ or a ‘place where the cranes nest’ by the transposition of the crane habitat concept: Lith. *gėrvė* → a nesting place/habitat of cranes → the *Geřvinė*. On the other hand, the potamonym may be related to Lith. *gervinė* ‘raspberry, blackberry (*Rubus caesius*)’ (LKŽe), and, therefore, the river name could be motivated by the name of the plant and mark the areas overgrown with blackberry bushes: Lith. *gervinė* → an area overgrown with blackberry bushes → the *Geřvinė*.

Another example could be the lake names *Gaigālis* and *Gaigaliùkas* (Pabradė eld, V D). *Gaigālis* is most probably Lith. inflection *-is*, used to derive nouns denoting bearer of a quality or an attribute of a subject (cf. DLKG 113ff.), derivative from and may be related to Lith. *gaĩgalas* ‘drake; male of all the duck (*Anatidae*) family birds’ (LKŽe) (cf. Vanagas 1981a: 103, LVŽ III 17–18), and semantically belongs to the group of hydronyms that convey the meaning of fauna, i.e., names derived from fauna related words (Vanagas 1981b: 76ff.). The name was possibly motivated by various species of birds from the *Anatidae* family, esp. a big number of male ducks. The limnonym may be considered a metaphoric transposition of a male-bird concept, or rather the lake that is habitat to many (male)-ducks: Lith. *gaĩgal-* + *-is* → a male-duck/the lake that is home for ducks → *Gaigālis*. The lymnonym *Gaigaliùkas* is the Lith. DIM Suf *-iukas* derivative from the name *Gaigālis* and probably shares the same etymology and motivation. The suffix is motivated by the actual size of the lake, which is approx. five times smaller than *Gaigālis*. Due to both lakes located close to each other, *Gaigaliùkas* may be considered the metonymic transposition of the name *Gaigālis*: *Gaigaliùkas* ← *Gaigal-* + *-iukas* ← a smaller lake close to lake *Gaigālis*.

#### 4.3.3. Toponyms Motivated by Fish Species

Toponyms of this semantic category are relatively infrequent in the territory of present-day Vilnius County. The most vivid example in this semantic category of names, in our opinion, are limnonyms *Krākinis* (Pabradė eld, Švčn D; REM1872 Rus. Оз. Кракини) and *Krakinùkas* (Pabradė eld, Švčn D; REM1872 Rus. Оз. Малини).

<sup>36</sup> The suffix is used in Lithuanian to derive words indicating the place (Ambrazas 1993: 63, 231).

*Krākinis* is most probably related to Lith. *krākė* ‘crucian (Carassius carassius)’ (LKŽe) (cf. Vanagas 1981a: 163). The limnonym is derived by means of Lith. Suf *-inis* that is used to derive distinctive adjectives, the meaning of which among others is “the one having a distinctive feature consisting of an object indicated by a reference word” (DLKG 212). It may be claimed that the name is motivated by the zoolexeme and belongs to the group of hydronyms relating to fauna (cf. Vanagas 1981b: 79). Therefore, it may be claimed that the limnonym is the conceptualization of a place (lake) in which the dominant species of fish is Carassius Carassius: Lith. *krāk-ė* + *-inis* → the lake in which one may catch crucians → *Krākinis*. *Krakinukas* is obviously the result of renaming (cf. the historical form<sup>37</sup>) regarding the lake’s size, which is indicated by Lith. Suf *-(i)ukas*, used to form the DIM names of babies, cubs, and fledglings (such derivatives can be considered as having the meaning of origin and belonging) (DLKG 90). The current name is derived from *Krākinis* and is of the same etymology and motivation as the superior limnonym’s name. Additionally, the DIM form is motivated by the size of the lake, as compared to that of lake *Krākinis*. The limnonym may be considered the conceptualization of a place (lake) in which the dominant species of fish is Carassius Carassius: Lith. *Krakin-* + *-ukas* → a small lake in which one may catch crucians → *Krakinukas*, but is also a metonymic transposition of the superior lake’s name: *Krakinukas* ← a small lake in the vicinity of lake *Krākinis*.

\*\*\*

All of the above potamonims and limnonims are motivated by the transposition of the relevant animal, bird, and fish species names into the name of the water body. Thus, it could be assumed, among other things, that these names could have served as indicators of the locations where certain animal species could be found in abundance, i.e., served the “addresses” of the species’ habitats. Animal species motivated toponyms may be considered the conceptualization of fauna typical of the region. Toponyms motivated by the concept of fauna include a total of 16 potamonims and 45 limnonims of clear etymology.

---

<sup>37</sup> The historical form is of unclear origins.

#### 4.4. Toponyms Reflecting

##### Cultural Realia

Vilnius County hydronyms build a bridge between Lithuania's past and present, communicating information about the beliefs and creed of the ancient Balts and modern Lithuanians. This is obvious in the potamonym the *Báltupis* (also known as the *Cēdronas/Kēdronas* (the Neris trib., V C). One of the stops on the Calvary Cross Road is on the bridge over the stream. The part of the *Báltupis* that flows through Vilnius Calvary is considered sacred. Downstream, before the confluence with the Neris, the stream flows to the East, where its water is given extraordinary properties. The quality of “flowing due east”, or “flowing against the Sun” is a characteristic feature of the sacred springs and streams of the ancient Balts (Vaitkevičius 2012). The second name of the stream is related to the Cedron river in Jerusalem, Israel (the Kidron ← Heb. *Naḥal Qidron*, literally the *Qidron River*). This is a good example of how the names that had a special meaning to people in the past obtain possibly new meanings relevant to the present. It has to be noted that *Báltupis* is a compound potamonym derived from the combination of Lith. *báltas* ‘white’ (LKŽe) + Lith. *upis* ‘a river’ (LKŽe) (cf. Vanagas 1981a: 56; LVŽ I 339–340). This is one of the many hydronyms across Lithuania that is motivated by colour. According to Vanagas (1988: 56), the meaning of the colour of water is characteristic of most Indo-European hydronyms.

The name of the *Koplyčianka* (the Neris trib., V D) stream reflects the symbols of Christianity. The potamonym is a Slav. resp. Pol./Rus. Suf *-(i)ank-a* (*-янк-(a)/-анк-(a)*)<sup>38</sup> derivative from Lith. *koplyčia* (← Pol. *kaplica*) ‘a chapel; a small church; a separate part of a large church or other building where services may be held’ (LKŽe). Thus, the potamonym is motivated by and refers to the place (object) next to the stream it names and expresses the relationship of belonging of the river to the mentioned object (Lith. *koplyčia*). There is little possibility that this potamonym conveys any sacred meaning besides the reference to the symbols of Christianity, i.e., a chapel/small church.

However, there are obviously much older names that have an embedded concept of sacredness, cf.: the lake name *Šveñtas* and/or stream name *Šventė*, which Vanagas

---

<sup>38</sup> This suffix is used to derive feminine nouns with the meaning of an object or action that is characterized by a relationship to what is called by the words from which the corresponding nouns are derived (Slovar.cc).

(1996: 244–246) claims to be currently non-existent<sup>39</sup>. The limnonym *Šveñtas* is related to Lith. *šveñtas* ‘arising from God, divine; the one in the grace of God, consecrated, sanctified’ (LKŽe) (cf. Vanagas 1981a: 337) and may be attributed to the group of hydronyms of demonological meaning, i.e., names of water bodies that are associated with superstitions and beliefs (cf. Vanagas 1981b: 110–111). Therefore, the limnonym could have been motivated by the concept of holiness, sanctity: Lith. *šveñtas* → the sacred lake → *Šveñtas*. The potamonym *Šventė* is Lith. inflection *-ė* derivative from Lith. *šveñtas*, *šventà* (cf. Vanagas 1981a: 337) and may be attributed to the group of hydronyms of demonological meaning, i.e., names of water bodies that are associated with superstitions and beliefs (cf. Vanagas 1981b: 110–111). In ancient times, the stream most probably was considered sacred, untouchable, posing no threat to humans; rituals of faith may have been performed in its vicinity. Therefore, the potamonym could have been motivated by the concept of holiness, sanctity: Lith. *šveñt-as*, *švent-à* + *-ė* → the sacred stream → *Šventė*. The similar meaning is conveyed by the first component of the compound potamonym *Šventelė-Dėmė* that names the stream flowing through lake *Šveñtas*. The component *Šventelė* is Lith. DIM Suf *-elė* from Lith. *šveñtas*, *šventà*, cf. limnonym *Šveñtas*, the second component *Dėmė* is related to Lith. *dėmė* ‘dirty, soiled place; sin, flaw; a place that stands out from the environment in its color’ (LKŽe), cf. Vanagas (1981a: 84). The potamonym may be considered the antonym itself, as its two components demonstrate the antonymic semantic relation between sacredness and sinfulness, purity and dirtiness. The name may also indicate the environment in which the stream flows, or the quality of the stream’s bottom, which in some places may be considered clean, in others – dirty, muddy.

The meaning of sacredness may also be read in the limnonym opposition *Šveñčius* (El; REM1872 Rus. Оз.[еро] Свещце) × *Švenčiùkas* (El). Just as the names mentioned above, *Šveñčius* is Lith. inflection *-(i)us*, used to form names of nominal property holders (DLKG 124), derivative from Lith. *šveñtas* ‘arising from God, divine;

---

39 Currently, there exist two lakes *Šveñtas* and two streams with the root *Švent-* at approx. the same distance from *Švenčionys town*: lake *Šveñtas* (6 km north of *Švenčionėliai town*) and *the Šventelė-Dėmė stream* (the *Žeimena trib.*), which drains its waters into the *Žeimena* 4 km north of *Švenčionėliai* (both the lake and the stream are approx. 11,3 km northwest of *Švenčionys*); one more lake *Šveñtas* and *the Šventė stream* (the *Juodynė trib.*) are approx. 11,5 km northeast of *Švenčionys*.



the one in the grace of God, consecrated, sanctified' (LKŽe) and may be attributed to the group of hydronyms of demonological meaning, i.e., names of water bodies that are associated with superstitions and beliefs (cf. Vanagas 1981b: 110–111). In ancient times, the lake most probably was considered sacred, untouchable, posing no threat to humans; rituals of faith may have been performed in its vicinity. Therefore, the limnonym could have been motivated by the concept of holiness, sanctity: Lith. *šveñt-as* [*t > č*] + *-ius* → the sacred lake → *Šveñčius*. *Švenčiukas* is Lith. DIM Suf *-(i)ukas* derivative from limnonym *Šveñčius* and may be considered either 1) the transposition of the concept of sacredness into the limnonym, coupled with the meaning of smallness: Lith. *šveñt-as* [*t > č*] + *-(i)ukas* → the small sacred lake → *Švenčiukas*, or 2) the metonymic transposition of the limnonym *Šveñčius*, and be considered the name formed on the principle of analogy, i.e., highlighting the same distinguishing feature, but also coupled with the meaning of smallness: *Švenčiukas* ← *Švenč-* + *-(i)ukas* ← the small sacred lake in the vicinity of lake *Šveñčius*.

An interesting example in the class of potamonyms that partly reflects Baltic mythology is the stream name *Kaukysa* (the Vilnia trib., V C). This potamonym, which has been mentioned in the 18<sup>th</sup> c. sources as *Kaykuca* (also, *Koykuuca*), is most probably derived from a Lith. root/stem *kauk-* and is related to Lith. *kaūkas* (Razauskas 2016: 8), i.e., 'a wealth-bearing spirit of the house' (LKŽe). Due to the polysemy of the base lexeme, the potamonym may also be related to Lith. *kaūkti* 'to howl; to produce a howling sound, to growl, to crackle' (LKŽe). The name may be motivated by the sound produced by the water, esp. when the stream floods in spring or autumn (our observations). Thus, additionally to the metaphoricity of the name (the transposition of the spirit into the stream), the meaning of the potamonym can be explained by the transposition of the concept of the sound: Lith. *kaūkti* → to produce a howling sound, to growl, to crackle → the *Kaukysa*.

\*\*\*

Toponyms presented in this category as well as similar place names across Lithuania are only a few of the names in the class of hydronyms that may have had symbolic meanings that reflect people's beliefs, whether past or present. Such toponyms may have marked places of worship or referred to the beings of the spiritual world. Some of them name geographical objects that are believed to have healing

powers, e.g., *Cēdronas/Kēdronas*. The meanings the names of this category had in the worldview of the ancient people are rather clear. This category is limited. It contains only 5 potamonyms and 11 limnonyms of more or less clear etymology in the overall corpus of 362 river names and 718 lake names.

#### 4.5. Toponyms Reflecting Nation's Historical Facts and Circumstances

Several toponyms communicate the historical development of Vilnius County (and Lithuania in general) through the perspective of the prevailing Lithuanian language – the official state language and the language of ethnographical regions of Lithuania. In some cases, the historical-cultural development of the state is also conveyed by toponyms of non-Lithuanian resp. Slavonic origin, but these names make only a small part (less than 3 percent) of the entire corpus of the currently functioning Vilnius County oikonyms and hydronyms.

##### 4.5.1. Toponyms Motivated by Settlement Types

This group contains mainly names from the class of oikonyms that have developed primarily from the nomenclature terms. The current forms of these oikonyms may be considered the perpetuation of a type of settlement, cf.: *Slabadà* (V D; GI1905 63 Rus. ф. Слободка, REM1872 Rus. ф. Слобода) and *Slabadkà* (V D; REM1872 Rus. ф. Слободка) – two villages approximately 10 km away from each other, as well as ten more villages derived from the same base in the present-day Vilnius County: *Slabadà* (V D; REM1872 Слободка); *Slabadà* (V D); *Slabadà* (Šlčn D); *Slabadiškė* (Švnč D; REM1872 Слободзишки); *Slabadà* (Švnč D); *Slabadà* (Trak D) REM1872 Слобода); *Slabadà* (Ukm D); *Slabadà* (Ukm D; REM1872 Слободка); *Slabadà* (Ukm D; REM1872 Слобода); *Slabadà* (Ukm D; REM1872 Слободка), as well as many more in various corners of Lithuania. These oikonyms are probably related to and derived from Bel. *слабада́*, Rus. *слобода́*, or Ukr. *слобода́*, i.e., ‘a large village with a free population (until the abolition of serfdom in Russia)’ or ‘a village near the city, a suburb (outdated)’ (SRY 649). In the history of Russia, Belarus, and Ukraine the word *слобода́* was used to refer to a type of settlement or part of town the people of which had freedom from local feudal lords and served the state as peasants, artisans,

or merchants (Chaikina, Monzikova, Varnikova 2004: 8). Until the 19<sup>th</sup> c., settlements inhabited by non-serf peasants and representatives of other classes<sup>40</sup> were called Rus. *свобода* ‘freedom’. After the abolition of serfdom, all the peasants became non-serfs, whereas the names of the settlements were changed to Rus. *слобода́* (the stress shifted from the second to the third syllable) (cf. Rut 2007). Therefore, the oikonyms *Slabadà*, *Slabadkà* (and other related place names) are motivated by the metaphoric transposition of the concept of freedom: Rus. *слобода́/свобода* ‘freedom’ → a (small) settlement with free population → *Slabadà* (*Slabadkà*).

Another example could be several settlements with the component *Būdà*, such as *Senóji Būdà* (E1; GI1905 339 Rus. д. Буда-Старая, REM1872 Rus. Буда), *Naujóji Būdà* (E1; GSD1974 654 Naujóji Būda<sub>v</sub>, GI1905 313 Rus. з. Буда-Новополь), *Būdà* (Trak D; GSD1974 648 Būda<sub>v</sub>, GI1905 339 Rus. д. Буда 2-ая, REM1872 Rus. з. Буда), *Senóji Būdà* (Trak D; GSD1974 646 Senoji Būda<sub>v</sub>, GI1905 339 Rus. д. Буда-Старая, REM1872 Rus. д. Старая Буда), *Būdà* (Trak D; GSD1974 642 Būda<sub>v</sub>, GI1905 313 Rus. ф. Буда, REM1872 Rus. д. Буда), *Semeliškių Būdà* (Trak D; GSD1974 658 Semeliškių Būda<sub>v</sub>, GI1905 337 Rus. д. Буда-Сумелишская (2 villages), REM1872 Rus. д. Буда Сумилишки), *Būdà I* (Trak D; GSD1974 646 Būda I<sub>v</sub>, GI1905 339 Rus. д. Буда 1-ая, REM1872 Rus. з. Буда), *Būdà III* (Trak D; GSD1974 646 Būda III<sub>v</sub>, GI1905 339 Rus. д. Буда 3-ая, REM1872 Rus. з. Буда). The lexeme *Būdà* in all the mentioned oikonyms, as well as oikonyms *Būdà* (Šr D), *Būdà* (E1), *Būdà* (Trak D), and many others across Lithuania, is most probably related to Lith. *būdà*, *būdė* ‘tent, shelter (guard’s, shepherd’s, etc.) cottage’ (LKŽe) (cf. LVŽ I 589–590) ← Bel. *буда*, Pol. *buda* ‘a simple structure made of perishable materials, used as a makeshift shelter for people’ (Skarnik.by, PWN, WSJPe). Oikonyms with component *Būdà* are historically (culturally) and economically motivated, as in the past (in Poland and neighbouring countries) this was a nomenclature term that referred to temporary settlements and accommodations in forests or deforested areas, but initially referred to temporary accommodation of settlers in the forest, who were engaged in hunting, beekeeping, etc., and later engaged in agriculture, the temporary accommodations were eventually replaced by permanent dwellings (cf. SGKP I 439). Thus, the oikonym *Būdà* is a

<sup>40</sup> The inhabitants of *слобода́* were called Rus. *слобожа́не* (pl from Rus. *слобожа́нин/слобожа́нка* ‘a m/f dweller of *слобода́*’ (SRY 649).

metonymic transposition of a nomenclature term: *Būdà* ← the settlement (dwelling) in the forest or deforested area ← Lith. *būdà* (Bel. *буда*, Pol. *buda*).

#### 4.5.2. Toponyms Motivated by the Recency of Settlements

This category contains several examples from the oikonymy of Vilnius County. For instance, there is a number of oikonyms referring to the settlements in the newly allocated lands, cf.: *Naujālaukis (I)* (El; GSD1974 558 Naujalaukis I<sub>v</sub>, GI1905 322 Rus. ф. Новополь, REM1872 Rus. Новополе), *Naujālaukis II* (Trak D; GI1905 314 Rus. д. Новополь, REM1872 Rus. Новополе), *Naujālaukis (I)* (El; GSD1974 558 Naujalaukis II<sub>v</sub>, GI1905 322 Rus. з. Новополь, REM1872 Rus. Новополе), *Naujālaukis II* (Trak D; GI1905 314 Rus. ф. Новополь, REM1872 Rus. Новополе). *Naujālaukis* is a compound oikonym, related to Lith. *naūjas* ‘new; one that appeared recently’ (LKŽe) and *laūkas* ‘a flat, tree-free location; a field’ (LKŽe), cf. Lith. *naujālaukis* ‘newly plowed soil’ (LKŽe), and is most likely the transposition of the concept of the new location (field) to the oikonym: Lith. *naūjas laūkas* → a new settlement in/by the field → *Naujālaukis*.<sup>41</sup> This may also be a metonymic transposition of the nomenclature term into the oikonym: *Naujālaukis* ← a new, flat, tree-free location ← Lith. *naūjas laūkas*, which is also reflected in the older oikonym forms. All the above settlements are rather old and started to form in the time when Lithuania was a part of the Russian Empire. The settlement names most probably were motivated by the allocation of new land parcels to people, esp. farmers, who moved into a new location to cultivate the wildlands.

Similar concepts are reflected in oikonyms *Naujāsodis I* (Trak D; GSD1974 645 Naujasodis I<sub>v</sub>, GI1905 340 Rus. д. Новоселки-Затрочские, REM1872 Rus. д. Новоселки) and *Naujāsodis II* (Trak D; GSD1974 645 Naujasodis II<sub>v</sub>, GI1905 338 Rus. д. Новоселки-Бражольские, REM1872 Rus. з. Новоселки), *Naujāsodis* (Šlčn D; REM1872 Rus. Новоселки), *Naujāsodis* (Švčn D), *Naujāsodis* (Ukm D; REM1872 Rus. Новосады) and many more similar names across Lithuania most probably share the same etymology and are related to Lith. *naūjas* ‘new; one that appeared recently’ and *sodà* ‘undispersed village; village’, *sōdžius* ‘peasant residence, village’, cf. Lith.

<sup>41</sup> The settlements *Naujālaukis<sub>v</sub>* (El; REM1872 Rus. Новоселки), *Naujālaukis<sub>stead</sub>* (Trak D; REM1872 Rus. з. Новополе), as well as many other same names across Lithuania most probably share the same etymology and motivation.

*naujāsodis* ‘newly planted garden’ ← *naiļjas* ‘new’ and *sōdas* ‘garden’ (cf. LVGDB, Zinkevičius 2011: 130). The oikonyms, therefore, were motivated by the concept of a new settlement with gardens (a typical attribute of such settlements in the rural area) and is a metonymic transposition of a nomenclature term: *Naujāsodis* ← a new settlement in the rural location ← Lith. *naiļjas sōdžius, naujā sodà, naujāsodis*.

#### 4.5.3. Toponyms Motivated by the Purpose of the Named Object

We believe, the meaning of the names in this group (mainly from the class of oikonyms) was once related to the use of the named objects (locations) for specific purposes. The group includes: 1) oikonyms that were motivated by the economic activities carried out in or in the vicinity of the named objects and locations by the dwellers and refer to the professions and crafts, and 2) oikonyms that were motivated by industrial facilities located in or near the named objects. Cf. the following:

##### a) Oikonyms Motivated by Economic Activities

Settlement names *Kalesniņkai*<sub>v</sub> (V D; REM1872 Rus. Колесники) and *Kalesniņkai*<sub>v</sub> (Šlčn D; REM1872 Rus. Колесники) are related to and derived from Bel. *калеснік* or Pol. *koleśnik* ‘wheelwright, wheeler; craftsman making and repairing cart wheels’ (Skarnik.by, WSJPe, PWN). The oikonyms most obviously served as an indicator of settlements, where the main economic activity of the dweller(s) has been the manufacture of cart or carriage wheels. These oikonyms could be considered the transposition of the profession name: Bel. *калеснік* / Pol. *koleśnik* → a settlement of wheelers → *Kalesniņkai*.

There are dozens of settlements *Kaniūkai* (REM1872 Rus. Конюхи) in both Vilnius County and across Lithuania, which are derivatives from Rus. *конюх*, Bel. *конюх* ‘a mews, stable worker, horse breeder’ (Slovar.cc; Skarnik.by). Thus, *Kaniūkai* is motivated by the transposition of the concept of the stable workers/horse breeders’ settlement, i.e., the transposition of the profession into the settlement name: Rus. *конюх* / Bel. *конюх, канюх* → a settlement of stable workers/horse breeders → *Kaniūkai*.<sup>42</sup>

<sup>42</sup> However, the question arises as to whether this name could be derived from Slav. words of the similar lexeme, i.e., Rus. *канюк* (also, *кобчик*), Bel. *канюк* (also, *каня*), Pol. *kaniuk*

*Mėdininkai* (V D; KA1861 719 Rus. м. Мѣдники)<sup>43</sup> is the name of the historical settlement known since the 13<sup>th</sup> c. and was granted the status of the town in the 14<sup>th</sup>-17<sup>th</sup> cc. The settlement faced a decline before the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> c. (VLE XIV). The present-day village forms the opposition with *Didieji Mėdininkai* (V D; GSD1974 756 *Didieji Medininkai*<sub>v</sub>, GI1905 82 Rus. им. Мѣдники Комаровские, REM1872 Rus. Госп. д. Мѣдники). Both oikonyms are *pl* derivatives from Lith. *mėdininkas* (the dialectal *mėdinykas*) ‘a forest dweller, forester’ (LKŽe), as, according to Zinkevičius (2007: 43), the obsolescent word Lith. *mėdis* (*mėdžias*) was used to refer not to a single tree, but rather to a forest. As Lithuania has always been a forested land, there have been plenty of inhabitants related to forests. Therefore, the motivation of the oikonyms *Mėdininkai* and *Didieji Mėdininkai* may be interpreted as the transposition of the concept of a forest dweller or forester (Lith. *miško sargas, eigulyš*) into a settlement as if perpetuating crafts and professions in its name: Lith. *mėdininkas / mėdinykas* → a forest dweller, forester → (*Didieji*) *Mėdininkai*.

Several settlement names could have been emotionally coloured at the time they originated. These are three homogeneous oikonyms *Šafárnė*<sub>stead</sub> (Šr D, GSD1974 586 *Šafárnė*<sub>stead</sub>, GI1905 81 Rus. з. Шафарня), *Šafárnė*<sub>v</sub> (Šr D, GSD1974 582 *Šafárnė*<sub>stead</sub>), *Šafárnė*<sub>v</sub> (Trak D, GSD1974 640 *Šafárnė*<sub>v</sub>, GI1905 315 Rus. з. Шафарня), which are related to and derived from Bel. (derogatory) *шафарня* ‘drivers’ (Skarnik.by). The motivation of these oikonyms is not very clear, but it may be assumed that the settlements they name were home to representatives of the driver’s profession. Thus, these oikonyms may also be considered the transposition of the professional term: Bel. (derogatory) *шафарня* → a settlement established by a person who worked as a driver → *Šafárnė*.

---

‘the common buzzard (*Buteo buteo*)’ (Slovar.cc, Skarnik.by, PSPR 179), thus relating the oikonym to the settlement of people, who either tamed these birds of prey, or used them in hunting.

43 Cf.: the dial. *Miedniki, Медники, Мėдныкаі*. Although *Mėdininkai*<sub>v</sub> historically was a bigger settlement, the status of which could be equalled to that of a small town, the present-day *Didieji Mėdininkai*<sub>v</sub> historically was bigger in terms of lands that belonged to it, to be more precise, at the end of 19<sup>th</sup> – the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> cc., the owner of the lands \*Komarovsky (Rus. \*Комаровски or \*Комаровский) owned 5 separate land parcels of various size with country seats (Lith. *dvaras, sodyba*) in the vicinity of the present-day *Didieji Mėdininkai* (cf. GI1905 82).

### b) Oikonyms Motivated by Industrial Facilities

*Tartōkas* (Šlčn D; GI1905 76 Rus. выс. Тартакъ (или Зарѣчье)) and *Šalčininkėlių Tartōkas* (Šlčn D; GI1905 76 Rus. вод. мел. Тартакъ, REM1872 Rus. Пильн.[я] [a sawmill]) may be derived from Lith. *tartōkas* ‘a lumbermill, sawmill’ (LKŽe), which is a Polonism, cf. Pol. *tartak* ‘a lumbermill, sawmill’, i.e., a facility where logs are cut into lumber, or ‘a mill’ (→ Bel. *маpmák* ‘a lumbermill, (saw)mill’, Rus. (dial.) *маpmák* ‘a lumbermill, (saw)mill’) (LKPŽ 647). According to the locals, there was a sawmill in *Tartōkas* village until the middle of the 20th century, while in *Šalčininkėlių Tartōkas* there was a mill by the Visinčią river. *Tartōkas* is motivated by the transposition of the concept of the sawmill into the oikonym: *tartōkas* → a settlement with the (saw)mill/lumbermill → *Tartōkas*. The composite oikonym *Šalčininkėlių Tartōkas* is motivated by the same concept of the sawmill but additionally is modified by the attribute *Šalčininkėlių* (genitive case ← *Šalčininkėliai*), which also expresses the relationships of possessivity and origins: *Šalčininkėlių Tartōkas* ← the settlement with a (saw)mill/lumbermill in the vicinity of *Šalčininkėliai* village.

A number of settlements scattered in various corners of Švenčionys and Širvintos districts obviously got their names from the nomenclature term for the industrial facility the main activity of which was the production of bricks and related building materials, cf. the following names: *Cegėlnė*<sub>v</sub> (Pabradė eld., Švčn; D GSD1974 598 *Cegelnė*<sub>v</sub>, GI1905 263 Rus. з. Цегельня), *Cegėlnia*<sub>stead</sub> (Sariai eld., Švčn D; GSD1974 605 *Cegelnia*<sub>stead</sub>, GI1905 263 Rus. з. Цегельня, REM1872 Rus. Кирп.[ичный завод]), *Cegėlnė*<sub>stead</sub> (Alionys eld., Šr D; GSD1974 581 *Cegelnė*<sub>stead</sub>, GI1905 63 Rus. з. Цегельня, REM1872 Rus. Кирп.[ичный завод]), *Cegėlnė*<sub>v</sub> (Gelvonai eld., Šr D; GSD1974 579 *Cegelnė*<sub>v</sub>, KGS1903 168 Rus. д. Цегельня, REM1872 Rus. Кирп.[ичный завод]), *Cegėlnė*<sub>stead</sub> (Širvintos eld., Šr D; GSD1974 584 *Cegelnė*<sub>stead</sub>, GI1905 81 Rus. Эсишки-Цегельня, з., REM1872 Rus. Кирп.[ичный завод]). These names are obviously related to and derived from Lith. Polonism *cegėlnė* ‘brick factory’ (LKŽe), but could also originate from one of two languages of the national minorities, cf. Bel. *цагельня*, Pol. *cegielnia* ‘factory of bricks and other clay building materials’ (Skarnik.by, WSJPe, PWN). The mentioned settlements developed in the vicinity of the brick factories, as can be seen from the information presented in REM1872, in which several of these settlements were marked as Rus. Кирп.[ичный завод], i.e., ‘brick factory’. Hence, the motivation of the oikonyms is under discussion. All of them are the transposition of

the nomenclature term into the oikonym: Lith. *cegel̃nė* / Bel. *цагельня*, Pol. *cegielnia* → a settlement in the vicinity of a brick factory → *Cegėlnė* / *Cegėlnia*.

A similar motivation is characteristic of the oikonyms *Papiernià*<sub>v</sub> (Šr D, GSD1974 582 *Papiernià*<sub>v</sub>, GI1905 22 Rus. д. Паперня, REM1872 Rus. Попирня, зав.[од]) and *Smoliárnė*<sub>stead</sub> (V D, GSD1974 746 *Smoliárnė*<sub>stead</sub>). The oikonym *Papiernià* is obviously of Slavic origin and is related to and derived from Bel. *паперня* or Pol. *papiernia* ‘paper factory’ (Skarnik.by, WSJPe, PWN) and is a metonymic transposition of the nomenclature term for the facility producing paper. This is also obvious from the historical map, in which next to the inscription of the settlement name there is a marking REM1872 Rus. зав.[од] ‘factory’. It may be suggested that in the vicinity of this village, there was a paper factory. Thus, the oikonym is the conceptualization of the factory producing paper: Bel. *паперня* / Pol. *papiernia* → a settlement in the vicinity of a paper factory → *Papiernià*. The same motivation and conceptualization may be read in the oikonym *Smoliárnė*, which is the derivative from Rus. *смолярня* / Pol. *smolarnia* / Bel. *смалярня* ‘tar factory’ (SRYAe, WSJPe, Skarnik.by): Rus. *смолярня* / Pol. *smolarnia* / Bel. *смалярня* → a settlement in the vicinity of tar producing facility → *Smoliárnė*.

\*\*\*

It may be claimed that toponyms, which reflect the historical facts and circumstances, i.e., the historical development of Lithuania, are historically and economically coloured, as they perpetuate not only types and recency of the named settlements, but also convey certain information about the economic activities carried out by the local population as well as the professions and crafts that had been (and most probably still are) relevant in Lithuanian lands. Such toponyms are observed mainly in the class of oikonyms and include 42 settlement names in the corpus of 3900 oikonyms.

#### 4.6. Toponyms Reflecting People

Based on the ideas about culture, language, and identity presented in Chapters 1 and 2, it may be claimed that the greatest assets of any nation are people. It is people, who classify and categorize the surrounding world. It is them, who are carriers of physical attributes, customs, beliefs, and language. It is people who both individually



and collectively add to that cumulative deposit of both tangible and intangible worlds that culture is. And it is them who create and bear the cultural resp. national identity.

The biggest part of the analyzed Vilnius County toponyms are names reflecting people. These are mainly oikonyms of anthroponymic origin and are motivated by the relationship with the person, i.e., express the concept of possessivity and belonging to the person.

The oikonym *Daučiónys*<sub>v</sub> (V D, GSD1974 741 *Daučionys*<sub>v</sub>, GI1905 50 Rus. д. Довцяны, REM1872 Rus. Довцяны) most probably originated and is *pl* Lith. Suf *-onys* derivative from PN *\*Daučiónis*, related to Lith. anthroponyms *Daučiónas*, *Daučỹs* (cf. LVŽ II 150). Therefore, it may be claimed that the oikonym is a metonymic transposition of PN *\*Daučiónis*: *Daučiónys* ← *Dauč-iónis* + *-onys* ← the settlement established by/belonging to *Daučiónis*/the *Daučiónys* family. The related oikonym *Daučioniùkai*<sub>v</sub> (V D; GSD1974 741 *Daučioniukai*<sub>v</sub>, GI1905 50 Rus. з. Довцянки, REM1872 Rus. з. Довцянки) is Lith. DIM Suf *-iukai* derivative from the oikonym *Daučiónys*, judging from both settlements' close proximity (also cf. LVŽ II 150, Razmukaitė 1998: 40). The settlement with the DIM name was most probably established by people who have separated/moved from *Daučiónys* village. From the historical types of both settlements, it is obvious that DIM Suf in *Daučioniùkai* is motivated by the settlement's size (based on the comparison of land plots belonging to both settlements by the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> c. (cf. GI1905 50)). Therefore, the oikonym may be considered a metonymic transposition of the bigger settlement's name with the concept of size coded in the DIM form of the neighbouring settlement: *Daučioniùkai* ← *Dauč-iónis* + *-iukai* ← a small(er) settlement in the vicinity of village *Daučiónys* (most probably established by people, who moved from the former).

The oikonyms *Kochanovkà I*<sub>v</sub> (Švčn D; GSD1974 609 *Kochanovka I*<sub>v</sub>, GI1905 300 Rus. з. Кохановка I, REM1872 Rus. ф. Кохановка), *Kochanovkà II*<sub>v</sub> (Švčn D; GSD1974 609 *Kochanovka II*<sub>v</sub>, GI1905 300 Rus. з. Кохановка II, REM1872 Rus. ф. Кохановка), *Kochanovkà III*<sub>v</sub> (Švčn D; GSD1974 609 *Kochanovka III*<sub>v</sub>, GI1905 300 Rus. з. Кохановка III, REM1872 Rus. ф. Кохановка), its form from the living language *Kachanaukà*, is of the anthroponymic origin and is Slav. origin Suf *-auka* derivative from Rus. PN *Кахан*, *Кахана* (cf. LVGDB). To be more precise, the oikonym is Pol. Suf *-ówka* or Rus. Suf *-овка* derivative and is related to either Pol. *Kochan* (old PN, surname) / *Kochanowski* (Rymut 1999: 420) or Bel. / Rus. PN *Кохан* (Biryla

1969: 216) ← analogical nickname *Kochan* (*Кохан*) ← Pol. *kochany*, Bel. *каханы*, Ukr. *коханій* ‘darling, beloved, sweet’ (cf. PWN, WSJPe, Skarnik.by, SUM). Therefore, the oikonym could be motivated by and is a metonymic transposition of the PN, based on the concept of ownership/possessivity: *Kochanovkà* ← *Кахан*, *Кахан-а*, *Kochan* + *-ówka* or *-овка* ← the settlement belonging to/established by *Кахан*, *Kochan*. The DMs *I*, *II*, *III* carry out no semantic load and perform only the differentiating function. However, it may be suggested that they could mark the chronology of settlements’ development (establishment).

The oikonym *Noškúnai<sub>v</sub>* (El D; GSD1974 658 *Noškúnai<sub>v</sub>*, REM1872 Rus. д. Нашкуны) is most probably Lith. Suf *-ūnai* derivative from Lith. anthroponym *\*Noškus*, cf. Lith. *Nōskus*, *Noskas*, probably with a consonant change [s → š], related to Pol. *Nosko*, *Nosek*, also Lith. PN *Naskáuskas* (PDB, Zinkevičius 2008: 315). On the other hand, the oikonym may be of Slav. origin and may be related to Bel. surname *\*Нашко*, cf. *Нашко*, *Нашкёвіч* (Biryla 1969: 298), with a possible vowel change [Slav. *a* → Lith. *o*], cf. the older forms: GI1905 338 Rus. д. Нашкуны, REM1872 Rus. д. Нашкуны, SGKP VI 930 *Naszkuny*, *Naszkunele*. The oikonym most probably is motivated by the concept of possessivity and is a metonymic transposition of the PN: *Noškúnai* ← the settlement established by/belonging to *\*Noškus* (*Nōskus*, *Noskas*) / *\*Нашко* (*Нашко*). The related oikonym *Noškūnėliai<sub>v</sub>* (El D; GSD1974 658 *Noškūnėliai<sub>v</sub>*, REM1872 Rus. з. Нашкунели) is Lith. DIM Suf *-ėl-iai* derivative from the oikonym *Noškúnai*. The DIM Suf is motivated by both the type of the settlement and the area of lands that belonged to it from the historical perspective, cf.: GI1905 338 Rus. д. Нашкуны, 144 дес.[ятин, *dessiatin*], REM1872 Rus. д. Нашкуны [*Noškúnai*] vs. GI1905 338 Rus. з. Нашкунели, 22 дес., REM1872 Rus. з. Нашкунели [*Noškūnėliai*]. The DIM oikonym is motivated by the settlement’s location in relation to *Noškúnai* and the village most probably was established either by people who separated from the main settlement or by newcomers who moved into the vicinity. The oikonym may be, therefore, considered the metonymic transposition of the primary oikonym: *Noškūnėliai* ← *Noškūn-ai* + *-ėliai* ← *Noškúnai*.

\*\*\*

Most of the oikonyms belonging to this category (as well as in those in the categories presented in the above sections of Chapter 4) are autochthonous legacies, i.e.,

are of Baltic resp. Lithuanian origin with very few names created by rather big Slavic minorities of the region. Overall, 570 oikonyms of clear semantics and motivation were identified during the research in the corpus of 3900 currently functioning oikonyms in Vilnius County. It is impossible to list and analyze hundreds of such toponyms, therefore, we again limited ourselves to the presentation of several examples only. All of these oikonyms are motivated by the concept of possessivity and are metonymic transpositions of personal names of individuals or families who lived in the region and left their footprint in the history of these lands in form of settlement names they were related to.

## 5. FINAL REMARKS

There is no doubt that the proper names of any nation reflect its culture and identity. The examples of hydronyms and oikonyms presented in this study in an attempt to look at Lithuanian toponymy through the prism of national and cultural identity show that for the most part Vilnius County toponymy is the autochthonous legacy, i.e., is of the Baltic resp. Lithuanian origin. Most of them testify to the Lithuanian spirit of this region. Due to the contradictory historical processes, the onomasticon of Vilnius Region (including the current Vilnius County) also reflects an obvious influence of other languages resp. cultures (ethnicities), esp. Slavonic. This is reflected in a number of Slavic origin toponyms. The most obvious examples of such toponyms are presented in the sections of Chapter 4 along with place names that are autochthonous legacies of the historical Vilnius lands. Nevertheless, the influence of Slavic minorities on toponymy and the Lithuanian onomasticon is difficult to evaluate, as in many cases it is difficult to identify whether a toponym is of Slavic or Lithuanian origin. These place names could be derivatives from either Slavic or Lithuanian appellatives or proper names, or are the result of onymization from Slavic or Lithuanian appellatives, or could be a translated name. Given the fact that rather big Slavic ethnic groups have been living in Vilnius County, there is a possibility that such place names could be derived from languages spoken by Belarussian, Russian, and Polish ethnic minorities, who for many centuries also populated the region.

All the analyzed toponyms perpetuate both the national and cultural identity of the population, which gave the places both Lithuanian and non-Lithuanian (Slavonic) names. In a multicultural environment, the identification of a toponyms' motivation is possible only with a thorough knowledge of historical-cultural realia and aspects of language development. The historical-cultural context is also important when it comes to determining the linguistic motivation (development and patterns of word formation in a particular linguistic environment) of onyms. The influence of historical-linguistic and socio-cultural contexts, i.e., the influence of other languages (Belarussian, Polish, Russian), disturbance, and decay of natural development, forms the specifics of the onyms resp. toponyms research in Vilnius lands.

The conceptualization of ethnic (national) and esp. cultural identity is quite difficult due to the complexity of both terms. They encompass a wide variety of

additional meanings and notions that are researched by different disciplines. The concepts of ethnic and cultural identity seem to overlap, as it is impossible to define a nation (ethnos) without mentioning the cultural factors shaping its identity. After all, each group of people, who attribute themselves to a certain nation, has their own, indigenous culture. Both ethnic and cultural identities are formed by the difference from other nations and cultures based on the “we-they” opposition, which promotes a sense of belonging to one’s own nation/culture. Among the identity-forming factors are common origin, language, state, customs and traditions, material culture, cultural values, ideas about the “homeland”, true faith, etc. These factors are always related to local contexts and are defined historically.

Language is not only a means of communication but also an instrument to conceptualize the world, name objects, and phenomena, give them meaning, and associate them with the material and spiritual life of a nation through word-evoked images. The national narrative expressed in and by language occupies a special place in every culture and is related both to the nation’s territories and to its history. Toponyms (like all onyms) are an integral part of any language. This means that they are an integral part of national and cultural identity, as they perform not only the referential function but also convey the cognitive, emotional, cultural, and social dimension of the place they name. They reflect both personal and collective identity. The analysis of the toponym motivating concepts helps to reveal both the geographical peculiarities and historical-cultural realia of a certain region. Therefore, toponyms have not only cultural value but are an important linguistic identity-forming factor.

The importance of language as a factor forming the ethnic and cultural narrative is revealed through the analysis of the present-day Vilnius County toponyms. The research based on both the traditional and modern (Cognitive) Onomastics theories and methods reveals the complexity of the semantic substrate in the toponymy of the region, which is affected by language interactions resp. contacts due to the cultural periphery and long-term multilingualism of the population. Ethnicity-related subjects are clearly expressed in the oldest proper names – hydronyms, which convey information about the natural and topographic relief features, flora, and fauna of this land. The features of cultural identity are reflected in both oikonyms and hydronyms, which unite Lithuania’s past and present, reveal certain aspects of the faith of the

ancient Balts and modern Lithuania, the historical development of the country, and perpetuate crafts and professions, people, etc.

In addition, the analysis of the selected toponyms demonstrates the influence of Slavonic languages on the Lithuanian onomasticon, as toponyms of Slavic origin (although a very small number) are also rather deeply rooted in Lithuanian toponymy and are functioning in the Vilnius County at the official level. Therefore, we are convinced that the analysis of toponyms or other names that have emerged in historically and culturally peripheral-problematic areas is likely to open up the possibility of a different approach to ethnicity, nationality, and cultural self-understanding.

It is obvious that the selected toponyms of the present-day Vilnius County not only perform a referential function. Through their semantics and meanings encoded in them, toponyms convey the cognitive, emotional, cultural, and social dimensions of the places they denominate, i.e., they convey a wealth of information about the nature, history, culture, and people of a given area.

## CONCLUSIONS

1. The concepts of ethnic (national) and esp. cultural identity are very complex, as they encompass a wide variety of additional meanings and notions. It is impossible to define a nation (ethnos) without mentioning the cultural factors shaping ethnic identity. Both ethnic and cultural identity is formed by the difference from other nations and is both shaped based on the local contexts and historically defined identity-forming factors, such as common origin, language, state, customs and traditions, material culture, cultural values, ideas about the “homeland”, true faith, etc.
2. Language, which is a means of communication, is also the instrument of world conceptualization through the naming of objects and phenomena and giving them meaning by associating them with the material and spiritual life of a nation through word-evoked images. The national narrative expressed in and by language occupies a special place in every culture and is related both to the nation’s territories and to its history. Like any other onym, a toponym is an integral part of any language and through language place names become an integral part of national and cultural identity. They perform the referential function and convey the cognitive, emotional, cultural, and social dimension of the place, reflecting reflect both personal and collective identity. The analysis of the toponym motivating concepts helps to reveal both the geographical peculiarities and historical-cultural realia of a region and serves as an important linguistic identity-forming factor.
3. The research based on both the traditional and modern (Cognitive) Onomastics theories and methods reveals the complexity of the semantic substrate of the present-day Vilnius County officially functioning toponyms. The features of ethnic and cultural identity are expressed in several toponyms resp. hydronyms and oikonyms of more or less clear etymology, semantics, and motivation. The analysis has also shown that the toponymy of the region is affected by language contacts due to the cultural periphery and the long-term multilingualism of the population.
4. The features of ethnic resp. national and cultural identity is reflected by the following semantic categories of both oikonyms and hydronyms:
  - 1) toponyms reflecting topographical relief features, i.e., hydronyms and oikonyms that conceptualize the region’s terrain, include a relatively small number of

## CONCLUSIONS

- hydronyms (only 25 limnonyms out of the total number of 718 lake names, and 14 potamonyms out of 362 river names) and oikonyms (51 out of 3900 settlement names);
- 2) toponyms reflecting flora, i.e., toponyms motivated by tree, terrestrial and aquatic plants species, as well as those motivated by forest type, include the total of 58 oikonyms, 7 limnonyms, 14 potamonyms now functioning in Vilnius County with only several examples presented in this study;
  - 3) toponyms reflecting fauna, i.e., toponyms motivated by the animal, bird, and fish species typical to the region and Lithuania in general, include the total of 16 potamonyms and 45 limnonyms of clear etymology, which are transpositions of relevant animal, bird, and fish species names into names of water bodies, which could be considered the conceptualization of fauna typical of the region;
  - 4) toponyms reflecting cultural realia, which may have had symbolic meanings that reflected people's beliefs, include only 5 potamonyms and 11 limnonyms of more or less clear etymology in the overall corpus of 362 river names and 718 lake names;
  - 5) toponyms reflecting nation's historical facts and circumstances, i.e., toponyms motivated by settlement types, recency of the settlement, purpose of the named object (economic activities and industrial facilities), are historically and economically coloured toponyms observed mainly in the class of oikonyms and include 42 settlement names in the corpus of 3900 oikonyms;
  - 6) toponyms reflecting people are observed in the class of oikonyms (570 names of clear semantics and motivation identified in the corpus of 3900 currently functioning oikonyms) and are motivated by the concept of possessivity and are metonymic transpositions of personal names of individuals or families who lived in the region.
5. The analysis of the selected toponyms demonstrates the influence of Slavonic languages on the toponymy of the region, as toponyms of Slavic origin (although a very small number, i.e., 150 place names or 2,92 % of the total corpus of 5126 Vilnius County toponyms) are also rather deeply rooted in the region at the official level.



## SUMMARY IN LITHUANIAN

### Tautinio ir kultūrinio tapatumo ženklai Vilniaus apskrities toponimijoje

Tauta, kaip atskira etninė grupė, egzistuojanti žmonijos istorijoje, yra kompleksinis ir pastovus socialinis darinys, kurio vidaus saitai, tokie kaip bendra teritorija, kalba, elgsenos ypatumai, papročiai, religija, savęs suvokimas ir kt., formavosi per amžius. Tautos istorija ir kasdienės vertybės, puoselėjamos bendruomenės, atlieka svarbų vaidmenį formuojant jos narių etninį (tautinį) tapatumą. Kiekviena tauta, arba etninė bendruomenė, palieka savo istorijoje įvairaus pobūdžio relikтус, liudijimus ir simbolius. Tokiais liudijimais (ir net simboliais) drąsiai galima laikyti toponimus, kurie yra neatsiejama individo gyvenimo ir tautos istorijos dalis, o kartu ir reikšmingas tapatumo komponentas, atskleidžiantis žmogaus kilmę ir gyvenamąją vietą. Nors vietovardžių, kaip ir viso vardyno, studijos pirmiausia yra kalbos tyrimo objektas, šie tyrimai siejasi ir su kitomis mokslo disciplinomis, tokiomis kaip kognityvinė lingvistika, antropologija, istorija ir t. t.

Etninio (tautinio), ypač kultūrinio, tapatumo sąvokų konceptualizavimas yra gana sudėtingas procesas dėl kiekvienos iš jų įvairiapusiškumo / įvairiaspektiškumo. Abi sąvokos apima didelę reikšmių įvairovę, kurią tyrinėja įvairios mokslo disciplinos. Atrodo, kad etninio (tautinio) ir kultūrinio tapatumo sampratos iš dalies sutampa, nes neįmanoma apibrėžti tautos (etnos) neminint kultūrinį etninį (tautinį) tapatumą formuojančių veiksnių, būdingų kiekvienai bendruomenei. Juk bet kuriai žmonių grupei būdinga savita kultūra ir tos kultūros charakteristika. Tarp tapatumą formuojančių veiksnių išskirtini šie: bendra kilmė, kalba, valstybė, papročiai ir tradicijos, materialioji kultūra ir kultūrinės vertybės, idėjos apie „gimtąjį kraštą“, tikėjimą ir pan. Šie veiksniai visada yra susiję su vietos kontekstu ir apibrėžti istoriškai.

Kalba yra ne tik bendravimo priemonė, bet ir pasaulio konceptualizacijos priemonė, įvardijanti daiktus ir reiškinius, suteikianti jiems reikšmę, per žodžius sužadinti asociacijas ir vaizdinius, siejanti juos su materialiniu ir dvasiniu tautos gyvenimu. Kalba išreiškiamas tautinis naratyvas užima ypatingą vietą kiekvienoje kultūroje ir yra susijęs tiek su tautos gyvenamąja teritorija, tiek su jos istorija. Toponimai (kaip ir visi vardai) yra neatsiejama kiekvienos kalbos dalis. Taigi, jie yra sudedamoji tautinio ir kultūrinio tapatumo dalis, nes ne tik atlieka referencinę funkciją, bet ir perteikia kognityvinį, emocinį, kultūrinį ir visuomeninį įvardijamų vietų vardų aspektą.

Vietovardžius motyvavusių konceptų analizė padeda atskleisti ne tik geografinius tam tikro regiono ypatumus, bet ir istorinius-kultūrinius dalykus, todėl toponimai turi ne vien kultūrinę vertę, – jie yra svarbus kalbinis tapatumą formuojantis elementas.

Kalbos, kaip etninį ir kultūrinį naratyvą formuojančio veiksnio, svarbą atskleidžia išskirtų dabartinės Vilniaus apskrities toponimų analizė. Per 2018–2020 m. buvo surinkti 5 126 dabartinėje Vilniaus apskrityje šiuo metu funkcionuojantys toponimai: 3 900 gyvenamųjų vietų (didmiesčių, miestelių, kaimų, geležinkelio stočių su gyvenvietėmis) vardai, 718 ežerų vardų, 362 upių ir upelių vardai, 146 tvenkinių vardai. Šioje mokslo studijoje analizuojami toponimai – tai tik maža vietovardžių dalis, kuri, manytina, geriausiai atspindi pagrindinį šio leidinio tikslą ir iškeltus uždavinius, bandant pademonstruoti, kad iš toponimų galima „perskaityti“ juose „užkoduotas“ tautines (etnines) ir kultūrinės reikšmes. Likusi surinktų vietų vardų dalis – būsimosios disertacijos, straipsnių ir kitų autoriaus tyrimų objektas.

Tyrimas, pagrįstas tiek tradicine, tiek šiuolaikine (kognityvine) onomastikos teorija ir metodais, atskleidžia regiono toponimijos semantinio substrato sudėtingumą, kuriam dėl kultūrinės periferijos ir gyventojų ilgalaikės daugiakalbystės situacijos įtakos turėjo kalbų sąveika (kontaktai). Etniniai dalykai yra aiškiai išreikšti seniausiuose tikriniuose varduose – hidronimuose, kurie atskleidžia šio krašto reljefo ypatybes, būdingą florą ir fauną, pavyzdžiui, ežerų vardai *Keřnavas*, *Luknà*, *Luknėlis* ir kt., upių vardai *Asiūklė*, *Bėržė*, *Mažoji Kenà* ir kt. Kultūrinio tapatumo bruožus atspindi tiek vandenvardžiai, tiek gyvenamųjų vietų vardai, kurie jungia Lietuvos praeitį ir dabartį, bylodami apie senovės baltų ir šiuolaikinės Lietuvos tikėjimą, pavyzdžiui, upėvardžiai *Báltupis* (*Cedronas*), *Koplyčianka*, *Kaukysa*, gyvenviečių vardai *Slabada*, *Slabadiškė* atskleidžia istorinę šalies raidą, *Kaniūkai*, *Mėdininkai*, *Tartōkas* įamžina amatus ir profesijas. Be to, pasirinktų vietovardžių analizė parodo kitų kalbų (ypač slavų) įtaką lietuvių onomastikai, nes randama nemažai nelietuviškų vietovardžių ar lietuvių (baltų) kilmės vietovardžių, slaviškų priesagų vedinių. Taip pat Vilniaus krašto toponimuose yra aptinkamas seniausias kalbinis substratas (ypač hidronimijoje), liudijantis gilią šių žemių praeitį ir tautų (kultūrų) migraciją. Taigi, tikėtina, kad, nagrinėjant istoriškai ir kultūriškai periferinėse–probleminėse teritorijose susidariusius toponimus (hidronimus, oikonimus ar kitus vietų vardus), rasis ir kitokio požiūrio į etniškumą, tautiškumą ir kultūrinį savęs supratimą galimybių.

Etninį resp. tautinį ir kultūrinį tapatumą atspindi šios semantinės oikonimų ir hidronimų kategorijos:

- 1) topografinius reljefo ypatumus atspindintys toponimai, t. y. regiono reljefą apibūdinantys hidronimai ir oikonimai, kurie apima palyginti nedaug hidronimų (tik 25 iš 718 ežerėvardžių ir 14 iš 362 upėvardžių) ir oikonimų (51 iš 3 900 gyvenviečių vardų);
- 2) florą atspindintys vietovardžiai, t. y. medžių, sausumos ir vandens augalų rūšimis motyvuoti vietovardžiai, taip pat miško tipo motyvuoti vietovardžiai apima iš viso 58 oikonimus, 7 limnonimus ir 14 potamonimų (šiam darbe analizuojami tik keli šios kategorijos pavyzdžiai);
- 3) fauną atspindintys toponimai, t. y. regionui ir Lietuvai būdingi gyvūnų, paukščių ir žuvų rūšių motyvuoti toponimai, iš viso apima 16 potamonimų ir 45 limnonimus, kurie yra atitinkamų gyvūnų, paukščių ir žuvų rūšių pavadinimų transpozicijos į vandens telkinių vardus, juos būtų galima laikyti regionui būdingos faunos konceptualizavimu;
- 4) kultūrinės realijas atspindintys toponimai, galėję turėti simbolines, žmonių įsitikinimus ir pasaulėžiūrą atspindinčias reikšmes, apima tik 5 potamonimus ir 11 aiškios etimologijos limnonimų iš visų 362 upių ir 718 ežerų vardų;
- 5) toponimai, atspindintys tautos istorinius faktus ir aplinkybes, t. y. vietovardžiai, motyvuoti gyvenviečių tipais, gyvenvietės naujumu, įvardijamo objekto paskirtimi (ūkine veikla ir pramonės objektais), yra istoriškai ir ekonomiškai nuspalvinti vietovardžiai, dažniausiai stebimi oikonimų klasėje ir apima 42 gyvenviečių pavadinimus 3 900 oikonimų korpuse;
- 6) žmones atspindintys toponimai apima 570 aiškios semantikos ir motyvacijos gyvenviečių pavadinimus iš visų 3 900 oikonimų ir yra motyvuoti posesyvumo samprata, jie yra metoniminiai asmenų ar šeimų, gyvenusių regione, asmenvardžių perkėlimai į gyvenviečių vardus.

Atrinktų toponimų analizė parodė slavų kalbų įtaką regiono toponimijai. Tyrimo metu buvo aptikta labai nedaug slavų kilmės vietovardžių (150 vietovardžių, arba 2,92 % visų 5 126 Vilniaus apskrities toponimų), giliai įsišaknijusių regione oficialiajame lygmenyje.

Akivaizdu, kad pasirinkti tirti dabartinės Vilniaus apskrities vietovardžiai ne tik atlieka referencinę funkciją. Savo užkoduotomis reikšmėmis toponimai perteikia pažintinius (kognityvinius), emocinius, kultūrinius ir socialinius įvardijamų vietų aspektus, t. y. suteikia daug informacijos apie tam tikros vietovės gamtą, istoriją, kultūrą ir žmones.

## TOPONYM SOURCES

- GI1905 – Goshkevich Iosif I. 1905: Гошкевич Иосиф I. *Виленская губернія. Полный списокъ населенныхъ мѣстъ со статистическими данными о каждомъ поселеніи*, Вильна: Губернская Типографія. Available at: [https://rusneb.ru/catalog/000199\\_000009\\_003727513/](https://rusneb.ru/catalog/000199_000009_003727513/).
- GK – *Gamtos katalogas. Lietuvos vandens telkiniai*. Available at: <http://ezerai.vilnius21.lt/>.
- GP – *Geoportal.lt: Lietuvos erdvinės informacijos portalas*. Available at: <https://www.geoportal.lt/geoportal/>.
- GSD1974 – Centrinė statistikos valdyba prie Lietuvos TSR ministrų tarybos 1974: *Lietuvos TSR kaimo gyvenamosios vietovės 1959 ir 1970 metais (Visasąjunginių gyventojų surašymo duomenys)*, Vilnius. Available at: [https://knyga.lietuvai.lt/w/images/7/79/Lietuvos\\_gyventoju\\_surasymas\\_1959\\_ir\\_1970.pdf](https://knyga.lietuvai.lt/w/images/7/79/Lietuvos_gyventoju_surasymas_1959_ir_1970.pdf).
- IVDB – Lietuvių kalbos instituto lietuvių kalbos išteklių informacinė sistema „E. kalba“: Istorinių vietovardžių duomenų bazė (*The Institute of the Lithuanian Language Informational System of the Lithuanian Language Resources: The Historical Place Names Database*). Available at: [https://ekalba.lt/Istoriniai\\_vietovardziai](https://ekalba.lt/Istoriniai_vietovardziai).
- KA1861 – Korevo Anton K. 1861: Корево Антон К. *Материалы для географіи и статистики Россіи, собранные офицерами генералного штаба. Виленская губернія*, Санкт-Петербургъ: типографія Иосафата Оргизко. Available at: <https://www.prlib.ru/item/426806>.
- KGS1903 – Ковенский Губернский Статистический комитет 1903: *Алфавитный списокъ населённыхъ мѣстъ Ковенской губерніи на 1902 год*, Ковна: Типографія Губернского Правленія. Available at: <http://book-olds.ru/BookLibrary/17000-Kovenskaya-gub/1902.-Spisok-naselennyih-mest-Kovenskoj-gubernii-na-1902-god.html>.
- LKIVK – Lietuvių kalbos instituto Vardyno skyriaus vietovardžių, surinktų iš gyvosios kalbos, kartoteka (*The Catalogue of Lithuanian Place Names Written from the Living Language of the Research Center of Baltic Languages and Onomastics at the Institute of the Lithuanian Language*).
- LVGDB – Lietuvių kalbos instituto lietuvių kalbos išteklių informacinė sistema „E. kalba“: Lietuvos vietovardžių geoinformacinė duomenų bazė (*The Institute of the Lithuanian Language Informational System of the Lithuanian Language Resources: Geoinformational Database of Lithuania's Place Names*). Available at: <https://ekalba.lt/lietuvos-vietovardziu-geoinformacine-duomenu-baze>.

## TOPONYM SOURCES

REM1872 – Russian Empire 1872 Map. MAPIRE – Historical Maps Online. Available at: <https://mapire.eu/en/map/russia-1872/>.

UETK – Lietuvos upių, ežerų ir tvenkinių kadastras (*The Rivers, Lakes, and Ponds Cadaster of the Republic of Lithuania*). Available at: <https://uetk.am.lt>.

Vilnius County Maps – Map of the Republic of Lithuania. Available at: <https://www.geoportal.lt>.

Vilnius County Municipalities' websites:

Elektrėnai Municipality web site at: <https://www.elektrenai.lt/>.

Šalčininkai District Municipality web site at: <http://www.salcininkai.lt/>.

Širvintos District Municipality web site at: <https://www.sirvintos.lt/lt>.

Švenčionys District Municipality web site at: [http://www.svencionys.lt/lit/I\\_pradzia](http://www.svencionys.lt/lit/I_pradzia).

Trakai District Municipality web site at: <https://www.trakai.lt/>; <http://old.trakai.lt/>.

Ukmergė District Municipality web site at: <https://www.ukmerge.lt/>.

Vilnius City Municipality web site at: <https://vilnius.lt/lt/>.

Vilnius District Municipality web site at: <https://www.vrsa.lt/>.

## REFERENCES

- Ahundova Gjulshen 2011: Ахундова Гюльшен. Психолингвистические основы функционирования тюркской топонимии (на материале географических названий Азербайджана, Дагестана и других сопредельных регионов). – *Türkologiya* 3, 45–51.
- Ainiala Terhi, Saarelma Minna, Sjöblom Paula 2016: *Names in Focus. An Introduction to Finnish Onomastics*, Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.
- Ainiala Terhi, Östman Jan-Ola (eds.) 2017: *Socio-Onomastics. The Pragmatics of Names, Pragmatics & Beyond New Series*, vol. 275, Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Alasli Malak 2019: Toponyms' contribution to identity: The case study of Rabat (Morocco). – *29th International Cartographic Conference (ICC 2019)*, 15–20 July 2019, Tokyo, Japan; *Proceedings of the International Cartographic Association*, 2: 1–7.
- Alminauskis Kazimieras 1934: *Instrukcija Lietuvos žemės vardynui surašyti*, Klaipėda: Rytas.
- Andryuchshenko Olga, Suyunova Gulnara, Tkachuk Sofja 2015: The Cognitive Aspects of the Study of Regional Onomastics. – *Indian Journal of Science and Technology* 8 (S10), 1–8. Available at: <http://indjst.org/index.php/indjst/article/view/84835>.
- Atshkasov Valeriy 1999: Ачкасов Валерий. Этническая идентичность в ситуациях общественного выбора. – *Журнал социологии и социальной антропологии* II(1), 45–56.
- Balode Laimute 1993: Skonio semantikos hidronimai Latvijoje. – *Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai* 32, 7–14.
- Balode Laimute 2012: Metaphoric hydronyms in Latvia. – *Baltistica: Studies in Baltic linguistics Supplement VIII*, 9–17.
- Balsys Rimantas 2016: Jautis baltų pasaulėjautoje: nuo aukos aukščiausiems dievams iki javų dvasios. – *Gimtasai kraštas* 1(10), 5–12. Available at: <http://www.ziemgala.lt/lt/metrastis-gimtasai-krastas/gimtasai-krastas-20161/jautis-baltu-pasaulejautoje-nuo-aukos-aukscausiems-dievams-iki-javu-dvasios>.
- Bilkis Laimutis, Ragauskaitė Alma, Sviderskienė Dalia, Kačinėnaitė-Vrubliauskienė Dalia, Skorupa Pavel 2019: *Grasilda Blažienė: bibliografija*, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.
- Bilkis Laimutis 2020a: Dėl kaimo vardo Ývoliai kilmės. – *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 83, 178–192. Available at: <http://journals.lki.lt/actalinguisticalithuanica>.
- Bilkis Laimutis 2020b: Dėl kaimo vardo Jedžiūtai raidos ir kilmės. – *Lituanistica* 66, 4(122), 275–287.

## REFERENCES

- Biolik Maria 1989: Nazwy bagien, brodów i mokradeł w dorzeczu dopływów Zalewu Wiślanego. – *Onomastica* 33, 123–138.
- Biryła Mikalaj V. 1966: Бірыла Мікалай В. *Беларуская антрапанімія. Уласныя імёны, імёны-мянушкі, імёны па бацьку, прозвішчы*, Мінск: Навука і Техніка.
- Biryła Mikalaj V. 1969: Бірыла Мікалай В. *Беларуская антрапанімія. 2: Прозвішчы, утвораныя ад апелятыўнай лексікі*, Мінск: Навука і Техніка.
- Blažienė Grasilda 2011: Блажене Г. О балтийских ойконимах Калининградской области. – *Культурное наследие Восточной Пруссии 1: сборник статей*, Калининград: Изд-во БФУ им. И. Канта, 78–95.
- Blažienė Grasilda 2013: Noch einmal zum Altpreußischen und zu den altpreußischen Eigennamen in den geschichtlichen Quellen des Deutschen Ordens. – *Индоевропейское языкознание и классическая филология – XVII: материалы чтений, посвященных памяти профессора Иосифа Моисеевича Тронского*, 24–26 июня 2013 г., Санкт-Петербург: Наука, 66–78. Available at: <http://iling.spb.ru/comparativ/mater/tronsky2013/tronsky2013.pdf>.
- Blažienė Grasilda 2018: Zu den russischen Personnamen in den Folianten des Deutschen Ordens. – *Индоевропейское языкознание и классическая филология–XXII (чтения памяти И. М. Тронского): материалы Международной конференции, проходившей 18–20 июня 2018 г.*, отв. ред. Н. Н. Казанский, первый полумтом, СПб.: Наука, 109–75. Available at: [https://tronsky.iling.spb.ru/static/tronsky2018\\_01.pdf](https://tronsky.iling.spb.ru/static/tronsky2018_01.pdf).
- Blažienė Grasilda 2020: Baltische Spuren in Ortsnamen Europas? – *Индоевропейское языкознание и классическая филология–XXIV: материалы чтений, посвященных памяти профессора Иосифа Моисеевича Тронского*, 22–24 июня 2020 г., Санкт–Петербург: Институт лингвистических исследований, 443–465. Available at: [https://tronsky.iling.spb.ru/static/tronsky2020\\_01.pdf](https://tronsky.iling.spb.ru/static/tronsky2020_01.pdf).
- Bölcskei Andrea 2014: Culture Dependent Toponym Types (The Concept of SETTLEMENT in Different Cultures). – *Els noms en la vida quotidiana: Actes del XXIV Congrés Internacional d'ICOS sobre Ciències Onomàstiques*, Barcelona: Generalitat de Catalunya, Departament de Cultura (=Biblioteca Tècnica de Política Lingüística 11), 1010–1018.
- Bourdieu Pierre 1991: *Language and Symbolic Power*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Brendler Silvio 2006: *Grundlagen der englischen Zunamenforschung*, Hamburg: Baar.
- Brendler Silvio 2008: *Nomematik: Identitätstheoretische Grundlagen der Namenforschung (insbesondere der Namensgeschichte, Namenlexikographie, Namengeographie, Namenstatistik und Namenstheorie)*, Hamburg: Baar.

## REFERENCES

- Brendler Silvio 2012: Identity of Name(s) as a Crucial Problem in Name Studies, Or: Towards the Recognition of Onymic Identity as a Principal Onomastic Concept. – *Oslo Studies in Language* 4(2), 29–44.
- Brendler Silvio (ed.) 2016: *Cognitive Onomastics. A Reader*, Hamburg: baar.
- Būga Kazimieras 1958: *Rinktiniai raštai 1*, Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla.
- Būga Kazimieras 1959: *Rinktiniai raštai 2*, Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla.
- Būga Kazimieras 1961: *Rinktiniai raštai 3*, Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla.
- Bukharova Gulnur Kh., Samitova Luiza Kh., Tagirova Salima A., Davletkulova Akhmet Kh., Davletbajeva Raisa G., Usmanova Minsilu G. 2016: Color Symbolism in the Bashkir Toponymy. – *International Journal of Environmental and Science Education* 11(18), 12281–12288.
- Chaikina Yulia I., Monzikova Liudmila N., Varnikova Yevgeniya N. 2004: Чайкина Юлия И., Монзикова Людмила Н., Варникова Евгения Н. *Из истории топонимии Вологодского края*, Вологда: Вологодский институт развития образования.
- Coates Richard 2006: Properhood. – *Language* 82(2), 356–382. Available at: <http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/196/>.
- Coates Richard 2012: Eight Issues in the Pragmatic Theory of Properhood / Aštuonios pragmatinės tikrinių žodžių problemos. – *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* LXVI, 119–140.
- Coates Richard 2015: A concise theory of meaningfulness in literary naming within the framework of The Pragmatic Theory of Properhood. – *Journal of Literary Onomastics* 4(1), 31–34. Available at: <http://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/jlo/vol4/iss1/3>.
- Coates Richard 2016: On the theoretical possibility of proper verbs. – *Linguistics* 54(2), 411–431. Available at: <http://eprints.uwe.ac.uk/27187>.
- Dacewicz Leonarda, Abramowicz Zofia 2001: Interdyscyplinarny charakter badań onomastycznych. – *Acta onomastica* XLI–XLII, 29–33.
- DLKG – Ambrazas Vytautas (red.), Garšva Kazimieras, Girdenis Aleksas, Jakaitienė Evalda, Kniūkšta Pranas, Krinickaitė Stasė, Labutis Vitas, Laigonaitė Adelė, Oginskienė Elena, Pikčilingis Juozas; Ružė Albertas, Sližienė Nijolė, Ulvydas Kazys, Urbutis Vincas, Valeckienė Adelė, Valiulytė Elena 1994: *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos gramatika*, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla.
- Dobrić Nikola 2010: Theory of Names and Cognitive Linguistics – the Case of the Metaphor. – *Filozofia i društvo* 21, 135–147.



## REFERENCES

- Dundulienė Pranė 2008: *Medžiai senovės lietuvių tikėjimuose*, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.
- Förstemann Ernst 1863: *Die deutschen Ortsnamen*, Nordhausen: Försteman.
- Garšva Kazimieras, Grumadienė Laima (sud.) 1993: *Lietuvos rytai*, Vilnius: Valstybinis leidybos centras.
- Garšva Kazimieras (sud.) 1999: *Etninių žemių lietuviai dabartinėje Baltarusijoje*, Vilnius: Tautinių mažumų ir išeivijos departamentas prie Lietuvos Respublikos Vyriausybės.
- Garšva Kazimieras 2019: Балтизмы (топонимы, фамилии) в Польше, Беларуси. – *Droga ku wzajemnosci* 20, 51–64.
- Garšva Kazimieras 2020a: Vilniaus apskrities kalbų interpretacijos. – *Voruta* 2(868), 60–64.
- Garšva Kazimieras 2020b: Lietuvių kalba ir vardynas tarp Kernavės, Trakų ir Vilniaus. – *Voruta* 3(869), 77–83.
- Gataullin Ravil G., Fatykhova Lija A. 2018: Гатауллин, Равиль Г., Фатыхова Лия А. „Цветные“ топонимы и их особенности. – *Вестник Башкирского университета* 23(1), 211–219.
- Gudavičius Aloyzas 2009: *Etnolingvistika*, Šiauliai: Šiaulių universiteto leidykla.
- Hontsa Irina S. 2014: Гонца, Ирина С. Структурно-граматичні особливості двочленних ойконімів Черкащини. – *Вісник Черкаського університету: Філологічні науки* 7, 86–90. Available at: <https://dspace.udpu.edu.ua/xmlui/handle/6789/3361?show=full>.
- ICOS OT – The International Council of Onomastic Sciences (ICOS) Onomastic terminology and ICOS lists of Onomastic terms [Interactive]: <https://icosweb.net/publications/onomastic-terminology/>.
- Ilchenko Irina I., Isachuk Nastasiya V. 2016: Ильченко, Ирина И.; Исачук, Настасия В. 2016. Бінарні опозиції в топовимії Надвеликолужжя. – *Перспективи розвитку філологічних наук* (м. Київ, 13–14 травня 2016 р.), Херсон: Видавничий дім «Гельветика» 99–102.
- Isajiw Wsevolod W. 1993: Definition and Dimensions of Ethnicity: A Theoretical Framework. – *Challenges of Measuring an Ethnic World: Science, politics and reality: Proceedings of the Joint Canada-United States Conference on the Measurement of Ethnicity* April 1–3, 1992, Statistics Canada and U.S. Bureau of the Census, eds. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 407–427.
- Ivoška Darius 2016: Bemerkungen zur Problematik der baltischen Ortsnamen westlich der Weichsel / Keletas pastebėjimų dėl baltiškų vietovardžių į vakarus nuo Vyslos problematikos. – *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 74, 208–225.
- Ivoška Darius 2018: *Baltische Eigennamen in den Dokumenten des Deutschen Ordens*: daktaro disertacija, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas.

## REFERENCES

- Ivoška Darius 2019a: Litauische historische Personennamen in dem “Marienburger Tresslerbuch der Jahre 1399–1409”. – *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 81, 97–109.
- Ivoška Darius 2019b: Widerspiegelung der prussischen Kultur in den Grenzenbeschreibungen des Deutschen Ordens. – *Jahrbuch der Historischen Kommission für ost- und westpreußische Landesforschung und der Copernicus-Vereinigung für Geschichte und Landeskunde Westpreußens. Mitteilungen aus dem Geheimen Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz* 10, 7–23.
- Ivoška Darius 2020a: Trends of Naming Individuals of Different Origin in the Medieval Prussia. – *Onoma* 55, 133–147. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.34158/ONOMA.55/2020/8>.
- Ivoška Darius 2020b: Zur Frage der baltischen Eigennamen des Gebietes *Ragnit* und *Tilsit* in den Ordensdokumenten des 14–15 Jahrhunderts / Dėl baltiškų *Ragainės* ir *Tilžės* srities tikrinių vardų XIV–XV a. ordino dokumentuose. – *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 83, 132–150. Available at: <http://journals.lki.lt/actalinguisticalithuanica/article/view/2045>.
- Jovaiša Eugenijus 2012: *Aisčiai*. I knyga: *Kilmė*, Vilnius: Edukologija.
- Jovaiša Eugenijus 2014: *Aisčiai*. II knyga: *Raida*, Vilnius: Lietuvos edukologijos universiteto leidykla.
- Jovaiša Eugenijus 2016: *Aisčiai*. III knyga: *Lietuvių ir Lietuvos pradžia*, Vilnius: Lietuvos edukologijos universiteto leidykla.
- Jovaiša Eugenijus 2020a: *The Aestii. The Western Balts*, Kaunas: Vytauto Didžiojo universiteto leidykla.
- Jovaiša Eugenijus 2020b: *Kapai ir žmonės*, Vilnius: Unseen Pictures.
- Jurkštas Jonas 1985: *Vilniaus vietovardžiai*, Vilnius: Mokslas.
- Karaliūnas Simas 2005: *Baltų praeitis istoriniuose šaltiniuose 2*, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.
- Karpenko Elena, Golubenko Lidiya 2015: Problems of Cognitive Onomastics. – *Записки з ономастику* 18, 285–293.
- Khokhlova Irena, Zamorshchikova Liudmila, Filipova Viktoria 2018: Indigenous place names: the cognitive-matrix analysis. – *XLinguae* 11(2), 275–291. Available at: [http://www.xlinguae.eu/2018\\_11\\_02\\_22.html](http://www.xlinguae.eu/2018_11_02_22.html).
- Kiseliūnaitė Dalia 2020: *Klaipėdos krašto toponimai. Istorinis ir etimologinis registras*, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.35321/e-pub.6.klaipedos-krasto-toponimai>.
- Kondrashina Vera V. 1980: Кондрашина, Вера В. Соотносительный ряд «верхний» — «нижний» в русской топонимии. – *Вопросы ономастику* 14, 29–35.

## REFERENCES

- Корепапова Анна Р. 1973: Корепапова, Анна П. Протиставлення як засіб утворення слов'янських ойконімів. – *Мовознавство* 4, 30–33.
- Kövecses Zoltan 2002: *Metaphor: a practical introduction*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lakoff George, Johnson Mark 2003 (1980): *Metaphors we Live By*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Leibnitz Gottfried Wilhelm 1881: *Die philosophischen Schriften* 5, Hrsg. von. C. I. Gerhard, Berlin: Weiddemann.
- Leino Antii 2005: In search of naming patterns: A survey of Finnish lake names. – *Naming the World. From Common Nouns to Proper Names: Proceedings from the International Symposium, Zadar, September 1st–4th, 2004; QUADRION* 1, 355–367, Roma: Società Editrice Romana.
- Leino Antii 2007: Construction Grammar in onomastics: the case of Finnish hydronyms. – *Proceedings of the XXII<sup>nd</sup> International Congress of Onomastic Studies* 1, 297–309.
- LKPŽ – Kregždys Rolandas 2016: *Lietuvių kalbos polonizmy žodynas I–II*, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.
- LKŽe – *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas* 1–20 (1941–2002), e. variantas, red. kolegija G. Naktinienė, J. Paulauskas, R. Petrokienė, V. Vitkauskas, J. Zabarskaitė, vyr. red. G. Naktinienė, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, 2005 (atnaujinta versija 2008 ir 2018). Available at: <https://ekalba.lt/lietuviu-kalbos-zodynas>.
- LSD 2013 – Lietuvos statistikos departamentas 2013: *Gyventojai pagal tautybę, gimtąją kalbą ir tikybę. Lietuvos Respublikos 2011 metų visuotinio gyventojų ir būstų surašymo rezultatai*, Vilnius. Available at: [https://web.archive.org/web/20130923095014/http://web.stat.gov.lt/uploads/docs/gyv\\_kalba\\_tikyba.pdf](https://web.archive.org/web/20130923095014/http://web.stat.gov.lt/uploads/docs/gyv_kalba_tikyba.pdf).
- LVGDB – Lietuvių kalbos instituto lietuvių kalbos išteklių informacinė sistema „E. Kalba“: Lietuvos vietovardžių geoinformacinė duomenų bazė / *The Institute of the Lithuanian Language Informational System of the Lithuanian Language Resources: Geoinformational Database of Lithuania's Place Names*. [Interactive]: <https://ekalba.lt/lietuvos-vietovardziu-geoinformacine-duomenu-baze>.
- Maciejauskienė Vitalija 2001: „Lietuvos vietovardžių žodynas“: pobūdis, sandara ir rengimo sunkumai. – *Tarptautinė Kazimiero Būgos konferencija: Etimologija ir onomastika*, Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas, Baltistikos ir bendrosios kalbotyros katedra, 29–31.
- Maciejauskienė Vitalija 2002: Lietuvių vietovardžiai – visuomenei ir mokslui. – *Kalbos kultūra* 75, 56–64.
- Maciejauskienė Vitalija 2002a: „Lietuvos vietovardžių žodynas“: pobūdis ir sandara. – *Lituanistica* 2(50), 102–117.

## REFERENCES

- Muldoon James 1997: *Varieties of Religious Conversion in the Middle Ages*, Florida: University Press of Florida.
- Petkova Diana 2005: Cultural Identity in a Pluralistic World. – Petkova Diana & Lehtonen Jaakko. *Cultural Identity in an Intercultural Context* 27, 11–66.
- Podolskaja Nataliya V. 1978: Подольская, Наталия В. *Словарь русской ономастической терминологии*, Москва: Наука.
- PSPR – Rozwadowska Maryja F. 1974: *Podręczny słownik polsko-rosyjski*, Warszawa: Wiedza powszechna.
- PWN – *Słownik języka polskiego* (na podstawie *Słownik języka polskiego pod red. W. Doroszewskiego 1997; Słownika 100 tysięcy potrzebnych słów pod red. J. Bralczyka 2005; Wielkiego słownika ortograficznego PWN z zasadami pisowni i interpunkcji pod red. E. Polańskiego 2017*), Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN 1997–2021, on-line version. Available at: <https://sjp.pwn.pl/>.
- Razauskas Dainius 2016: Kaukysa ir kaukai. – *Tarpdalykiniai kultūros tyrimai* 4(1), 8. Available at: [http://www.sovijus.lt/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/8\\_Razauskas.pdf](http://www.sovijus.lt/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/8_Razauskas.pdf).
- Razmukaitė Marija 1998: *Lietuvos priesaginiai oikonimai*: daktaro disertacija, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas.
- Razmukaitė Marija 2002: Lietuvos sudėtinių oikonimų darybos bruožai. – *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 46, 123–130.
- Razmukaitė Marija 2003: Sudėtiniai Lietuvos oikonimai. – *Baltu Filologija* 12(2), 63–80.
- Reszegi Katalin 2012: Cognitive Approaches to Hungarian Toponymy. – *Onoma* 47, 367–379.
- Rymut Kazimierz 1999: *Nazwiska Polaków 1 (A–K)*, Kraków: Wydawn. Inst. Języka Polskiego PAN.
- RLKŽ – *Rusų–lietuvių kalbų žodynas I–IV*, Vilnius: Mokslas, 1982–1985.
- Rut Marija 2007: Рут Мария. *Этимологический словарь русского языка для школьников*, Екатеринбург: У-Фактория Владимир.
- Rutkowski Mariusz 2011: Dictionary of Proper Names, Metaphors and Connotations: Outline of Theoretical Background. – *Acta onomastica* LII, 141–148.
- Saparov Arseny 2003: The alteration of place names and construction of national identity in Soviet Armenia. – *Cahiers du Monde russe* 44(1), 179–198. Available at: <http://monderusse.revues.org/docannexe4079.html>.
- SGKP – Sulimierski Filip, Walewski Władysław (red.) 1880–1914: *Słownik geograficzny Królestwa Polskiego i innych krajów słowiańskich I–XV*, Warszawa: Druk „WIEKU“ Nowy-Świat Nr. 59, Available at: [http://dir.icm.edu.pl/pl/Sownik\\_geograficzny/](http://dir.icm.edu.pl/pl/Sownik_geograficzny/).

## REFERENCES

- Sjöblom Paula 2011: A Cognitive Approach to the Semantics of Proper Names. – *Onoma: Journal of the International Council of Onomastic Sciences* 41, 63–82.
- Skarnik.by – Мазок Алєг, Літ Сєрж (comp.) 2015: *Бєлорускє–русскій словарь* (на основе академического словаря под редакцией Я. Коласа, К. Крапивы и П. Глебкы 1953: *Руска-бєларускі Слоўнік* 1–3, Мінск: Інстытут Мєвазнаўства АН БССР), e-version. Available at: <https://www.skarnik.by/>.
- Skorupa Pavel 2021a: Motivation and semantics of the present-day Vilnius County toponym oppositions: the concept of the object’s position in space. – *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 84, 254–282.
- Skorupa Pavel 2021b: Footprints of Language Contacts in the Present-Day Vilnius County Hydronyms and Oikonyms: The Impact of Slavic Languages on Lithuanian Toponymy. – *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 85, 219–243.
- Slíz Mariann 2017: *Personal Names in Medieval Hungary*, Hamburg: baar.
- Slovar.cc – *Большой современный толковый словарь русского языка*, 2010–2020, e-version [authors collective]. [Interactive]: <https://slovar.cc/rus/tolk.html>.
- Soleimani Sara 2017: Солеймани Сара. Концепция культурной идентичности в социологии. – *Теория и практика общественного развития* 6. Available at: [http://teoria-practica.ru/rus/files/arhiv\\_zhurnala/2017/6/sociology/soleimani.pdf](http://teoria-practica.ru/rus/files/arhiv_zhurnala/2017/6/sociology/soleimani.pdf).
- SRY – Ožegov Sergej I. 1984: Ожегов, Сергей И. *Словарь русского языка*, Москва: «Русский Язык».
- SRYAe – Yevgenyeva Anastasiya (ed.) 1999: Евгеньєва Анастасія П. *Словарь русского языка: В 4-х т*, Москва: Полиграфресурсы. Available at: <http://feb-web.ru/feb/mas/mas-abc/default.asp>.
- Stachowski Kamil 2018: O opozycjach kolorystycznych w ojkonomii Polski. – *Acta onomastica* LIX, 197–214.
- Starks Donna, Taumoeolau Melenaite, Bell Allan, Davis Karen 2005: Language as a Marker of Ethnic Identity in New Zealand’s Pasifika Communities. – *ISB4: Proceedings of the 4<sup>th</sup> International Symposium on Bilingualism*, 2189–2196. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Štěpán Pavel 2009: *Oppositions in Toponymy*. – *Names in Multi-Lingual, Multi-Cultural and Multi-Ethnic Contact: Proceedings of the 23rd International Congress of Onomastic Sciences*, August 17–22, 2008, York University, Toronto, Canada, 915–920. Available at: <https://yorkspace.library.yorku.ca/xmlui/handle/10315/4034>.
- SUMe – *Словника української мови. Академічний тлумачний словник (1970–1980)*, онлайн-версія на бази *Словника української мови в 11 томах* за ред. І. К. Білодіда, Київ: Наукова думка, 1970–1980. Available at: <http://sum.in.ua/>.

## REFERENCES

- Superanskaja Aleksandra V. 1970: Суперанская, Александра В. Терминологичны ли цветковые названия рек? – *Местные географические термины*, 120–127. Москва: Мысль.
- Sviderskienė Dalia 2006a: Marijampolės apskrities sudurtiniai oronimai. – *Lituanistica* 4(68), 47–59.
- Sviderskienė Dalia 2006b: Marijampolės apskrities drimonimų darybos ir kilmės polinkiai. – *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica / Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai* 54, 49–62.
- Sviderskienė Dalia 2007: Marijampolės apskrities gyvenamųjų vietų vardai. – *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica / Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai* 57, 99–122.
- Sviderskienė Dalia 2016: Sudurtinių Marijampolės apskrities helonimų motyvacija / Motivation of Compound Helonyms of Marijampolė County. – *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* LXXV, 243–273.
- Sviderskienė Dalia 2017: Sudėtinių Marijampolės apskrities helonimų motyvacija / Motivation of Composite Helonyms of Marijampolė County. – *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* LXXVII, 78–102.
- Szerszunowicz Joanna 2010: Some Remarks on Cultural Connotations of Urbanonyms and Idiomaticity in a Contrastive Perspective. – *Acta onomastica* XLI(2), 547–555.
- Tkachenko Yevgeniy N. 2003: Ткаченко, Евгений Н. Взаимодействие гидронимов и ойконимов (в бассейне реки Казенный Торец). – *Філологічні студії*, 58–62.
- Tkachenko Yevgeniy N. 2013: Ткаченко, Євген М. Бурлук – Бурлукочок: формально незмінні та граматично переоформлені імена (у басейні річки Великий Бурлук). – *Філологічні студії. Науковий вісник Криворізького державного педагогічного університету* 9, 399–406. Available at: [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/PhSt\\_2013\\_9\\_59](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/PhSt_2013_9_59).
- Tkachenko Yevgeniy N. 2014: Ткаченко, Евгений Н. Явление бинарной оппозиции в региональной топонимии (на примере географических названий Слобожанщины). – *Вестник Воронежского государственного университета* 3, 67–70.
- Udolph Jürgen 2004: Gewässernamen. – *Namenarten und ihre Erforschung. Ein Lehrbuch für das Studium der Onomastik*, Hrsg. von Andrea und Silvio Brendler. Hamburg: baar.
- UNGEGN Resolutions Adopted at the Eleven United Nations Conferences on the Standardization of Geographical Names. Available at: [https://unstats.un.org/unsd/geoinfo/UNGEGN/docs/pdf/RES\\_UN\\_E\\_updated\\_1-11\\_CONF.pdf](https://unstats.un.org/unsd/geoinfo/UNGEGN/docs/pdf/RES_UN_E_updated_1-11_CONF.pdf).
- Vaitkevičius Vykintas 2012: *Neris. 2007 metų ekspedicija*, antra knyga, Vilnius: Mintis.
- Vaitkevičiūtė Valerija 2007: *Tarptautinių žodžių žodynas*, Vilnius: Leidykla „Žodynas“.
- Vanagas Aleksandras 1970: *Lietuvos TSR hidronimų daryba*, Vilnius: Mintis.

## REFERENCES

- Vanagas Aleksandras 1981a: *Lietuvių hidronimų etimologinis žodynas*, Vilnius: Mintis.
- Vanagas Aleksandras 1981b: Lietuvių hidronimų semantika. – *Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai* 21, 4–153.
- Vanagas Aleksandras 1988: *Lietuvių vandenvardžiai*, Vilnius: Mokslo.
- Vanagas Aleksandras 1996: *Lietuvos miestų vardai*, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla.
- Van Langendonck Willy 2007: *Theory and Typology of Proper Names*, Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Van Langendonck Willy 2013: A Semantic-Pragmatic Theory of Proper Names / Semantinė pragmatinė tikrinių žodžių teorija. – *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* LXIX, 99–129.
- Van Langendonck Willy, Van de Velde Mark 2016: Names and grammar. – Carole Hough (ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Names and Naming*.
- Van Langendonck Willy 2017: A Dichotomy in the Diachronic Structure of Family Names. – *PROCEEDINGS OF ICONN* 4, 45–50.
- Vitkus Aleksandras 2001: Dualistinis lietuvių tautybės susidarymas ir trialistinis Lietuvos krikšto pobūdis; skiriama Mindaugo krikšto 750 metų sukakčiai. – *Mokslas ir gyvenimas* 7/8, 42–43.
- Woodman Paul 2014: The Interconnections Between Toponymy and Identity. – *Review of Historical Geography and Toponomastics* IX(17–18), 7–20.
- WSJPe – *Wielki słownik języka polskiego*, red. P. Źmigrodski, Kraków: Instytut języka polskiego PAN, e. wersja. Available at: <https://wsjp.pl/>.
- Zinkevičius Zigmantas 2007: *Senosios Lietuvos valstybės vardynas*, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.
- Zinkevičius Zigmantas 2008: *Lietuvių asmenvardžiai*, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.
- Zinkevičius Zigmantas 2011: *Lietuvos senosios valstybės 40 svarbiausių mįslių*, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.
- Zinkevičius Zigmantas 2012: *Vilnijos lenkakalbių pavardės*, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos centras.

## ABBREVIATIONS

### Object Abbreviations

C	– city
D	– district
eld	– eldership
mun.	– municipality
RS	– railway station
stead	– steading
tn	– town
trib.	– tributary
v	– village

### Localization Abbreviations

El	– Elektrėnai
Ign	– Ignalina
Jon	– Jonava
Šlčn	– Šalčininkai
Šr	– Širvintos
Švnč	– Švenčionys
Trak	– Trakai
Ukm	– Ukmergė
V	– Vilnius

### Other Abbreviations

Alb.	– Albanian
Bel.	– Belarussian
cf.	– compare
dial.	– dialectal
DIM	– diminutive
DM/DMs	– differentiating marker(s)
e.g.	– for example
En.	– English
et al.	– and others
etc.	– and other
<i>f</i>	– feminine
Finn.	– Finnish
Heb.	– Hebrew
i.e.	– that is
Indo-Eur.	– Indo-European
Lith.	– Lithuanian
Lv.	– Latvian
<i>m</i>	– masculine
<i>pl</i>	– plural
Pol.	– Polish
PN	– personal name
Pref	– prefix
Rus.	– Russian
<i>s</i>	– singular
Slav.	– Slavic
Suf	– suffix
Thr.	– Thracian
Ukr.	– Ukrainian



## TOPONYM INDEX

### A

Alėšiškė 24  
Alėšiškė I 24  
Alėšiškė II 24  
Antakalnis 28  
Antakalnis I 28  
Antakalnis II 28  
Antakalnis III 28  
Asiūklė 33  
Aukštėji Semeniūkai 26  
Ažuoluona 31

### B

Baltėlė 33  
Baltupis 39  
Bėržė 31  
Beržėlis 31  
Beržūnà 31, 32  
Beržuolė 31  
Beržuonà 31, 32  
Boruvkà 33  
Bražuolė 23  
Bražuolės II tvenkinys 23  
Bražuolės I tvenkinys 23  
Bražuolės tvenkinys 23  
Būdà 43  
Būdà I 43  
Būdà III 43

### C

Cėdronas 39, 42  
Cegėlnia 47, 48  
Cegėlnė 47, 48

### D

Dambuvkà 33  
Daučioniūkai 49  
Daučionys 49  
Dembuvkà 33  
Didėji Mėdininkai 46

### E

Elna 35

### G

Gaigālis 37  
Gaigaliūkas 37  
Gajuvkà 33  
Geřvinė 36

### J

Jagėlónys 27  
Jarà 13

### K

Kalesniūkai 45  
Kalnėniai Mijāugonys 27  
Kaniūkai 45  
Kaukysa 41  
Kėdronas 39, 42  
Kenà 29  
Kenà (Kinė) 29  
Kenėlė (Kinėlė) 29  
Kernavė 25  
Keřnavas 25  
Kiaunà 35  
Klevà 32  
Klėnėniai Jagėlónys 27  
Klėnėniai Mijāugonys 27  
Kochanovkà 50  
Kochanovkà I 49  
Kochanovkà II 49  
Kochanovkà III 49  
Koplyčiankà 39  
Krākinis 37, 38  
Krakinūkas 37, 38  
Krienūkė 33  
Kėrnė 25  
Kėvė 13

**L**

Lokỹs 36  
Luknà 33  
Luknėlė 33  
Luknėlis 33

**M**

Mažóji Kenà 29  
Mėdininkai 46  
Mijáugonys 27

**N**

Naujálaukis 44  
Naujálaukis (I) 44  
Naujálaukis II 44  
Naujásodis 44  
Naujásodis I 44  
Naujásodis II 44  
Naujóji Būdà 43  
Nemenčià 24  
Nemenčìné 24  
Nemenčìné II 24  
Nėvardas Áukštas 26  
Nėvardas Žėmas 26  
Noškūnėliai 50  
Noškūnai 50

**O**

Osinuvkà 32

**P**

Pakenė 29, 30  
Papiernià 48  
Pāšilinis 34

**S**

Šafárnė 46  
Šalčininkėliai 47  
Šalčininkėlių Tartōkas 47  
Sasnukà 32  
Šalčininkų II tvenkinỹs 23  
Šalčininkų I tvenkinỹs 23  
Semeliškių Būdà 43  
Senóji Būdà 43  
Šilinis 34  
Slabadà 42, 43  
Slabadkà 42, 43  
Slabadiškė 42  
Smoliárnė 48  
Švenčiukas 40, 41  
Šveñcius 40, 41  
Šveñtas 39, 40  
Šventė 39

**T**

Tartōkas 47  
Taurijà 36  
Turė 36

**U**

Užùkenė 29, 30

**V**

Viesų III tvenkinỹs 23  
Viesų II tvenkinỹs 23  
Viesų I tvenkinỹs 23

**Z**

Žemíeji Semeniùkai 26

Pavel SKORUPA

VILNIUS COUNTY TOPONYMS  
AS SIGNS OF NATIONAL AND  
CULTURAL IDENTITY

TAUTINIO IR KULTŪRINIO  
TAPATUMO ŽENKLAI VILNIAUS  
APSKRITIES TOPONIMIJOJE

Mokslo studija

Lietuvių kalbos redaktorė *Irutė Raišutienė*

Maketuotoja *Silva Jankauskaitė*

Išleido Lietuvių kalbos institutas, Petro Vileišio g. 5, LT-10308 Vilnius