

ALISA STUNŽAITĖ

Institute of the Lithuanian Language

ORCID id: orcid.org/0000-0002-4816-2629

Fields of research: Toponymy, Cognitive Onomastics,
Cognitive Semantics.

DOI: doi.org/10.35321/all87-08

MANIFESTATION OF PHYSIS IN VILNIUS COUNTY DRYMONYMY

Gamtos apraiškos Vilniaus apskrities
drimonimijoje

ANNOTATION

The current research aims to shed some light on the conceptualization of physis¹ in the drymonyms from present-day Vilnius County. The research is limited to the analysis of 65 names selected from the corpus of 787 drymonyms currently officially functioning in the territory of Vilnius County. Data were collected from printed (*Onomasticon of Lithuania's Forests* (Part I, 1994)), electronic (*Electronic Nature Catalogue* (www.ezerai21.lt)) sources, and interactive maps (*Portal of Spacial Information of Lithuania* (www.geoporta.lt)). The study reveals that the domain of physis, in a broad sense, is an abundant motivation source. The drymonyms were divided into two groups, those of clear semantics and motivation and those of obscure semantics and motivation. The drymonyms of clear semantics and motivation conceptualize dominant vegetation species (21), fauna (9), forest type (15), and the peculiarities of the landscape (17). The group of obscure semantics and motivation presents an overview of names, the conceptualization of which is ambiguous due to

¹ The term *physis* is associated with Greek *φύσις* – plants, animals, and other features of the world that pass through a process of birth and death coming to be or passing away (Guthrie 1965; Kratochvíl 2016: 20).

The current research employs the term physis in its broadest sense, signifying both the elements of living nature and features of topographic relief that come to existence (are being born/formed) by natural causes or human intervention, develop and change, and eventually die (disappear).

the polysemy of the motivating appellative (1), the appellative or nominal nature of the motivating concept (5), or even both (3).

KEYWORDS: Vilnius County, drymonyms, conceptualization of toponyms, physis, cognitive onomastics.

ANOTACIJA

Šiuo tyrimu siekiama nustatyti, kokiomis gamtos sąvokomis yra konceptualizuojami drimonimai, funkcionuojantys šių dienų Vilniaus apskrityje. Tyrimui buvo surinkti 787 dabartiniai drimonimai. Duomenys buvo renkami iš rašytinių (*Lietuvos miškų vardynas* (I dalis, 1994)) ir elektroninių (*Elektroninis gamtos katalogas* (www.ezerai21.lt)) šaltinių bei iš interaktyvių žemėlapių (*Lietuvos erdvinės informacijos portalas* (www.geoportal.lt)). Analizės rezultatai parodė, kad gamtos konceptas yra įprasmintas 65 varduose. Tiriamieji drimonimai buvo suskirstyti į dvi didelės grupes: aiškios semantikos ir motyvacijos bei ne visai aiškios semantikos ir motyvacijos. Aiškios semantikos ir motyvacijos drimonimai yra konceptualizuojami per dominuojančios augmenijos rūšių (21), gyvūnijos (9), miško tipo (15) ir kraštovaizdžio ypatumų (17) sąvokas. Ne visai aiškios semantikos ir motyvacijos drimonimų grupė pateikia vardą, kurių konceptualizavimas yra dviprasmiškas dėl motyvuojančių apeliatyvų polisemijos (1), motyvuojančios sąvokos apeliatyvinės ar tikrinės prigimties (5) arba dėl abiejų (3).

ESMINIAI ŽODŽIAI: Vilniaus apskritis, drimonimai, toponimų konceptualizavimas, gamta, kognityvinė onomastika.

INTRODUCTION

The debate on the meaning of proper nouns is exceedingly old. While there are schools that support the idea that names are meaningless, i.e., they only have a reference (Kripke 1972; Ullmann 1969: 33), the Cognitive Approach to the onym analysis provides evidence in favour of the fact that names carry not only lexical features but are also semantically charged, and associated with the conceptual content (Berezovič 1991: 75; Rut 2001: 59; Leino 2011: 215). The cognitive view of a name suggests that it has much more to tell. It consists of multiple layers reflecting traditional, kinship, possessive, and many other bonds with the surrounding world (Langendonck 2013; Ainiala et al. 2016). As soon as an interaction between a human being and the environment begins, every undiscovered land, living nature body, or phenomenon gains a name. Therefore, the meanings of names become encrypted with the individual's understanding of the world. In other words, the names start to reflect the worldview, which may be understood as the foundational perspective of the person based on which

every question of existence is addressed; it is a coherent image of what is being recognized by both individuals and communities (Sire 2015: 24; Głaz 2017: 35). If the perception of the world shapes the worldview, it is a cognitive process, and it depends on subjective judgments which were imposed on a person by the community. This leads to the idea that toponyms, as Ilona Mickienė and Rita Baranauskienė (2019: 60) describe, are a message from the past which reflects the history of the Lithuanian nation, their spiritual and material life, household, and the relationship with the surrounding environment.

Language is a significant element of the worldview, it transmits cultural reality, and thus community members with the same linguistic background feel historical continuity (Fong, Chuang 2004: 8; Kramsch 1998). The linguistic nature of place names makes it easier to address the real world (Vasil'eva 2007). Moreover, names exist in every society. Therefore, they could be perceived as cultural universals (Alford 1988). However, the lexical form of onyms should not be separated from the semantic form, as only through semantics is it possible to take a path from the linguistic world to the real one (Ter-Minasova 2000: 46–47). As toponyms are a part of the linguistic system and are found in all languages around the world, their existence leads to the idea that they preserve the evidence of human-nature interactions. After all, they were based on impressions of the residents about the objects of reality. Long-term contacts between people and living nature form a specific image of the area (Vasil'eva 2007: 96).

Scholars have observed the correlation between physis and toponymy. For instance, Sousa and Garcia-Murillo (2001: 391) question whether landscape changes are reflected in place names. Their research concludes that such change prevails and discusses how such a shift is perceived. Fagúndez and Izco (2016) claim that the species found in a particular place may be encoded in toponyms, signifying the location's biological diversity. Giedrė Beconytė et al. (2019) took a closer look at the correlation between the phytolexemes and zoolexemes with oikonyms in Lithuania. Pavel Skorupa (2021) analysed toponyms containing the concepts of flora and fauna as signs of national and cultural identity. Generally, toponyms containing the concept of flora and fauna signify locations inhabited by certain species or densely distributed plants; such names do not necessarily reveal all living nature entities typical for the region. Instead, they disclose the specific elements which turn into a place's distinguishing markers (Skorupa 2021: 37; Saparov et al. 2021: 96; Vasil'eva 2007). The research mentioned above gives a fair ground for further investigation of toponyms motivated by the concept of nature. The embodiment of physis in Vilnius County drymonyms has not been approached by scholars yet. Therefore, the current research should

shed some light on the landscape peculiarities and region-specific biological diversity, underscoring the dominant species of a place.

This article is based on the analysis of the conceptualisation of physis in the drymonyms from present-day Vilnius County. Mickienė and Bieliauskaitė (2018) note that forests are part of a constantly changing landscape, and it is valuable to investigate their names once in a while. Present-day Vilnius County is a wooded land. Here, forests make up 43.9% of the territory (VLEe). Undoubtedly, their names carry valuable knowledge about the surroundings and are ready to reveal the peculiarities of the region's landscape, flora, and fauna.

The aim of the current research is to identify the concepts of physis encrypted in the drymonyms of present-day Vilnius County.

Research material and sources. The scope of the current research comprises 65 drymonyms that reflect the concepts of physis. These names were selected from the corpus of 787 drymonyms that are currently officially functioning within the present-day Vilnius County boundaries. The names were collected from both electronic and printed sources.² Drymonyms motivated by the surrounding settlements or bodies of water were abandoned in the investigation. These forest names follow the metonymic naming pattern and denote the connection between the settlement/water body name and the drymonym. They do not carry any significant semantic charge (Reszegi 2012: 5). However, they make up the most significant part of all drymonyms of the corpus, i.e., 577 forest names are associated with other toponyms and/or hydronyms. Therefore, 65 drymonyms out of 210 are linked to the concept of physis, thus making it a relatively abundant source of motivation.

Research methodology. The framework for the drymonym analysis is adopted from the research models proposed by Aleksandras Vanagas (1981), Dalia Sviderskienė (2016; 2017; 2019; 2022), Ilona Mickienė, Rita Baranauskienė (2019), Pavel Skorupa (2019; 2021; 2021a), and others. Location, origin, and possible etymons and their meanings are provided for every drymonym under investigation. The motivating appellatives are retrieved from e-dictionaries of Lithuanian, Russian, Polish, and Belarusian languages. The research follows the tradition of cognitive onomastics analysis; therefore, it claims that all names have meaning. The model of conceptual content realization through language is adopted referring to Nicola Dobrič (2010). The conceptualization of the drymonyms is illustrated through the source and target domains, where the source is an appellative, and the target is a drymonym, i.e., appellative → conceptual structure → drymonym. The adopted theory of name conceptualization deals with identifying the conceptual structure motivating the coining of a name.

² See Drymonym Sources & References.

The current research divides the analyzed drymonyms into two groups: those of clear semantics and motivation and those of obscure semantics and motivation.

1. DRYMONYMS OF CLEAR SEMANTICS AND MOTIVATION

The current group of drymonyms is formed by names that do not pose any ambiguity in the identification of their motivation. These drymonyms are motivated by the domain of physis and involve the concepts of vegetation species, animals, forest types, and peculiarities of the forest landscape. It is noteworthy that most of the names are Lith. Suf *-ynas*, *-ynė*, in rear cases, *-ytė* derivates. These suffix-derivatives follow a long-time name-giving tradition in the Lithuanian language. Usually, they denote the accumulation of plants or other objects of the living nature, less often living creatures in one place. Therefore, they are usually found in toponyms (Ambrasas 1995: 184–185).

1.1. Drymonyms Reflecting the Vegetation Species

Avietynė (V D) reflects the conceptualization of the dominant berries in the territory. It is derived from Lith. *avietynė*, *avietýnas* ‘raspberry bushes, a place where raspberries grow’ (LVŽ I: 243) and follows the pattern of conceptualization: Lith. *avietynė*, *avietýnas* → a forest where raspberries grow → *Avietynė*.

Ažuolýnas (V D, Ukm D) could be related to Lith. *qžuolýnas* ‘oak forest’ (LVŽ I: 271), which is formed from Lith. *qžuolas* ‘oak tree’ + Lith. Suf *-ynas*. Transparent naming signifies that oaks cover the territory of the forest and is conceptualized through the following model: Lith. *qžuolýnas* → a forest of oak trees → *Ažuolýnas*.

The following drymonyms could be presented in the group as all of these are formed with the base lexeme *berž-*: ***Beržýnas*** (Šlčn D, Ukm D), ***Beržynėlis*** (Šr D), ***Beržytė*** (Ukm D), and ***Berželai*** (Ukm D). All these drymonyms embed the concept of Lith. *béržas* ‘leafy tree with white bark, a birch’ (LKŽe). However, the conceptualisation of each slightly differs. For instance, ***Beržýnas*** employs the idea of the location covered with birches: Lith. *beržýnas* → a birch forest → *Beržýnas*. So does ***Beržytė***, Lith. *berž-* + Lith. Suf *-ytė* → a birch forest → *Beržytė*. ***Beržynėlis*** is probably associated with the size of trees, or forest as such, as Suf *-ėlis* in most cases signifies either the smaller size of an entity or pleasure. (cf. Urbutis 2009: 330): Lith. *berž-* + Lith. *-yn* + Lith. Suf *-ėlis* → a small forest

of (low) birches → *Beržynėlis* or Lith. *berž-* + Lith. Suf *-yn* + Lith. Suf *-ėlis* → a pleasant forest of birches → *Beržynėlis*. **Beržėliai** was motivated by the same concept, Lith. Suf *-elis*, which in this case is probably associated with smallness (Urbutis *ibid.*). It should also be noted that the name is a plural form. Therefore, considering all the evidence, the conceptualisation model could be: Lith. *berž-* + Lith. Suf *-elai* → a forest of low/newly planted birches → *Beržėliai*.

The manifestation of the Slavonic languages is encrypted in **Boras** (Šlčn D). The name is derived from Rus. *бор* ‘conifer forest, pine forest’, or Bel. *бор* ‘clean, old, pine forest’, or Pol. *bor* ‘pine forest, forest’ (LVŽ III: 538). In all cases, the name bears the concept of the pine tree. Therefore, it could be conceptualized as: Rus. *Bor* / Bel. *Bor* / Pol. *bor* → a pine forest → *Boras*.

Bruknýnė (Šlčn D) is another example of berries spread in the territory and is related to Lith. *bruknýnė, bruknýnas* ‘a place where lingonberries grow, where there are many lingonberries’ (LVŽ I: 574). Therefore, the name is just a transfer of the dominating berry species in the forest: Lith. *bruknýnė, bruknýnas* → a forest where lingonberries grow → *Bruknýnė*.³

Drebulýnė (V D) is associated with Lith. *drebulýnas, drebulýnė* ‘a forest full of trees with trembling leaves, (*Populus tremula*), an aspen’ (LVŽ II: 324). The name directly transmits which tree species are spread in the area, and, therefore, the conceptualisation model is: *drebulýnė* → an aspen forest → *Drebulýnė*.

Eglýnas (V D, Šlčn D) and **Eglynėlis** (Švnč D) may be analysed in a group too. Both are associated with Lith. *eglýnas, eglýnė* ‘a fir forest’ (LVŽ II: 464). Even though the drymonyms share the same base lexeme, they may slightly differ in meaning. The motivation of **Eglýnas** is rather transparent: Lith. *eglýnas* → a fir forest → *Eglýnas*. However, there is more to discuss in terms of **Eglynėlis**, as its diminutive formed with Lith. Suf *-ėlis*⁴ should be related to the concept of smallness. The small size of the forest could have served as a marker for this name. Also, it may be plausible that the name was coined with reference to the size of fir trees at that time, i.e., firs might have been rather low, newly planted. Consequently, the following conceptual model could have been employed to

³ It should be noted that both *Avietýnė* and *Bruknýnė* are forests in the vicinity of which there are villages of the same names, cf. *Avietýnė* x *Avietýnė* and *Bruknýnė* x *Bruknýnė*; however, these names were not omitted from the list of the onyms under investigation as we firmly believe that drymonyms were the sources of oikonym motivation. The berries are spread in the wooded areas. Therefore, the villages were unlikely to be built in the territories where these berries grow. A more convincing theory is that these berries grow in the forests, and only later did the villages established here gain their names.

⁴ Cf. Urbutis 2009: 330.

motivate a dryronym: Lith. *eglyn-* + Lith. Suf *-ėlis* → a small forest of (low/ newly planted) firs → *Eglynėlis*.

Júodgiris (Ukm D) is probably from Lith. *júodgiris, júodgirė* ‘coniferous (spruce, pine), forest’ (LVŽ IV: 212). The name transfers the concept of the area’s most dominant species of trees – conifers: Lith. *júodgiris, júodgirė* → a coniferous forest → *Júodgiris*.

An interesting case is **Liepāberžis** (Šlčn D), which is a composite onym that comprises two lexemes. The first is associated with Lith. *liépa* ‘a linden’ and the second – with Lith. *bérzas* ‘a birch’. The name clearly states that the dominant species in the forest are both lindens and birches. The conceptualisation could be illustrated as: *liépa* + *bérzas* → a forest of lindens and birches → *Liepāberžis*.

Liepýnas (El D) is from Lith. *liepýnas* ‘a place covered with lindens, a linden forest’ (LKŽe). The name directly describes the location covered with lindens; therefore, it is conceptualised as: Lith. *liepýnas* → a forest of lindens → *Liepýnas*.

Names as **Pušýnas** (Šr D), **Pušynėlis** (Ukm D), and **Didžiöji Pušis** (Švnč D) are linked by the same base lexeme Lith. *puš-*, but just as the examples analyzed above, they slightly differ in meaning. For instance, **Pušýnas** is from Lith. *pušýnas* ‘pine forest’ (LKŽe), where the root of the name is conceptualized as: Lith. *pušýnas* → a pine forest → *Pušýnas*. **Pušynėlis**, similarly to the already presented dryonyms, is most probably associated with the concept of smallness due to Lith. Suf *-ėlis*⁵, and it may follow this model of conceptualization: Lith. *puš-* + Lith. Suf *-yn-* + Lith. Suf *-ėlis* → a small/pleasant pine forest → *Pušynėlis*. Lastly, attention should be drawn to a compound name **Didžiöji Pušis**, where Lith. *didýsis*, cf. *didis, -i, -é, -ė, didžià* stand for ‘notable for its volume, large’ (LKŽe). This dryronym signifies a large pine in the forest which served as a marker for the location. Therefore, the exceptional size of a pine tree should have been encrypted in the name. Consider the conceptualization model: Lith. *didžiöji* + Lith. *pušis* → a forest with a huge pine tree → *Didžiöji Pušis*.

The last in this category is **Šermukšnýne** (Ukm D). It is another example of the conceptualization of the dominant tree species and is derived from Lith. *šermukšnýne* ‘a place where many rowan trees grow’ (LKŽe). Its conceptualization model is: *šermukšnýne* → a forest of rowans → *Šermukšnýne*.

At first sight, the meanings of these dryonyms seem to be transparent. It is unclear which concepts motivated the process of nomination. The concept of vegetation reveals the most common tree or other plant species in a particular forest. They shed some light on such details as the size or possible age of the forest at the time it was named. Finally, these dryonyms expose the emotional

⁵ Cf. Urbutis 2009: 330.

value of trees to the national worldview. It is believed that every tree in the ancient Lithuanian culture was related to the manifestation of different deities, the most common types were oaks, lindens, birches, and pines (Klimka 2011; Vaitkevičius 2013). The concept of vegetation species served as the motivating factor for 21 drymonyms now functioning in Vilnius County.

1.2. Drymonyms Reflecting the Forest Type

The concept of the forest type seems to be the second most productive source for the conceptualization of drymonyms in the physis domain. Even though some meanings seem rather obvious, they reveal certain peculiarities of the woody locations they name.

Atžalýnas (Ukm D) is derived from Lith. appellative *atžalýnas* 'a place where many offspring grow; young forest' (LVŽ I: 213). The concept of newly-planted trees is employed: Lith. *atžalýnas* → a young forest → *Atžalýnas*.

Girià (V D, Ukm D), **Girėlė** (V D, V D, El D, Švčn D), and **Girelka** (Šr D) are derived from the same base lexeme Lith. *gir-*. **Girià** was motivated by Lith. *girià* 'big forest' (LVŽ III: 198), its conceptualization is presented as follows: Lith. *girià* → big forest → *Girià*. The drymonym **Girėlė** in all cases should have been influenced by the appellative Lith. *girià*, which is a big forest, but Lith. Suf *-elė* signifies the concept of smallness. However, the forest could not be big and small simultaneously. Thereby, it should be more logical to associate the Suf *-elė* with the meaning of pleasure (Ubrutis 2009: 310). Thus, the name should have been conceptualized as: Lith. *gir-* + Lith. Suf *-elė* → a pleasant forest → *Girėlė*. The conceptualization model of **Girelka** is influenced by the Slavonic Suf *-ka/-ka*, which is usually used in the diminutive forms expressing the concept of smallness or pleasure (cf. Voronina 2012: 15). As in **Girėlė**, the semantic charge of the small size seems illogical, it is probable that the Suf expresses the concept of pleasure: Lith. *gir-* + Lith. Suf *-el* + Slav. Suf *-ka/-ka* → *a pleasant forest* → *Girelka*. The last name in this group also serves as a toponymic monument transmitting the influence of the Slavonic languages on the national worldview.

Gōjus (El D, Šr D) is formed with the help of the Slavonic root *zaū*, Lith. *gōjus* 'a small, beautiful forest, grove' (LKŽe; LVŽ III: 237). The concepts of smallness and pleasure are employed in the name. The following conceptualization is revealed: Slav. *zaū* → a small, beautiful forest → *Gōjus*. The Slavonic origin of the onym should not be left unnoticed, as it provides valuable information on the influence of the Slavonic languages on the Lithuanian lands.

Krúmai (Šr D) could have originated from Lith. *krúmai* ‘a young forest of small trees’ (LKŽe). The drymonym’s conceptualization could be: Lith. *krúmai* → a forest of young and small trees → *Krúmai*.

The influence of the Slavonic languages is observed in **Maladakas** (Šlčn D), which could be associated with Slav. lexemes, i.e., Rus. *Молод*, *-a* (BTSe); Bel. *молодá* (Skarnik.by); in both cases, the concept of youth is observed. However, Rus. *Молод*, *-a* also stresses the meaning of ‘something that has recently appeared, began to exist or grow’ (BTSe). At this point, the transfer of the young forest could be observed. Therefore, it may have the following conceptualization model: Rus. *Молод*, *-a*; Bel. *молодá* → a forest of recently planted trees → *Maladakas*.

Medelýnas (Ukm D) is related to Lith. *medelýnas* ‘a place for growing trees and fruit trees, arboretum’ (LKŽe). This naming signifies that fruit trees possibly cover the territory and are grown there. The concept is transferred as: Lith. *medelýnas* → a forest of trees/fruit trees → *Medelýnas*.

Samānis (El D) could be associated with Lith. *samānis* ‘living in moss, made of moss’ (LKŽe). The drymonym conceptualizes the vegetation which probably covers the land and trees in the forest: Lith. *samānis* → a forest covered with moss → *Samānis*.

Tañkmiškis (Trak D) is a compound name formed from two Lith. lexemes *tánkus* ‘consisting of closely spaced equal parts, dense’ and Lith. *miškas* ‘a place covered with trees, a forest’ (LKŽe). The semantic load the name carries signifies that the forest could be characterized by its luxuriant vegetation. Therefore, the name is conceptualized as: Lith. *tánkus* + Lith. *miškas* → a forest with dense vegetation → *Tañkmiškis*.

There is no doubt that these onyms were semantically motivated. They reveal the concepts of size, vegetation density, beauty, and age of the forest. In total, this passage contains 15 drymonyms, the majority of which are of Lithuanian origin (12), two are influenced by the Slavonic languages, and one is a contaminated drymonym which contains a Slavonic inflexion. The influence of the languages spoken in the neighbouring countries is inevitable, as Lithuania has a shared history with Slavonic cultures.

1.3. Drymonyms Reflecting Landscape

Names which reflect the landscape character of a particular territory are presented in this chapter. It would be worthwhile to refer to Aleksandras Vanagas (1981: 20), who stated that all landscape peculiarities have specific names. Therefore, hydronyms which acquired their names from those peculiarities are

considered nomenclature terms. They are not charged with semantics. Instead, they describe the peculiarities of a lake or river location. However, these names store information that, on the one hand, may be characteristic of different areas in different territories, but, on the other hand, they also describe the physiographic characteristics of the analyzed territory and embed the concepts of the distinguishing location markers.

Miškytė (Ukm D) drymonym is a derivative from Lith. *miškas* ‘forest’ and Lith. Suf *-ytė*. It refers to the area outgrown with trees, a forest: Lith. *mišk-* + Lith. Suf *-ytė* → a forest → *Miškytė*. Surprisingly, this drymonym is probably one of those rare instances where the name is truly a nomenclature term. It simply states the fact that the area is covered with woods.

The peculiarities of the location are also encoded in ***Raistas*** (El D, Šr D, Ukm D). These drymonyms were motivated by Lith. *raistas* ‘a sticky place covered with bushes or trees, a swamp’ (LKŽe). Therefore, not only does it state the forest’s features, but it may also be a warning about the swampy area. The name is conceptualized as: Lith. *raistas* → a forest in the swampy area → *Raistas*. There is also ***Raistėliai*** (Šr D), which was derived from the same lexeme Lith. *raist-* and originated from Lith. *raistas* by means of Lith. Suf *-ėliai*. The name probably employs the concept of smallness.⁶ The plural form of the drymonym stresses that the forest area is covered with multiple swamps. The conceptualization model could be: Lith. *raist-* + Lith. Suf *-ėliai* → a forest in the area with many small swamps → *Raistėliai*.

Another example could be ***Skynimas*** (El D), which is derived from Lith. *skýnimas*, *skynimas*, *skýnymas*, *skynýmas* ‘a cut forest side’ (LKŽe) and conceptualizes the area of the forest that was cut down: Lith. *skýnimas*, *skynimas*, *skýnymas*, *skynýmas* → a forest a part of which is cut down → *Skynimas*.

Šilas (Šlčn D, Šr D), ***Šilai*** (Tr D), and ***Šilėlis*** (V D, Tr D, El D, Ukm D, Šr D) are united by the lexeme Lith. *šil-* and are derived from Lith. *šilas* ‘a forest of tall, straight conifers (esp. pines) growing in sand dunes’ (LKŽe). The conceptualisation model is easy to retrieve for both ***Šilas*** and ***Šilai***. The latter is a plural form ***Šilas***: Lith. *šilas* → conifer forest growing in sand dunes → ***Šilas***, ***Šilai***. Not only does the name reveal what the dominant species of the forest trees are, but it also stresses the ground’s peculiarities, stating that it is mostly sand. ***Šilėlis*** probably refers to the size of smallness, as Lith. Suf *-elis*⁷ is added. The conceptualisation differs in: Lith. *šil-* + Lith. Suf *-elis* → a small conifer forest growing in sand dunes → ***Šilėlis***.

⁶ Cf. Urbutis 2009: 330.

⁷ Cf. Urbutis 2009: 330.

Šlaǐtas (Ukm D) probably originated from Lith. *šlaǐtas* ‘sloping area covered with trees and bushes, a slope’ (LKŽe). The onym transmits significant details about the landscape of the forest. The conceptualization model is represented as: Lith. *šlaǐtas* → a forest on the slope → *Šlaǐtas*. **Šlaitaī** (Trak D) expresses the exact meaning of a slopy area, though the plural form may signify that the area is full of slopes covered with the forest: Lith. *šlaǐt-* + *-aī* → a forest in the area full of slopes → *Šlaitaī*.

An interesting case is **Zaliesė** (Ukm D), which probably originated from Rus. *залесье* ‘the area behind the forest’ (Guseva 1971: 94; Gun’ko 2015: 176). The drymonym indicates that the named forest is located behind other forests. However, the extralinguistic data available to the author at the time of writing revealed that the closest forest⁸ is 29 km away (GP). It is noteworthy that the toponym *Залесье* is outspread throughout the Slavonic world, and it is often addressed as a landmark term⁹ (Guseva 1971: 91, 94). The conceptualization of other toponyms with the same name is transparent, but the motivation behind the drymonym remains vague. The only logical explanation is that a part of the field behind the forest was addressed as *Zaliesė*; as the area got outgrown, the name was transferred to the forest. In this case, the concept of location is conveyed: Rus. *залесье* → a forest behind forests → *Zaliesė*. Unfortunately, there is no evidence that the fields or their parts surrounding *Zaliesė* forest were referred to as *Zaliesė*. Therefore, the idea expressed by the author is just a matter of interpretation. This onym is probably another pure nomenclature term.

Drymonyms referring to the peculiarities of the landscape may be, on the one hand, considered nomenclature terms, as Vanagas (1981) proposed it. On the other hand, an unconventional landscape is embedded in these names. In some cases, names do not carry any significant semantic charge, just as in *Miškytė*. However, the other examples disclose that the wooded area is swampy. Some territories of the forests are cut down, some grew up on the sandy ground, and others covered the slopy areas. There are 17 drymonyms in present-day Vilnius County which fall into this category.

1.4. Drymonyms Reflecting Fauna

Just as the most widespread species of vegetation are embedded in toponymy, so do the dominant species of fauna. Surprisingly, Vilnius County drymonyms do not have many instances of fauna manifestation.

⁸ Cf. *Lančiūnavos* forest (GP).

⁹ Rus. *Термины-ориентиры* (cf. Guseva 1971: 91).

Barsiukynė (V D) most likely originated from Lith. *barsiukynė* ‘the residence of badgers in the forest’ (LVŽ I: 382). The dryronym makes it clear that the place is dominated by badger clans: Lith. *barsiukynė* → the residence of badgers → *Barsiukynė*.

Gyatynė (V D) is derived from Lith. *gyvatýnas*, *gyvatýnė* ‘a place full of snakes’ (LVŽ III: 216). Hence the transfer of the dominating fauna species concept is carried out: Lith. *gyvatýnas*, *gyvatýnė* → a place full of snakes → *Gyatynė*.

Pavarnālizdė (Trak D) is a compound derived from Lith. *várna* ‘a bird of the crow family with grey and black feathers, a crow’ and Lith. *lìzdas* ‘the place of laying eggs, hatching and rearing, a nest’ (LKŽe) by means of Lith. Pref *pa-* which in most of cases expresses the concept of location and has the meaning of being under something (Kniūkšta 2004). The name embodies the following conceptualization model: Lith. Pref *pa-* + Lith. *várna* + Lith. *lìzdas* → a forest which abounds in crow nests → *Pavarnālizdė*.

Žvériñcius (Šr D) is probably from Lith. *žvériñcius*, *žvérýnas* cf. *žvérìs* ‘a wild mammal’ (LKŽe). In Lithuanian, *žvériñcius*, *žvérýnas* are associated with ‘a place where animals are kept for display to visitors’ (LKŽe), which is unlikely in this case. However, the name may figuratively imply that in this forest, there are plenty of animals, which perhaps are even fed for hunting. Therefore, it would follow the conceptualization model: Lith. *žvériñcius*, *žvérýnas* → a forest where many wild animals live → *Žvériñcius*.

There are only four dryonyms which convey the concepts of fauna. They conceptualize mammals, reptiles, and birds and encrypt the image of wild animals as such.

2. DRYMONYMS OF OBSCURE SEMANTICS AND MOTIVATION

Dryonyms that belong to the physis domain are also of obscure semantics and motivation. This is due to ambiguous boundaries between the types of motivation as there is little to no evidence for these cases, and they remain the object of interpretation. The dryonyms in this part are analysed in groups: 1) motivated by polysemous appellatives, 2) motivated by appellative or proper nouns, and 3) motivated by polysemous appellatives or proper nouns.

2.1. Drymonyms Motivated by Polysemous Appellatives

The unclear source of motivation in this category deals with the ambiguous nature of the motivating appellatives of the dryronym. The assumptions raised are plausible, and it is impossible to tell which concept was encoded in the dryronym. There is only one dryronym in this category. It is **Černicos** forest that probably gained its name from Pol. *czernica* ‘blackberry’ (PWNe). The name describes what kind of forest goods are there: Pol. *czernica* → a forest where blackberries grow → **Černicos** forest. On the other hand, the possibility of another origin cannot be overlooked: Pol. *czernica* means ‘wild duck with a prominent tuft on the head, tufted duck’ (PWNe). This motivation is likely because this duck species is common in Lithuania (VLEe). Consequently, colonies of these birds could have been found in the surroundings: *czernica* → a forest where flocks of ducks live → **Černicos** forest. However, considering both versions, the first one is more appealing. Blackberries usually grow in thickets or forest outskirts. Their prevalence in the territory of Lithuania is indisputable (Gudžinskas 1999). Nevertheless, wild ducks typically do not settle in the woodlands. They instead prefer small lakes, rivers or ponds (VLEe). There are no water bodies in the surroundings. Consequently, this motivation loses its grounding.

2.2. Drymonyms Motivated by an Appellative or a Proper Noun

In this part of the paper, the names that could have been derived from proper nouns and appellatives are described presupposing that the concepts of physis influenced both. However, so far, it is hardly possible to claim which source of motivation the dryronym can be traced to. If drymonyms were motivated by a proper noun, they would express the concept of possessivity and lose the link to the concept of physis. However, if the core for the dryronym’s motivation was an appellative, a different conceptualization model could have been employed. There are five examples presented below.

Balañdžio miškas (Šr D) expresses the concept of possessivity by the possessive case (Lith. *Kilmininkas*). Normally, the concept of the dominating fauna of the place could have been employed. The name could have been associated with Lith. *balañdis* ‘such a bird, a sow, a pegeon’ (LKŽe). In this case, the name of the forest is the concept of a bird characteristic of the area:

Lith. *balañdis* → a forest where pigeons live → *Balañdžio miškas*. However, we should not overlook that the name can be derived from Lith. PN *Balañdis* (LVŽ I: 323), which is also derived from Lith. *balañdis* (a pigeon), but the motive for the drymonym would be quite different. In this case, we would already be talking about possessivity relationships, i.e., Lith. PN *Balañdis* → a forest owned by *Balañdis* → *Balañdžio miškas*.

The same may be observed in ***Barsiùko miškas*** (Šr D); the article already presented the conceptualization model for the forest with the same base lexeme,¹⁰ no ambiguity in the semantics was observed due to its Lith. Suf -ynė.¹¹ Though this time the ambiguity is employed by the possessive case, which allows considering two sources of motivation. First, the drymonym may have been influenced by Lith. *barsiùkas* 'a beast of prey with coarse hair; Ursus meles (Ursus meles), a badger' (LVŽ I: 382). If this version is valid, the concept of dominating fauna is expressed: Lith. *barsiùkas* → a forest where clans of badgers live → *Barsiùko miškas*. Also, Lith. PN ***Barsiùkas*** (PDBe) does exist, and even though there is no data that such a surname was common in the district where the forest is located, this version should not be left aside. Therefore, it expresses possessivity: Lith. PN *Barsiùkas* → a forest owned by *Barsiùkas* → *Barsiùko miškas*.

The same model of dominating flora/fauna or possession is expressed in the number of names. ***Baravýkų miškas*** (Ukm D) may be associated with two motivations, the first one is of the appellative nature, where the name derives from Lith. *baravýkas* 'type of a mushroom, a Penny Bun' (LVŽ I: 366). The possessive case suggests that the forest belongs to this type of mushroom, i.e., the species are widely spread: Lith. *baravýkas* → a forest where there are many penny buns → *Baravýkų miškas*. On the other hand, Lith. PN *Baravýkas* (PDBe) is widely spread on the territory of Lithuania, and even though there are none of this surname bearers in the Ukmurgė district, such motivation is still possible. The concept of possession is expressed: Lith. PN *Baravýkas* → a forest owned by *Baravýkas* → *Baravýkų miškas*.

Dubniākas (V D) may be associated with Slav. appellatives: Bel. *дубняк*, Rus. *дубняк* 'oak-grown place, young oak forest' (LVŽ II: 361; BTSe). The transfer of the dominating flora is carried out: Bel. *Дубняк* / Rus. *дубняк* → a forest of oaks → *Dubniākas*. The ambiguity of the motivating concept is employed by Lith. PN *Dubniokas*, *Dubna* (Razmukaitė 1998: 107), Lith. PN *Dùbnikas* (PDBe), Bel. PN *Дубник* (Biryla 1969: 138). If the onym was motivated by the

¹⁰ Cf. *Barsiukynė*.

¹¹ Cf. Ambraszas 1995: 184–185.

surname, the ties of possession would be expressed: Lith. PN *Dubniokas, Dubna, Dùbnikas*, Bel. PN *Дубнік*, → a forest owned by *Dubniokas / Dubna / Дубнік / Dùbnikas* → *Dubniākas*.¹²

Lith. *taūras* ‘an animal of the horned family, the ancestor of the cattle, an auroch’ (LKŽe) should have influenced ***Taūrų miškas*** (V D). Evidence that aurochs existed in Lithuania is still found in forests and lakes. Whether it is a skull or horns, it only confirms the theory about the distribution of these animals in wildlife.¹³ Therefore, the dryronym comes from the name of this beast: Lith. *taūras* → a forest where herds of aurochs used to live → *Taūrų miškas*. At the same time, such Lith. PN as *Táura, Tauráitis, Taurēlis*, etc. (PDBe) should not be ignored. In this case, the dryronym expresses possessivity: Lith. PN *Táura, Tauráitis, Taurēlis* → a forest owned by *Táura, Tauráitis, Taurēlis* → *Taūrų miškas*.¹⁴

2.3. Dryonyms Motivated by a Proper Noun or Polysemous Appellatives

The dryonyms motivated by the PNs and/or appellatives with more than one meaning are analyzed here. There are two examples presented below. One is ***Kárpių miškas*** (Ukm D), which also falls into this category, as it could have been motivated by Lith. PN *Kařpius*, the origin of which may be associated with Bel. PN *Kapnycь* (Biryla 1966: 95). The possessive form of the onym could signify that it expresses the concept of possessivity: Lith. PN *Kařpius* / Bel. PN *Kapnycь* → a forest owned by *Kapnycь* → *Kárpių miškas*. At the same time, the name could be related to Lith. *kárpis* ‘common privet, a type of a bushy plant’ (LKŽe). Considering the dryonyms analyzed above, they usually obtain their names due to the dominant species of vegetation; it is plausible that it is encrypted in this dryronym too: Lith. *kárpis* → a forest where common privets grow → *Kárpių miškas*. Finally, in Lith. *kárpis* stands for the name of the fish ‘a carp’ (LKŽe). Even though there are some rivers and ponds in the surroundings of the forest, this version is least convincing, as, according to the cognitive

¹² The appellative nature of the dryronym is more convincing. Firstly, it is rather common to name forests according to the dominant tree species; this was already discussed. Secondly, the surnames *Dubniokas, Dubna, Дубнік, Dùbnikas* are not recorded in the region under investigation (PDBe).

¹³ The paleozoological research conducted in 1960 in Vilnius concluded that 47.5% of all the bones found in the territory belonged to aurochs (Vitkūnas 2009: 6).

¹⁴ It should be noted that this version is only partly possible as the distribution of the surnames mentioned contradicts the assumption of the dryronym’s motivation (cf. PDBe).

models, it should have reflected the species in the forest or surroundings. However, if there were any reasons to transfer the concept of a fish into the forest, the conceptualization model would be: Lith. *kárpis* → a forest where carps live in the ponds, rivers → *Kárpių miškas*.

It is also possible to take a look at the dryronym ***Lapelių miškas*** (Šr D), which could have been motivated by Lith. PN *Lapēlis*, which was not found in the district under investigation,¹⁵ yet it does exist in the territory of Lithuania. Therefore, the possessive bonds may be revealed: Lith. PN *Lapēlis* → a forest owned by *Lapēlis* → *Lapelių miškas*. The appellative nature of the onym should not be overruled, as it may have been associated with Lith. *lapēlis*, which is diminutive for Lith. *lāpas* 'a leaf' (LKŽe), the ground for such a motivation may have been the type of trees in the forest: Lith. *lapēlis* → a deciduous forest → *Lapelių miškas*. However, the dryronym could also be related to Lith. *lāpē* 'a fox', and if this version is presented, the name of the forest should reflect the fact that there are foxes in the forest: Lith. *lāpē* + Lith. Suf *-elis* → a forest where foxes live → *Lapelių miškas*.

CONCLUSIONS

To sum up the analysis of the dryonyms of present-day Vilnius County, several conclusions could be drawn:

1. The domain of physis is a relatively productive motivation source; 65 out of 787 dryonyms were conceptualized through the imagery of physis.
2. Dryonyms under investigation fall into two groups, those of clear semantics and motivation and those of obscure semantics and motivation.
 - A. The manifestation of physis in the group of clear semantics and motivation is perceived through such concepts as a) dominating vegetation (21), b) the forest type (15), c) the peculiarities of the landscape (17), and e) fauna (9).
 - B. The group of dryonyms of obscure semantics and motivation contains onyms which a) are ambiguous due to the polysemy of the motivating concept (1), b) are either of the appellative and/or proper name nature (5), and c) are motivated either by a polysemous appellative or by proper nouns (3).
3. The analysis of the dryonyms presented above demonstrates the significance of the physis on the national worldview. Dryonyms, which at

¹⁵ Cf. PDBe.

first sight do not carry any semantic charge, reveal what biological diversity and topographic relief are common to the region and transmit what was truly important for the population of that time.

ABBREVIATIONS

Bel. – Belarusian; cf. – compare; D – district; El – Elektrénai; et al. – and others; Lith. – Lithuanian; PN – personal name; Pol. – Polish; Pref – prefix; Rus. – Russian; Slav. – Slavonic; Suf – suffix; Šlčn – Šaččininkai; Šr – Širvintos; Švčn – Švenčionys; tn – town; Trak – Trākai; Ukm – Ukmergė; V – Vilnius.

DRYMONYM SOURCES

GP – *Lietuvos erdvinės informacijos portalas* [Portal of Spacial Information of Lithuania]. Available at: <https://www.geoportal.lt/geoportal/>.

LMV – *Lietuvos miškų vardynas*, d. 1, Kaunas: Lietuvos miškininkų sąjunga, 1994.

LVŽ I – *Lietuvos vietovardžių žodynas 1 (A–B)*, red. kolegija L. Balode, V. Blažek, G. Blažienė, V. Kardelis, A. Ragauskaitė, S. Temčinas, J. Udolph, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos instituto leidykla, 2008.

LVŽ II – *Lietuvos vietovardžių žodynas 2 (C–F)*, aut. L. Bilkis, G. Blažienė, M. Norkaitienė, M. Razmukaitė, A. Ragauskaitė, D. Sviderskienė, atsak. red. L. Bilkis, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, 2014.

LVŽ III – *Lietuvos vietovardžių žodynas 3 (G–H)*, aut. V. Adamonytė, L. Bilkis, G. Blažienė, D. Kačinaitė-Vrubliauskienė, M. Norkaitienė, M. Razmukaitė, A. Ragauskaitė, D. Sviderskienė, atsak. red. L. Bilkis, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, 2018.

LVŽ IV – *Lietuvos vietovardžių žodynas 4 (I–J)*, aut. L. Bilkis, G. Blažienė, A. Ragauskaitė, D. Sviderskienė, atsak. red. L. Bilkis, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, 2021.

LEXICOGRAPHIC SOURCES

BTSe – Kuznecov Sergej A., ed., 2000: Кузнцов, Сергей А., ред. *Большой толковый словарь русского языка* [Bol'soj tolkowyj slovar' russkogo jazyka], Санкт-Петербург: Норинт [Sankt-Peterburg: Norint]. Available at: <https://archive.org/details/Bolshoy-tolkov-slovar-russkogo-yazyka-2000>.

LKŽe – *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas 1–20* (1941–2002), red. kolegija G. Naktinienė, J. Paulauskas, R. Petrokienė, V. Vitkauskas, J. Zabarskaitė, vyr. red. G. Naktinienė, e. variantas, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, 2005 (updated version, 2008 & 2018). Available at: <https://ekalba.lt/lietuviu-kalbos-zodynus>.

PWN – *Slownik języka polskiego*, on-line version, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 1997–2021. Available at: <https://sjp.pwn.pl/>.

Skarnik.by – Mazok Aleg, Lit Serž, comp., 2015: Мазок Алег, Літ Серж, камп. *Белорусско-русский словарь* [Belorussko-russkij slovar'], e-version. Available at: <https://www.skarnik.by/>.

REFERENCES

Ainiala Terhi, Saarelma Minna, Sjöblom Paula 2016: *Names in Focus. An Introduction to Finnish Onomastics* Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Alford Richard 1988: *Naming and Identity. a Cross-Cultural Study of Personal Naming Practices*, New Haven: HRAF Press.

Ambrazas Saulius 1995: Lietuvių kalbos kuopinių ir vardažodinių vietų pavadinimų darybos raida. – *Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai. Gramatika ir leksikografija* 33, 180–200.

Beconytė Giedrė, Budrevičius Julius Donatas, Ciparytė Irena, Balčiūnas Andrius 2019: Plants and Animals in the Oikonyms of Lithuania. – *Journal of Maps* 15(2), 726–732.

Berezovič Elena L. 1991: Березович, Елена Л. 1991: Семантические микросистемы топонимов как факт номинации [Semantičeskie mikrosistemy toponimov kak fakt nominacii]. – *Вопросы ономастики* [Voprosy onomastiki] 19, 75–90.

Biryla Nikolaj V. 1969: Бірыла, Ніколай В. *Беларуская антрапанімія. Уласныя імёны, імёны-мянушкі, імёны па бацьку, прозвішчы* [Belaruskaja antrapanimija. Ulasnyja imёny, imёny-mjanuški, imёny pa bac'ku, prозвiščy], Мінск: Навука тэхніка [Minsk: Navuka tèchnika].

Dobrić Nicola 2010: Theory of Names and Cognitive Linguistics – the Case of the Metaphor. – *Filozofia i društvo* 21, 135–147.

Fagúndez Jaime, Izco Jesús 2016: Diversity patterns of plant place names reveal connections with environmental and social factors. – *Applied Geography* 74, 23–29.

Fong Mary, Rueyling Chuang 2004: *Communicating Ethnic and Cultural Identity*, United States of America: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc.

Głaz Adam 2017: Worldview as Cultural Cognition. – *LaMiCus* 1(1), 34–53.

Gun'ko Ol'ga G. 2015: Гунько, Ольга Г. Конфиксальные способы выражения топонимических значений [Konfiksal'nye sposoby vyraženija toponimičeskix značenij]. – *Казанская наука* [Kazanskaja nauka] 10, 175–177.

Guseva Ljudmila G. 1971: Гусева, Людмила Г. Географическая терминология Каргопольского края и её отражение в топонимике. [Geografičeskaja terminologija Kargopol'skogo kraja i eë otrazhenie v toponimike]. – Ученые записки УРГУ [Učenye zapiski URGU] 114(18), 86–98.

Klimka Libertas 2011: Medžių mitologizavimas tradicinėje lietuvių kultūroje. – *Acta humanitarica universitatis Saulensis* 13, 18–39.

Kniūkšta Petras 2004: *Kompiuterinis lietuvių kalbos žinynas. Nuo morfologijos iki reikalų raštų*, Vilnius: Šviesa.

Kramsch Claire 1998: *Language and Culture*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kratochvíl Zdeněk 2016: *The Philosophy of Living Nature*, transl. V. Paris, Prague: Charles University in Prague, Karolinum Press.

Kripe Soul 1972: *Naming and Necessity*, Cambridge: MA Harvard University Press.

Langendonck van Willy 2013: a Semantic–Pragmatic Theory of Proper Names. – *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 69, 99–130.

Leino Antii 2011: Place–Names as Constructions. – *Onoma: Journal of the International Council of Onomastic Sciences* 41, 215–235.

Mickienė Ilona, Bieliauskaitė Rimantė 2018: Radviliškio rajono drimonimų darybos aspektai. – *Respectus Philologicus* 33(38), 83–92.

Mickienė Ilona, Rita Baranauskienė 2019: Pietų Aukštaitijos regiono toponimai, kilę iš asmenų pavadinimų. – *Respectus Philologicus* 36(41), 60–72.

PDBe – *Lietuvių kalbos instituto lietuvių kalbos išteklių informacinė sistema „E. kalba“: Pavardžių duomenų bazė* [The Institute of the Lithuanian Language Informational System of the Lithuanian Language Resources: Surname database]. Available at: <https://ekalba.lt/pavardziu-duomenu-baze/>.

Razmukaitė Marija 1998: *Lietuvos priesaginiai oikonimai*: daktaro disertacija, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas.

Reszegi Katalina 2012: Cognitive approaches to Hungarian toponymy. – *Onoma* 47, 367–379.

Rut Marija È. 2001: Рут, Мария Э. Антропонимы: размышления о семантике [Antroponimy: razmyšlenija o semantike]. – *Известия Уральского государственного университета* [Izvestija Ural'skogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta] 20, 59–64.

Saparov Kalandar, Rasulov Anvar, Nizamov Asror 2021: Making Geographical Names Conditions and Reasons. – *World Bulletin of Social Sciences* 4, 95–99.

Sire James 2015: *Naming the Elephant – Worldview as a Concept*, 2nd Edition, Illinois: An imprint of InterVarsity Press.

Skorupa Pavel 2019: Semantic Oppositions in Vilnius County Toponyms. – *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 81, 139–159.

Skorupa Pavel 2021: 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.

Skorupa Pavel 2021a: *Vilnius County Toponyms as Signs of National and Cultural Identity*, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.

Sousa Arturo Martin, Garcia-Murillo Pablo 2001: Can place names be used as indicators of landscape changes? Application to the Donana Natural Park (Spain). – *Landscape Ecology* 16(5), 391–406.

Sviderskienė Dalia 2016: Sudurtinių Marijampolės apskrities helonimų motyvacija. – *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 75, 243–273.

Sviderskienė Dalia 2017: Sudėtinių Marijampolės apskrities helonimų motyvacija. – *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 77, 78–102.

Sviderskienė Dalia 2019: Priesaginių Marijampolės apskrities helonimų motyvacija. – *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 81, 110–140.

Sviderskienė Dalia 2022: Utenos apskrities Anykščių valsčiaus (1935–1937) helonimų motyvacija. – *Lituanistica* 68, 1(127), 43–65.

Ter-Minasova Svetlana G. 2000: Тер-Минасова, Светлана Г. *Язык и межкультурная коммуникация* [Jazyk i mežkul'turnaja komunikacija], Москва: Слово [Moskva: Slovo].

Ullmann Stephen 1969: *Words and Their Use*, London: F Muller.

Urbutis Vincas 2009: *Žodžių darybos teorija*, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.

Vaitkevičius Vyktinas 2013: Gamta ir Kultūra: šventos Viešnių pušys. – *Viešniai. Istorija ir Kultūra*, 69–101.

Vanagas Aleksandras 1981: Lietuvių hidronimų semantika. – *Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai* 21, 4–153.

Vasil'eva Svetlana P. 2007: Васильева, Светлана П. Ментальный образ природы в топонимии Приангарья [Mental'nyj obraz prirody v toponimii Priangar'ja]. – Вестник КГПУ им. В. П. Астаф'ева [Vestnik KGPU im. V. P. Astaf'eva] 3, 96–104.

Vitkūnas Mantvydas 2009: Medžioklė XIII–XIV a. (tyrinėjimų Pietryčių Lietuvoje duomenimis). – *Istorija* 76, 3–17.

VLEe – *Visuotinė lietuvių enciklopedija* [Universal Lithuanian Encyclopedia]. Available at: <https://www.vle.lt>.

Voronina Ljudmila P. 2012: Воронина, Людмила П. Семантика и прагматика деминутивных суффиксов в русском языке [Semantika i pragmatika deminutivnyx suffiksov v russkom jazyke]. – *Вестник Томского государственного университета* [Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta] 359, 15–17.

William Keith, Chambers Guthrie 1965: *a History of Greek philosophy – The Presocractic Tradition from Permenides to Democritus* 2, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gamtos apraiškos Vilniaus apskrties drimonimijoje

SANTRAUKA

Šio tyrimo objektas yra gamtos sąvokomis motyvuoti Vilniaus apskrties drimonimai. Iš 787 atrinktų vardų, funkcionuojančių šių dienų Vilniaus apskrtyje, 65-iuose yra įprasminti gamtos konceptai. I tyrimo lauką nepateko drimonimai, kurių motyvacija siejama su apylinkėse esančiomis gyvenvietėmis ar hidronimais. Iš viso tokiai vardų yra 577. Taigi galima teigti, kad gamtos konceptas yra gana turtingas drimonimų motyvacijos šaltinis. Aiškios semantikos ir motyvacijos drimonimai sudaro beveik 88 proc. nagrinėtų vardų, t. y. 57 var-dai. Juose yra įprasminti dominuojančios augmenijos (21), paplitusios gyvūnijos (4), miško tipo (15) ir miško kraštovaizdžio (17) konceptai. Ne visai aiškios semantikos ir motyvacijos drimonimai yra nulemti motyvuojančių apeliatyvų polisemijos (1), motyvuojančios sąvokos apeliatyvinės arba tikrinės prigimties (4), o kai kuriais atvejais – abiejų (3). Tyrimas priklauso kognityvinės onomastikos paradigmai, todėl teigiamai, kad visiems vardams yra būdinga semantinė įkrova. Vardų konceptualizavimas pateikiamas per šaltinio ir tikslo sritis, iš kurių šaltinis yra apeliatyvas, o tikslas – drimonimas, t. y. apeliatyvas → konceptualioji struktūra → drimonimas. Šis modelis – tai Nicolo Dobričiaus (2010) pasiūlyto modelio adaptacija, realizuota autoriaus moksliniuose darbuose apie kognityvinį vardų aspeką ir vėliau taikyta Lietuvos mokslininkų darbuose (žr. Skorupa 2021; 2021a).

Neabejojama, kad toponimai atspindi žmonių pasaulėvaizdį, juose išlieka įprasmin-ta tautos istorija, dvasinis ir materialus gyvenimas, buitis ir santykis su supančia aplinka

(Mickienė, Baranauskienė 2019). Gamta yra vienas iš žmoniją supančių elementų, taigi toponimai, iš kurių ir drimonimai, ne tik gali atskleisti, bet ir atskleidžia žmogaus bei gamtos sąveikos duomenis. Gamtos tematika toponimijoje yra gana dažna: aptariami kraštovaizdžio pokyčių atspindžiai (Garcia-Murrilo 2001), toponimuose išrasminčiai vietovės biologinė įvairovė (Fagundez, Izco 2016), oikonimuose išlikę gyvosios gamtos objektai (Beconytė et al. 2019), į floros ir faunos elementą saugančius toponimus žvelgiant kaip į etninio ir kultūrinio tapatumo ženklus (Skorupa 2021). Vilniaus apskrities drimonimai iki šiol nebuvo tiriami gamtos konceptualizavimo aspektu, todėl šio tyrimo duomenys atskleis teritorinę biologinę įvairovę, kraštovaizdžio ypatumus bei dominuojančias augmenijos ir gyvūnijos rūšis, taip išryškindami šio regiono gamtinę pasaulėvaizdį.

Įteikta 2022 m. rugpjūčio 23 d.

ALISA STUNŽAITĖ

Lietuvių kalbos institutas

Petro Vileišio g. 5, LT-10308 Vilnius, Lietuva

alisa.stunzaite@vilniustech.lt