ALISA STUNŽAITĖ

Institute of the Lithuanian Language

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

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

UNRAVELING VILNIUS COUNTY DRYMONYMY: THE CASE OF METONYMY

Vilniaus apskrities drimonimijos analizė: metonimijos atvejis

ANNOTATION

The primary objective of this study is to provide insights into the metonymic patterns exhibited by drymonyms within present-day Vilnius County. The research focuses on a selection of 696 names extracted from a total of 787 officially functioning drymonyms found in the territory of Vilnius County. Data for the study were collected from various sources, including printed materials, electronic resources, and interactive maps. The research findings underscore the prevalence of metonymic thinking in forming drymonyms. Three distinct metonymic models emerged from the analysis: PLACE FOR THE PLACE, SALIENT FEATURE FOR THE PLACE, and PERSON FOR THE PLACE. THE PLACE FOR THE PLACE model proved highly productive, yielding 570 drymonyms. The SALIENT FEATURE FOR THE PLACE model was linked to 100 drymonyms. The PERSON FOR THE PLACE model influenced the naming of 26 drymonyms.

KEYWORDS: Vilnius County, drymonyms, metonymy, metonymic models, cognitive onomastics.

ANOTACIJA

Šiuo tyrimu siekiama nustatyti, kokie metoniminiai modeliai dominuoja Vilniaus apskrities drimonimijoje. Iš rašytinių ir elektroninių šaltinių bei interaktyvių žemėlapių tyrimui buvo surinkti 787 drimonimai, funkcionuojantys dabartinėje Vilniaus apskrityje. Tyrimo rezultatai atskleidė 696 Vilniaus apskrities drimonimų metoniminę prigimtį. Minėti

vardai siejami su šiais metoniminiais modeliais: VIETA VIETOJ VIETOS, IŠSKIRTINĖ YPATYBĖ VIETOJ VIETOS IR ŽMOGUS VIETOJ VIETOS. Itin produktyvus modelis, pagal kurį sudaryta 570 drimonimų, VIETA VIETOJ VIETOS. Metoniminis modelis IŠSKIRTINĖ YPATYBĖ VIETOJ VIETOS siejamas su 100 drimonimų. Pagal modelį ŽMOGUS VIETOJ VIETOS buvo įvardinti 26 Vilniaus apskrities miškai.

ESMINIAI ŽODŽIAI: Vilniaus apskritis, drimonimai, metonimija, metoniminiai modeliai, kognityvinė onomastika.

INTRODUCTION

Proper names, resp. toponyms, constitute an integral part of language analogous to any other lexical units. Unlike ordinary words, names are imbued with distinct connotations and semantic implications. Though some proper names may initially appear to serve purely referential functions, an examination through the lens of cognitive onomastics unveils their intrinsic narrative significance. Such designations emerge from the interplay between individuals and specific locations, bestowing upon them substantive import, particularly for their users (Ainiala, Östman 2017: 5). Indeed, names wield the capacity to elicit reminiscences, fantasies, linguistic competencies, and emotional responses (Nyström 2016: 40). Furthermore, they possess the faculty to elicit specific cognitive processes by augmenting the content of a toponym (Berezovič 1991: 75; Langendonck 2013). Consequently, names transcend mere labels; instead, they bear profound cultural significance, augmenting the overall value of the language they employ.

Following the postulates of cognitive linguistics, the meaning of the onyms does not emerge in isolation; instead, it is constructed. In other words, it follows the process of *conceptualization* that encompasses a myriad of factors, extending beyond preexisting known concepts and unique personal experiences of an individual (Langacker 2006: 30; Boldyrev 2016: 32). The concept exhibits multidimensionality and can be analogized to an image characterized by indistinct boundaries (Lakoff, Johnson 1980: 3; Gudavičius 2011: 109, 112–113). However, a potential misinterpretation exists concerning the equivalence of a concept to a word's meaning (Kerevičienė 2009: 5). The lexical meaning is a starting point of concept decoding. However, it should not be overlooked that concepts are abstract entities. They necessitate a mode of manifestation, and at this point, language serves as a primary medium for their expression. As meanings of the words are stored in the dictionaries, concepts find their abode in the mental lexicon. In this cognitive repository, all accumulated knowledge is stored over an individual's lifetime. Consequently, any conceivable obstacles

that hinder comprehension can be precisely demarcated and subsequently articulated through language, wherein the conceptual content aligns with the meanings affiliated with particular words (Karpenko, Golubenko 2015: 286; Nyström 2016: 43).

The process of conceptualization is achieved through various mechanisms of thought. One such mechanism, extensively discussed over the past decade, is the theory of conceptual metaphor (Gibbs 1994: 123–124; Croft 2000: 197; Lakoff, Johnson 1980: 4), which is beyond the scope of this article. Instead, this research will concentrate on the manifestation of metonymic thinking as evident in toponymy resp. drymonymy. To commence, it is essential to clarify the concept of metonymy itself.

Metonymic thinking constitutes a prominent facet of human cognition, illuminating the intricacies of language use, comprehension, and various cognitive interactions (Gibbs 1999: 61, 66). Essentially, metonymy serves as a cognitive and linguistic tool for representing universal categories prevalent in the human mind; it involves a pattern of comprehending one object using its association with another, particularly when both objects coexist within the same domain (Kövecses, Günter 1999: 21; Kerevičienė 2009: 14–15). This implies that an object's proximity and connectedness are broadly considered. The transfer of names occurs between objects related in various ways: spatially, situationally, structurally, historically, and more. According to Jurij Karpenko (1980: 49), any toponymic area is inherently predisposed to extend beyond its confines, primarily through the migration of proper names, formations based on analogy, and other subtler toponymic processes.

Building upon the notion that onyms can be subject to analysis through the prism of other names, scholarly investigations have been directed toward explicating prevalent models of metonymic name-giving. Presently, the representatives of cognitive onomastics do not doubt that metonymy truly is one of the key means of name formation (Langendonck 2007: 4; Rapa 2019: 38). In this regard, Katalin Reszegi (2022) has identified several models extracted from country-level toponym collections. These models include the PLACE FOR THE PLACE scheme, grounded in spatial relationships, alongside other schemes like PERSON FOR THE PLACE, VEGETATION FOR THE PLACE, ANIMAL FOR THE PLACE, etc. Notably, Pierre Arnaud (2022) has made analogous discoveries; however, he has chosen to adopt a more encompassing designation, namely, SALIENT FEATURE FOR THE PLACE, which encapsulates specific patterns observed in metonymic name-giving. Given metonymy's perceived potential as a productive source within the toponymic domain, the decision has been made to conduct an in-depth examination of Lithuania's toponymic system, focusing on the class of drymonyms in Vilnius County.

The present study advocates adopting a comprehensive interpretation of the drymonyms, aligning with the Eastern-European tradition. This type of toponym denotes names associated with wooded areas, such as forests, pine groves, and any other areas covered with woods (Nikonov 1966: 124; Superanskaja 1973: 186; Podol'skaja 1988: 57). In regional onomastic research, the equivalent term *mìško vȧ̃rdas*, signifying *forest name*, is commonly employed (Sviderskienė 2006; Mickienė 2019), and will also be used interchangeably with the term *drymonym*.

The field of Lithuanian drymonymy has yet to be comprehensively discussed. Without a doubt, Ilona Mickienė's substantial scholarly contributions (2001, 2004, 2006, 2011, 2012, 2018, 2019) hold undeniable significance. Over nearly two decades, her research has been dedicated to exploring the derivational aspect of drymonyms in Northern Lithuania. While there have been some limited episodic analyses by Renata Endzelytė (2003, 2005), Nerija Bartkutė (2006, 2008), and Dalia Sviderskienė (2006), it is essential to note that none of these studies have approached the subject of drymonyms from the perspective of cognitive onomastics. However, implementing the alternative approach could enrich the paradigm of Lithuanian onomastic studies as it may uncover the narrative aspects the onyms hold. In other words, the cognitive approach could clarify how complex ideas and experiences become imprinted in the local toponymy. Drymonyms have the potential to unveil intriguing peculiarities of thought inherent in their structure. Therefore, **the aim** of the current research is to identify metonymic models reflected in the drymonyms of present-day Vilnius County.

The research material and sources encompass 696 metonymy-based drymonyms, constituting the focus of the current study. From a corpus of 787 drymonyms presently in official use within the geographical confines of Vilnius County, these specific onyms were carefully selected. The data collection involved both electronic and printed references and sources.[1] Omitted from the research are drymonyms with an inherent ambiguity in their nature. These names might have been influenced by polysemous appellatives or an appellative and/or proper nouns. Including such cases could introduce variations influenced by metonymic models, thereby impacting the study's results. Consequently, the decision was made to analyze the drymonyms of clear semantics. In deciphering the origins of drymonyms rooted in appellatives, dictionaries of the Lithuanian, Polish, Russian, and Belorussian languages served as key references.

---

[1] The main research material collection sources were: the Portal of Spacial Information of Lithuania (GP), Onomasticon of Lithuania's Forests (LMV), and Dictionary of Lithuanian Place Names (LVŽ I, II, III, IV), also see Drymonym Sources & References.

A comprehensive approach was adopted for drymonyms derived from personal nouns, incorporating electronic and printed sources for verification.[2]

Research methodology. The current research adheres to the cognitive onomastics tradition, asserting the inherent meaningfulness of all names. The analytical framework for examining drymonyms is adapted from Nicola Dobrić's (2010) proposal, which entails scrutinizing the conceptualization of these onyms through source and target domains, represented as source → conceptual structure → domain. However, since our focus lies on investigating metonymic models exclusively, we simplify the model for conceptual content realization to source → target, highlighting the transfer of the concept from one entity to another.

Certain cases under investigation necessitate a more comprehensive elucidation, and thus, we employ research models introduced by Aleksandras Vanagas (1981), Sviderskienė (2016, 2017, 2019, 2022), Ilona Mickienė, Rita Baranauskienė (2019), Pavel Skorupa (2019, 2021, 2021a, 2023), among others. In this study, the analysis of drymonyms is approached through three overarching generic metonymic models: I. PLACE FOR THE PLACE, II. SALIENT FEATURE FOR THE PLACE, and PERSON FOR THE PLACE, are further subcategorized into more specific models.

1. METONYMIC MODEL: PLACE FOR THE PLACE

The metonymic model PLACE FOR THE PLACE has been well-established in the onomastic domain as transonimization, signifying the transfer of onyms from one class to another (Podol'skaja 1988: 87). This comprehensive definition encompasses diverse possibilities for interactions among proper names, thereby emphasizing a wide-ranging comprehension of the phenomenon's essence. From a cognitive standpoint, this type of transition can be classified as metonymy. This implies that objects' proximity and contiguity are extensively considered. Such names also contribute to a better comprehension of the relationship between various toponymic objects, making it easy to recognize the manifestation of metonymic thinking (Markert, Nassim 2006: 2; Reszegi 2012: 5). The current article proposes to distinguish between two dominant target domains: settlements and aquatic features. However, this model is commonly

—— —— —— —— —— —— —— —— —— —— —— —— —— —— —— —— —— ——

[2] See References.

linked to the salient features of the location.[3] The current article distinguishes between the drymonyms motivated by other onyms, thus linking them to a specific place, and those motivated by appellative forms associating these with salient location features. The drymonyms that fall into the categories based on other onyms are analyzed below.

1.1. Settlement for the Forest

Most drymonyms identified in Vilnius County have origins in the nearby settlements. Considering the extensive scope of this research, only the most prototypical and distinguished examples are presented herein. In total, 546 drymonyms adhere to this metonymic pattern. According to Reszegi (2022: 209), a new name may emerge, referring to a broader space; the new name beholds a close relationship with the original meaning of the name that inspired it. Given the synthetic nature of the Lithuanian language, wherein lexical items change forms through inflections, the newly coined names are usually represented through Possessive case (Lith. *Kilmininko linksnis*), which may express an immense aptitude of various relationships, including possession/ownership (Vaičienė 214: 320). These drymonyms also have an additional lexical component, *mìškas*, which translates to the *forest*. Therefore, such metonynies could be observed: ***Avižónys*** (Šr D) → ***Avižoniŭ mìškas*** (Šr D), ***Bagotẽliai*** (El D) → ***Bagotẽliŭ mìškas*** (El D), ***Bùikos*** (Šlčn D) → ***Bùikŭ mìškas*** (Šlčn D), ***Gelẽdnė*** (Švnč D) → ***Gelẽdnės mìškas*** (Švnč D), ***Giruliaĩ*** (V D) → ***Giruliŭ mìškas*** (V D), ***Kakaríeka*** (Ukm D) → ***Kakaríekos mìškas*** (Ukm D), ***Semelíškės*** (El D) → ***Semelíškiŭ mìškas*** (Trak D), and other.

A comparable relationship is evident in certain drymonyms, where the second lexical component assumes a more precise semantic significance. For illustrative purposes, let us consider the following examples: ***Barsū́niškės*** (El D) → ***Barsū́niškiŭ eglýnas*** (El D), wherein the Lithuanian word *eglýnas* designates a 'fir forest', thereby providing specific information about the vegetative species. In another instance, ***Beliónys*** (Švčn D) → ***Belioniŭ šilẽlis*** (Švčn D) the second component Lith. *šìlas* denotes 'a forest of tall, straight conifers (especially pines) growing in sand dunes'. Moreover, the Lith. Suf. *-el-*[4] here possibly conveys the concept of smallness, the marker word *šilẽlis* reveals the prevailing vegetation characteristic of the location.

---

[3] Cf. Arnaud 2022.

[4] Cf. Urbutis 2009: 330.

In another illustrative example, the toponym transformation ***Šešuõliai*** (Ukm D) → ***Šešuõlių girià*** (Ukm D) employs the Lithuanian word *girià* to convey the notion of a 'big forest', effectively accentuating the extensive dimensions of the wooded area. Similarly, in the case of ***Batė́nai*** (Mlt D) → ***Batė́nų girė̃lė*** (Ukm D) the Lith. Suf. *-el-* is added to the marker word, thus signifying pleasure. Both second lexical components of these drymonyms distinctly reflect the forest type.

In ***Januvkà*** (V D) → ***Janùvkos raistė̃lis*** (El D), the Lithuanian word *raistė̃lis*, a diminutive of *raĩstas* signifying 'a sticky place covered with bushes or trees, a swamp', imparts further details regarding the landscape. Moreover, the Lithuanian suffix *-el-* conveys the notion of smallness or pleasure in this context.[5]

An intriguing example of a second lexical component can be found in ***Gudė̃liai*** (Šlčn D) → ***Gudė̃lių kė̃lias*** (Šlčn D) wherein the Lith. *kė̃lias* is linked to the meaning of *road*. Upon examining the map, it becomes apparent that this marker holds no peculiarity, as it is evident that the road leading to *Gudė̃liai* passes through this wooded area.

Another captivating illustration is found in ***Naujíenos*** (Trak D) → ***Naujienų̃ salà*** (Trak D), where the Lith. *salà* signifies 'an area of land surrounded by water'. This particular marker choice could be attributed to the observation that upon closer examination of the surroundings, it becomes evident that water stems, including the *Grãžupis* River and smaller streams, encircle the forest. A parallel marker *salà* is likewise observed in ***Tìltai*** (Trak D) → ***Tìltų salà*** (Trak D), wherein the forest is also encompassed by water stems. Notably, both of these drymonyms are situated within the confines of the same district, which may suggest a cultural peculiarity in the name-giving process, considering the absence of such markers in other districts of Vilnius County.

Certain drymonyms exhibit the employment of double or even triple markers, as exemplified by ***Antãkalnis*** (V D) → ***Antãkalnio šìlo mìško párkas*** (V D). In this instance, the toponym offers supplementary details concerning the prevalent vegetation, with Lith. *šìlas* conveys the concept of 'a forest of tall, straight conifers (especially pines) growing in sand dunes', while Lith. *párkas* denotes a 'park', thereby implying the recreational purpose attributed to the forest.

Remarkably, a recurring naming convention, wherein the second lexical component is *párkas* emerges as a prevalent trend in urban areas. This is evident from the numerous drymonyms within the confines of Vilnius municipality district, featuring this specific element. For instance, ***Bukčiaĩ*** (V D) → ***Bukčiũ mìško párkas*** (V D), ***Gariúnai*** (V D) → ***Gariúnų mìško párkas*** (V D), ***Fabijõniškės*** (V D) → ***Fabijõniškių mìško párkas*** (V D), and several others exemplify this pattern.

— — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —

[5] Ibid.

It is pertinent to underscore that specific drymonyms encompass a combination of multiple settlements alongside a specifying lexical element, notably *mìškas* (forest). These composite onyms imply an inferred proximate spatial relationship to both settlements: ***Nerãvai*** (V D), ***Grìgiškės*** (V D) → ***Nerãvų-Grìgiškių mìškas*** (V D), ***Vaišėtai*** (Šlčn D), ***Trébuškės*** (Šlčn D) → ***Vaišėtų-Trébuškių mìškas*** (Šlčn D). Within this context, the presence of drymonyms featuring multiple markers is worth noting, akin to the previously discussed models. Examples of such dual markers, like *mìško párkas,* can be found in such forest names as ***Visõriai*** (V D), ***Bajõrai*** (V D) → ***Visõrių-Bajõrų mìško párkas*** (V D).

Contrastively, some drymonyms encompass the settlement's name without its associated marker. In such cases, these drymonyms function as unifying elements of space, implying a shared affiliation with both inhabited areas. To illustrate this phenomenon, the following examples may be considered: ***Mãžosios Sélos*** (Šlčn D), ***Dìdžiosios Sélos*** (Šlčn D) → ***Sélų mìškas*** (Šlčn D), ***Naũjosios Raklìškės*** (Šlčn D), ***Sēnosios Raklìškės*** (Šlčn D) → ***Raklìškių mìškas*** (Šlčn D).

The metonymic correlation linking the settlement and the forest becomes apparent in drymonyms that employ the Lithuanian prefix *pa-*. This prefix conventionally imparts a notion of proximity to the object denoted by the primary term (LKG I 424). Consequently, these drymonyms adopt the implication of being located at the periphery of the inhabited area. The subsequent instances exemplify this phenomenon: ***Leñtvaris*** (V D) → ***Paleñtvario mìškas*** (V D), ***Dailìdžiai*** (Šr D) → ***Padailìdžių mìškas*** (Šr D).

By applying the metonymic SETTLEMENT FOR THE FOREST model, one can glean insights into the historical trajectory of the country's development. It is anticipated that particular settlements will rise to prominence while others gradually fade. Those settlements that have vanished from the geographical maps of Vilnius County endure through the drymonyms they once motivated. These settlements might have undergone shifts in their official names, as evidenced by instance ***Gaĩliškė*** (Švčn D) → ***Gaĩliškės mìškas*** (Švčn D), ***Ivičizna*** (Trak D)[6] → ***Ivičiznos mìškas*** (Trak D), or were abolished as ***Plačiavẽlė*** (Ukm D) → ***Plačiavẽlės mìškas*** (Ukm D).

An intriguing instance of the metonymic model can be observed, as exemplified by the case like ***Šveicãrai*** (V D) → ***Šveicãrijos mìškas*** (V D). In this particular example, the toponym of the settlement, *Šveicãrai*, is derived from the name of the nation, *the Swiss*. In contrast, the drymonym, *Šveicãrijos mìškas*, is predicated upon the name of the country – *Switzerland*. This illustration

— — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —

6 Now *Barbõriškės* (Trak D).

raises intriguing considerations, potentially rooted in the landscape analogy. It is important to acknowledge that Switzerland is renowned for its mountainous topography, a feature that diverges from Lithuania's absent prominent mountain ranges. Nevertheless, the wooded area in question is situated on undulating terrain, which resonates with local urbanonyms such as *Aukštóji* str., connoting *High Street*.

Upon careful examination, it is clear that settlement-based metonymy is a prolific source of motivation for Lithuanian drymonyms. It is possible to decipher spatial correlations among topographic elements and uncover the nuanced ways particular markers offer valuable information concerning forest attributes and unique landscape traits employing the SETTLEMENT FOR THE FOREST model. Drymonyms that find their origins in settlements hold a distinctive role as custodians of historical memory. They signify the existence of bygone inhabited areas and encapsulate the essence of these vanished locales. This phenomenon underscores the intricate interplay between linguistic expression and the cultural and geographical history of the region, shedding light on the intricate layers of meaning embedded within toponyms.

1.2. Aquatic Feature for the Forest

Water bodies hold immense importance in human activities and consequently emerge as prominent features within a geographical region. Their pivotal role in shaping the landscape and influencing human settlements renders them integral components of the local toponymic fabric. Historically, water bodies have served as sources of sustenance, trade routes, and places of cultural significance, making them focal points for human settlements and activities. These names provide a sense of place and serve as links between the water body and other toponymic entities in the vicinity (Reszegi 2022; Skorupa 2023: 231). As a result, the toponymic nomenclature creates a semantic interconnectedness that imparts a deeper understanding of the region's spatial relationships and cultural landscape.

Although one could argue that rivers, lakes, and ponds often function as salient features within a location, in this context, it is worth citing Vanagas (1981: 35), given his insightful observation that rivers, among various geographical attributes, can function as distinct markers of a locale when they exhibit distinctive characteristics within the broader geographical context. A deliberate decision has been made to encompass drymonyms that draw inspiration from other toponyms within the overarching metonymic framework of PLACE FOR THE PLACE, i.e., AQUATIC FEATURE FOR THE FOREST instead

of merely linking these forest names with the salient features of the geographical area, which they represent. Therefore, within the confines of Vilnius County, 24 drymonyms derive their foundation from the proximity of aquatic features. It is of significance to underscore that these specific drymonyms draw their inspiration solely from hydronyms, without the inclusion of any potential impact from neighboring regions sharing identical appellations. Let us consider the most prominent examples.

Given the absence of adjacent seas within Vilnius County's geographical context, drymonyms grounded in hydronyms tend to find their association with the water bodies commonly present in the vicinity. Thus, drymonyms motivated by lakes, as exemplified by toponyms like **Rašià** (Švčn D) → **Rašiõs mìškas** (Švčn D), **Skrebỹs** (Trak D) → **Skrēbio mìškas** (Trak D), **Žiřnajai** (Ukm D) → **Žiřnajų mìškas** (Ukm D), and those rooted in river names like **Šalčià** (Šlčn D) → **Šalčiõs mìškas** (Šlčn D), **Šventėlė** (Švčn D) → **Šventėlės mìškas**, **Versekà** (Šlčn D) → **Versekõs mìškas** (Šlčn D), (Švčn D) emerge as prevalent patterns in this region.

As evident from the examples above, drymonyms rooted in hydronyms adhere to a conventional structure, manifesting in the Possessive case and incorporating an adjunct lexical component *mìškas*. However, similar to the observed phenomenon in the metonymic model SETTLEMENT FOR THE FOREST, a parallel trend is discernible here, where certain onyms have modified their forms while maintaining their origins in aquatic features. Take, for instance, the case of **Veřknė** (Trak D) → **Mìškas Paverknẽ** (Trak D), wherein the morphological construction of the drymonym employs the Lithuanian prefix *pa-*, that typically conveys the notion of peripheral positioning.[7] However, upon closer cartographic scrutiny, it becomes apparent that the river traverses through the forest. Consequently, the semantic connotation of the Lithuanian prefix *pa-* could be associated with going through, as in this instance, the river floats through the forest.

Another noteworthy example is the drymonym **Júodupės raĩstas** (Ukm D), most likely derived from the potomonym **Júodupis** (Ukm D). This case holds intrigue due to several reasons. Firstly, it presents an apparent incongruity in grammatical gender, with the drymonym clearly stemming from a feminine form, while the potomonym adopts a masculine. This gender discordance may be attributed different linguistic contexts where the onyms were coined, thus offering distinct linguistic origins. Secodly, it substitudes the commonly used marker *mìškas* with the more specific term *raĩstas*, which can be associated with 'a sticky place covered with bushes or trees, a swamp' (LKŽe). This addition

---

[7] Cf. LKG I 424.

provides additional insight into the landscape of the area. Furthermore, the alteration in form within the drymonym warrants scrutiny. While the Lithuanian language typically employs *ùpė* [river], the source hydronym centers around an alternative form, *upìs* [river]. As detailed by Vanagas (1981: 51), there exists a theoretical possibility that the potomonym could have emanated initially from the gender form *ùpė*. Accordingly, *Júodupis* could signify a shift in terms. Consequently, the drymonym might be linked to the shift in the usage of a lexical form. As the most ancient components of toponymic entities, aquatic features play a foundational role in motivating and shaping the comprehensive landscape of toponymic data. Drymonyms, despite their distinct nature, align with this trend. However, it is evident that while hydronyms hold a significant place in this context, they are not the primary source for generating drymonyms. Typically, those drymonyms that do stem from hydronyms adhere to a classical framework. In this conventional representation, the name of the water body is integrated using the possessive case and supplemented with an additional marker that denotes the nature of the object. This pattern is consistent, with only rare exceptions.

2. METONYMIC MODEL: SALIENT FEATURE FOR THE PLACE

While serving as a prolific source for naming, metonymy may sometimes manifest with equal prominence across all levels of onyms. The process of coining place names often involves the utilization of appellative forms. This pattern is particularly evident within the realm of Lithuanian toponymy, and scholars like Vanagas (1981: 20), Sviderskienė (2016, 2017, 2019, 2022), Mickienė (2018), and Skorupa (2021, 2021a, 2023), have extensively explored this aspect. The present article introduces a differentiation between onym-based metonymies, aligning with the conceptual model of PLACE FOR THE PLACE, and appellative-based metonymies, linked to the SALIENT FEATURES FOR THE PLACE model. This part delves explicitly into the analysis of the latter approach.

2.1. Forest Type for the Forest

Reszegi (2022) points out that this could be associated with the metonymic model PLACE FOR THE PLACE, as the appelative forms describe and denote the place. Indeed, it is widely acknowledged that such toponyms inherently convey

distinct attributes of the location, elucidating the unique characteristics of the forest. In total, this category beholds 36 drymonyms.

The previous research discussed the motivation of most drymonyms that fall into the forest-type category.[8] However, to exemplify the metonymic model, this article will analyze some drymonyms that were not previously discussed. One such instance is the drymonym ***Lužỹnė*** (Šr D), which potentially originates from the Lithuanian term *lūžà*, denoting 'a dense thicket of interwoven trees and vegetation, or a deforested woodland area' (LKŽe). This choice of name sheds light on the state of the forest at the time of the name's creation, offering additional insight into its condition, and thus the conceptual structure is represented via Lith. *lūžà → **Lužỹnė*** (Šr D).

Another intriguing example within the category of forest-type-related drymonyms is found in ***Margaĩ*** (Šr D). This onym likely draws its motivation from the Lith. *márgas, -à* which signifies 'diverse, mixed, heterogeneous' (LKŽe). Consequently, this naming choice conveys the notion that the forest is composed of various tree species. During the investigation, it became apparent that the forest's vegetation is diverse, encompassing deciduous and coniferous trees. The conceptual structure can thus be outlined as follows: Lith. *margaĩ →* ***Margaĩ*** (Šr D). However, another source of motivation is also plausible as the drymonym could have been influenced by Lith. *márgas* meaning 'a unit of a land measure' (LKŽe). Thus, linking the drymonym in question to the land measurement practices. The conceptual framework remains consistent: Lith. *margaĩ →* ***Margaĩ*** (Šr D).

2.2. Landscape Feature for the Forest

The present category portrays the forest by embedding it within the context of the surrounding landscape, thereby designating it as a prominent area attribute. Consequently, it becomes evident that drymonyms can articulate information about the nature of the terrain, indicating whether it is marshy, level, punctuated with sand dunes, or characterized by other topographical irregularities. Such toponyms serve as a transparent depiction of the primary layer of the concept. Concurrently, these names can be linked to a process of categorization. Naturally, individuals have sought to navigate their environment by identifying its defining elements-ascribing meaning to the landscape. Vilnius County has 35 drymonyms that are based on the concept of landscape.

---

[8] Cf. Stunžaitė 2022.

The most effective method to convey the distinctive characteristics of a landscape is by naming a prominent nearby feature based on its attributes. This rationale is evident in the drymonym of the largest and most ancient park in Vilnius, known as **Vìngis** (V D), which derives its name from the loop of the *Nerìs* river. The term *vìngis* translates to *loop* in English. Notably, the park is bordered by the currents of the *Nerìs* river on three sides, thereby demonstrating a clear conceptual alignment: Lith. *vìngis* → **Vìngis** (V D).

The topographical attributes of the region are encapsulated in the drymonym **Kapinių mìškas** (Šlčn D), which draws its motivation from the Lithuanian term *kãpinės*, signifying *cemetery*. This association holds merit, as a cemetery roughly 700 meters away from the location exists. However, according to official records from the *Šalčininkai* municipality,[9] the neighboring cemetery was established as recently as 2009. Nonetheless, considering that the forest element is part of an older layer of toponymic data, it is plausible that a cemetery was in proximity at some point. Thus, the transition of a landscape characteristic into the drymonym is accomplished: Lith. *kãpinės* → **Kapinių mìškas** (Šlčn D).

2.3. Vegetation for the Forest

In these drymonyms, the notion of prevailing vegetation takes on significance. Often, the predominant species not only characterizes the location but also indicates the potential source of wood, raw materials, or other materials that might be derived from it. Such names can also bear cultural connotations. For instance, the significance of birches and lindens in Lithuanian culture is undeniable. These tree types held associations with mystical powers: Lindens were considered sacred, while birch sap was believed to possess healing or magical attributes (Klimka 2011: 26–29). Consequently, the forests where these trees held cultural meaning could underscore their crucial role within the community. Therefore, the symbolic significance of these trees could facilitate a linkage between cultural traditions and the forest environment itself. In total, 24 drymonyms underscore the metonymic model of VEGETATION FOR THE PLACE.

The mention of birches is particularly noteworthy, as it may come as a surprise that within Vilnius County, at least 7 forests derive their names from the Lith. *béržas* meaning *birch*. These drymonyms include **Beržýnas** (Šlčn D, Ukm D, Ukm D), **Beržỹnė** (Švnč D), **Beržynẽlis** (Šr D), **Beržýtė** (Ukm

---

D), and **Beržẽliai** (Ukm D). Although these forms exhibit variations in their inflections, such differences do not impact their conceptual representation. It only provides supplementary information.[10] They all encapsulate the dominant vegetation, which, in this case, refers to birch trees: Lith. *béržas* → **Beržýnas** (Šlčn D, Ukm D, Ukm D), **Beržỹnė** (Švnč D), **Beržynẽlis** (Šr D), **Beržýtė** (Ukm D), **Beržẽliai** (Ukm D).

Overall, in Lithuanian drymonyms, it is a prevalent tendency to mirror the prevalent species of vegetation, as demonstrated in examples such as Lith. *liepýnas* [linden forest] → **Liepýnas** (El D), Lith. *bruknỹnė* [area where lingonberries grow] → **Bruknỹnė** (Šlčn D), Lith. *eglýnas* [fir forest] → **Eglynẽlis** (Švčn D), and similar instances.

2.4. Fauna for the Forest

The drymonyms of this metonymic model predominantly feature zoonyms, signifying the prevalence of specific animal species within the respective areas. Essentially, they imbue the concept of fauna with meaning. Beyond this, these onyms can convey additional implications. Historically, forests were not solely places for leisure and fresh air but active sites of economic endeavors and sustenance. Animals hunted within these forests provided food, fur, and various resources. Consequently, these names offer valuable insights into the forest's resource potential. There are only 4 drymonyms that fall under this category.

Let us consider the example of a drymonym that may serve a dual purpose: on the one hand, it acts as a cautionary indicator; on the other, it represents the concentration of animals within the area. That is **Gyvatỹnė** (V D) that derived from Lith. *gyvatýnas*, *gyvatỹnė* 'a place full of snakes' (LVŽ III 216). Therefore, this drymonym forewarns a high likelihood of encountering snakes. Historically, snakes served multifaceted purposes; they were fried, boiled, dried, and even utilized for medicinal purposes (TLE I 629). It should not be ignored that Lithuanian mythology is also centered around snakes, in particular around *Žaltỹs* [Grass-snake] was perceived as representing chthonic and vital energies, serving as a benevolent household spirit and guardian (VLEe). The conceptual representation of the metonymic transfer could be reflected as: Lith. *gyvatỹnė* → **Gyvatỹnė** (V D).

---

[10] See Stunžaitė 2022.

2.5. Purpose for the Forest

This category presents a certain level of ambiguity, as it proves challenging to establish a precise metonymic model that encapsulates the essence of the drymonyms falling within. The ambiguity lies within the motivating concept. It is unsurprising that forests historically and presently serve as locations for berry and mushroom picking and for acquiring various resources. Hunting has long been a favored activity among Lithuanians, initially pursued for sustenance and later transitioning into a recreational pursuit. One of the drymonyms in Vilnius County embodies this concept, potentially aligning with the metonymic model FAUNA FOR THE FOREST. The rationale behind this is that with the presence of animals, hunting activities would have taken place in the forest. Moreover, as this specific drymonym, *Medžiõklės mìškas* (Trak D), lacks zoolexeme, it has been assigned to a separate category that more closely captures its essence. This drymonym derives from the Lith. *medžiõklė*, signifying *hunting*, is used in the Possessive case, reflected in the Lith. Ending *-ės*, as if showing this forest's purpose, reflects the following conceptual transfer: Lith. *medžiõklė* → *Medžiõklės mìškas* (Trak D).

The metonymic model SALIENT FEATURE FOR THE FOREST can be further clarified by emphasizing the specific feature that warrants attention. In this category, certain drymonyms have clear and straightforward semantic connections. However, delving into the conceptual evolution from an appellative form to a drymonym can unveil supplementary insights. In essence, this model highlights a unique attribute of the forest, encapsulating it within the drymonym. While the immediate connection between the feature and the forest is evident, exploring the journey from the original descriptive term to the final drymonym can provide a deeper contextual understanding. This process sheds light on the thought process that led to selecting that particular attribute for association with the forest, potentially revealing cultural, historical, or practical considerations.

3. METONYMIC MODEL: PERSON FOR THE PLACE

These names frequently capture individuals' significance in shaping a region's historical, cultural, and identity-related aspects. They serve as a means of paying tribute and commemorating those who have played pivotal roles in society's evolution. Such names can honor pioneers, area proprietors, or anyone contributing substantially to the local community. The origins of these

names raise no questions, as they straightforwardly indicate the concentration of people in specific areas. Nevertheless, these names offer intriguing insights from the perspective of cognitive onomastics due to their less obvious and more complex conceptualization model. To gain insight into the motivations behind these drymonyms, it is essential to delve into the underlying concept that these names encapsulate. This involves meticulous analysis of each unique case, as the motivations can vary significantly. However, what remains consistent across all anthroponymic toponyms is the implication that an individual or group of individuals held some form of significance. For instance, as Santa Rapa (2019: 39) notes, the names of forest guards may remain encapsulated in the drymonyms. In this article, rather than delving into potential reasons for the coinage of these names, the focus will be on providing an overview of the drymonyms rooted in personal names. A total of 26 forest names fall under this category, originating purely from anthroponyms and following the metonymic model of PERSON FOR THE FOREST.

Commonly, the drymonyms reflecting the accumulation of people in one place are characterized by the utilization of plural forms derived from motivating patronyms. An illustrative example is **Kiškénų mìškas** (Švčn D), which is believed to have been inspired by the Lith. patronym *Kiškénas* (PDBe). This correlation gains validity from the fact that the Lith. patronym *Kiškénas* is documented in the same geographical area, specifically within the *Kaĺtanėnai* Eldership, where the forest **Kiškénų mìškas** (Švčn D) is situated. Thus the transfer of the patronym into the drymonym is Lith. *Kiškénas → **Kiškénų mìškas*** (Švčn D). Similarly, the example of *Mikáiliškių mìškas* (Trak D) could be provided. Here, the drymonym was based on Pol. patronym *Michajło*, *Michał* (SSNO III 448–449), Bel. *Михайло*, *Михайла Михаил* (Biryla 1966: 121), Lith. *Mikáilas* (PDBe). Therefore, it could be represented as Pol. *Michajło*, *Michał*, Bel. *Михайло*, *Михайла Михаил*, Lith. *Mikáilas → **Mikáiliškių mìškas*** (Trak D).

However, it's worth noting that instances of singular-form representation also exist. For example, Pol. patronym *Lisowski* (SSNO III 270), Rus. *Лисовский*, Bel. *Лісоўскі*, *Лысеўскі* (Biryla 1969: 253) is transferred into **Lesòvskio mìškas** (Šr D). This transition could be represented as follows: Pol. *Lisowski*, Rus. *Лисовский*, Bel. *Лісоўскі*, *Лысеўскі → **Lesòvskio mìškas*** (Šr D).

This alignment of drymonyms within a specific locality suggests a possible naming motivation rooted in the person's connection to the landscape. Claiming that all these drymonyms or any other toponyms are solely rooted in the concept of ownership without further analysis of registers and other documents could be a bold assertion. This research adopts the metonymic model PERSON FOR THE PLACE to illustrate its productivity and significance better to prevent data misinterpretation.

CONCLUSIONS

The findings of this research reveal several key points:

1. Metonymy, a significant cognitive mechanism, plays a central role in forming drymonyms. It is evident in 696 officially recognized drymonyms within Vilnius County, a substantial portion of the total 787 drymonyms.

2. Three primary metonymic patterns have been identified: PLACE FOR THE PLACE, SALIENT FEATURE FOR THE PLACE, and PERSON FOR THE PLACE.

   • The metonymic model PLACE FOR THE PLACE can be further specified into two distinct models: SETTLEMENT FOR THE FOREST, encompassing names of surrounding inhabited areas, dominates with 546 instances, making it the most prevalent pattern in drymonym conceptualization. The second model, AQUATIC FEATURE FOR THE FOREST, represents names of water bodies in proximity and has contributed to 24 drymonyms.

   • The metonymic model SALIENT FEATURE FOR THE PLACE can be subdivided into five specific models: FOREST TYPE FOR THE FOREST, LANDSCAPE FEATURE FOR THE FOREST, VEGETATION FOR THE FOREST, FAUNA FOR THE FOREST, and PURPOSE FOR THE FOREST. These subcategories are represented by 36, 35, 24, 4, and 1 drymonyms, respectively.

   • The metonymic model PERSON FOR THE PLACE was refined into PERSON FOR THE FOREST. It is important to note that this does not necessarily imply ownership; rather, it indicates a connection between the person and the forest. There are a total of 26 drymonyms falling under this model.

Overall, the findings shed light on the intricate interplay between language, landscape, and human interaction within Vilnius County, showcasing the rich tapestry of meanings embedded in the names of its forests.

ABBREVIATIONS

Bel. – Belorusian; cf. – compare; D – district, El– Elektrénai; et al. – and others; Lith. – Lithuanian; Mlt. – Molétai; Pol. – Polish; Pref – prefix; Rus. – Russian; Suf – suffix; Šlčn – Šalčininkai; Šr – Šìrvintos; Švčn – Švenčiónys; Trak – Trākai; Ukm – Ukmergẽ; V – Vìlnius.

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

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-zodynas.

REFERENCES

Ainiala Terhi, Östman Jan-Ola, eds., 2017: *Socio-Onomastics. The Pragmatics of Names*, Pragmatics & Beyond New Series, 275, Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Arnaud Pierre 2022: Metaphor, Metonymy and the Nounness of Proper Names. – *Lexis. Journal in English Lexicology* 20. DOI: doi.org/10.4000/lexis.6617.

Bartkutė Nerija 2006: The Tendencies of Change: Toponymy Derivation in Skaistgyris' surroundings. – *Proceedings of the 4th International Congress of Dialectologists and Geolinguists*, Abstracts, July 28 – August 2, Riga: 2003, 56–61.

Bartkutė Nerija 2008: *Joniškio rajono teritorijos toponimija: daryba ir raidos polinkiai*: daktaro disertacija, Šiauliai: Vytauto Didžiojo universiteto leidykla.

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

Biryla Nikolaj V. 1966: Бірыла, Николай В. *Беларуская антрапанімія. Уласныя
імёны*, *імёны-мянушкі*, *імёны па бацьку*, *прозвішчы* [Belaruskaja antrapanimija.
Ulasnyja imëny, imëny-mjanuški, imëny pa bac'ku, prozvišču], Мінск: Навука тэхніка
[Minsk: Navuka tèchnika].

Biryla Nikolaj V. 1969: Бірыла, Николай В. *Беларуская антрапанімія* [Belaruskaja
antrapanimija] 2, *Прозвішчы, утвораныя ад апелятыўнай лексікі* [Prozvišču, utvoranye
ad apeljatyŭnaj leksiki], Мінск: Навука тэхніка [Minsk: Navuka tèchnika].

Boldyrev Nikolaij N. 2016: Болдырев Николай Н. *Когнитивная семантика*
[Kognitivnaja semantika], Москва, Берлин [Moskva, Berlin]: DirectMedia.

Croft William 2000: *Cognitive Linguistics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Endzelytė Renata 2003: Šiaurės panevėžiškių vietovardžiai. – *Žmogus kalbos erdvėje*,
566–583.

Endzelytė Renata 2005: *Šiaurės vidurio Lietuvos vietovardžiai*: daktaro disertacija,
Kaunas: Vytauto Didžiojo universiteto leidykla.

Gibbs Raymond 1994: *The Poetics of Mind*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gudavičius Aloyzas 2011: Reikšmė – sąvoka – konceptas ir prasmė. – *Res
Humanitariae* 10, 108–119.

Lakoff George, Johnson Mark 1980: *Metaphors we Live By*, Chicago: The
University of Chicago Press.

Langacker Roland 2006: Introduction to Concept, Image and Symbol. – *Cognitive
Linguistics: Basic Readings*, ed. by D. Geeraerts, New York: Mauton de Gruyter, 29–69.

Langendonck van Willy 2007: *Theory and Typology of Proper Names*, Berlin, New
York: Mouton de Gruyter.

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

LKG I – *Lietuvių kalbos gramatika* 1: *Fonetika ir morfologija (daiktavardis, būdvardis,
skaitvardis, įvardis)*, red. K. Ulvydas, Vilnius: Mintis, 1965.

Karpenko Elena, Golubenko Lidija 2015: Problems of Cognitive Onomastics, –
Записки з ономастики [Zapiski z onomastiki] 18, 285–293.

Karpenko Jurij A. 1980: Карпенко, Юрий А. Признаки молодости топонимичес-
кой системы [Priznaki molodosti toponimičeskoj sistemy]. – *Перспективы
развития славянской топонимики* [Perspektivy pazvitija slavjanskoj toponimiki],

отв. ред. А. В. Суперанская, Н. В. Подольская [otv. red. A. V. Superanskaja, N. V. Podol'skaja], Москва: Наука [Moskva: Nauka], 48–57.

Kerevičienė Jurgita 2009: *Glossary of Cognitive Terms*, Kaunas. Available at: https:/ www.knf.vu.lt/dokumentaifailaikatedrugermanuKereviciene%20%20kognityviniu%20 ter minu%20zodynas.pdf.

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

Kövecses Zoltán, Günter Radden 1999: Towards a Theory of Metonymy. – *Metonymy in Language and Thought*, eds. by K.-U. Panther, G. Radden, Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing, 17–59.

Markert Katja, Nissim Malvina 2006: Metonymic proper names: A corpus-based account. – *Trends in Linguistics Studies and Monographs* 171, 1–17.

Mickienė Ilona 2001: *Telšių rajono toponimų daryba*: daktaro disertacija, Kaunas: Vytauto Didžiojo universiteto leidykla.

Mickienė Ilona 2004: Dėl Lietuvos asmenvardinės kilmės drimonimų darybos. – *Baltu filoloģija* 13(1), 121–131.

Mickienė Ilona 2011: Sudėtiniai Lietuvos drimonimai: asmenvardiniai, hidroniminiai, toponiminiai. – *Valoda dažādu kultūru kontekstā: Zinatnisko rakstu krajums* 21, Daugavpils: Saule, 387–395.

Mickienė Ilona 2019: Asmenvardinės kilmės miškų vardai: vakarinių pietų aukštaičių regionas. – *Lituanistica* 1(115), 30–38.

Mickienė Ilona, Bačiūnaitė-Lužinienė Lina 2013: *Onomastikos įžvalgos*: mokomoji knyga, Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas. Prieiga internete: http://www. khf.vu.lt/dokumentai/failai/katedru/lietuviu/Onomastikos_izvalgos_Mickiene_ Baciunaite-Luziniene_2013.pdf.

Mickienė Ilona, Bankauskaitė-Sereikienė Gabija 2012: Labūnavos krašto toponimija: lingvistinės įžvalgos. – *Lituanistica* 2(58)*, 161–179.

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

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

Nikonov Vladimir A. 1966: Никонов, Владимир А. *Краткий топонимический словарь* [Kratkij toponimičeskij slovar'], Москва: Мысль [Moskva: Mysl'].

Nyström Staffan 2016: Names and Meaning. – *The Oxford Handbook of names and naming*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Podol'skaja Natalija V. 1988: Подольская, Наталия В. *Словарь русской ономастической терминологии* [Slovar' russkoj onomastičeskoj terminologii], отв. ред. А. В. Суперанская [otv. red. A. V. Superanskaja], 2-е изд., Москва: Наука [2-e izd., Moskva: Nauka].

Rapa Santa 2019: Metonymy as a Basis of Toponymy. – *4ᵗʰ International Scientific Aleksandras Vanagas' Conference "Onyms in Space and Space in Onyms"*, Abstracts, November 7–9, Vilnius: 2019, 38–39. Available at: http://lki.lt/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/Vanago-konferencijos-prane%C5%A1im%C5%B3-TEZ%C4%96S.pdf.

Reszegi Katalin 2012: Cognitive approaches to Hungarian toponymy. – *Onoma* 47(1), 367–379.

Reszegi Katalin 2022: Metonymic Namegiving from a Cognitive Perspective. – *Acta Onomastica* 63(1), 206–225.

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.

Skorupa Pavel 2023: *Semantics of Present-Day Vilnius County Toponym Opositions*: Doctoral Dissertation, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.

SSNO III – *Słownik staropolskich nazw osobowych* 3 (*Kl–M*), red. W. Taszycki, Wroclaw: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1971.

Stunžaitė Alisa 2022: Manifestation of Physis in Vilnius County Drymonymy. – *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 87, 155–176.

Superanskaja Aleksandra V. 1973: Суперанская, Александра В. *Общая теория имени собственного* [Obščaja teorija imeni sobstvennogo], Москва: Наука [Moskva: Nauka].

Sviderskienė Dalia 2006: Marijampolės apskrities drimonimų darybos ir kilmės polinkiai. – *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 54, 49–62.

S v i d e r s k i e n ė D a l i a 2016: Sudurtinių Marijampolės apskrities helonimų motyvacija, – *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 75, 243–273.

S v i d e r s k i e n ė D a l i a 2017: Sudėtinių Marijampolės apskrities helonimų motyvacija, – *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 77, 78–102.

S v i d e r s k i e n ė D a l i a 2019: Priesaginių Marijampolės apskrities helonimų motyvacija. – *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 81, 110–140.

S v i d e r s k i e n ė D a l i a 2022: Utenos apskrities Anykščių valsčiaus (1935–1937) helonimų motyvacija. – *Lituanistica* 68, 1(127), 43–65.

TLE I – *Tarybų Lietuvos enciklopedija* 1 (*A–Grūdas*), red. J. Matulis, Vilnius: Vyriausioji enciklopedijų redakcija, 1985.

V a i č i e n ė A g n ė 2014: Lietuvių kalbos kilmininko semantikos tyrimai: rezultatai ir perspektyvos. – *Res Humanitariae* 16, 319–339.

V a n a g a s A l e k s a n d r a s 1981: Lietuvių hidronimų semantika. – *Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai* 21, 4–153.

VLEe – *Visuotinė lietuvių enciklopedija* (= *Universal Lithuanian Encyclopedia*), e. variantas, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos centras, 2001–2020. Available at: https://www.vle.lt.

Vilniaus apskrities drimonimijos analizė: metonimijos atvejis

SANTRAUKA

Šio tyrimo objektas – metonimijos būdu sudaryti Vilniaus apskrities drimonimai. Iš 787 atrinktų dabartinėje Vilniaus apskrityje funkcionuojančių vardų net 696 buvo inspiruoti metoniminio mąstymo būdo. Į tyrimo lauką nepateko drimonimai, kurių motyvacija siejama su motyvuojančių apeliatyvų polisemija ir su motyvuojančios sąvokos apeliatyvine ir (arba) onimine prigimtimi. Minėti drimonimai, įtraukti į tyrimą, potencialiai galėjo kelti abejonių, ar atitinka nustatytus metoniminius modelius, todėl jų buvo atsisakyta ir apsiribota tik visiškai aiškios semantikos miškų vardų analize.

Atlikus tyrimą nustatyti dominuojantys modeliai: VIETA VIETOJ VIETOS, IŠSKIRTINĖ YPATYBĖ VIETOJ VIETOS IR ŽMOGUS VIETOJ VIETOS. 570 drimonimų yra siejama su metoniminiu modeliu VIETA VIETOJ VIETOS, jį sukonkretinus, paaiškėjo, kad drimonimų susiradymą dažniausiai inspiravo gyvenvietės (546) ir vandens telkiniai (24). 100 miškų vardų motyvacija grindžiama metoniminio modelio IŠSKIRTINĖ YPATYBĖ VIETOJ VIETOS. Minėtinos šios tyrimo patvirtintos šškirtinės ypatybės: miško tipas (36), kraštovaizdis (35), augmenija (24), gyvūnija (4) ir miško

paskirtis (1). Apie žmonių santalką miškingose vietovėse galima spręsti iš 26 Vilniaus apskrities drimonimų, jie siejami su ŽMOGUS VIETOJ VIETOS, t. y. ŽMOGUS VIETOJ MIŠKO, metoniminiu modeliu.

Kadangi šis tyrimas buvo vykdomas kognityvinės onomastikos lygmeniu, jame laikomasi nuostatos, kad visi vardai turi reikšmę. Analizuotų drimonimų konceptualizavimo modelis buvo atskleistas adaptavus Nikolos Dobričiaus (2010) modelį, pagal kurį autorius siūlo numatyti koncepto kelią per šaltinio ir tikslo sritis, iš kurių šaltinis – apeliatyvas arba tikrinis žodis, o tikslas – onimas, šio tyrimo atveju – drimonimas. Taigi straipsnyje nagrinėjamų vardų konceptai atvaizduojami remiantis šia schema: apeliatyvas / tikrinis žodis → drimonimas. Panašią schemą vykdomuose tyrimuose taiko ir Vengrijos mokslininkė Katalina Reszegi (2022).

Kadangi metonimijos apraiškų randama apeliatyvuose, tikimasi, kad metoniminis mąstymas būdingas ir tikriniams žodžiams. Juk metonimija yra kognityvinė ir lingvistinė priemonė universalioms kategorijoms formuotis žmogaus sąmonėje, kurios vėliau gali būti atspindėtos kalboje. Metonimija apima vieno objekto sampratos modelį susiedama jį su kitu, ypač tada, kai abu objektai egzistuoja toje pačioje paradigmoje (Kövecses, Günter 1999: 21; Kerevičienė 2009: 14–15). Toponimija ir yra būtent ta sritis, kuri parodo, kad objektai koegzistuoja, kad dėl įvairių priežasčių jai būdingas polinkis peržengti savo pačios ribas, įskaitant vardų migraciją tarp objektų klasių bei analogija pagrįstų darinių (Karpenko 1980: 49). Metoniminiai procesai yra labai svarbūs ir įdomūs, kadangi jie atskleidžia glaudų žmonijos suvokimo, vietovės ypatybių, kalbos bei vardo formavimosi mechanizmų ryšį.

ALISA STUNŽAITĖ
Lietuvių kalbos institutas
Petro Vileišio g. 5, LT-10308 Vilnius, Lietuva
alisa.stunzaite@vilniustech.lt