PAVEL SKORUPA

Lietuvių kalbos institutas

SEMANTIC OPPOSITIONS IN VILNIUS COUNTY TOPONYMS

Vilniaus apskrities toponimų semantinės opozicijos

ANNOTATION

The current paper deals with (semantic) oppositions in the present-day Vilnius County toponyms (both settlement and non-settlement names). Although the traditional research into Lithuanian toponymy, esp. hydronymy, points out antonymic semantic relationships in certain place names based on distinctive elements of both composite and compound names, these elements do not receive due attention. 5103 toponyms (river, stream, pond and settlement names) that currently exist in the region were collected for the research and 400 toponyms in the classes of hydronyms and oikonyms that form 191 oppositions were identified. The oppositions are analyzed not only in terms of their antonymic semantic relationships, but also formally, i.e. the role of composite and compound names components is examined on the syntactic (word-formation) level.

KEYWORDS: opposition, toponym, present-day Vilnius County, semantic relationships, antonymic relationships.

ANOTACIJA

Straipsnyje nagrinėjamos šių dienų Vilniaus apskrities toponimų (tiek gyvenviečių, tiek ne gyvenviečių vardų) (semantinės) opozicijos. Tradiciniuose lietuvių toponimijos tyrimuose, ypač hidronimijos, minimi paskiri antoniminiai vietovardžių pavyzdžiai, tačiau iki šiol sistemiškiau jie nebuvo tyrinėti. Tyrimui buvo surinkti 5103 dabartiniai toponimai (upių, upelių, tvenkinių ir gyvenviečių vardai) ir nustatyta, kad 400 toponimų (hidronimų ir oikonimų klasėse) sudaro 191 opoziciją. Opozicijos analizuojamos ne tik pagal jų antoniminius semantinius ryšius, bet ir formaliai, t. y. sudėtinių ir sudurtinių vardų komponentų vaidmuo tiriamas sintaksiniu (žodžių darybos) lygmeniu.

INTRODUCTION

The traditional research into Lithuanian toponymy resp. hydronymy (esp. Aleksandras Vanagas 1981a) points out antonymic relationships in certain water body names. Sometimes etymologists suggest that, for instance, qualifying adjectives of colour in toponyms are motivated by the colour, fertility or other physical characteristic of soil; the prevailing colour of buildings; the qualifying adjectives of size are motivated by the actual size of the named object, etc. However, normally these distinctive elements in toponyms do not receive due attention (Stachowski 2018).

Antonymic relationship is often associated with the distinctive attributes of a composite name, usually qualifying adjectives of size, age, horizontal or vertical position in space, colour etc., which are used as pre- or post-modifiers to distinguish between two identical names. Traditionally antonyms are words with the opposite meaning, i.e. words in semantic opposition. According to John I. Saeed (2016: 63), contrary to 'antonym', the term 'opposition' is a broader general label that indicates the relationship between two entities that does not necessarily mean that one entity is the negative of the other. Thus, oppositions in the current research are viewed not only as an antonymic semantic relationship between the distinctive attributes of the name, but as any type of relationship between distinguishing constituent parts of names, including the elements of compound names that have a clearly distinct function. The research, however, does not include the analysis on the phonetic oppositions, i.e. the identical names that follow different stress patterns. Also, due to the scope of the paper and a big number of oppositions it is impossible to describe etymologies and motivation of each proper name, therefore, only some of them are described in terms of their etymology and motivation.

The object of the current research is oppositions based on distinctive attributes of names in present-day Vilnius County toponymy (both settlement and non-settlement names).

The aim of the present study is to examine typical oppositions among Vilnius County toponyms in terms of their syntactic features and semantics of distinctive attributes.

The article is based on the analysis of oppositions in toponyms (river, lake, ponds, settlement names) that currently exist within the borders of the present-day Vilnius County, which covers a big part (about one third) of the interwar

Western Vilnius Region, which is now part of Lithuania. The choice to analyze toponymy of this area was determined by its long, turbulent and often sad history, which leads to the complexity of the current study, as place names of the region are affected by language interactions not only due to cultural periphery but also to long-term multilingualism of the population. Currently, Vilnius County consists of 6 district municipalities, 1 municipality and 1 city municipality: Elektrėnai Municipality, Šalčininkai District Municipality, Širvintos District Municipality, Švenčionys District Municipality, Trakai District Municipality, Ukmergė District Municipality, Vilnius City Municipality, and Vilnius District Municipality.

The total of 400 (8%) place names that form 191 oppositions were identified in the corpus of 5103 toponyms, i.e. river (including streams), lake, pond and settlement (cities, towns, villages and steadings) names in the region: 25 out of 335 river names make 14 (7%) oppositions; 78 out of 714 lake names make 37 (20%) oppositions; 32 out of 146 pond names make 12 (6%) oppositions; 267 out of 3905 settlement names make 128 (67%) oppositions. In the number of cases, three or more place names in each category are in opposition. All the selected toponyms that exist in oppositions are within 0,1 to 20 km from each other.

Toponyms (both settlement and non-settlement names) were collected from: Vilnius County district municipalities' web sites; *The Rivers, Lakes and Ponds Cadaster of the Republic of Lithuania* (Lith. *Lietuvos Respublikos upių, ežerų ir tvenkinių kadastras*, *UETK*, https://uetk.am.lt); *Vilnius County maps* at https://www.geoportal.lt; *The Catalogue of Lithuanian Place Names Written from the Living Language* at the Institute of the Lithuanian Language Onomastics Department (Lith. Lietuvių kalbos instituto Vardyno skyriaus *Lietuvių vietovardžių, užrašytų iš gyvosios kalbos, kartoteka*)*; The Archive of Vilnius Region Land Names Questionnaires* at the Institute of the Lithuanian Language Onomastics Department (Lith. Lietuvių kalbos instituto Vardyno skyriaus prieškarinės *Vilniaus krašto žemės vardyno anketų archyvas*); during the analysis, the variants of some name forms were checked in *the Russian Empire Map of 1872* (hereinafter, REM 1872) (https://mapire.eu/en/map/russia-1872/).

1. SYNTACTIC FEATURES OF OPPOSITIONS IN TOPONYMY

The present study is based not only on the examination of the typical antonymic semantic relationships among Vilnius County toponyms, but also includes their formal analysis, i.e. the role of (composite and compound) names

components on the syntactic (word-formation) level. Thus, the first part of the paper analyzes the syntactic features of toponyms.

1.1. Pre- and post-modifiers

It has been observed that the majority of oppositions in composite toponyms are formed by such elements as distinctive attributes that serve as pre- or post-modifiers of the place name, i.e. autonomous words (e.g., qualifying adjectives) are placed either before or after the modified name.

1.1.1. Autonomous words as pre- and post-modifiers

Oppositions based on the antonymic relationships of the autonomous words either in pre- or post-position are made following these patterns: *zero modifier + name x pre-modifier + name*, *pre-modifier + name x pre-modifier + name*, *name + zero modifier x name + post-modifier*. From the perspective of word-formation toponymic oppositions with pre- and post-modifiers are classified as composite place names.

The **zero modifier + name x pre-modifier + name** pattern can be observed in 28 oppositions: 2 river names oppositions – *Upėsė x Mažóji Upėsė*, *Kenà x Mažóji Kenà*; 2 lake names oppositions – *Antavilio ẽžeras* (lake) *x Mažàsis Antavilio ẽžeras*, *Guĺbinas x Mažàsis Guĺbinas*; 24 settlement names oppositions – *Bezdónys* (tn) *x Bezdónys* (v) *x Aukštíeji Bezdónys* (v), *Brastà x Naujóji Brastà*, *Būdà x Senóji Būdà x Naujóji Būdà* (El mun.), *Būdà x Senóji Būdà* (Trak. D. mun.), *Būdà x Semelìškių Būdà* (Aukštadvaris eldership), *Gedũnai x Didíeji Gedũnai, Jagėlonys x Klòniniai Jagėlonys, Kálviai x Naujíeji Kálviai, Karklėnai x Ùžupio Karklėnai x Didíeji Karklėnai, Katutiškės x Mãžosios Katutiškės, Kudžionys x Mažíeji Kudžionys, Laibiškės x Didžiõsios Laibiškės, Leñtvaris* (tn) *x Leñtvaris* (v) *x Naujàsis Leñtvaris* (v), *Liepónys x Mažíeji Liepónys, Maceliai x Seníeji Macėliai, Mēdininkai x Didíeji Mēdininkai, Migūčionys x Seníeji Migūčionys x Naujíeji Migūčionys, Pamerkỹs x Aukštàsis Pamerkỹs, Piktakonys x Naujíeji Piktakonys, Rėvà x Naujóji Rėvà, Riešẽ̃* (stead.) *x Riešẽ̃* (v) *x Mažóji Riešẽ̃ x Didžióji Riešẽ̃, Tartõkas x Šalčininkẽlių Tartõkas, Trãkai* (tn) *x Seníeji Trãkai* (v) (Trak. D. mun.)*, Zadvarninkai x Naujíeji Zadvarninkai*.

The **pre-modifier + name x pre-modifier + name** pattern can be observed in 25 cases: 1 river names opposition – *Didỹsis Pir̃čiupis x Mažàsis Pir̃čiupis*; 3 lake names oppositions – *Dìdelis Macijonėlis x Mãžas Macijonėlis, Didysai Siaurỹs x Mažasai Siaurỹs, Didíeji Vagiekai x Mažíeji Vagiekai*; 21 settlement names oppositions – *Didíeji Baušiaĩ x Mažíeji Baušiaĩ, Naũjas Janãvas x Sènas*

Janãvas, *Mãžosios Kabìškės x Dìdžiosios Kabìškės, Aukštíeji Karklénai x Žemíeji Karklénai, Sẽnosios Kietãviškės x Naūjosios Kietãviškės, Mažóji Kúosinė x Didžió-ji Kúosinė, Didíeji Lygainiai x Mažíeji Lygainiai, Seníeji Miežionys x Naujíeji Miežionys, Kalnìniai Mijáugonys x Klòniniai Mijáugonys, Naujà Pašaminė x Senà Pašaminė, Naūjosios Rakliškės x Sẽnosios Rakliškės, Aukštíeji Rusokai x Žemíeji Rusokai, Aukštíeji Semeniukai x Žemíeji Semeniukai, Mãžosios Sélos x Dìdžiosios Sélos, Sẽnas Strūnáitis x Naūjas Strūnáitis, Aukštíeji Svirnaĩ x Žemíeji Svirnaĩ, Naujì Šaminiai x Senì Šaminiai, Naujàsis Tar̃pupis x Senàsis Tar̃pupis, Senõsios Viẽsos x Áukštosios Viẽsos x Žẽmosios Viẽsos, Baltóji Vókė* (tn) (Šlčn. D. mun.) *x Juodóji Vókė* (V C mun.) *x Baltóji Vókė* (V C mun.), *Trãkų Vókė* (V C mun.) *x Mū̃rinė Vókė* (V C mun.).

The **name + post-modifier x name + post-modifier** pattern can be observed in 3 oppositions: 1 river names opposition – *Cùdykas Dìdelis x Cùdykas Mãžas*; 2 lake names oppositions – *Ìlma Didžióji x Ìlma Mažóji, Nevar̃das Áukštas x Nevar̃das Žẽmas*.

As it can be seen in the above examples, the *zero modifier x pre-modifi-er* and *pre-modifier x pre-modifier* patterns are most productive in the class of settlement names oppositions, comprising 28 and 25 out of 191 oppositions respectively.

1.1.2. Numbers as post–modifiers

In a great number of pond and settlement names (32 and 114 respectively) numbers are used to make distinction between two identical toponyms (in some cases, among three and more names). Such toponymic constructions do not form semantic oppositions and can be observed only in ponds and settlement names that most often follow the *name + zero modifier x name + post modifier* and *name + post-modifier x name + post-modifier* patterns, the latter being the most productive (the total of 51 cases).

The pattern **name + zero modifier x name + post modifier** can be observed in: 1 pond names opposition – *Bražuõlės x Bražuõlės I x Bražuõlės II*; 6 settle-ment names oppositions – *Antãkalnis x Antãkalnis I x Antãkalnis II x Antãkalnis III, Būdà* (Trakai eldership) *x Būdà I x Būdà III, Naujãlaukis (Naujãlaukis I) x Naujãlaukis II* (El D. mun.), *Naujãlaukis x Naujãlaukis II* (Trak. D. mun.), *Ne-menčìnė x Nemenčìnė II, Versekà x Versekà I x Versekà II*.

The pattern **name + post-modifier x name + post-modifier** can be observed in: 11 pond names oppositions – *Buivydìškių I x Buivydìškių II x Buivydìškių III x Buivydìškių IV x Buivydìškių V x Buivydìškių VI, Júodės I x Júodės II x Júodės III x Júodės IV, Mostìškių I x Mostìškių II, Navakonių I x Navakonių II, Šalčininkų I x Šalčininkų II, Taujénų x Taujénų II, Teténų I x Teténų II, Tolkìškių I x Tolkìškių*

II, *Turnìškių I x Turnìškių II*, *Viesų I x Viesų II x Viesų III*, *Viȓkščių I x Viȓkščių II*; 44 settlement names oppositions – *Alẽšiškės I x Alẽšiškės II*, *Aliónys (Aliónys I) x Aliónys II*, *Antãliedė I x Antãliedė II*, *Arénai I x Arénai II*, *Ažùmiškė I x Ažùmiškė II*, *Bastū̃nai I x Bastū̃nai II*, *Buivỹdžiai I x Buivỹdžiai II*, *Bùrbliškė I x Bùrbliškė II*, *Dailydùkas I x Dailydùkas II*, *Gemelìškis I x Gemelìškis II*, *Gimžiaĩ I x Gimžiaĩ II*, *Jùsiškis I x Jùsiškis II*, *Kalnuõtė I x Kalnuõtė II x Kalnuõtė IV x Kalnuõtė V x Kalnuõtė VII*, *Kiauklìškis I x Kiauklìškis II*, *Kochanovkà I x Kochanovkà II x Kochanovkà III*, *Kryžiáuka I x Kryžiáuka II*, *Kunigìškiai I x Kunigìškiai II*, *Kúosinė I x Kúosinė II x Kúosinė III*, *Lapìškiai I x Lapìškiai II*, *Levãniškis I x Levãniškis II*, *Liū̃nai I x Liū̃nai II*, *Lygùmai I x Lygùmai II*, *Maigiaĩ I x Maigiaĩ II*, *Malináuka I x Malináuka II*, *Myliaĩ I x Myliaĩ II*, *Meriónys I x Meriónys II*, *Nacėliškiai I x Nacėliškiai II*, *Naujãsodis I x Naujãsodis II*, *Navasiòlkai I x Navasiòlkai II x Navasiòlkai III*, *Nenórtai I x Nenórtai II*, *Pãgaigalė I x Pãgaigalė II*, *Parijà I x Parijà II*, *Pãšilė I x Pãšilė II x Pãšilė III*, *Pìliakalnis I x Pìliakalnis II*, *Poguliánka I x Poguliánka II*, *Ramõniškiai I x Ramõniškiai II*, *Raudõnė I x Raudõnė II*, *Sakalìškė I x Sakalìškė II*, *Saveikiškia I x Saveikiškia II*, *Šẽškuškė I x Šẽškuškė II*, *Šešuolẽliai I x Šešuolẽliai II*, *Ùosininkai I x Ùosininkai II x Ùosininkai III*, *Urnẽžiai I x Urnẽžiai II*, *Vaičiùkiškė I x Vaičiùkiškė II*, *Varnikẽliai I x Varnikẽliai II*.

The use of numbers in place names is characteristic of the quite recent nomination patterns, esp. since the beginning of the 20th century (Štěpán 2009: 915). It is important to notice that numbers are used only in the official sources (municipalities websites, documents and maps, etc.) to make distinction between the identical names, whereas the locals do not usually use numbers with these names. Thus, for instance, *Buivỹdžiai I* and *Buivỹdžiai II* are both referred to as *Buivỹdžiai*; or *Ùosininkai I*, *Ùosininkai II* and *Ùosininkai III* are known as *Ùosininkai* in the living language. The same usage applies to pond names. All pond names, esp. those modified by numbers are artificial toponymic objects, which were named after the places they are located in, and their names are the result of transonymization. Thus, they are of no interest and are not further analyzed.

1.2. Affixes

In a number of cases the place name opposition can be formed by affixes, i.e. prefixes or suffixes, esp. diminutive suffixes as opposed to names without any modifying elements (names with zero modifiers).

1.2.1. Suffixes

The group of oppositions based on diminutive suffixes is the biggest and includes the following 69 cases: 9 river names oppositions – *Lãtvė x Latvẽlė*, *Luknà x Luknẽlė (Baltẽlė), Kenà x Kenẽlė (Kinẽlė), Mūšià x Mūšẽlė, Nẽrupis x Nerupẽlis* (also, see 1.3.), *Strūnà x Strūnẽlė, Šalčià x Šalčýkščia, Zizdrà x Zizdrẽlė, Žeimenà x Žeimenẽlė*; 30 lake names oppositions – *Akìs x Akẽlė* (as well as two more lakes *Akìs* in the same eldership that make an opposition with *Akẽlė*), *Bakà x Bakùtis, Báltas x Baltẽlis x Baltẽlis, Bėlỹs x Bėláitis, Beržuõlis x Beržuoliùkas, Briaũnis x Briauniùkas, Bedùgnis x Bedugniùkas, Drabùžis x Drabužáitis, Gėjus x Gėjùkas, Gėla x Gėláitis, Gruožỹs x Gruožáitis, Gaigãlis x Gaigaliùkas, Gélvis x Gelváitis, Jagùdis x Jagudẽlis, Juodýnas x Juodynẽlis, Kãris x Karáitis, Krãkinis x Krakinùkas, Kretúonas x Kretuonỹkštis, Líedis x Liedáitis, Mónis x Monáitis, Pažemỹs x Pažemẽlis, Skrìtis x Skričiùkas, Spindžiùs x Spindžiùkas, Sudotà x Sudotẽlis, Šeřmis x Šermùkas, Šamìnis x Šaminẽlis, Šíemetis x Šiemetùkas, Šveñčius x Švenčiùkas, Ungurỹs x Unguráitis, Varnākis x Varnakẽlis*; 30 settlement names oppositions – *Akmenà (v) x Akmenà (v) x Akmenẽlė (v), Bařbiškis x Barbiškẽlis, Bařdiškiai x Bardiškẽliai, Bugėnai x Bugenẽliai, Dainavà x Dainavẽlė, Déltuva (tn) x Deltuvẽlė (v), Dùsmenys x Dusmenẽliai, Grúožninkai x Gruožninkẽliai, Grùžos x Gružẽlės, Juodýnas x Juodynẽlis, Júodiškis x Juodiškẽlis, Laukénai x Laukénẽliai, Lazdýnai x Lazdinẽliai, Makùčiai x Makučiùkai, Miškìniai x Miškinẽliai, Mùsninkai x Musninkẽliai, Naidaĩ x Naidẽliai, Nemenčìnė x Nemenčinẽlė, Prūdìškė x Prūdiškẽlė, Purnùškės x Purnuškẽliai, Raguvà x Raguvẽlė, Sámninkai x Samninkẽliai, Slabadà x Slabadkà, Šalčininkai (v) x Šaľčininkai (tn) x Šalčininkẽliai (v), Šiùkštiškiai x Šiukštiškẽliai, Švenčiónys x Švenčionẽliai, Taujénai (tn) x Taujénai (v) x Taujénẽliai (v), Trãkai (v) x Trãkai (stead.) x Trakẽliai (v)* (Švnč. D. mun.), *Versekà x Versekẽlė, Vytìnė x Vytinẽlė*.

The most productive suffixes are *-ėl- (-is, -ė, -iai)* and *-el- (-is, -ė, -ės, -iai)* (30 and 13 cases respectively) in both settlement and non-settlement names. All diminutive toponyms are suffix-derivatives from the toponyms they are in opposition with and are formed under the influence of a toponymic context. According to Vanagas (1970: 75), such toponyms can be considered the continuation ("continuum") of the primary place names. Their relation to the toponymic context is indicated by the common root, whereas the suffix indicates the relationships of belonging (possessivity) and origin. These relationships reflect the belonging (or quantitative) subordination and are determined by the relationship of the toponymic objects themselves and provide certain information (belonging-origin relationship). Diminutive toponyms listed in this section name objects that are characterized by their size and are smaller than the objects from the names of which their diminutive names were derived. In all the above cases, the topo-object are located in a very close proximity to each other.

1.2.2. Prefixes

There are only two oppositions based on prefix derivatives that can be found among settlement names: *Ūdrónys x Paūdrónys, Voverẽ x Pavoverẽ.* The prefix *pa-* derivatives in the Lithuanian language denote a place below or near something. *Ūdrónys* and *Paūdrónys* are two villages in the vicinity of the village Tãbariškės in Turgeliai eldership, Šlčn. D. mun. Both villages are in close proximity and are located on the opposite sides of the road to Turgẽliai. According to Marija Razmukaitė (2009: 34), oikonyms with the suffix *–onys* (*-oniai*) are *plularia tantum* derivatives from personal names with patronymic suffixes *–aitis, –ėnas, –onis, –ūnas.* Thus, it may be claimed that the settlement name *Ūdrónys* is a derivative from the anthroponym *Ūdrỹs*[1]. The prefix *pa-* in the opposition *Ūdrónys* and *Paūdrónys* indicates the relationships of belonging (possessivity) and origin.

The second opposition in this category is made by two villages *Voverẽ* and *Pavoverẽ* that are 4 km away from one another on the right bank of *the Voveráitė*[2] (the right tributary of *the Žeimenà*) in Pabradės eldership, Švnč. D. mun. *Pavoverẽ* is located close (0,3 km) to the confluence of *the Voveráitė* and *the Žeimenà*, whereas *Voverẽ* is located 4 km away from *Pavoverẽ,* upstream *the Voveráitė.* Both *Voverẽ* and *Pavoverẽ* are surrounded by forests (Katelninkų, Kulniškės, Pavoverės, Voverẽs). These settlement names were motivated by the potamonym they are located next to, whereas the prefix *pa-* in the name *Pavoverẽ* not only indicates the relationship of this settlement with the stream and *Voverẽ* village, Pavoverės and *Voverẽs* forests it is located in close proximity to. The prefix *pa-* also serves a distinctive element between two settlement names and indicates the relationships of possessivity and origins.

1.3. Compound place names

Only two compound name oppositions with no autonomous words used as pre- or post-modifiers were identified among the analyzed region's toponyms, i.e. one compound settlement name opposition *Senādvaris x Naujādvaris* and one compound river name opposition *the Nẽrupis x the Nerupẽlis.* Each of the two oppositions present different compound names formation models: *Adjective*

---

[1] A Lithuanian male name, which could be derived and motivated by the qualities ascribable to *ū̃dra* (otter) 'predatory aquatic fur animal (Lutra lutra)'.

[2] The river *Voveráitė* may be derived from the diminutive form of the zoonym *voverẽ* (squirrel) 'small, long tailed rodent (Sciurus)' (LKŽe) and could be motivated by the place where there were / are many animals of this species.

+ *common Noun* (*Senãdvaris* → *sẽnas* 'old' + *dvãras* 'estate, property' as opposed to *Naujãdvaris* → *naũjas* 'new' + *dvãras* 'estate, property') and *Verb* + *common Noun* (the *Nẽrupis* → *nérti* 'to dive; to flow quickly' + *upis* 'river' as opposed to the *Nerupẽlis* → *nérti* 'to dive; to flow quickly' + *upẽlis* 'small river, stream'). In case of *Senãdvaris x Naujãdvaris* the opposition is formed by the first parts of these compound names ← *sẽnas* 'old' and *naũjas* 'new'. The compound river name opposition is based on the diminutive suffix derivative (see 1.2.1. above).

2. SEMANTIC CATEGORIES OF OPPOSITIONS IN TOPONYMY

As described above, distinctive elements of proper names create an opposition. Although antonymic relationships are typical in toponymy, not all of the cases create a semantic opposition, as the distinctive attributes of the opposition belong to different semantic categories, esp. when they are derived from other proper names (e.g., oikonyms, hydronyms, etc.). To illustrate, *Tartõkas* and *Šalčininkẽlių Tartõkas* (*Tartõkas* ← Lith. *tartõkas* 'a lumbermill, sawmill' ← Pol. *tartak* 'a sawmill or lumber mill', i.e. a facility where logs are cut into lumber) are two villages in Šlčn. D. mun. 8,5 km from each other and definitely create an opposition. One of them has a zero attribute, or modifier, (*Tartõkas*), while the second member of the opposition is modified by the attribute derived from the proper name (oikonym) *Šalčininkẽliai*.

Another example of place names that form an opposition that are not based on the antonymic semantic relationship of their distinctive attributes are two villages that now make a part of Vilnius City – *Trãkų Vókė* (← *Trãkų* is the genitive case of the oikonym *Trãkai*) and *Mũrinė Vókė* (*Mũrinė* ← Lith. *mũrinis (-ė)* 'made of stones or bricks'). Both settlements are situated on the *River Vókė*[3] in close proximity to one another (approx. 1 km). The name *Vókė* was

---

[3] The motivation of the river name *Vókė* can be interpreted in several ways because of its complex semantics (words in different languages may have different associations). *The Vókė* (the left tributary of *the Neris*) is a stream flowing from *Lake Pãpis*. The name can be culturally motivated. In his book, Józef Krajewski (2013: 225) suggests that this name is derived from the Tatar *voka* 'water'. However, this statement is highly questionable, as the first mention of the name *Vókė* in the historical documents was made at least a decade earlier than the fact about the first Tartars settlement in the vicinity. Thus, it is highly likely the name is derived from the Lithuanian verbs *vóktis* 'to clear', *vókti* 'to harvest, to clear, to gather' (LKŽe) by means of the suffix *-ė*, which is the derivational suffix for agent (doers of the action) (see Ambrazas 1993: 170 ff). The motivation of *Vókė* can be interpreted as follows: *vóktis / vókti* → vokėjas 'the one who harvests, cleans / cleanses' → *Vókė*.

first mentioned in 1375, when Prussian Marshal Godfrid von Linden († 25 July 1379) and his army looted the vicinity of *Trãkai* for nine days. Then a big battle took place near *the Vókė* between the regiments of the Lithuanian dukes Kęstutis (c. 1300 – 15 August 1382) and Algirdas (11 February 1296 – 24 May 1377) and the Teutonic Order. In 1396–1397 the Grand Duke of Lithuania Vytautas (c. 1350 – 27 October 1430) settled the Tatar prisoners by the *River Vókė*. In 1415 the village of *Vókė* was written by Duke Vytautas to the Old Trakai Benedictine Monastery (VLE XXIV). The attribute *Trãkų* in the composite name *Trãkų Vókė* is motivated by the oikonym *Trãkai*, as the settlement is situated near the road to *Trãkai*. Thus, the name *Trãkų Vókė* means no more or less than 'the settlement (*Vókė*) on the road (in the direction to Trakai) near the *Vókė* river'. The distinctive attribute *Mũrinė* 'made of stones or bricks' (← Lith. *mũras* 'a wall or enclosure made from mortar, stones or bricks' or ← Lith. verb *mũryti* 'to lay bricks; to build from stones or bricks') was motivated by the type of buildings prevalent in the settlement. Both names (*Trãkų Vókė* and *Mũrinė Vókė*) definitely create an opposition, but the opposition of these composite names is not based on antonymic semantic relationship of their distinctive attributes *Trãkų* and *Mũrinė*.

The majority of the analyzed toponymic oppositions are based on antonymic semantic relationships between the modifying words. The semantic analysis focuses on the toponymic opposition types in terms of *size*, *position*, *age*, and *colour* of the named object.

2.1. Size

The semantic category based on antonymic relationships of qualifying adjectives of size (*dìdelis* 'big' x *mãžas* 'small') is comprised of 24 toponymic oppositions, i.e. 11 hydronym (5 potamonym and 6 limnonym) and 13 oikonym oppositions.

The analysis of the geo-data shows that almost all distinctive attributes that form oppositions literally refer to the size of the modified object and indicate the semantic antonymic relationship between the members of the opposition, e.g., *the Kenà* (23,9 km) is literally a longer river than *the Mažóji Kenà* (10,4 km) and *the Kenẽlė* (8 km)[4]; the lake *Didìeji Vagiekai* (0,047 km²) is twice bigger than

---

[4] The *River* Kenà is a left tributary of the Vilnia. The river gave name to the village Kenà (Kinẽ) in Vilnius District municipality (approx. 1 km upstream the Kenà and its confluence with the Vilnia). The Kenẽlė (Kinẽlė) is a left tributary of the Kenà and is the diminutive suffix derivative. The sources of the Kenà and the Mažóji Kenà are 6,6 km away from one another and both rivers flow

the lake *Mažìeji Vagiekai* (0,023 km²)[5]; the village *Dìdžiosios Kabìškės* occupy much bigger area than the village *Mãžosios Kabìškės*. The same can be told about oppositions based on the diminutive suffixes (see 1.2.1.), e.g. *the Mūšià* (29 km) is almost four times longer than its tributary the *Mūšẽlė* (8 km)*; the lake *Báltas*[6] (0,65 km²) is almost twice bigger than the lake *Baltẽlis* (0,038 km²) and yet another lake *Baltẽlis* (0,015 km²) in Švnč. D. mun.; *Šal̃čininkai* town (2,98 km²) and the village of the same name *Šal̃čininkai* (1,5 km²) (in the vicinity of the town) are both bigger than the village *Šalčininkė̃liai* (0,5 km²).

However, there is one exception that stands out from the majority of semantic antonymic oppositions in this category – two rivers in the direct oppositions the *Didỹsis Pir̃čiupis* and the *Mažàsis Pir̃čiupis*[7]. The distinguishing attributes (adjectives) in pre-position (*Didỹsis* ← *dìdis* (great, big) and *Mažàsis* ← *mãžas* (small)) were added to the river names *Pir̃čiupis* most probably in the second half of the 20th century (as a result of re-naming of the two rivers), as *The map of Russian Empire* (REM 1872) features two river names *Pir̃čiupis* (Rus. *Пируюписъ*) with the settlement name *Pir̃čiupė* (Rus. *Пируюпе*), now *Pir̃čiupiai,*

in the opposite directions from one another. The Mažóji Kenà (a right tributary of the Merkys) is the name made by the principle of analogy from the Kenà, as the opposition of the former with qualificational adjective mãžas (–à) (small) 'of small dimensions; spare, sparse; slight, weak; less important' (LKŽe). Vanagas (1981: 156) claimed that the name Kenà is derived from Lith. kinẽ 'a raised place in a meadow, bog, or in water' or 'roots of trees and shrubs on the river bank (in water)' (LKŽe); also, from Lith. kinìs 'a crust on the water; slough, marsh' or 'a small island in a river or lake; the area of slough, marsh' (LKŽe). Therefore, the motivation for the name is quite confusing and can be interpreted as a transposition of the concept: kinẽ → a place overgrown with trees and shrubs → the (Mažóji) Kenà (and the Kinẽlė); or kinìs → a crust on the water; slough, marsh → the (Mažóji) Kenà (and the Kinẽlė).

5 In the Russian Empire Map of 1872, the Lake *Didìeji Vagiekai* are recorded as (Rus.) оз.[еро] *Важье*, *Mažieji Vagiekai* – (Rus.) оз.[еро] *Важьика* (see REM 1872). An unnamed stream drains into the Lake *Didìeji Vagiekai*. The southern part the lake is also a source of yet another unnamed stream, which joins *Didìeji Vagiekai* with the lake *Mažìeji Vagiekai*, which in its turn is a source of yet one more unnamed stream that joins it with the Lake *Luknia*. Both *Didìeji Vagiekai* and *Mažìeji Vagiekai* lie in the bed or watercourse of a nameless stream. Thus, the name *Vagiekai* may be derived by means of the suffix –*iek*- with pluralium tantum inflection –*ai* from the Lith. *vagà* (riverbed, channel) 'the place where the river flows' (LKŽe). The motivation of the name can be interpreted as a transposition of the concept: vag*à* → the one that lies in the riverbed / course → *Didìeji Vagiekai* / *Mažìeji Vagiekai*.

6 The Lake *Báltas*, as well as two lakes *Baltẽlis* in its opposition, is motyvated by colour *báltas, –a* (white).

7 Both the *Didỹsis Pir̃čiupis* and the *Mažàsis Pir̃čiupis* are left tributaries of the *Merkỹs* (the confluence of the *Mažàsis Pir̃čiupis* and the *Merkỹs* is 2 km further upstream from the place the *Didỹdis Pir̃čiupis* discharges its waters).

on the river now known as the *Didỹsis Piřčiupis*. This can also be observed in the maps from the Soviet period. These two composite river names do not actually refer to the size of both rivers, as the *Mažàsis Piřčiupis* is 1,8 km longer than the *Didỹsis Piřčiupis*, i.e. their length is 9,1 km and 7,3 km respectively. This geographical fact leads to at least several interpretations of the semantic motivation of both toponyms. First, the choice of qualifying adjectives cannot be explained by the real size of both rivers; it could be motivated by the intensity and volume of the flow – *didỹsis*, therefore, could mean 'notable in volume, abundant; strong, violent, intense' (LKŽe), whereas *mažàsis* could mean 'which is of small dimensions, weak' (LKŽe), highlighting the most vivid characteristics of both rivers. However, such interpretations of the distinguishing attributes motivation, though possible, are arguable, as once intense and voluminous currents could have lost their volumes and vigour. Second, the attributes *didỹsis* and *mažàsis* could respectively mean 'important, significant' and 'insignificant, less important'. The *Didỹsis Piřčiupis* could be made more 'important, significant' than the *Mažàsis Piřčiupis* because of the following reasons: a) the name *Piřčiupiai*[8] was first mentioned as early as the 16th–17th centuries. The village was located on the road to Grodno. Dukes of the Grand Dutchy of Lithuania loved to hunt in its vicinity. Here was the royal hunting lodge (see ML-I; Maculevičius, Baltrušienė 1999: 92); there has been the village *Piřčiupiai* (Rus. *Пирчюпе* ← **Pirciupė, *Pirčiupė* ← *Pirčiupė, Pirčiupis*) on the banks of the *Didỹsis Piřčiupis* (see REM 1872); b) the village *Piřčiupiai* (and the river it is located next to) is known for the tragedy of June 1944, when after the Soviet partisans'[9] attack on the Nazi battalion, the Schutzstaffel sent a punishment squadron and burned alive almost all (119, including children under age of 16) inhabitants of Pirčiupiai (see Lipovec 2019). The tragedy of *Piřčiupiai* is covered in many books, articles, etc. Considering the above, the distinctive attributes *didỹsis* and *mažàsis* could actually highlight the significance of one river over the other irrespective of their actual lengths.

---

[8] The name of the village *Piřčiupiai* is motivated by the river name(s) in the vicinity of which it is situated. The river name is a compound, the first part of which is related by Vanagas (1981: 260) to the Lith. *pirtìs* (bathhouse)'a certain building or a place for bathing; the building or room where the flax is dried' (LKŽe). Taking into consideration the historical facts that the vicinity was a favourite hunting place of the Grand Dukes of the GDL and there once has been a royal hunting estate, as well as the tragedy of 1944, the motivation of the qualitative adjective *Didỹsis x Mažàsis* can be interpreted according to Stachowski's (2018: 197–214) theory and it can be stated that *the Didỹsis Piřčiupis* is more important. Linguistic-cognitive motivation can be interpreted as a transfer of the concept: *pirtìs* (bath) → bathing river / bathhouse → *Piřčiupis*.

[9] Members of resistance movements that fought against the Axis forces in the Soviet Union.

2.2. Position

The semantic category based on the antonymic relationships of the distinctive attributes (adjectives) indicating the relative position of the toponymic objects in space (in all cases – the vertical position *áukštas* 'high' x *žẽmas* 'low') consists of 10 toponymic oppositions (1 limnonym and 9 oikonym). In two cases (*Jagélonys x Klòniniai Jagélonys* and *Kalnìniai Mijáugonys x Klòniniai Mijáugonys*) the identical place names are modified by the adjectives *klòninis* 'of the valley' (meaning 'located / situated in the valley') and *kalnìnis* 'of the hill / mountain' (meaning 'located / situated on the hill / mountain') and are derived from the Lithuanian nomenclature terms *klónis* 'valley, dip, lowland, ravine' and *kálnas* 'high natural ground elevation; hill, mountain'.

One of the most interesting oppositions in this category is that of lakes *Nevar̃das Áukštas* and *Nevar̃das Žẽmas* – two limnonyms in the analyzed region the opposition of which is based on the antonymic semantic relationship of the qualifying adjectives *áukštas* 'high' and *žẽmas* 'low'. The lakes are in V D. mun., 10.5 km northeast of the village *Pabéržė*. *Nevar̃das Áukštas* is characterized by high, dry banks mostly covered with trees and meadows; *Nevar̃das Žẽmas* is the larger lake 0,07 km to the south from *Nevar̃das Áukštas*. In comparison with *Nevar̃das Áukštas* the shores of *Nevar̃das Žẽmas* are low and swampy (the lake is surrounded by *Vilkiškių Swamp*). The name *Nevar̃das* is a negative prefix *ne-* derivative from the base *vard-*. According to Aleksandras Vanagas (1981: 362), all the hydronyms with the base *vard-* have to be related with the hydronyms with bases *verd-* and *vird-*. All of them comprise three variants of etymologically single root – *vard-, verd-* and *vird-*. Such hydronyms can be derived from Lith. *verdẽnė, verdẽnis* 'spring, source' (LKŽe), *virdùklis* 'spring, whirlpool' (LKŽe) ← Lith. verb *vìrti* (*vérda, vìrė*) or *ver̃stis* 'to popple or bounce from dungeons (about source)' (LKŽe). Thus, linguistic–cognitive motivation of the names *Nevar̃das Áukštas* and *Nevar̃das Žẽmas* can be interpreted as a transposition of the concept: *ne + var̃das* (*verdẽnis, verdùklis*) (not + spring, source) → the body of water that is not a spring, source → *Nevar̃das* (*Áukštas / Žẽmas*). The distinctive attributes of both names indicate to their actual position in space, *Nevar̃das Aũkštas* being positioned somewhat higher in space (i.e. elevated, located on the hill) than its counterpart.

2.3. Age

The biggest number of oppositions (19 cases) based on the antonymic relationships of the distinctive attributes (adjectives in the pre-position) with the

semantic meaning of *sẽnas* 'old' and *naũjas* 'new' can only be found in the category of oikonyms, as in *Sẽnas Strūnáitis x Naũjas Strūnáitis* (two villages in Strūnaitis eldership, Švnč. D. mun.) or *Naujàsis Tar̃pupis x Senàsis Tar̃pupis* (two villages in Senieji Trakai eldership, Trak. D. mun.). Sometimes the opposition *old x new* can be only inferred, as one of the members has no modifier: cf. *Leñtvaris* (tn) *x Leñtvaris* (v) *x Naujàsis Leñtvaris* (v)*, Trãkai* (C) (Trakai eldership, Trak. D. mun.) *x Seniéji Trãkai* (v) (Senieji Trakai eldership, Trak. D. mun.)*. The distinctive attributes *sẽnas* 'old' and *naũjas* 'new' of the oppositions in this category of semantic antonymic relationship point to the age difference between the members of the opposition, i.e. one member of the opposition is literally older than the other. Thus, for instance, the village *Seniéji Trãkai* is literally older than the historic city of *Trãkai*[10]*, or both *Leñtvaris*[11] town and *Leñtvaris* village are older than the village *Naujàsis Leñtvaris*.

2.4. Colour

Colour oppositions are surprisingly scarce in toponymy of the present-day Vilnius County. Only one case was identified in the class of oikonyms. Although, according to Saeed (2016: 64) "the term antonymy is sometimes used to describe words which are at the same level in a taxonomy", i.e. hierarchical classification system, one of which is the system of colour adjectives that being "sister-members of the same taxonomy and therefore incompatible with each other", toponyms (river, lake, settlement names, including compound and

---

[10] According to legends, *Seniéji Trãkai* was founded in 1316 by Grand Duke Gediminas, who transferred the capital of Lithuania from Kernavė to *Seniéji Trãkai* and erected the brick castle. Trakai and the Duchy of Trakai were first mentioned in 1337 in the Vygand Marburgian Chronicle. Historians associate this mention of *Trakai* with *Seniéji Trãkai*. When GD Gediminas settled in Vilnius, his son Kęstutis inherited the Dutchy of Trakai and moved the town from *Seniéji Trãkai* to its current location, known as (*Naujíeji*) *Trãkai*. The castle of *Seniéji Trãkai* was destroyed by the Teutonic Order in 1391 (ML-I; Kerbelytė 1983; Vanagas 1996; Maculevičius, Baltrušienė 1999; Mišeikis 2001; Malinauskas, Kriaučiūnas 2005; Zinkevičius 2007; Lisauskas 2009; Vercinkevičius 2010; VLE XXI). The name *Trãkai* is derived from Lith. *trãkas* (glade, clearing) 'dry, grassy meadow overgrown with rare shrubs and trees in the forest' or 'cut or scorched forest, picking', or 'shrubs or trees growing under tree crowns, undergrowth' (LKŽe). Thus, linguistic-cognitive motivation can be interpreted as a transfer of the concept: *trãkas* (glade, clearing) → meadow in the forest, picking, undergrowth → *Trãkai*.

[11] *Leñtvaris* is mentioned as early as in 1596 as *Lentvario* (*Lentvoriškių*) *dvaras* (En. *Lentvaris manor, estate*), which started developing into a settlement in 1861–1862, when the railroad St. Petersburg–Warsaw was built (see Vanagas 1996: 135–137).

composite names) of the same syntactic composition or form modified by any colour could potentially make an opposition. However, no such names were identified in the corpus of 5103 toponyms[12].

Colour components in toponymy, according to Stachowski (2018: 199–200) can be motivated by the following: 1) geographical factors, i.e. such names can be derived by means of analogy from other toponyms (esp. the hydronyms) the geographical object is in close proximity to; 2) geological factors, i.e. the colour of soil in the vicinity of the named object, and/or fertility of soil, which is closely related to its colour, i.e. the darker the colour of soil, the more fertile it is; 3) the colour of buildings; 4) symbolism, i.e. colours in toponyms may have a symbolic meaning, as in many cultures have symbolic meaning with reference to space, esp. point of the world: the North, South, East and West[13]; 5) colour oppositions may correspond to oppositions, such as *old x new*, *upper x lower, big x small*, e.g., colour *white* could mean *big* and, eventually, *old,* as opposed to *black* with the meaning *small* and, eventually, *new*; 6) as a distinguishing element between two identical names.

The opposition under discussion, based on the antonymic relationship of the colours *báltas* (white) and *júodas* (black), is formed by two villages in V C mun. – *Juodóji Vókė* and *Baltóji Vókė* (for the meaning and motivation of the name *Vókė*, see section 2). *Baltoji Vokė* (v) is 8,8 km away from *Juodóji Vókė* (v), both are on the right bank of *the Vókė*. *Juodóji Vókė* can also be considered an opposition to the town *Baltóji Vókė* (Šlčn. D. mun.), which is 8,7 km away from *Juodóji Vókė* (v). It is very difficult to explain the motivation of colour adjectives in composite toponyms or colour component in compound place names, in this case – settlement names, for several reasons.

Let us consider some possible factors that could motivate the names *Juodóji Vókė* and two *Baltóji Vókė* settlements based on the data from the *Russian Empire 1872 Map,* which features only *Baltóji Vókė* village (Rus. *Белая Вака*) out of three names. The colour attributes in these settlement names may be explained with reference of their age, where colour *white* could mean *big* and, eventually,

---

[12] There are several toponyms, such as rivers *the Báltupis* (also known as *the Cedronas* or *Kedronas*), *the Juodẽ, the Raudonẽlė, the Rudaminà, the Rudẽlė, the Žalesà*, lakes *Juõdis, Balˆtis*, which were obviously in one way or another motivated by colour adjectives *báltas* (white), *júodas* (black), *raudónas* (red), *rùdas* (brown, red), *žãlias* (green), but they are at a too big distance from other colour-motivated toponymic objects to form oppositions.

[13] This will not be considered in the current analysis, as the cases are too few to draw any plausible conclusions. The theory of colour oppositions based on ancient colour symbolism with reference to points of the compass were studied in Superanskaja (1970), Štěpán (2009), Stachowski (2018) and others, however, no regularities were proved.

old, as opposed to *black* with the meaning *small* and, eventually, *new*. The absence of the village *Juodóji Vókė* and the town *Baltóji Vókė* in the 19th century map means that both the village and the town are relatively 'young' settlements. Thus, the reasoning '*white* is *old* and *black* is *young*' could only be true for the opposition *Baltóji Vókė* (v, V C mun.) *x Juodóji Vókė* (v), but not for the opposition *Juodóji Vókė* (v) *x Baltóji Vókė* (tn, Šlčn. D. mun.). The town *Baltóji Vókė* was initially founded as a settlement known as *Naujóji Žagarìnė* and got its current name as well as the status of the town in 1958[14]. Therefore, it may be concluded that the name *Baltóji Vókė* is made by analogy to *Baltóji Vókė* village (V C mun.).

The statement that colour adjectives in names can be motivated by geographical and geological factors can partly be true in case of *Juodóji Vókė,* which is situated in the middle of the *Baltóji Vókė* swamp, the biggest peatbog in Lithuania. It is highly likely that the colour adjective *Juodóji* (black) in the name of this village could be motivated by the dark colour of soil (peat), taking into the consideration the village's location. The presence of colour in all three settlement names could be motivated by the colour of buildings in each settlement. The absence of black colour in most settlement names (esp. villages) could be explained by dark or black colour of wooden buildings (Štěpán 2009: 917). Wood (a common building material) gets darker or black with age. The presence of wooden structures does not explain the colour adjective in the name *Juodóji Vókė*, as toponyms are usually motivated by certain features exclusively characteristic of the named object, but not the common qualities, which means that if the black colour was or is typical in the time of name giving, i. e. the prevalent dark (black) colour of most wooden structures in the settlement could not be considered the unique quality (outstanding feature) of the oikonym, and, thus, could not motivate its name.

However, the colour of buildings as the outstanding feature is a possible and highly likely motivational factor in case of *Baltóji Vókė* (v), which has been famous for its centuries old *Baltóji Vókė Mansion* (Lith. *Baltõsios Vókės dvaras*), included in the list of protected objects of the country's Department of Cultural Heritage[15]. The mansion with its light (white) structures is the most prominent object in *Baltóji Vókė* village and, thus, may be considered the settlement's exclusive, outstanding feature. The adjective *báltas* 'white' in settlement names is usually associated with white coating of masonry buildings. The motifs of renaming *Naujóji Žagarìnė* into *Baltóji Vókė* (tn, Šlčn. D. mun.) are not quite clear and the new (current) name of the town could only be deemed to be motivated

---

[14] Baltoji Vokė eldership website at: https://www.baltojivoke.lt/apie-seniunija/

[15] See *Kultūros vertybių registras* at: https://kvr.kpd.lt/#/

by *Baltóji Vókė* (swamp) peatbog, as *Naujóji Žagarìnė* was founded as a settlement for workers who have been digging peat for Vilnius heat plant.

3. CONCLUSIONS

1. 191 oppositions were identified in the corpus of 5103 toponyms that currently exist in Vilnius County: river (including streams) names make 14 (7%) opposition; lake names make 37 (20%) opposition; pond names names make 12 (6%), settlement names make 128 (67%) opposition. The oppositions were selected with reference to the distance between the objects, i.e. the objects within 0,1 to 20 km from each other were considered to form an opposition.

2. The analysis of the syntactic features of toponyms shows that the majority of oppositions in composite toponyms are formed by distinctive attributes (usually qualifying adjectives) that serve as pre- or post-modifiers of the place name and follow these word formation patterns: *zero modifier + name x pre-modifier + name, pre-modifier + name x pre-modifier + name, name + zero modifier x name + post-modifier*. From the perspective of word-formation these toponymic oppositions are classified as composite place names.

3. The use of numbers in place names is characteristic of nomination patterns of the 20th century and can be observed in a great number of pond and settlement names numbers are used to make distinction between two identical toponyms (in some cases, among three and more objects). Such toponymic constructions can be observed only in ponds and settlement names oppositions that more often follow the *name + zero modifier x name + post modifier* and *name + post-modifier x name + post-modifier* patterns, the latter being the most productive (the total of 51 oppositions).

4. Affixes (prefixes or diminutive suffixes) form oppositions with the place names with zero modifiers. The group of oppositions based on diminutive suffixes is the biggest (69 oppositions). All diminutive toponyms are suffix-derivatives (suffixes *–ėl–* (*–is, –ė, –iai*) and *–el–* (*–is, –ė, –ės, –iai*) being the most productive) from the toponyms they are in opposition with, are characterized by their size and are smaller than the objects from the names of which they were derived. Oppositions based on prefix *pa–* derivatives (with the meaning of a place below or near something) that can be found among settlement names (2 cases).

5. Only two compound name oppositions without any autonomous words used as pre- or post-modifiers were identified among the analyzed region's toponyms: one compound settlement name opposition and one compound river name opposition. The compound river name opposition is an opposition based on the diminutive suffix derivative.

6. Although antonymic relationships are typical in toponymy, not all of the cases create a semantic opposition, esp. when descriptive attributes are derived from other proper names or when descriptive attributes belong to different semantic categories. The majority of the analyzed toponymic oppositions are based on antonymic semantic relationships between the modifying words. The semantic analysis focuses on the toponymic opposition types in terms of size, position, age, and colour of the named object. The biggest number of oppositions (19 cases) based on the antonymic relationships of the distinctive attributes (adjectives in pre–position) with the semantic meaning of *sẽnas* 'old' and *naũjas* 'new' can only be found only in the category of oikonyms. Whereas colour oppositions are surprisingly scarce in toponymy of the present–day Vilnius County with only one case identified in the class of oikonyms based on the antonymic relations of the colours *báltas* (white) and *júodas* (black).

ABBREVIATIONS

C – city; D. – district; El – Elektrėnai; Lith. – Lithuanian; mun. – municipality; Pol. – Polish; Rus. – Russian; stead. – steading; Šlčn. – Šalčininkai; Švnč. – Švenčionys; tn – town; Trak. – Trakai; V – Vilnius; v – village.

REFERENCES AND SOURCES

Ambrazas Saulius 1993: *Daiktavardžių darybos raida*. Vilnius: Mokslo enciklopedijų leidykla.

Baltoji Vokė eldership web site at: https://www.baltojivoke.lt/apie-seniunija/

Kerbelytė Bronislava 1983: *Kai milžinai gyveno: Padavimai apie miestus, ežerus, kalnus, akmenis*. Vilnius: Vaga.

Krajewski Józef 2013: *Wilno i okolice: przewodnik*. Piastów: Oficyna Wydawnicza „Rewasz".

Kultūros vertybių registras web site at: https://kvr.kpd.lt/#/

Lipovec Aleksandr 2019: *Birželio 3-oji – nacių sunaikinto Lietuvos Pirčiupių kaimo ir nužudytų 119 gyventojų 1944 metais tragedijos minėjimo diena* [interaktyvus]. Prieiga internete: https://sputniknews.lt/columnists/20190604/9212111/Pirciupiu-kaimo-tragedija-lietuvos-gyventojai-nese-geles-prie-Pirciupiu-Motinos-paminklo.html.

Lisauskas Vytautas 2009: *Trakai: praeities vaizdai*. Vilnius: Darlis.

LKŽe – *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas* 1–20, 1941–2002, elektroninis variantas, redaktorių kolegija: Gertrūda Naktinienė (vyr. red.), Jonas Paulauskas, Ritutė Petrokienė, Vytautas Vitkauskas, Jolanta Zabarskaitė. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, 2005 (atnaujinta versija, 2008) [interaktyvus]. Prieiga internete: http://www.lkz.lt/

Maculevičius Steponas, Baltrušienė Dolores, red., 1999: *Znajomość z Litwą. Księga tysiąclecia. Tom pierwszy. Państwo.* Kaunas: Kraštotvarka.

Malinauskas Vidmantas, Kriaučiūnas Jonas 2005: *Trakų krašto gamtos ir kultūros paveldas.* Vilnius: Daigai.

Mišeikis Jonas 2001: *Senieji Trakai istorijos verpetuose.* Trakai: Trakų sp.

ML-I – Mūsų Lietuva, T. 1, 1964. *Pirčiupis.* Bostonas: Lietuvių enciklopedijos leidykla.

Razmukaitė Marija 2009: Apie kai kuriuos Vakarų Lietuvos priesaginius oikonimus. – *Kalbos kultūra* 82, 34–40.

REM 1872 – *Russian Empire 1872 Map.* MAPIRE – Historical Maps Online [interractive]. Available at: https://mapire.eu/en/map/russia-1872/

River, Lakes and Ponds Cadastre of the Republic of Lithuania (Lith. Lietuvos Respublikos upių, ežerų ir tvenkinių kadastras) at https://uetk.am.lt.

Saeed John I. 2016: *Semantics.* Fourth edition. Chichester: WILEY Blackwell.

Stachowski Kamil 2018. O opozycjach kolorystycznych w ojkonimii Polski. – *Acta onomastica* LIX, 197–214.

Superanskaja Aleksandra 1970: Суперанская Александра. Терминологичны ли цветовые названия рек? – *Местные географические термины.* Москва: Мысль, 120–127.

Štěpán Pavel 2009: Oppositions in Toponymy. – *Names in Multi–Lingual, Multi–Cultural and Multi–Ethnic Contact.* Proceedings of the 23rd International Congress of Onomastic Sciences. August 17–22, 2008, York University, Toronto, Canada, 915–920 [interractive]. Available at: https://yorkspace.library.yorku.ca/xmlui/handle/10315/4034.

Vanagas Aleksandras 1970: *Lietuvos TSR hidronimų daryba.* Vilnius: Mintis.

Vanagas Aleksandras 1981: *Lietuvių hidronimų etimologinis žodynas.* Vilnius: Mintis.

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

Vanagas Aleksandras 1996: *Lietuvos miestų vardai.* Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla.

Vercinkevičius Juozas 2010: *Kur dunkso Trakų pilys: publicistika (apie Trakų praeitį ir dabartį)*. Trakai: Voruta.

Vilnius County map [interractive]. Available at: https://www.geoportal.lt.

VLE XXI – Visuotinė lietuvių enciklopedija, T. XXI, 2012. *Senieji Trakai*. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas [interaktyvus]. Prieiga internete: https://www.vle.lt.

VLE XXIV – Visuotinė lietuvių enciklopedija, T. XXIV, 2015. *Trakų Vokė*. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas [interaktyvus]. Prieiga internete: https://www.vle.lt.

Zinkevičius Zigmas 2007: *Senosios Lietuvos valstybės vardynas*. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.

Vilniaus apskrities toponimų semantinės opozicijos

SANTRAUKA

Šio tyrimo objektas yra semantinės opozicijos Vilniaus apskrities toponimikoje. Tarp 5103 toponimų buvo nustatyta 191 opozicija: 14 (7 %) upių vardų opozicijų; 37 (20 %) ežerų vardų opozicijos; 12 (6 %) tvenkinių vardų opozicijų; 128 (67 %) gyvenviečių vardų opozicijos. Opozicijos atrinktos atsižvelgiant į atstumą tarp objektų, t. y. laikoma, kad objektai, esantys nuo 0,1 iki 20 km atstumu vienas nuo kito, sudaro opoziciją. Tradiciniai lietuvių toponimijos resp. hidronimijos tyrimai (ypač Vanagas 1981) nurodo antoniminius ryšius tam tikruose vandens telkinių varduose, ypač tuose, kurie yra modifikuoti kvalifikaciniais spalvos, dydžio ir pan. būdvardžiais. Kartais etimologai teigia, kad, pvz., spalvos kvalifikaciniai būdvardžiai toponimuose yra motyvuojami dirvožemio spalva, derlingumu ar kitomis dirvožemio fizinėmis savybėmis; vyraujančia pastatų spalva; dydžio būdvardžius motyvuoja tikrasis įvardijamojo objekto dydis ir pan. Tačiau paprastai šiems skiriamiesiems elementams toponimuose neskiriama reikiamo dėmesio (Stachowski 2018).

Sąvoka *opozicija* yra platesnė nei *antonimija* ir nurodo bet kokį ryšį tarp elementų, kurie turi aiškią skiriamąją funkciją (Saeed 2016: 63). Straipsnyje nagrinėjami ne tik tipiški antoniminiai semantiniai ryšiai tarp Vilniaus apskrities toponimų, bet taip pat atliekama jų formali analizė, t. y. nustatomas sudėtinių ir sudurtinių vardų komponentų vaidmuo sintaksiniame (žodžių darybos) lygmenyje. Sintaksinių charakteristikų analizė rodo, kad didžiąją dalį sudėtinių toponimų opozicijų sudaro kvalifikaciniai būdvardžiai, einantys prieš vietovės vardą arba po jo. Nustatyti tokie vardo darybos modeliai: *vardas be pažymimojo žodžio*

x pažymimasis žodis + vardas, pažymimasis žodis + vardas x pažymimasis žodis + vardas, vardas be pažymimojo žodžio x vardas + pažymimasis žodis (plg. *Kenà x Mažóji Kenà*; *Mãžosios Kabìškės x Dìdžiosios Kabìškės*; *Cùdykas Dìdelis x Cùdykas Mãžas*; *Ìlma Didžióji x Ìlma Mažóji* ir t. t.). Žodžių darybos požiūriu šios opozicijos yra klasifikuojamos kaip sudėtiniai vietovardžiai. Kartais oikonimuose naudojami skaitmenys, norint atskirti du identiškus vardus (kai kuriais atvejais tris ir daugiau vardus), pvz.: *Antãliedė I x Antãliedė II*, *Júodės I x Júodės II x Júodės III x Júodės IV* ir t. t., kas yra būdinga XX a. nominacijai. Tokie pavadinimai būdingi tvenkinių ir gyvenviečių vardams, sudarytiems pagal šiuos modelius: *vardas be pažymimojo žodžio x vardas + pažymimasis žodis*, *vardas + pažymimasis žodis x vardas + pažymimasis žodis*. Antrasis modelis yra produktyviausias – užfiksuotas 51 atvejis.

Opoziciją gali sudaryti afiksai, pvz., mažybinės priesagos (plg. *Bedùgnis x Bedugniùkas*, *Prūdiškė x Prūdiškėlė*, *Žeimenà x Žeimenėlė*, t. t.) arba priešdėliai (*Ūdrónys x Paūdrónys*, *Voverė̃ x Pavoverė̃*). Deminutyvinių opozicijų grupė yra didžiausia (69 atvejai). Visi deminutyviniai toponimai yra priesagų vediniai (priesagos -ėl- ir -el- yra produktyviausios) iš toponimų, su kuriais jie sudaro opozicijas, ir yra mažesni už objektus, iš kurių yra kilę jų vardai. Priešdėlių vedinių opozicijas (su vietos reikšme) sudaro gyvenviečių vardai (2 atvejai). Tarp analizuojamos apskrities toponimų buvo aptiktos tik dvi sudurtinių vardų opozicijos: *Senãdvaris x Naujãdvaris* (opoziciją sudaro pirmieji sandai) ir *Nẽrupis x Nerupėlis* (opoziciją sudaro mažybinė priesaga).

Antoniminiai ryšiai yra būdingi toponimijai, tačiau ne visais atvejais sukuriama semantinė opozicija, ypač kai pažymimieji žodžiai (dažniausiai kvalifikaciniai būdvardžiai) yra kitų vardų vediniai arba priklauso skirtingoms semantinėms kategorijoms (plg. *Tartõkas x Šalčininkėlių Tartõkas*, *Trãkų Vókė x Mūrinė Vókė*). Didžioji dalis analizuotų opozicijų yra grindžiamos pažymimųjų žodžių antoniminiais semantiniais ryšiais. Semantinėje analizėje daugiausia dėmesio skiriama toponiminių opozicijų tipams, atsižvelgiant į įvardijamojo objekto *dydį*, *padėtį*, *amžių* ir *spalvą*. Daugiausia opozicijų (19 atvejų), grindžiamų kokybinių būdvardžių *sēnas* ir *naũjas* antoniminiais ryšiais, sudaro oikonimai (pvz.: *Didíeji Baušiaĩ x Mažíeji Baušiaĩ*, *Naũjas Janãvas x Sènas Janãvas*, *Mãžosios Kabìškės x Dìdžiosios Kabìškės*, t. t.). Mažiausią semantinių opozicijų grupę sudaro spalvos opozicija (*bálta x júoda*) oikonimų klasėje: *Baltóji Vókė* (k, V m. sav.) *x Juodóji Vókė* (k, V m. sav.) *x Baltóji Vókė* (m., Šlčn. r. sav.).

PAVEL SKORUPA
Lietuvių kalbos institutas
Petro Vileišio g. 5, LT-10308 Vilnius, Lietuva
pavel.skorupa@vgtu.lt