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.
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ANOTACIJA

Straipsnyje nagrinėjamos šių dienų Vilniaus apskrities toponimų (tiek gyvenviečių, tiek ne gyvenviečių vardo) (semantinės) opozicijos. Tradiciniuose lietuvių toponimijos tyrimuose, ypač hidronimijos, minimi paskiri antonominiai 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 antonomininius semantinius ryšius, bet ir formaliai, t. y. sudėtinių ir sudurtinių vardu komponentų vaidmuo tiriamas sintaksiniu (žodžių darybos) lygmeniu.
ESMINIAI ŽODŽIAI: opozicija, toponimas, dabartinė Vilniaus apskritis, semantiniai ryšiai, antoniminiai ryšiai.

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. Lietuvis 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 ankėtų 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 Mažoji Upėsė, Kenà x Mažoji Kenà; 2 lake names oppositions – Antavilio ežeras (lake) x Mažasis Antavilio ežeras, Gulbinas x Mažasis Gulbinas; 24 settlement names oppositions – Bezdónys (tn) x Bezdónys (v) x Aukštėji Bezdónys (v), Brastà x Naujóji Brasta, Budà x Senóji Budà x Naujóji Budà (El mun.), Budà x Senóji Budà (Trak. D. mun.), Budà x Semeliškių Budà (Aukštadvaris eldership), Gedūnai x Didieji Gedūnai, Jagėlonys x Klöniniai Jagėlonys, Kaltaviai x Naujieji Kaltaviai, Karklénai x Üžupio Karklénai x Didieji Karklénai, Katutiskės x Mažosios Katutiskės, Kudžionys x Mažieji Kudžionys, Laibiškės x Didžiosios Laibiškės, Leinvaris (tn) x Leinvaris (v) x Naujasis Leinvaris (v), Liepónys x Mažieji Liepónys, Maceliai x Senieji Maceliai, Mėdininkai x Didieji Mėdininkai, Migučionys x Senieji Migučionys x Naujieji Migučionys, Pamerkys x Aukštasis Pamerkys, Piktakonys x Naujieji Piktakonys, Rėvà x Naujóji Rėvà, Riešë (stead.) x Riešë (v) x Mažoji Riešë x Didžioji Riešë, Tartokas x Šalčininkelių Tartokas, Trakai (tn) x Senieji Trakai (v) (Trak. D. mun.), Zadoarinkai x Naujieji Zadoarinkai.

The pre-modifier + name x pre-modifier + name pattern can be observed in 25 cases: 1 river names opposition – Didysis Pičiupis x Mažasis Pičiupis; 3 lake names oppositions – Didelis Macijonėlis x Mažas Macijonėlis, Didysai Siaurys x Mažasai Siaurys, Didieji Vagiokai x Mažieji Vagiokai; 21 settlement names oppositions – Didieji Baušiai x Mažieji Baušiai, Naujas Janavas x Sėnas
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Janavas, Magosių Kabiskės x Didžiosios Kabiskės, Aukštėji Karklėnai x Žemėji Karklėnai, Senosios Kietaviškės x Naugados Kietaviškės, Mažoji Kūosinė x Didžioji Kūosinė, Didieji Lygainiai x Mažieji Lygainiai, Senieji Miežionys x Naugieji Miežionys, Kalniniai Mygtukones x Klono Kūosinės, Naugės Pašaminė x Sena Pašaminė, Naugados Rakliškės x Senosios Rakliškės, Aukštėji Rusokai x Žemėji Rusokai, Aukštėji Semeniukai x Žemėji Semeniukai, Magosių Selos x Didžiosios Selos, Senosios Strūnaitės x Naugados Strūnaitės, Aukštėji Svirnai x Žemėji Svirnai, Naujieji Šaminiai x Senieji Šaminiai, Naugės Tsirpalas x Senosios Tsirpalas, Senosios Viesos x Aukstėsios Viesos x Žemosios Viesos, Baltijos Vokė (tn) (Slčn. D. mun.) x Nuodėjo Vokė (V C mun.) x Baltijos Vokė (V C mun.), Trakų Vokė (V C mun.) x Mūrinė Vokė (V C mun.).

The name + post-modifier x name + post-modifier pattern can be observed in 3 oppositions: 1 river names opposition – Cūdykas Didelis x Cūdykas Mažas; 2 lake names oppositions – Ilma Didžiøjį x Ilma Mažojį, Nevardojus Aukštas x Nevardojus Žemas.

As it can be seen in the above examples, the zero modifier x pre-modifier 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 – Bražuolės x Bražuolės I x Bražuolės II; 6 settlement names oppositions – Antakalnis x Antakalnis I x Antakalnis II x Antakalnis III, Būdai (Trakai eldership) x Būdai I x Būdai III, Naujukais (Naujukais I) x Naujukais II (El D. mun.), Naujukais x Naujukais II (Trak. D. mun.), Nemenčinė x Nemenčinė II, Vereskė x Vereskė I x Vereskė II.

The pattern name + post-modifier x name + post-modifier can be observed in: 11 pond names oppositions – Buivydiškių I x Buivydiškių II x Buivydiškių III x Buivydiškių IV x Buivydiškių V x Buivydiškių VI, Jūodės I x Jūodės II x Jūodės III x Jūodės IV, Mostiškių I x Mostiškių II, Navakonių I x Navakonių II, Salčininkų I x Salčininkų II, Taujėnų x Taujėnų II, Tetėnų I x Tetėnų II, Tolkiškių I x Tolkiškių...
II, Turniškių I x Turniškių II, Viesų I x Viesų II x Viesų III, Viškščių I x Viškščių II; 44 settlement names oppositions – Alėšiškės I x Alėšiškės II, Aliónys (Aliónys I) x Aliónys II, Antaliedė I x Antaliedė II, Arénai I x Arénai II, Ažumiškė I x Ažumiškė II, Bastūnai I x Bastūnai II, Buvydžiai I x Buvydžiai II, Būrblėskė I x Būrblėskė II, Dailydūkas I x Dailydūkas II, Gemeliškis I x Gemeliškis II, Gimžiai I x Gimžiai II, Jūsiškis I x Jūsiškis II, Kalnuotė I x Kalnuotė II x Kalnuotė IV x Kalnuotė VII, Kliaukliškis I x Kliaukliškis II, Kochanovkà I x Kochanovkà II x Kochanovkà III, Kryžiaukà I x Kryžiaukà II, Kunigiskiai I x Kunigiskiai II, Kūosinė I x Kūosinė II x Kūosinė III, Lapiškiai I x Lapiškiai II, Levaniškis I x Levaniškis II, Liūtai I x Liūtai II, Lygumai I x Lygumai II, Maigiai I x Maigiai II, Malinauka I x Malinauka II, Myliai I x Myliai II, Merionys I x Merionys II, Mylielai I x Mylielai II, Naujauskas I x Naujauskas II, Navasiolkai I x Navasiolkai II x Navasiolkai III, Namūrtais I x Namūrtais II, Pakalniškis I x Pakalniškis II, Paliakalnis I x Paliakalnis II, Pagiriukà I x Pagiriukà II, Poguliánka I x Poguliánka II, Ramoniškiai I x Ramoniškiai II, Raudonė I x Raudonė II, Sakališkė I x Sakališkė II, Saveikiškia I x Saveikiškia II, Šešulėliai I x Šešulėliai II, Šešulėliai I x Šešulėliai II, Šešulėliai I x Šešulėliai II, Šešulėliai I x Šešulėliai II, Šešulėliai I x Šešulėliai II, Šešulėliai I x Šešulėliai II, Šešulėliai I x Šešulėliai II, Urnaiškis I x Urnaiškis II, Vaičiūkiškė I x Vaičiūkiškė II, Varnikeliai I x Varnikeliai 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, Buivydžiai I and Buivydžiai II are both referred to as Buivydžiai; or Ūosininkai I, Ūosininkai II and Ūosininkai III are known as Ūosininkai 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 – *Lätvė* x *Latvėlė*, *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 – *Akįs* x *Akẽlė* (as well as two more lakes Akis in the same eldership that make an opposition with Akẽlė), *Bakà* x *Bakùtis*, *Báltas* x *Balt ẽlis* x *Baltẽlis*, *Bėlỹs* x *Bėláitis*, *Beržuõlis* x *Beržuo- liūkas*, *Briaũnis* x *Briauniùkas*, *Bedùgnis* x *Bedugniùkas*, *Drabužiš* x *Drabužã- tis*, *Géjus* x *Gėjûkas*, *Gėla* x *Gėlaitis*, *Gruožỹs* x *Gruožáitis*, *Gaigãlis* x *Gaiga- liūkas*, *Juodýnas* x *Juodynėlis*, *Kãris* x *Karáitis*, *Skrûtis* x *Skrîčiùkas*, *Spindžiùs* x *Spin- džiùkas*, *Sudotà* x *Sudotûlis*, *Varnãkis* x *Varnakûlis*; 30 settlement names oppositions – *Akmenà* (v) x *Akmenãlė* (v), *Babiškis* x *Barbiškûlis*, *Bugẽnai* x *Bugenûliai*, *Dainavà* x *Dainavûlė* (v), *Déltuva* (tn) x *Deltuvûlė* (v), *Dùsmenys* x *Dusmenûliai*, *Gruožninkai* x *Gruožnûkštis*, *Juodûnis* x *Juodûnûlis*, *Laukûnai* x *Laukûnûliai*, *Makùčiai* x *Makučiùkai*, *Miškûniai* x *Miškinûliai*, *Miškinêlis* x *Musninkûliai*, *Naidai* x *Naidêliai*, *Nemençinê* x *Nemençinûliai*, *Prûdiškûs* x *Prûdiškûlė* (v), *Raguva* x *Raguvoûlė* (v), *Šamninkai* x *Samnûkštis*, *Slabadû* x *Slabadûkas*, *Švenčionûliai* (v) x *Švenčionûliai* (tn) x *Švenčionûniai* (v), *Trakûkûs* x *Trakûkûliai* (v), *Trakûliai* (v) x *Trakûliai* (stead.), *Au- jaâewith* (tn) x *Aujaûniai* (v) x *Aujaûniai* (v), *Aujaûniai* (v) x *Aujaûniai* (v), *Trakûkûs* x *Trakûkûliai* (v) (Švnc. D. mun.), *Vytinûs* x *Vytnûlė*.

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, Voverė x Pavoverė. 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 Turgėliai. 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 Ūdrỹs¹. 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 Voverė and Pavoverė that are 4 km away from one another on the right bank of the Voveraitė² (the right tributary of the Žeimenà) in Pabradės eldership, Švnč. D. mun. Pavoverė is located close (0,3 km) to the confluence of the Voveraitė and the Žeimenà, whereas Voverė is located 4 km away from Pavoverė, upstream the Voveraitė. Both Voverė and Pavoverė are surrounded by forests (Katelninkų, Kulniškės, Pavoverės, Voverės). These settlement names were motivated by the potamonym they are located next to, whereas the prefix pa- in the name Pavoverė not only indicates the relationship of this settlement with the stream and Voverė village, Pavoverės and Voverės 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 Senãdvaris x Naujãdvaris and one compound river name opposition the Nërups x the Nerupėlis. 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 ūdra (otter) ‘predatory aquatic fur animal (Lutra lutra)’.
² The river Voveraitė may be derived from the diminutive form of the zoonym voverė (squirrel) ‘small, long tailed rodent (Sciurus)’ (LKŽe) and could be motivated by the place where there were / are many animals of this species.
Semantic Oppositions in Vilnius County Toponyms

+ common Noun (Senądvaris → sēnas ‘old’ + dvāras ‘estate, property’ as opposed to Naujādvaris → naũjas ‘new’ + dvāras ‘estate, property’) and Verb + common Noun (the Nėrupis → nérti ‘to dive; to flow quickly’ + upis ‘river’ as opposed to the Nerupėlis → nérti ‘to dive; to flow quickly’ + upėlis ‘small river, stream’). In case of Senądvaris x Naujādvaris the opposition is formed by the first parts of these compound names ← sēnas ‘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, Tartōkas and Šalčininkelių Tartōkas (Tartōkas ← Lith. tartōkas ‘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, (Tartōkas), while the second member of the opposition is modified by the attribute derived from the proper name (oikonym) Šalčininkeliai.

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 – Trąkų Vokė (← Trąkų is the genitive case of the oikonym Trąkai) and Mūrinė Vokė (Mūrinė ← Lith. mūrinis (-ė) ‘made of stones or bricks’). Both settlements are situated on the River Vokė3 in close proximity to one another (approx. 1 km). The name Vokė was

---

3 The motivation of the river name Vokė can be interpreted in several ways because of its complex semantics (words in different languages may have different associations). The Vokė (the left tributary of the Neris) is a stream flowing from Lake Papis. 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 Vokė 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 vōktis ‘to clear’, vōkti ‘to harvest, to clear, to gather’ (LKŻe) 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 Vokė can be interpreted as follows: vōktis / vōkti → vokėjas ‘the one who harvests, cleans / cleanses’ → Vokė.
first mentioned in 1375, when Prussian Marshal Godfrid von Linden († 25 July 1379) and his army looted the vicinity of Trakai for nine days. Then a big battle took place near the Vokė 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 Vokė. In 1415 the village of Vokė was written by Duke Vytautas to the Old Trakai Benedictine Monastery (VLE XXIV). The attribute Trakų in the composite name Trakų Vokė is motivated by the oikonym Trakai, as the settlement is situated near the road to Trakai. Thus, the name Trakų Vokė means no more or less than ‘the settlement (Vokė) on the road (in the direction to Trakai) near the Vokė river’. The distinctive attribute Mūrinė ‘made of stones or bricks’ (← Lith. mūras ‘a wall or enclosure made from mortar, stones or bricks’ or ← Lith. verb mūryti ‘to lay bricks; to build from stones or bricks’) was motivated by the type of buildings prevalent in the settlement. Both names (Trakų Vokė and Mūrinė Vokė) definitely create an opposition, but the opposition of these composite names is not based on antonymic semantic relationship of their distinctive attributes Trakų and Mūrinė.

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 (didelis ‘big’ x mazas ‘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 Kenė (23.9 km) is literally a longer river than the Mažoji Kenė (10.4 km) and the Kenėlė (8 km); the lake Didžiejų Vagiekai (0.047 km²) is twice bigger than

---

4 The River Kenė is a left tributary of the Vilnia. The river gave name to the village Kenė (Kinė) in Vilnius District municipality (approx. 1 km upstream the Kenė and its confluence with the Vilnia). The Kenėlė (Kinėlė) is a left tributary of the Kenė and is the diminutive suffix derivative. The sources of the Kenė and the Mažoji Kenė are 6,6 km away from one another and both rivers flow
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the lake Mažieji Vagiekai (0,023 km²); the village Didžiosios Kabiskės occupy much bigger area than the village Mažosios Kabiskės. The same can be told about oppositions based on the diminutive suffixes (see 1.2.1.), e.g. the Mūšia (29 km) is almost four times longer than its tributary the Mūšėlė (8 km); the lake Baltas (0,65 km²) is almost twice bigger than the lake Baltėlis (0,038 km²) and yet another lake Baltėlis (0,015 km²) in Švenč. D. mun.; Šalčininkai town (2,98 km²) and the village of the same name Šalčininkai (1,5 km²) (in the vicinity of the town) are both bigger than the village Šalčininkėliai (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 Didysis Pičiupis and the Mažasis Pičiupis. The distinguishing attributes (adjectives) in pre-position (Didysis ← didis (great, big) and Mažasis ← mazas (small)) were added to the river names Pičiupis 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 Pičiupis (Rus. Пирупьись) with the settlement name Pičiupė (Rus. Пирупе), now Pičiupiai, in the opposite directions from one another. The Mažoji Kenė (a right tributary of the Merkys) is the name made by the principle of analogy from the Kenė, as the opposition of the former with qualificational adjective mazas (-a) ‘of small dimensions; spare, sparse; slight, weak; less important’ (LKŽe). Vanagas (1981: 156) claimed that the name Kenė is derived from Lith. kinė ‘a raised place in a meadow, bog, or in water’ or ‘roots of trees and shrubs on the river bank (in water) ’(LKŽe); also, from Lith. kinis ‘a crust on the water; slough, marsh’ or ‘a small island in a river or lake; the area of slough, marsh’ (LKŽe). Therefore, the motivation for the name is quite confusing and can be interpreted as a transposition of the concept: kinė → a place overgrown with trees and shrubs → the (Mažoji) Kenė (and the Kinėlė); or kinis → a crust on the water; slough, marsh → the (Mažoji) Kenė (and the Kinėlė).

In the Russian Empire Map of 1872, the Lake Didieji Vagiekai are recorded as (Rus.) оз.[epo] Бажье, Mažieji Vagiekai – (Rus.) оз.[epo] Бажыка (see REM 1872). An unnamed stream drains into the Lake Didieji Vagiekai. The southern part the lake is also a source of yet another unnamed stream, which joins Didieji Vagiekai with the lake Mažieji Vagiekai, which in its turn is a source of yet one more unnamed stream that joins it with the Lake Luknia. Both Didieji Vagiekai and Mažieji 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: vagà → the one that lies in the riverbed / course → Didieji Vagiekai / Mažieji Vagiekai.

The Lake Baltas, as well as two lakes Baltėlis in its opposition, is motivated by colour baltas, -a (white).

Both the Didysis Pičiupis and the Mažasis Pičiupis are left tributaries of the Merkys (the confluence of the Mažasis Pičiupis and the Merkys is 2 km further upstream from the place the Didysis Pičiupis discharges its waters).
on the river now known as the *Didỹsis Pičiupis*. 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 Pičiupis* is 1,8 km longer than the *Didỹsis Pičiupis*, 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 Pičiupis* could be made more ‘important, significant’ than the *Mažàsis Pičiupis* because of the following reasons: a) the name *Pičiupiai* was first mentioned as early as the 16th–17th centuries. The village was located on the road to Grodno. Dukes of the Grand Duchy 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 *Pičiupiai* (Rus. *Pupuye* ← *Pirciupė*, *Pirčiupė* ← Pirčiupė, Pirčiupis) on the banks of the *Didỹsis Pičiupis* (see REM 1872); b) the village *Pičiupiai* (and the river it is located next to) is known for the tragedy of June 1944, when after the Soviet partisans’ 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 *Pičiupiai* 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 *Pičiupiai* 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. *pirtis* (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 Pičiupis* is more important. Linguistic-cognitive motivation can be interpreted as a transfer of the concept: *pirtis* (bath) → bathing river / bathhouse → *Pičiupis*.

9 Members of resistance movements that fought against the Axis forces in the Soviet Union.
2.2. Position

The semantic category based on the antonymous relationships of the distinctive attributes (adjectives) indicating the relative position of the toponymic objects in space (in all cases – the vertical position ėukštas ‘high’ x žėmas ‘low’) consists of 10 toponymic oppositions (1 limnonym and 9 oikonym). In two cases (Jagėlonys x Klòniniai Jagėlonys and Kalninsiai Mijáugonys x Klòniniai Mi-jáugonys) the identical place names are modified by the adjectives klòninis ‘of the valley’ (meaning ‘located / situated in the valley’) and kalnins ‘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 Nevađas ėukštas and Nevađas žėmas – two limnonyms in the analyzed region the opposition of which is based on the antonymic semantic relationship of the qualifying adjectives ėukštas ‘high’ and žėmas ‘low’. The lakes are in V D. mun., 10.5 km northeast of the village Pabéržė. Nevađas ėukštas is characterized by high, dry banks mostly covered with trees and meadows; Nevađas žėmas is the larger lake 0.07 km to the south from Nevađas ėukštas. In comparison with Nevađas ėukštas the shores of Nevađas žėmas are low and swampy (the lake is surrounded by Vilkiškių Swamp). The name Nevađas 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. verdénė, verdénis ‘spring, source’ (LKŽe), virdúklis ‘spring, whirlpool’ (LKŽe) ← Lith. verb vërti (vérda, vërë) or vërstis ‘to popple or bounce from dungeons (about source)’ (LKŽe). Thus, linguistic-cognitive motivation of the names Nevađas ėukštas and Nevađas žėmas can be interpreted as a transposition of the concept: ne + vađas (verdénis, virdúklis) (not + spring, source) → the body of water that is not a spring, source → Nevađas (ēukštas / žėmas). The distinctive attributes of both names indicate to their actual position in space, Nevađas ėukštas 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 antonymous relationships of the distinctive attributes (adjectives in the pre-position) with the
semantic meaning of *sėnas* ‘old’ and *naũjas* ‘new’ can only be found in the category of oikonyms, as in *Sėnas Strūnáitis x Naũjas Strūnáitis* (two villages in Strūnaitis eldership, Švnč. D. mun.) or *Naujàsis Taþpupis x Senásis Taþpupis* (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 *Senieji Trãkai* (v) (Senieji Trakai eldership, Trak. D. mun.). The distinctive attributes *sėnas* ‘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 *Senieji 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, *Senieji Trãkai* was founded in 1316 by Grand Duke Gediminas, who transferred the capital of Lithuania from Kernavė to *Senieji Trãkai* and erected the brick castle. Trakai and the Duchy of Trakai were first mentioned in 1337 in the Vygang Marburgian Chronicle. Historians associate this mention of *Trakai* with *Senieji Trãkai*. When GD Gediminas settled in Vilnius, his son Kęstutis inherited the Duchy of Trakai and moved the town from *Senieji Trãkai* to its current location, known as (*Naujàji*) *Trãkai*. The castle of *Senieji Trãkai* was destroyed by the Teutonic Order in 1391 (ML-I; Kerbelytė, 1983; Vanagas, 1996; Maculevičius, Baltrušienė, 1999; Mišeikis, 2001; Malinauskas, Kriauciūnienė, 2005; Zinkevičius, 2007; Laisauskas, 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).
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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 jūodas (black), is formed by two villages in V C mun. – Juodójį Vókė and Baltójį Vókė (for the meaning and motivation of the name Vókė, see section 2). Baltoji Vokė (v) is 8,8 km away from Juodójį Vókė (v), both are on the right bank of the Vókė. Juodójį Vókė can also be considered an opposition to the town Baltójį Vókė (Šlčn. D. mun.), which is 8,7 km away from Juodójį 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 Juodójį Vókė and two Baltójį Vókė settlements based on the data from the Russian Empire 1872 Map, which features only Baltójį 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 Bältupis (also known as the Cedronas or Kedronas), the Juodė, the Raudonėlė, the Rudaminà, the Rudėlė, the Žalesà, lakes Juodis, Baltis, which were obviously in one way or another motivated by colour adjectives báltas (white), jūodas (black), raudonas (red), rūdas (brown, red), žalius (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), Štĕpán (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 Juodójį 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 Juodójį Vókė (v), but not for the opposition Juodójį Vókė (v) x Baltóji Vókė (tn, Šlčn. D. mun.). The town Baltóji Vókė was initially founded as a settlement known as Naujóji Žagarė and got its current name as well as the status of the town in 195814. 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 Juodójį 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 Juodójį (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 Juodójį 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. Baltósios Vókės duaras), included in the list of protected objects of the country’s Department of Cultural Heritage15. 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 Žagarė 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) peat bog, as Naujóji Žagarînė 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 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 sēnas ‘old’ and naūjas ‘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 jūodas (black).

ABBREVIATIONS

C – city; D. – district; El – Elektrėnai; Lith. – Lithuanian; mun. – municipality; Pol. – Polish; Rus. – Russian; stead. – steadying; Šlčn. – Šalčininkai; Švnč. – Švenčionys; tn – town; Trak. – Trakai; V – Vilnius; v – village.
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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 opozicijų; 12 (6 %) tvenkinių vardų opozicijų; 128 (67 %) gyvenviečių vardų opozicijų. 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 kvalifikacinius spalvos, dydžio ir pan. būdvardžiais. Kartais etimologai teigia, kad, pvz., spalvos kvalifikacinius būdvardžius būdvardžiai toponimuose yra motyvuojami dirvožemio spalva, derlingumu ar kitomis dirvožemio fizinėmis savybėmis; vyraujančia pastatų spalva; dydžio būdvardžius motyvuojà tiksirija jvardijamojo objekto dydį 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 formalai 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 kvalifikacinius būdvardžiai, einantys prieš vieto- vės vardą arba po jo. Nustatyti tokie vardo darybos modeliai: vardas be pažymimojo žodžio...
Semantic Oppositions in Vilnius County Toponyms

x pažymimasis žodis + vardas, pažymimasis žodis + vardas x pažymimasis žodis + vardas, vardas be pažymimojo žodžio x vardas + pažymimasis žodis (plg. Kenà x Mažójì Kenà; Mâžosios Kabîškës x Didžiosios Kabîškës; Čûdykas Didelis x Čûdykas Mâžas; Ïlma Didžioji x Ïlma Mažoji 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.: Antâliedë I x Antâliedë II, Jûodës I x Jûodës II x Jûodës III x Jûodës IV ir t. t., kas yra bûdinga XX a. nominacijai. Tokie pavadinimai bûdingi 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., mažybinës priesagos (plg. Bedûgnis x Bedugniûkas, Prûdiškë x Prûdiškëlë, Žeimenà x Žeimenëlë, t. t.) arba priešdëliai (Îdrônis x Paîdrônys, Voîverë x Pavoverë). Deminutyvinës opozicijų grupë yra didžiausia (69 atvejai). Visi deminutyviniai toponimai yra priesagu vadiniai (priesagos -êl- ir -ël- yra produktyviausios) iš toponimų, su kuriais jie sudaro opozicijas, ir yra mažesni už objektus, iš kurii yra kilę jų vardai. Priešdélių vediniai opozicijos (su viešo reikšme) sudaro gyvenviečių vardai (2 atvejai). Tarp analizuojamos psikrities toponimu buvo aptiktos tik dvi sudurtinių vardų opozicijos: Senâduaris x Naujâduaris (opoziciją sudaro pirmieji sandai) ir Nërupis x Nerupëlis (opoziciją sudaro mažybinë priesaga).

Antoniminiai ryšiai yra bûdingi toponimitajai, tačiau ne visais atvejais sukuriama semantinë opozicija, ypač kai pažymimieji žodžiai (dažniausiai kvalifikaciniai bûdvardžiai) yra kitų vardu vadiniai arba priklauso skirtingoms semantinëms kategorijoms (plg. Tartôkas x Šalčininkëliai Tartôkas, Trûkë Vôkë x Mûrinë Vôkë). Didžioji dalis analizuotų opozicijų yra grindziamas pažymimųjų žodžių antoniminiais semantiniais ryšiais. Semantinėje analizėje daugiausia dėmesio skiriama toponominëi opozicijų tipams, atsižvelgiant į įvardijamojo objekto dydį, padėtį, amžių ir spalvą. Daugiausia opozicijų (19 atvejų), grindžiamų kokybinių bûdvardžių sënas ir naûjas antoniminiais ryšiais, sudaro oikonimai (pvz.: Didûji Baušiai x Mažûji Baušiai, Naujûjas Janûvas x Sënas Janûvas, Mâžosios Kabîškës x Didžiosios Kabîškës, t. t.). Mažiausiai semantinių opozicijų grupę sudaro spalvos opozicija (bálta x jûoda) oikonimu klasëje: Baltôji Vôkë (k, V m. sav.) x Jûodôji Vôkë (k, V m. sav.) x Baltôji Vôkë (m., Šlên. r. sav.).
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