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1. Introduction

Eastern Obonezh’e is a North Russian territory stretching from Lake Onega’s eastern shore to upstream on the Onega River, and comprising the land around lakes Vodlozero and Kenozero, which used to fall within the Pudozh and Kargopol uezds (districts) of the Olonets Province at different times (it is now divided between Pudozh District, the Republic of Karelia, north-western Kargopol District and south-western Plesetsk District, Arkhangelsk Region). Eastern Obonezh’e formed as a historical and cultural area along historical pathways, following the Finnic (Vepsian) population (who, in turn, encountered (an) ethnic group(s) of the Sami type there), used by Novgorodians as they colonised northern lands and assimilated local people. It is there, along the Vodla River and its tributaries, across Lake Kenozero and further
along the Onega River, that one of the famous northern portage routes on the way from Novgorod to Pomor’e used to run – Kenskij volok, described in Cadastral Books of the Obonezhskaya Pyatina, years 1496 and 1563 (Piscovye knigi). Thus, Eastern Obonezh’e is an area where human activity started early (see for example Spiridonov 2001), as did interethnic contact, which could not but tell on the language, material and spiritual culture, as well as the toponymy of the region (Figure 1).

In addition to their naming function, the names of geographical objects (rivers, lakes, wetlands, islands, capes, bays, settlements, agricultural holdings, etc.) are a source of linguistic, landscape, historical, and ethno-cultural information. Owing to its abundance and long life, toponymy supplies us across centuries with valuable data about the past of the land. It portrays its landscape characteristics, soil properties, local vegetation, fish inhabiting local waters, wildlife in the local woods, etc. Relying on toponymic data one can draw conclusions concerning the economic activities, trades, and beliefs of the people who created the place names, their ethnic roots and the time when they occupied the territory.

The territory is the western margin of the Russian North, and the region’s toponymy in its current state is of the North Russian type, but with a rich substratal component researchers define as the Balto-Finn-
Sami substrate (A. Sjögren, M. Vasmer, A. I. Popov, V. V. Pimenov, A. K. Matveev, I. I. Mullonen, J. Saarikivi, E. A. Khelimsky, etc.).

The toponymic material from Eastern Obonezh’e – made up mainly of data stored in the Scientific Toponymic Card Index of the Institute of Language, Literature and History, the Karelian Research Centre, the Russian Academy of Sciences, the card index of the Toponymic Expedition of the Ural Federal University, materials from the Republic of Karelia National Archives, as well as cartographic sources – is rich and multi-layered, comprising some 20,000 place names, a third of which are place names of non-Russian origin.

2. Eastern Obonezh’e toponymic substrate

The fact that non-Russian place names are quite well preserved is due to considerable isolation of the settlement range (being a land of transit in the Middle Ages, at the time following Peter-the-Great’s rule, after the capital had been moved to St Petersburg, Eastern Obonezh’e slipped sideways from the transit routes, with hardly any cultural impacts produced by the neighbours (Loginov 2006: 6), as well as the colonisation pattern, which apparently was not dense or massive, but gradual, with a prolonged period of bilingualism (as evidenced by dual place names – both translated Russian and original Finnic ones – in Cadastral Books of the Obonezhskaya Pyatina, years 1496 and 1563, Piscovye knigi) and subsequent russification of local people, which, in turn, facilitates the preservation of the preceding toponymic stratum (Mullonen 1994: 132).

Note that place names of non-Russian origin occur throughout the study area, but there is a certain pattern: Russian place names prevail where the contacts of local the Finnic population with Slavs were more active (along Lake Onega, Vodla River, Kensky portage route), whereas in settlement clusters along lakes far away from water and portage routes (Kolodozero, Vodlozero, Salmozero, Sumozero, Korbozero, etc.) the concentration of substratal place names is much higher. An example is the range distribution of bay naming models. The Russian term guba is established along Lake Onega’s shores: Orovguba, Katežguba, Konguba, Unoiguba, etc., whereas on inland lakes (with a prevailing Finnic population that was gradually russified on their shores) the term lahta, of Finnic origin, is still in use: Gablahta, Ižlahta, Kaislahta, Kižimlahta, etc.
The oldest stratum of place names in Eastern Obonezh’e are the hydronyms – names of most rivers and the largest lakes (R. Vodla, L. Vodlozero, R. Otovža, L. Otovozero, R. Kelka, L. Kelkozero, R. Koloda, L. Kolodozero, etc.), the etymologies of which are still undetermined. This situation is observed throughout the Russian North. Presumably, these place names represent the heritage of the nationality or nationalities that used to inhabit this extensive range, but were later assimilated by new waves of colonisation and lost their native language.

### 2.1. The Sami-type toponymic substrate

A stratum of place names in Eastern Obonezh’e evidences Sami presence in the territory in the past. One should specify however that the ethnic group that has left this toponymy behind could be a formation of the Balto-Finno-Sami type, which had existed before the Sami-Finnic language entity fell apart, or represented a stage of such a disintegration. No wonder it is often easier to approach the etymology of these place names through linguistic reconstruction, i.e. via the state of the language preceding the modern state, rather than relying on the modern Sami language (Mullonen 1995: 193–194, Xelimskij 2006: 41).

Names of the Sami type are linked to relatively large features of high significance in the landscape, first of all aquatic objects: strait, Vlg. Čjolma, L. Čjolmozero (Sami čoal’bme ‘strait’); B. Njuhpoča, Brk. Njuhručej, L. Njuhčozero (Sami njuhčč ‘swan’); L. Torosozero (Sami doares ‘across, cross-running’, the motivation being ‘oriented across the river flow’, L. Jangozero (P.-Sami *jenke ‘wetland’), etc.

### 2.2. The Finnic toponymic substrate

Place names of Finnic origin constitute the biggest component of the Eastern Obonezh’e toponymic substrate; they are present in all toponymic components from the oldest and most lasting hydronymy (suggesting that the Finnic population appeared in the territory earlier than the Slavic population) to the younger and more labile microtoponymy (indicating that this group of population thoroughly utilised the territory, and was russified quite late).

---

1 For meanings of Sami words hereinafter see: Itkonen (1958), Lehtiranta (1989).
Let us remark that when speaking of the Finnic toponymic substrate we mean Eastern Obonezh’e toponymy of the Vepsian-Karelian type, differentiation between the two components often being problematic because of the high similarity of the Karelian and the Vepsian linguistic systems: cf. Mt. *Venegora*, Brk. *Veneručej* (Kar. *veneh*, Veps. *veńeh* ‘boat’); L. *Kivozero* (Kar., Veps. *kivi* ‘stone’); L. *Maimozero* (Kar. *maima*, Veps. *maim* ‘fry, bait’); W. *Mjandozero*, L. *Mjandomeh*, Brk. *Mjandruchej* (Kar. *mānty*, Veps. *mänd* ‘wide-ringed pine, pine bog’); L. *Padozero* (Kar. *pato*, Veps. *pado* ‘dam, dike’); L. *Her-kozero* (Kar. *härkä*, Veps. *härg* ‘bull’), etc.

The challenge is to find the traits that differentiate the Vepsian substrate from the Karelian one. The toponymy of the study areas contains at the phonetic, morphological and lexical levels the markers that enable differentiation between Vepsian and Karelian toponymy and assumptions concerning the time when these nations colonised the region. This issue has been dealt with in detail elsewhere (for details see Zaxarova and Mullonen 2012, Zaxarova 2013), so we shall only give a few examples. Analysis of the distribution range of place names that begin with *h* (Rus. *х*) and *g* (Rus. *г*) (when assimilated into Russian usage Karelian names usually retain the initial Finnic *h*, whereas the sound in assimilated Vepsian names is usually transformed into *g*: cf. L. *Habozero* – L. *Gabozero*, B. *Hižlahta* – L. *Gižezero*, I. *Gižostrov*, etc.) has shown that the bulk of place names beginning with *g* concentrate along the eastern shore of Lake Onega and in the Vodlozero region (where, by the way, one encounters at the toponymic level some typical Vepsian geographical terms (*puganda* Veps. *∗pugand* ‘narrow swift-flowing river site’ (Mullonen 1994: 60), *kara* Veps. *kar*, *kara* ‘small bay, bight’, etc.), and some oikonyms identical to whose found in originally Vepsian land in the Svir area, in which the Finnic anthroponym in the stem (often non-Christian) is coupled with Finnic locative suffix -l (Rahkajla, Vačelovo, Dešalovo, Kurgilovo, etc.). At the same time, the main range of the place names beginning with *h* is Kolodozero area and part of Kenozero area: R. *Habanzja*, L. *Habozero*, C. *Harjus*, L. *Haragozero*, etc. The area also contains place names that have retained sibilants: L. *Šalmozero*, Brk. *Šalmručej* (Kar. *šalmi* – Veps. *salm* ‘strait’), B. *Pačelakša* (Kar. *lakši* – Veps. *laht* ‘bay’), etc.

2 For meanings of Karelian words hereinafter see: Karjalan kielen sanakirja. I – VI. LSFU XVI. Helsinki, 1968–2005; for meanings of Vepsian words see: Zajceva and Mullonen (1972).
The range-based analysis of the toponymic material and its mapping indicate that the Karelian models, which are usually represented in central and northern Karelia, have spread to Eastern Obonezh’e from Northern Priladozh’e, passing Lake Onega on the North, whereas Vepsian models reached Eastern Obonezh’e from the territory between Lake Ladoga, Lake Onega and Lake Beloe via Southern Obonezh’e. The Vepsian substrate dominates in the Vodlozero region, along the Vodla River, in southern Pudozh District, which falls within the same range with adjacent areas in Vytegra District, partly in the Kenozero region, apparently marking the pathways along which the Vepsian population had colonised the territory. The Karelian substrate, in turn, is found on the Lake Onega eastern coast, but is most explicit in the toponymy of the Kolodozero and Kenozero regions.

One may assume that Vepsians arrived in Eastern Obonezh’e earlier than Karelians. Vepsians used the waterways leading from southern Obonezh’e, where the presence of the Vepsian ethnic component is regarded proven.

Karelian toponymy appears to be an overlying (younger than the Vepsian) stratum of the multi-layered toponymic substrate of the territory, dated to the time of eastward migrations of Karelians from northern and north-western Priladozh’e in the 16th and 17th centuries (for details see Zaxarova and Mullonen 2012).

Below we shall consider the Eastern Obonezh’e undifferentiated Karelian-Vepsian toponymic substrate.

3. Geographical terms of Finnic substrate origin

The substrate appellative lexis fixed in the toponymy of Eastern Obonezh’e is represented by the following groups: landscape lexis, flora lexis, fauna lexis, qualitative lexis, spatial relations lexis, and lexis related to people, their trades and occupations, as well as religious and mythological ideas.

This paper will focus on the landscape terms of Finnic substrate origin – one of the most widely represented groups in the toponymy of the study area, which reflects the surrounding world – actual kinds of landscape people used for building settlements or setting up economic activities, since only the object used in the domestic, social and economic activities of local people would be given a name. The terms belonging to this group are used in the names of lakes, brooks, uplands,
wood parcels, holdings, sites with a certain type of soil and vegetation, etc., since one had to denote hunting and fishing grounds, and because settlements were situated by the water, and the most suitable sites (often on uplands) were used for agriculture.

3.1. Geographical terms of Finnic substrate origin in the structural types of the toponymy of Eastern Obonezh’e

Landscape terms are found in both the attributive and the basic (in determinants) parts of semi-calque place names. Remarkably, this structural type is the most popular in the toponymic substrate of Eastern Obonezh’e (and the Russian North in general). Names of this type appeared through adaptation of composite Finnic place names to Russian usage: *Kivi/järvi > Kivozero. The basic component of the composite place name, represented by a geographical term, was usually translated with a corresponding Russian word, whereas the attributive element remained in its original form: -ozero ‘lake’ (Kangasozero, Nemozero, Salmozero, etc.), -ručej ‘brook’ (Vojručej, Kaliručej, Kukručej, etc.), -navolok ‘cape, headland’ (Varnavolok, Litjanavolok, Korbnavolok, etc.), -moh ‘wetland’ (Vadomoh, Kalimoh, etc.), -gora ‘mount’ (Vargora, Sel’gora, etc.), and so on.

There are however some place names in Eastern Obonezh’e where the determinant is the dialectal lexeme of Finnic origin: -lahta ‘bay’3 (Gablahta, Kuklahta, Peršlahta, etc.); -pahta ‘wetland’ (Valga pahta, Gojpahta, Nešpahta, etc.); -selga/-sel’ga, -čelga, -šelga/šalga ‘upland, ridge’ (Ninsel’ga, Lepsel’ga, Masel’ga, Pedasel’ga, Gabčelga, Jenšelga, Kuršelga, Debrešalga, Pušalga, etc.); -salma ‘strait’ (Kevasalma, Koskosalma, Vojnasalma, etc.); -orga ‘tall old forest, swampy site, forest site’ (Kukor’ga, Rumorga, Savorga, etc.); -luda ‘underwater rock, scarp, cliff; rock sticking out of water, rocky islet’ (Parmišluda, Rohlaluda, etc.), and so on.

A peculiar group is microtoponyms where the original Finnic word remained as the determinant, suggesting that the local population has become russified quite recently, given that microtoponymy tends to be highly variable and short-lived (Mullonen 1995: 196–197): -mjaga/-mega ‘mount, hill, upland’ (Mt., F. Mudomjaga, Cm.,

---

3 For meanings of dialectal lexemes hereinafter see: Myznikov (2003), Mamontova and Mullonen (1991).
In addition to structural components of semi-calque place names, the landscape vocabulary is found also in the names adapted to the Russian toponymic system morphologically – using Russian affixes (F. Čurovatica, Brk. Luhtinskij, etc.), as well as in the names directly assimilated into the Russian toponymic system (Hf. Gon’žema, F. Kukkaži, etc.).

3.2. Geographical terms of Finnic substrate origin in the toponymy of Eastern Obonezh’e

In preparing the paper the author utilised the “Toponymy of Karelia” GIS (Geographic Information System), which is being compiled at the Karelian Research Centre of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Institute of Language, Literature and History, and now comprises over 70,000 (expected to be expanded to hundreds of thousands) place names collected during field trips around Karelia and to adjacent regions. The information included in the GIS database is referenced to the map, so that the user can both retrieve the necessary material and see it mapped to link the names of objects to their actual physical and geographic characteristics. This way one can verify the etymologies of substrate place names, and suggest etymological interpretations for some substrate toponymic bases not considered previously.

Below we provide a commentary-supplied alphabetic listing of Eastern Obonezh’e place names, in which the landscape terms are represented:

**I. Čiraki:** Veps. čirak ‘shallow, ridge, reef’;

**L. Jogozero:** Kar., Veps. joki, jogi, d’ogi ‘river, rivulet’;

**F. Jul’mjaki, F. Lužnye Jul’myaki, Hf. Gul’miki, Hf. Pod Gul’mjakami, W. Gul’minskoe, Hf. Gul’mjaki, F., B. Dul’metka:** the stem is the Karelian term jylmäkkö ‘rounded mountain, steep slope’ from Suojarvi vernaculars (Mullonen 2008: 188);

**B., Hf. Kagrema, pool Podkagremnyj:** Kar. kauruma ‘bight, small lake or river bay’; judging by the phonetic appearance, one cannot rule out a reconstruction of the local Vepsian type landscape term *kagrem. The Karelian diphthong -au- would rather be adapted to become -av- (*Kavrema), cf. the Zaonezhje Lovgi from Louhi (Mullonen 2008: 30);

**W. Kalimoh / Kalij Moh, Brk. Kaliručej / Kalij / Kaloj, F. Kal’jenki, F. Kal’navolockoje:** Kar. kallivo, kal’l’o, kalli, kal’l’ ‘cliff, rock pile in
the woods’, Veps. *kal’l’, kalli* ‘cliff, stone quarry’ (Mullonen 2008: 24). Attribution to the Sami source is also possible, cf. Sami *kalli, kallëi, káll* ‘cliff’;

L. Kangasozero: Kar. *kankaš, kangaš, kangas*; Veps. *kangaz* ‘pine forest’. This place name can also be classed into the lexical-semantic group ‘Flora’, as it denotes a locality with certain vegetation;

B. Karelhta: Kar. *kari* ‘rocky rapid, shoal, reef’. There may be a connection with the Veps. *kar, kara* ‘small bay, bight’, which is quite productive in Vepsian toponymy (Mullonen 2008: 25–26);

B., F. Kivelahta, L. Kivozero: Kar., Veps. *kivi* ‘stone’;

L. Korbozero, B. Korblahta, C. Korbnavolok, F. Korby: Kar. *korpi, korbi* ‘thick woods, usually spruce-dominated, growing in a low wet site’, Veps. *korb* ‘thick woods; wet depression’. Place names with this stem can also be included in the group ‘Flora’. Some researchers relate hydronyms with the stem *Korb*- with the fish species name: *korba, korbica* ‘dace’ (Myznikov 2003: 233). This version does not sound convincing since the range of the dialectal lexeme *korbica*, which descends from the Finnic *korpiainen, korbiainen, korpu, korpus* ‘a kind of roach’, is limited to several communities on Lake Onega’s eastern shore, whereas the range of the dialectal lexeme *korba* (found in even the bylinas recorded by Rybnikov and Hilferding) meaning ‘thick spruce forest; forested mire; wet swampy site in the woods; forest on elevated ground’, and hydronyms with the stem *Korb*- is much wider;

Hf. Kukkaži: Veps. *kukkaz* ‘hill, low mountain’;

Mt. Kuksel’ga, Brk. Kukručej, B. Kuklahta: judging by the landscape characteristics of the objects the toponymic basis is probably related to the Vepsian dialectal *kuk* ‘low mountain, hill’, with the corresponding Karelian *kukkula, kukkura* ‘mount, mountain top’, which, in turn, is the source of Mt. *Kukol*’ name (Mullonen 1994: 66–67);

L. Lahtozero, I. Lahtinskaya luda: Kar. *lahti* ‘bay’, Veps. *laht* ‘bay; swampy part of the lake; low lakeshore or riverbank flooded at high water’. The same series includes the names of bays where the determinant is the dialectal lexeme of Finnic origin -lahta: *Gablahta, Kižimlahta, Kuklahta, Peršlahta*, etc.;

L. Landozero, H. Lan’žina: Kar. *lantto* ‘depression, trough’, as well as ‘low-lying, low; shallow’. The stem *Land*- of the first example can be traced also to the Sami source (cf. Sami *läntö, länd* ‘pond, forest lake’);

C. Litjanavolok: Kar. *liete*, Veps. *lete* ‘sand, low sandy shore’; judging by the phonetic appearance of the place name, the Karelian interpretation appears more likely, since the Karelian diphthong *ie* was
usually assimilated into Russian usage in the form і (cf. Л. Virozero, Brk. *Virručej*: Kar. виерã, виãрã, вейрã ‘curved, flexuous’);

-luda: the determinant in the complex place names (Voikaluda, Parmišluda, Rohlaluda, etc.) is the lexeme borrowed into Russian vernaculars from Finnic languages, which means ‘rock scarp, slope; sandy shoal; rock, reef, shoal (submerged or emergent); small rocky (barren) island’: Kar. *luoto, luodo*, Veps. *lod, lodo, luda* ‘underwater rock, scarp, cliff; rock sticking out of water, rocky islet, shoal in a lake or river’ (Matveev 2001: 218);

Brk. *Luhtručej*. Brk., И. Luhtinskij, В. Luhta: Kar. *luhta*, Veps. *luht* ‘puddle; floodplain hayfield; wet low-lying site’ (Matveev 2004: 168), the Finnic original had been assimilated into Russian vernaculars in the form *luhta*, and was represented as the determinant in the name of the wetland and holding *Poiluhta*;

М., Vlg. Maselga: the names contain the Karelian geographical term *moanselgä, moaňelkä, maanselkä* ‘ridge, drainage divide’ (Мамонтова и Муллонен 1991: 60), with geographic evidence behind it: a drainage divide, which is part of the Baltic/White Sea divide or, in a wider sense, the Atlantic/Arctic Ocean divide, runs between villages Morshchikhinskaya and Maselga (Кенозеро area);

Megrepuganda rapid: the place name is based on the Vepsian geographical term *pugand* ‘narrow swift-flowing river site’, which И. Муллонен has traced to the Vepsian verb *pugetada* ‘shove, push through’ (Муллонен 1994: 60);

Л. *Mjagozero*, as well as the names of the upland and the cemetery on an elevated sandy site *Mudomjaga, Sajmega*, where the determinant is the Finnic -mjaga/-mega: Kar. *mäki*, Veps. *mägi* ‘mountain, hill, upland’ (Муллонен 2008: 30);

Л., Vlg. *Nemozero*: Kar. *niemi*, Veps. *nem* ‘cape, peninsula’ (Матвеев 2004: 54), judging by the phonetic appearance of the place name, the Vepsian interpretation appears more likely (see above for the pattern of assimilation of the Karelian diphthong ie into Russian usage);

-orga ‘swampy lowland, usually covered with spruce forest; thick spruce forest’ – the Russian dialectal lexeme acts as the determinant in the names of the fields and hayfields *Kukor’ga, Rumorga, Savorga*, etc.: Kar. *orko, orgo* ‘trough between fells; thick spruce forest in a low-lying wet site’, Veps. *org* ‘dark forest, thicket; gully, depression’ (Муллонен 2008: 31, Матвеев 2004: 173);

Л., В. *Pahta*, Brk. Pahtovskij, Л. *Pahtzerozero*: the stem is the substratal landscape term *pahta* ‘wetland (wet or well-drained, with or
without herb, shrub or tree cover); hayfield in a wetland; overgrown
river channel’, which is quite productive in the Eastern Obonezh’e
toponymy. It appears in names of wetlands, lakes, brooks, either inde-
pendently or as the determinant in place names with complex structure:
W. Valgapaha / Valdopahta, W. Goipahta, W. Laipahta, W. Bol’šaja
/ Malaja Lepahta, Brk. Bolšoi / Malyj Laipah-tin ručež, W. Nešpahta.
Correlates with the Finnic lexeme pehka, pehku, pehko, pehk ‘decay-
ing, rotten wood’, which is mainly found in the toponymy in the names
of wetlands: Pjohka, Pjovka, Pjohovskoje, Pjohtač, Pjohtal’’nica,
Pehozero, etc. Mapping of the place names indicates that these models
reached the study area via different pathways: place names with the
stem Pehk- are Vepsian heritage, the model beginning with Pahta-
is the heritage of another, linguistically related people, which used to live
in the Belozer’e – Poonezh’e region before its active colonisation by
Russians (for details see Zaxarova 2012);

F. Paltega, F. Paltegi, Mt., F. Paltežnaja Gora: the stem can be
traced to the Veps. palte < *palteg < *palttek ‘slope, hillside’ (Saarikivi
2006: 34, Mullonen 2008: 31);

Brk., W. Randručež, L. Randzero, as well as names of the holdings
along the shore, where the determinant is the Finnic original Šivaranda,
Kačkaranda: Kar. ranta, randa, Veps. rand ‘shore’ (Matveev 2004: 62);

L. Salmozero, Brk. Salmrucčež, H. Zasalom’je, L. Šalmozero, Brk.
Šalmručež: Kar. šalmi, salmi, Veps. salm ‘strait’. The phonetic appear-
ance of the latter two examples (the sibilant š at the beginning of the
toponymic basis) points to their Karelian origin (Matveev 2004: 65).
This group also includes place names with the determinant expressed by
the dialectal lexeme -salma: Vlg. Kevasalma, Vlg. Koskosalma, strait
Voinasalma, etc. ;

L. Sarožero, B. Sarlahta, B. Sarapljoso, L., W. Saremoh / Sarmoh,
Brk. Sararučež, F. Saranivy, F. Saraži, R. Sara, as well as names with
the Finnic determinant -sara: R. Matsara, Hf. Gabsara, Hf. Riksara.
Where the name refers to a lake, two interpretation options are possible:
Kar. soari, suari, Veps. sar ‘island’, or Kar. šoara, suara, Veps. sara,
sar ‘forked trunk or branch; branching’; the stem in the names of rivers
and brooks is related to the concept of bifurcation, branching (Matveev
2001: 277, Matveev 2004: 118, 162);

Hf. Savorga, Mt., F. Savsel’ga, Brk. Savručež, Mt. Saimega: Kar.,
Veps. savi ‘clay’ (Matveev 2004: 65);

L. Sel’gozero, I. Sel’gos trov, Mt. Sel’gora, Brk. Sel’goručež,
L. Želgozero: Kar. šelkä, šelgä, selgä, Vep. selg ‘ridge, upland, hill,
mountain; middle of the lake’ (Matveev 2004: 168, 173), the latter example is based on the Karelian source. Let us also point out the names of uplands and holdings on them, where the determinant is expressed by the dialectal lexeme borrowed from the Finnic source: -selga/-sel’ga, -čelga, -šelga/salga: Ninsel’ga, Lepsel’ga, Pedasel’ga, Gabčelga, Jen’šelga, Kuršelga, Debrešalga, Pušalga, etc.;

Hf. Vadegi, W. Vadomoh, W., Hf. Vadežnoe, W. Vadeckoe, W. Vadežinskoe, F. Vadesel’ga: the Vepsian source *vadag’ meaning ‘hayfield on swampy ground’ is identified as the basis of the place names (for details see Zaxarova 2012);

C., F. Varnavolok, L. Varozero, Mt. Vargora: Kar. vuara, voara ‘forested mountain’. The toponymic base V- can be traced also to the Sami source (cf. Sami varre, vārra, varr ‘mountain, hill’) (Mullonen 2008: 21);

B. Voilahta, Brk. Voiručej, R., Brk., L. Vojja: Kar., Veps. oja ‘brook’ with prosthetic v to begin the word. The word stem here can be traced also to the Sami source (cf. Sami vūaijë, vūaije, vuoi ‘brook, ditch’), but given that the toponymy in the range comprises quite a number of such names, where the prosthesis shapes the toponymic basis of Finnic and Russian origin: Voinasalma (< Finnic oinas ‘ram’), Vagnozero (< Finnic ahne, ahven ‘perch’), Vestro, Vostrij Nos (< Rus. ostryj ‘sharp’), etc. – the Finnic interpretation appears more likely. The names of brooks Rogoj, Kaloj, Kivoj, Hirboi, where the main element is the Finnic original -oj, which agrees with the toponographic term rućej ‘brook’ in gender, also fit in this series;

F. Čurpalda, F. Čurovatica, F. Čurovatičnoe, F. Čurpol, Brk. Čuručej, C. Čurnavolok, F. Čuračiha, F. Čurovatka: Kar. čuur, Veps. čuru, čuur ‘coarse sand, gravel’ (Matveev 2004: 134, Mullonen 2008: 20, 40), or Kar., Veps. čura ‘edge, side; end, flank’.

4. Conclusions

Analysis of the vocabulary used in the formation of the toponymy of the study area helped draw some conclusions concerning the population that had colonised the territory, the patterns and periods of Eastern Obonezh’e colonisation by various ethnic groups, since different groups had their specific sets of toponymic bases reflecting the period in history and the cultural level of the settlers (Superanskaja 1969, Mullonen 1994).
The stratum of geographical names with the appellative lexis of the Finnic substrate is the most extensive, but not the only one in the toponymic substrate of Eastern Obonezh’e. It reflects the pre-Slavic period of colonisation of the study area. The presence of this geographical name stratum is evidence of long-standing cross-cultural and cross-language contacts, which had resulted in russification of local Finnic population.

Geographical terms of substrate origin in Eastern Obonezh’e toponymy are the most comprehensively represented compared to other lexical semantic groups as they reflect the natural geographic features of the environment colonised by Finnic people, who built settlements and practiced various trades and occupations, to be then dissolved in the Russian milieu but with memories of them remaining in the language, culture and toponymy of the land. Furthermore, geographical terms of substrate origin occur both in the more lasting hydronymy, and in the more variable and younger microtoponymy, evidencing an early arrival of a Finnic population in Eastern Obonezh’e and its relatively recent russification. In addition, the place names considered in the paper are both those descending from Karelian sources and those of Vepsian origin. Analysis of the distribution ranges and mapping of place names with typically Vepsian or Karelian toponymic bases confirmed the conclusions made previously (Bubrikh 1947, Mullonen 1995, Loginov 2006) about an earlier arrival of a Vepsian population at the turn of the 2nd millennium AD, and a later (Karelian) population that had come with a massive wave of migration in the 16th and 17th centuries.

Address:
Ekaterina Zakharova
Institute of Language, Literature and History
Karelian Research Centre, Russian Academy of Sciences
11 Pushkinskaya St., 185910 Petrozavodsk
Karelia, Russian Federation
E-mail: katja.zaharova@mail.ru

Abbreviations
B. – bay, Brk. – brook, C. – cape, Cm. – cemetery, F. – field, Hf. – hayfield, I. – island, L. – lake, M. – meadow, Mt. – mount, R. – river, Vlg. – village, W. – wetland.

Languages and dialects: Kar. – Karelian, P.-Sami – Proto-Sami, Rus. – Russian, Veps. – Vepsian.
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