

HARALD BICHLMEIER

Sächsische Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig
Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg

Fields of research: onomastics (toponymy), historical
phonology of the Germanic languages, Indo-European
linguistics, Aljamiado-texts.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.35321/all82-06>

THE MORPHOLOGY OF LITHUANIAN TOPONYMS – DIFFERENCES AND PARALLELS OF DIFFERENT CLASSES OF NAMES

Lietuvių toponimijos morfologija – įvairių
vardų grupių skirtumai ir paralelės

ANNOTATION

The participation in the project “Vakarinių pietų aukštaičių vietovardžių integravimas į Lietuvos vietovardžių geoinformacinę duomenų bazę ir jų kilmės bei motyvacijos tyrimai” [The integration of Western South Aukštaitian toponyms into the *Lithuanian geoinformational database* and studies on their origin and motivation] led to two interesting results: 1) It seems necessary to refine (Lithuanian) terminology and 2) there can be found remarkable differences in the percentage of the morphological (and syntactical) structures used to build names for flowing bodies of water (potamonyms) and names for standing bodies of water (limnonyms). It turns out that in the researched area in limnonyms the percentage of derivational formations is significantly higher and that of compound names significantly lower than in potamonyms. More research needs to be done to find out, whether this is a characteristic of the researched area or a general tendency all over Lithuania.

KEYWORDS: potamonyms/river-names, limnonyms/lake-names, morphology of onyms, syntactical structure of onyms, western south aukštaitian/dzukian toponomastics.

ANOTACIJA

Parašyti šį straipsnį paskatino projekte „Vakarinių pietų aukštaičių vietovardžių integravimas į Lietuvos vietovardžių geoinformacinę duomenų bazę ir jų kilmės bei motyvacijos tyrimai“, kuriame teko dalyvauti ir atlikti tyrimus, gautos įdomios išvados: 1) pasirodo, būtina peržiūrėti ir tikslinti lietuviškąją toponimų darybos terminiją; 2) susumavus rezultatus pastebėta didelių skirtumų morfologinėje (ir sintaksinėje) upėvardžių (potamonimų) ir ežerų vardų (limnonimų) daryboje. Tyrimas parodė, kad didžioji dalis ištirtų limnonimų yra vediniai, atvirksčiai negu potamonimai, pastarieji dažniausiai yra sudurtiniai dariniai. Reikalinga atlikti daugiau tyrimų, siekiant išsiaiškinti, ar tokia daryba būdinga tik ištirtam regionui, ar visai Lietuvos teritorijai.

ESMINIAI ŽODŽIAI: potamonimai / upėvardžiai, limnonimai / ežerų vardai, onimų morfologija, onimų sintaksinė struktūra, pietvakarių aukštaičių / dzūkų toponomastika.

1. INTRODUCTION¹

This paper intends to give an insight into differences and parallels in different classes of names within Lithuanian toponyms.

1.1. Thus, at the beginning, we have to clarify, what exactly we are talking about, what we understand by toponyms etc.

Toponyms shall be understood here in the widest sense of the word, that is as onyms/names for all kinds of topoi, i.e. places – in German this would be *Ortsnamen* and *Örtlichkeitsnamen* combined. This is more or less the way in which Lithuanian *toponimai* tends to be understood. Thus, in principle, we are talking here about the whole array of names for places in the sense of geographical entities, that is names for inhabited places on the one hand, as there are towns, villages, farmsteads, houses etc., which are toponyms in the narrow sense of the word, in the way German *Ortsname* is often used, and names for not inhabited geographical units on the other hand, as there are

- drymonyms (names of woods and forests),
- oronyms (names of hills and mountains),

¹ This paper is based on the talk with the same title presented in November 2019 at the „4-oji tarptautinė mokslinė Aleksandro Vanago konferencija: *Tikriniai žodžiai erdvėje ir erdvė tikriniuose žodžiuose*. Lietuvių kalbos institutas, Vilnius / The 4th International Scientific Aleksandras Vanagas Conference: *Onyms in Space and Space in Onyms*. The Institute of the Lithuanian Language, Vilnius“. – The structure, contents and character of the talk delivered at the conference was mostly retained in this printed version.

- potamonims (names of rivers, creeks etc.),
- limnonims (names of lakes),
- helonims (names of swamps),
- agronims (names of fields),
- leimononims (names of meadows).

Of course there are also names for seas – thalassonims – but they did not play a role in a project doing research in a landlocked area (more on that project further down).

1.2. For all these kinds of toponyms the Lithuanian language offers a multitude of possibilities, how to form them. The standard ways to build Lithuanian toponyms are: word formation, i.e. derivation and composition, on the one hand and the formation of syntagmatic groups on the other. In both types we do not find anything that is not also known from the appellative lexicon of Lithuanian or from Lithuanian syntax. Both main types can be divided up into several subgroups, as will be shown in the next paragraphs.

1.3. The analysis of different types of toponyms shows that we find the same means of formation in all those different onymic classes, but we also find that the percentage of names covered by each of the types can differ significantly.

2. THE PROJECT AND ITS RESULTS

In what follows I want to present mainly three things:

- some of the results of a project from the years 2017 and 2018 at the Institute of the Lithuanian Language, run by Grasilda Blažienė and Laimutis Bilkis,
- some considerations about the traditional supgrouping of the morphological ways of name-formation and what they are called and finally, also a result from the just mentioned project,
- some considerations about a well-known river-name and about a lake-name relatively well-known amongst researchers probing into the Old-European hydronymy – and its connection with a river-name in Lithuania and one in Southern Tyrolia.

2.1. The project alluded to, was roughly researching South-West Lithuanian place-names, microtoponyms and hydronyms in their European context (project title: “Vakarinių pietų aukštaičių vietovardžių integravimas į *Lietuvos vietovardžių geoinformacinę duomenų bazę* ir jų kilmės bei motyvacijos tyrimai” [The integration of Western South Aukštaitian toponyms into the *Lithuanian geoinformational database* and studies on their origin and motivation]). Finally a book in German with the results from that project appeared in January 2020:

Blažienė, Grasilda / Bilkis, Laimutis (eds.): *Die Orts-, Flur- und Gewässernamen Süddwestaukštaitiens*. (Schriftenreihe der Gesellschaft für baltische Studien 2), Hamburg: Baar 2019.

In it there can be found – besides articles by the two already mentioned project leaders, Grasilda Blažienė (on settlement names, cf. Blažienė 2019) and Laimutis Bilkis (on helonyms, cf. Bilkis 2019) – papers by Veronika Adamonytė (on agronyms, cf. Adamonytė 2019), Dalia Kačinė-Vrubliauskienė (on oronyms, cf. Kačinė-Vrubliauskienė 2019), Ilona Mickienė (on drymonyms, cf. Mickienė 2019a, and on leimononyms, cf. Mickienė 2019b) and by the author of this article (Bichlmeier 2020a).

2.2. That project researched *toponimai* in the Lithuanian sense of the word in the Lithuanian region Dzūkija, which is the Western part of the Southern Aukštaitija region bordering on Poland and Belarus. In the center of interest were the Rayons of Alytus and Lazdijai, partially also Druskininkai, mainly areas west of the river Nemunas. Dialectally this is also the western south-aukštaitian region, Lith. *vakarinių pietų aukštaičių*, also called Western Dzūkian, Lith. *vakarinių dzūkių*. Interestingly, in spite of bordering on Slavic settled areas and in spite of the fact that also in the researched area there are quite a number of speakers of Slavic languages and numerous settlements with a mixed Slavic and Lithuanian population, the number of toponyms in the wider sense with a Slavonic etymology can be very low in certain types of names, for example in lake- and river-names it is about 2-3 %. In others, for example in meadow-names, it is – as one would expect it to be anyway – some five to ten times that number.

On the other hand, of course, the research tool for the project, the Lithuanian geo-data-base of toponyms (*Lietuvos vietovardžių geoinformacinė duomenų bazė*; cf. <http://lkiis.lki.lt/lietuvos-vietovardziu-geoinformacine-duomenu-baze>) might be somewhat lopsided at that point, as at least for the region researched in the project, the data had been collected mostly during some scientific explorations of the area in 1935-36, in which predominantly speakers of Lithuanian seem to have been asked more or less exclusively about Lithuanian forms of toponyms. Thus the corresponding toponyms for the same places, rivers, lakes etc. used by speakers of Polish and Belarusian have usually not been recorded.

2.3. But something else can be seen rather clearly, namely that we are in an area, where we can find remnants of a West-Baltic substrate, traditionally attributed to Yatvingian. Mainly it can be discerned from East-Baltic forms by the appearance of *s*, *z* at places, where *š*, *ž* might be expected. This can be exemplified on three examples taken from the corpus of river-names of the area:

*Sākna*s m. (2) Ve (42868), *Saknius* m. (?) Ve (42868) vs. Lith. *šaknis* f. ‚root‘;²
Azāgis m. (2) Lp (42933) cf. OPr. *assegis* (**azegīs*), Lith. *až(e)gỹs*, *ež(e)gỹs*
,*Gymnocephalus cernua* (a fish);³
Zebrius m. (4) Kr (126445) vs. Lith. *žėbras* ‚dirty, unwashed‘.⁴

2.4. The author’s part in that project consisted of analyzing the 423 names of bodies of standing and flowing water, comprising 240 limnonyms and 183 potamonyms.⁵

And this will now take us back to morphology:

2.4.1. As mentioned already in the introduction, there are three main types of forming toponyms in Lithuanian – and usually we find these types also in actually all other Indo-European languages in Europe – although in different quantities, of course.

These types are derived names, compound names and syntagmatic names. In all three types, we can differentiate between names made exclusively from appellative material and names containing also onymic material. For derived names, e.g., the difference is between deappellative derivatives and deonymic derivatives. But these theoretical differentiations come with some limitations and need to be explained in a more precise way.

2.4.2. Especially in need of such more precise explanations are the deonymic formations. They are rarely conversions or quasi-conversions (on conversions see below § 2.4.4.) without a suffix from other kinds of names. In the predominant number of cases they are formed by means of overt suffixation. The dependency on the base word, the derivational basis, is usually expressed by a possessive suffix or a diminutive suffix. So, for example, the name of a tributary to a river can be formed by deriving a diminutive form from the name of the main river (e.g. *Savica* as the name of a tributary of the *Sava* in Slovenia),⁶ or the name of a bay of a lake can be formed by deriving a form with a possessive suffix from the name of the actual lake.

2.4.3. Also deappellative derived names can pose problems for analysis. In many cases we are not able to tell with confidence, whether the suffixation

² Cf. LitEW 957; not registered in Vanagas 1970; cf. Vanagas 1981a: 287; Vanagas 1981b: 104, 135; ALEW 1003f.

³ Cf. LitEW 28, 118, 125; Savukynas 1960: 299; Savukynas 1966b: 169; Vanagas 1970: 11, 32, 65; Vanagas 1981a: 54; Vanagas 1981b: 77; PKEŽ 1: 104f.; PKEŽ² 49; ALEW 271f.; LVŽ 1: 249.

⁴ Cf. LitEW 1294; Vanagas 1970: 68, 69; Vanagas 1981a: 394; Vanagas 1981b: 135.

⁵ For the full corpus cf. Bichlmeier 2019a, 2019b.

⁶ Cf. Bezlaj 1956–1961: 2, 171–174; ESSZI 367f.

happened during the process of onymization – or already in the appellative sphere:

If the derivation happened already in the appellative sphere, then of course the name came into being by the act of conversion with zero-suffixation from an appellative into an onym. As especially possessive and diminutive suffixes are very productive in Lithuanian, the fact that a certain formation is not booked in a dictionary does not mean much in that context.

Anyway we may say that of course there are several suffixes in Lithuanian which turn up more often than others in the formation of names, but there does not seem to be a single suffix which can be called an onymic suffix in the sense that it is used exclusively to form names. The same is true, for example, also for Slavic family names (cf. Bichlmeier 2020) – and we may actually suppose that this is a universal feature at least of the Indo-European languages of Europe: There is no suffix exclusively forming names. But of course there are suffixes popping up in that sphere more often than others.

2.4.4. Before we proceed to some Lithuanian terminological specialties in name-formation, let's have a look at what was just called 'conversions'. I call 'conversions' derivational processes with zero-suffixation. This means a certain word turns into another word without a change of form. Here we find four subtypes:

a) 'simple' conversions, in which an appellative (a noun) is converted into an onym, cp. e.g. *Balañdis* m. Ku (40169): < Lith. *balañdis* m. 'dove';⁷

b) 'double' conversions, in which besides the conversion of an appellative into an onym also takes place a conversion from an adjective into a noun, cp. e.g. *Bedùgnis* m. Ka (40254, 42932), Ku (40174) < Lith. *bedùgnis* 'without ground or bottom';⁸

c) 'pseudoconversions' are conversions looking like simple conversions, which are indeed backformations, however, cp. e.g. the lake-name *Šaulỹs* m. (4) < **Šaũlio/-ių ėžeras* (not < *šaulỹs* m. 'hunter, shooter');⁹

⁷ Cf. LitEW 31; Savukynas 1961: 219; Savukynas/Vanagas/Vitkauskas/Vosylytė/Ermanyte 1963: 12; Vanagas 1970: 31; not registered in Vanagas 1981a; cf. Vanagas 1981b: 39, 77; ALEW 88; LVŽ 1: 322f.

⁸ Cf. LitEW 38, 108; Savukynas 1961: 221; Savukynas/Vanagas/Vitkauskas/Vosylytė/Ermanyte 1963: 16; Vanagas 1970: 44; Vanagas 1981a: 60f.; ALEW 101, 238; LVŽ 1: 414. – Cf. also the limnonym *Bedùgnė* f. (2) Al (42731) in Bichlmeier 2019a: § 2.2.1.1.1.

⁹ Cf. LitEW 125; not registered in Vanagas 1970; cf. Vanagas 1981a: 327; ALEW 271.

d) ‘onymic conversions’, in which the transfer of an onym from one onymic class to another onymic class takes place, cp. e.g. the lake-name *Gadeikà* f. Šv (42799) < PN *Gadéika*.¹⁰

2.5. Let’s now have a look at two specialties of the Lithuanian terminology of word-formation and name-formation. The first one are the so-called ‘ending-derivatives’, Germ. *Endungsableitungen*, Lith. *galūnių vediniai*, the other ones are the so-called ‘prefix-derivatives’, Germ. *Präfixableitungen*, Lith. *priešdėlių vediniai*.

2.5.1. These ‘ending-derivatives’, Germ. *Endungsableitungen*, Lith. *galūnių vediniai* turn out to be a somewhat inhomogeneous group:

2.5.1.1. Among these formations count:

- simple pluralizations of normal appellatives – so actually there is no derivation whatsoever – and

- names which show a synchronic stem-vowel alteration between the name and the appellative. This is, however, merely a description of what we see, not an explanation. The explanation for these formations seems to be a bit different. They mostly or at least at their core seem to be derivatives with a suffix containing yod. Thus these formations are in the end actually derivatives of a rather archaic kind, as the suffix **-iō-* served to build derivatives, mostly adjectives of pertinence, already in Proto-Indo-European. Thus, if there is an appellative or an onym *XY* and we add a suffix **-iō-* we get a word meaning ‘belonging or pertaining to *XY*’. Nice examples for that are Old Slavic/Old Russian place-names as, e.g., *Jaroslav-lb* ‘Jaroslav’s (city)’ < **Jaroslav-ia-* ← ORuss. PN *Yaroslavv*, a similar case is the place-name Pol. *Przemysł* etc.

In our corpus we find, e.g.,

Ángé f. (1) Si (42698) < **angi-iā-* ← Lith. *angi-s* f. ‘snake’;¹¹

Angỹs m. (4) Si (42698) < **angi-ia-* ← Lith. *angi-s* f. ‘snake’;¹²

¹⁰ Cf. Savukynas/Vanagas/Vitkauskas/Vosylytė/Ermanytė 1963: 41; Savukynas 1966a: 185, 186; Vanagas 1970: 107, 108, 134; Vanagas 1981a: 102; Vanagas 1981b: 32; Zinkevičius 2008: 281; LVŽ 3: 7.

¹¹ Cf. LitEW 10; not registered in Savukynas/Vanagas/Vitkauskas/Vosylytė/Ermanytė 1963; not registered in Savukynas 1960; not registered in Vanagas 1970; cf. Vanagas 1981a: 42 (*Ángé* according to Būga apud Vanagas s.v. *Anginas*); ALEW 40f.; LVŽ 1: 98f.

¹² Cf. LitEW 10; Savukynas/Vanagas/Vitkauskas/Vosylytė/Ermanytė 1963: 6; not registered in Savukynas 1960; not registered in Vanagas 1970; cf. Vanagas 1981a: 42; Vanagas 1981b: 77; ALEW 40f.; LVŽ 1: 98f.

Dum̃blis m. (2) Ka (42940), Ka (42945), Lz (40151) < **dumbl-ja-* ← Lith. *dum̃blas* m. ‘mud (on the ground of a lake)’;¹³

Samānius m. (2) Ka (42923) < **saman-ju-* ← Lith. *sāmana*, *samanà* f. ‘moss’;¹⁴

Nemajúnė f. Lz, Šv (37117) < **Nemaiūn-iiā-* ← Lith. PLN *Nemajún-ai* m. Pl.¹⁵

2.5.1.2. So we come to the conclusion, that this synchronic class is one which simply does not exist in the diachronic perspective. But as only the diachronic perspective offers an explanation – and explanations are what we are looking for – this class should better be discarded. All members of that class are either simple suffixal derivatives or plural-forms of the base-word (thus zero-derivatives [of plural-forms]).

2.5.2. Another problematic case – as far as terminology is concerned – are the so-called ‘prefix-derivatives’, Germ. *Präfixableitungen*, Lith. *priešdėlių vediniai*. In this case we also got to do with a piece of terminology, which seems unproblematic from a synchronic perspective, but should be discarded from a historic, that is explanatory perspective. Although some of these formations only show the addition of a prefix at the beginning of the basic word, the by far bigger number of formations show also a change of stem class at the end of the word.

2.5.2.1. In both cases we should be more precise: If only a prefix is added, this is formally not a process of derivation, but one of composition. But if additionally to the addition of a prefix also the stem-class is altered, we see here actually a process of circumfixation. The vast majority of those formations thus shows a derivational process well known from the Germanic languages – among which German itself – and from the Slavic languages: The core formations were collectives, but of course the semantics would widen with time, so it seems that in Lithuanian these derivative processes show a certain accumulation in several types of onyms.

2.5.2.2. Formations like the meadow-names and field-names *Pa-lazdynė* ← lith. *lazdýnas*, *Pa-salaiťys* ← lith. *salaitė* (*salà*), *Pa-salỹs* ← lith. *salà* show in the end – on a Proto-Baltic or at least Proto-Lithuanian level – the same derivational structure as their Germanic and Slavic counterparts:

PLith. **Pa-lazdīn-iiā* ← PLith. **lazdīn-a-* ‘hazel’,

¹³ Cf. LitEW 108; Savukynas 1962: 197; Savukynas/Vanagas/Vitkauskas/Vosylytė/Ermanyte 1963: 35; Vanagas 1970: 11, 65, 148; Vanagas 1981a: 96; Vanagas 1981b: 65; ALEW 243; LVŽ 2: 386–388.

¹⁴ Cf. LitEW 761; Savukynas/Vanagas/Vitkauskas/Vosylytė/Ermanyte 1963: 142; Vanagas 1970: 69, 220; Vanagas 1981a: 289; Vanagas 1981b: 93.

¹⁵ Cf. Savukynas/Vanagas/Vitkauskas/Vosylytė/Ermanyte 1963: 108; not registered in Vanagas 1970; cf. Vanagas 1981a: 226.

**Pa-sal-ia-* ← PLith. **salā-* ‘island, dry patch in a swamp’
are completely parallel to
NHG *Berg* m. ‘mountain’ → *Gebirge* n. ‘the mountains, mountain-range’
(PGerm. **berg-a-* → **ga-berg-ia*) or to
Serb.-Croat. *Dùnāv* m. ‘Danube’ → *Pòdunāvlje* n. ‘area along the Danube’,
Czech *břeh* m. ‘river-side, bank’ → *po-břež-í* n. ‘area along the river-side’,
ná-břež-í n. ‘promenade along a river-bank’ (< CSlav. **bergъ* : **po-/na-berg-ъje*
< PSlav. **berg-a-* : **pa/nā-berg-ia-*).

2.6. Let’s come to the compound names. They pose less problems and show structurally clear-cut subdivisions. The second compound member is (with few exceptions, where we find an adjective) a noun, mostly one designating a body of water like Lith. *ėžeras* m. ‘lake’, dimin. *ėžerėlis* m., *prūdas* m. ‘pond’, *ùpė* f. ‘river’ etc. The first compound member can either be an onym or an appellative; if it is an appellative, it can actually be a noun – which is the most frequent case – or an adjective or rarely even a verb(al root). Normally the second compound member shows a change of the stem-class respectively of the stem-vowel (which younger layers of compounds do not). And this synchronic change of the stem-class is usually brought about by a historic suffix change, usually by a suffix with yod – the same kind of yod described above in 2.5.1.1.

Thus theoretically we find at least the following types:

A) appellative first compound member:

Aa) noun + noun:

*Pelialapūkas*¹⁶ m. (?) Ve (42896): Lith. *pelė* f. ‘mouse’ or Lith. *pėlūs* m. Pl. ‘chaff’¹⁷ + Lith. *lapūkas* m. ‘coltsfoot (*Tussilago*), marsh marigold (*Caltha palustris*), water lily (*Nymphaea alba*), leave (of cabbage vel sim.)’.¹⁸

Ab) noun + noun + change of stem-class:

Vilkežeris m. (1) Lp, Ve (42877): Lith. *vilkas* ‘wolf’ and *ėžeras* ‘lake’.¹⁹

Ac) adjective + noun:

*Šventupė*²⁰ f. (?) Te (130781): Lith. *šveñtas* ‘holy’ and *ùpė* f. ‘river’.²¹

¹⁶ Name unaccented in the database.

¹⁷ Vgl. LitEW 565f., 568f.; ALEW 751f., 754f.

¹⁸ Not registered in Vanagas 1970; not registered in Vanagas 1981a.

¹⁹ Cf. LitEW 125, 1251f.; Vanagas 1970: 231; Vanagas 1981a: 384; Vanagas 1981b: 40, 42, 82; ALEW 271, 1243f.

²⁰ Name unaccented in the database.

²¹ Cf. LitEW 1041f., 1169; Vanagas 1970: 247; Vanagas 1981a: 337f.; Vanagas 1981b: 111; ALEW 1060–1062, 1155f.

Ad) adjective + noun + change of stem-class:

Báltabalė f. (1) Šv (42792): Lith. *báltas* 'white' and *balà* f. 'swamp',²²

Senāupis m. (1) Si (133679): Lith. *sėnas* 'old' and *ùpė* f. 'river'.²³

Ae) adjective + adjective:

Not attested in the corpus.

Af) adjective + adjective + change of stem-class:

Lapōčiažalis m. (1) Se (120807): Lith. *lapotas* 'having leaves' and *žālias* 'green'.²⁴

Ag) verb + noun:

Zūrzaupė f. (1) Si (133303): Lith. *zur̃zti* 'hum, whirr, crackle' and Lith. *ùpė* f. 'river'.²⁵

Ah) verb + noun + change of stem-class:

Šliaūžupis f. (1) Al (39512): Lith. *šliaūžti* 'go slowly, drag along, creep' and *ùpė* f. 'river'.²⁶

B) onymic first compound member:

Ba) onym + noun:

Stasiùpė f. (1) Lp (93705): Lith. PN *Stasỹs* and Lith. *ùpė* f. 'river'.²⁷

Bb) onym + noun + change of stem-class:

Gūdežeris m. (1) Ve (43073): ethnonym Lith. *gūdas* 'White Russian' and *ēžeras* 'lake',²⁸ *Račkupỹs* m. (3b) Al (120573): Lith. PN *Račkỹs* or *Rāčkus* and Lith. *ùpė* f. 'river'.²⁹

2.7. The last way to form place-names is by forming syntactical units. Mostly they consist of two parts, rarely of three. The second member is always the head

²² Cf. LitEW 30f., 32; not registered in Savukynas 1961; cf. Savukynas/Vanagas/Vitkauskas/Vosylytė/Ermanytė 1963: 13; Vanagas 1970: 251, 252, 254; Vanagas 1981a: 56; ALEW 87, 89f.; LVŽ 1: 338.

²³ Cf. LitEW 775, 1169; Savukynas/Vanagas/Vitkauskas/Vosylytė/Ermanytė 1963: 144; Vanagas 1970: 248, 252; Vanagas 1981a: 296 (s.v. *Senūtė*); Vanagas 1981b: 71; ALEW 901f., 1155f.

²⁴ Cf. LitEW 339f., 1287; not registered in Vanagas 1970; cf. Vanagas 1981a: 181; ALEW 1285f.

²⁵ Cf. LitEW 1169, 1280f.; not registered in Savukynas/Vanagas/Vitkauskas/Vosylytė/Ermanytė 1963; cf. Vanagas 1970: 240; Vanagas 1981a: 395; ALEW 1155f.; Zinkevičius 2008: 582.

²⁶ Cf. LitEW 1003, 1169; Vanagas 1970: 252; Vanagas 1981a: 334; ALEW 1044, 1155f.

²⁷ Cf. LitEW 1159; not registered in Vanagas 1970; not registered in Vanagas 1981a; cf. ALEW 1155f.; Zinkevičius 2008: 345, 475.

²⁸ Cf. LitEW 125, 174; Savukynas 1966a: 193; Vanagas 1970: 238; Vanagas 1981a: 125f.; Vanagas 1981b: 115; ALEW 271; LVŽ 3: 333, 341.

²⁹ Cf. LitEW 1169; not registered in Vanagas 1970; not registered in Vanagas 1981a; cf. ALEW 1155f.; Zinkevičius 2008: 515.

noun, the first member is either a congruing adjective or a dependent noun in the genitive, which can either be an appellative or a name, if it is a name, it can be an anthroponym or a toponym.

A) congruing structure:

Aa) adjective + noun:

Gilūlis nendrūnas m. Lp (94814): Lith. *gilūs* ‘deep’ + (collective) *nendrūnas* ‘place with reed’.³⁰

Ab) adjective + onym:

Baltóji Ánčia f. (1) Lp, Ve (35048): Lith. *báltas* ‘white’³¹ + lake-name *Ánčia*.³²

B) structures of dependence:

Ba) noun [Gen.] + noun:

*Gluosnių griovis*³³ m. Al (120557): Gen. Pl. of Lith. *gluosnis* m. ‘willow’ + Lith. *griovis* m. ‘ditch, trench’,³⁴

Bb) onym [Gen.] + noun:

Ániškio ėžeras m. Al, Kr (42692): PlN *Ániškis* + Lith. *ėžeras* m. ‘lake’.³⁵

2.8. As mentioned above, the author’s task in the project was to analyze lake-names and river-names. Theoretically, of course, further subdivisions could be made and it remains to be researched in the future, whether these subdivisions made according to the extralinguistic reality are reflected in different approaches to naming these entities. Such differences might be seen in differing percentages of the different types in which names can be formed.

Limnonyms/lake-names are here understood as names for mainly standing bodies of water. These can be natural or artificial, man-made. So we might surmise that theoretically there might be more anthroponyms and toponyms contained in names of artificial lakes, as they might have been named more often after the person who made them or had them made or owned them or after the village or farmstead, near which they were dug. But as the database does not offer such data, we cannot tell much about that. The same might be valid also for river-names or more generally for bodies of running water, contrasting the

³⁰ Cf. LitEW 151, 493f.; not registered in Savukynas 1966a; not registered in Vanagas 1970; not registered in Vanagas 1981a; cf. ALEW 324, 694f.; not registered in LVŽ 3.

³¹ Cf. LitEW 32; ALEW 89f.

³² Cf. Vanagas 1970: 275; Vanagas 1981a: 42.

³³ Name unaccented in the database.

³⁴ Cf. LitEW 158, 171; not registered in Vanagas 1970; not registered in Vanagas 1981a; cf. ALEW 346, 366f.; LVŽ 3: 228.

³⁵ Cf. LitEW 125; Vanagas 1970: 266; Vanagas 1981a: 42; Pupkis 2002: 22; ALEW 271; LVŽ 1: 103.

naming of natural rivers and creeks with that of channels, trenches etc. So such internal subgroups cannot be researched so far because of lack of data in the database – one would have to do research in archives. As always, this would be a very time-consuming job on the one hand, but might also lead to rather interesting results.

2.8.1. But what we can do with our results is compare the naming strategies for rivers and creeks on the one hand with those for lakes and ponds on the other hand, and as it turns out, there are quite remarkable differences in the percentage of certain types of name-formation and thus in the ranking of the different types between the two groups. The results are based on the full corpus of the region, that is 240 lake-names and 183 river-names. But so far we cannot tell, whether these results are representative for all of Lithuania, as research of this kind is still lacking for the rest of the country as far as I know. But for Dzūkija they show nice differences, indeed:

2.8.2. If we make up a frequency hierarchy for the different formations of lake-names and river-names we see:

a) in the case of lake-names:	
suffixed derivatives	(43.75 %)
> syntactic names	(18.75 %)
> conversions	(17.92 %)
> ending derivatives	(10.42 %)
> compounds	(08.33 %)

and

b) in the case of river-names:	
suffixed derivatives	(26.23 %)
> syntactic names	(22.95 %)
> ending derivatives	(18.03 %)
> conversions	(17.49 %)
> compounds	(14.75 %)

So we see that amongst lake-names suffixed derivatives form clearly the most prominent subgroup with almost 44 %, being almost 2.5 times as frequent as syntactic names. This same subgroup is the most frequent also in river-names, but with a bit more than a quarter it is hardly more frequent than syntactic names, which make up almost a quarter.

2.8.3. As mentioned above (§ 2.5.), ending-derivatives are taken as an extra group in Lithuanian linguistics and onomastics, but indeed they are nothing else but a special group of suffixed derivatives. So we may be entitled to subsume them under the suffixed derivatives diachronically. Thus we arrive at the following hierarchy for

a) lake-names:

suffixed derivatives including ending-derivatives	(54.17 %)
> syntactic names	(18.75 %)
> conversions	(17.92 %)
> compounds	(08.33 %)

and

b) for river-names:

suffixed derivatives including ending-derivatives	(44.26 %)
> syntactic names	(22.95 %)
> conversions	(18.67 %)
> compounds	(14.75 %)

As can be seen, the hierarchical structure for river-names and lake-names is now the same, but the frequency of the subclasses is still rather divergent in certain points, i.e. at the top and at the bottom of the hierarchies. Lake-names show a significantly higher percentage of derivatives and a significantly lower percentage of compounds than river-names.

2.8.4. Let's do a last step: Conversions are actually nothing else but derivations with a zero-suffix (see § 2.4.4. above). So they *are* derivatives in the end.

Thus we arrive at the following results:

a) lake-names:

suffixed derivatives including ending-derivatives and conversions	(72.09 %)
> syntactic names	(18.75 %)
> compounds	(08.33 %)

and for

b) river-names we find:

suffixed derivatives including ending-derivatives and conversions	(62.91 %)
> syntactic names	(22.95 %)
> compounds	(14.75 %)

These combined results underline the result mentioned above: derivatives are significantly more frequent in lake-names, while compounds are significantly more frequent in river-names. Syntactic names take the middle positions with slightly over a fifth in river-names and slightly under a fifth in lake-names.

2.9. As so far no general count of the formations of river-names and lake-names in Lithuania exists (to my knowledge), we cannot tell, whether our result is 'normal' by Lithuanian standards or shows a significant deviation from the average. Further research will be necessary to find that out. When such research will be finally done, these results might be nicely compared to similar results from other onymic landscapes. But actually I think, such research in

other onymic landscapes also will still have to be done. Anyway I am not aware of such research for other Baltic or Slavic countries, the less so for Germany. One reason might be that simply databases like the *Lietuvos vietovardžių geoinformacinė duomenų bazė* are lacking elsewhere.

3. TWO ETYMOLOGIES

In the end – and as etymology is simply my favorite – I want to shortly discuss the etymologies of two names that appeared in the corpus. The one rather boring at first – because its etymology has been actually undisputed for decades – and the other interesting mainly from the point of the history of research, Old-European hydronymy and Indo-European linguistics. Moreover these two names share one common feature: They belong to the extremely small group of names from our area of research, which stand quite a fair chance of being of Proto-Baltic, maybe Pre-Proto-Baltic origin.

3.1. First the less intriguing one shall be discussed, the name of the biggest river flowing through Lithuania, the *Nėmunas*:

3.1.1. According to many researchers the river-name *Nėmunas* m. (3b) Al, Lp (37080) goes back to an adjective PBalt. **nemuna-* ‘bent, curvy’. As far as semantics is concerned, this is quite a good choice for that river – as for most rivers flowing slowly through the plains of Eastern and North-Eastern Europe. This adjective is regarded as a secondary derivative in **-na-* (< PIE **-nó-*) from an *u*-stem noun PBalt. **nemu-* ‘curve, bending’ from a root PIE **nem-* ‘bend’. Usually now the meaning of his root is rather thought to have been ‘bow, lean downwards’ (thus LIV² 453f.). This of course makes the etymology just mentioned look less straightforward. But probably it might work nevertheless.

But besides that we also find in Lithuanian words like Lith. *nėmuogė* f. ‘blackberry’ or *nėmūnė* f. ‘a mushroom growing in swampy, moist areas’. The argumentation for making an explanation of the two plant-names possible, is more or less as follows:

Starting from ‘curve, bending’ we get to an adjective ‘having curves, bendings’; ‘having curves’ might then be reinterpreted as ‘being uneven, not flat’, which might finally lead to ‘having higher and deeper places or parts’.

Then the development is twofold:

- a) ‘having higher places or parts’
 - ‘being dry’
 - ‘having dry floor/ground’
 - ‘forest’

→ ‘fir-forest’

→ *nēm-uogė* ‘*forest-berry’ > ‘blackberry’;

b) ‘having deeper places or parts’

→ ‘being moist’

→ ‘swamp’

→ *nemùnė* ‘swamp-mushroom’.

3.1.2. Of course also Lat. *nemus* n. ‘(holy) little forest’ somehow gets into the discussion. Generally it is thought that the primary meaning was ‘place, where the gods are attributed their share’. So we have here in Latin – besides PIE **nem-u-* which is probably continued in Baltic – an *s*-stem PIE **nem-e/os-*, which we also find in Indo-Iranian. Whether this Latin word is identical with OI *námas-* n. ‘veneration’, OAv. *nəmah-* n. ‘veneration’, depends in the end on the answer to the question, whether there were two roots in PIE **nem⁻¹* ‘attribute’ und **nem⁻²* ‘bow, bend oneself’ (thus LIV² 453f.) or whether there was only one root PIE **nem-* ‘distribute’ (thus EDLIL 405). If the last mentioned version is the correct one, it might be necessary to develop a new etymology for the river-name *Nēmunas*, as in that case we can hardly still presuppose an etymology meaning ‘the curvy, bent one’.

Maybe we have to presuppose for Baltic similar semantic developments as in Latin, where the development goes from ‘place, where their shares are attributed (to the gods)’ to ‘forest’. If this should be correct, PBalt. **nem-u-* might also have meant ‘forest’ just as PItal. **nem-e/os-* does, which leads to the conclusion that PBalt. **nemu-na-* might have meant ‘having forests (around itself)’. This meaning might then also be reflected in the plant-names *nēmuogė* and *nemùnė*. Of course, for the moment we cannot be completely sure about all that – but it seems worth thinking about it.

3.2. The second interesting name I stumbled upon during the project was that of the lake-name *Atesỹs* m. (3^b) Al, Mrs, Si (42705)³⁶ and the corresponding river-name *Atesė* f. (3^b) Si (34967):³⁷

³⁶ Cf. Savukynas 1960: 298; Savukynas/Vanagas/Vitkauskas/Vosylytė/Ermanyte 1963: 9; Schmid 1971: 41f. with fn. 20; Schmid 1972: 7; Vanagas 1970: 137; Vanagas 1981a: 50; Vanagas 1981b: 74, 96, 131; Kühebacher 1995: 65f. (with a completely different etymology for *At(h)esis/Etsch*); Pupkis 2002: 29; LVŽ 1: 201.

³⁷ Cf. Savukynas/Vanagas/Vitkauskas/Vosylytė/Ermanyte 1963: 9; Vanagas 1970: 137, 205; Schmid 1971: 41f. with fn. 20; Schmid 1972: 7; Vanagas 1981a: 50; Vanagas 1981b: 74; Kühebacher 1995: 65f.; Pupkis 2002: 29; LVŽ 1: 201, 204.

3.2.1. The lake-name Lith. *Atesỹs* (3^b) can be traced back to a pre-form PBalt. **at-es-(i)ia-*. According to general thinking the name is part of wider European contexts and is often compared to the name of the South Tyrolian river-name *Etsch*, which is attested in antiquity as *At(h)esis*. Whether *At(h)esis* goes back to **at-es-jo-*, which would correspond to the Lithuanian form, or **at-es-i-* we cannot tell. The two names are generally said to derive from a root PIE **h₂et(h₂)-* ‘go, wander’.³⁸ We see here most probably a derivative from an s-stem PIE **h₂et(h₂)-es-* ‘wandering, going’.

But semantics remain a problem: *Atesỹs* is a lake-name – and wandering around, i.e. moving ahead in one direction is not really, what lakes tend to do. Thus we come to the result, that maybe the equation *Atesỹs* : *At(h)esis/Etsch* found in onomastic literature since Hans Krahe and Wolfgang P. Schmid might be not completely correct. Sometimes already W. P. Schmid mentions also *Atesė* besides *Atesys* as does Greule quoting Schmid (cf. DGNB 135), but they are subsumed under one heading as ‘Gewässernamen’ (hydronyms) and are not differentiated as a lake-name and a river-name. If we do not want to think that the Alpine and the Lithuanian names are independent, but parallel formations, we must look for a connection – but it is different from what has been assumed so far.

A further connection is thought to exist with Thrac. *(*)at(-u)-*, supposedly meaning ‘stream, torrent’.³⁹ But Thracian as a ‘Trümmersprache’, about which we do not know hardly anything, is a bad candidate to prove anything at all. Together with Lat. *annus* ‘year’ < PIE **h₂et(h₂)-no-* (cf. EDLIL 43f.) and maybe Thracian **at(u)-* the Lithuanian hydronym might point to a group of words showing suffixes from the so-called Caland-Wackernagel-suffix-system (on that cf. Bichlmeier 2014 with further literature).

3.2.2. If this etymology is correct, then from the view-point of semantics, it seems more probable that the lake-name *Atesỹs* is a secondary derivative from the river-name Lith. *Atesė* < PBalt. **at-es-iā-*. That a river-name is based on a word meaning ‘wanderer’ or ‘wandering’ is a rather trivial affair, though we would still have to explain, how this ending-derivative really came into being, and why here the feminine form seems to be the primary one – as usually it is the other way around.

3.2.3. In Lithuania there are a few other hydronyms which have the same suffix-combination at the end – and do not have any connections with formations outside of Lithuania. There are for example Lith. *Eglesỹs* (Lith. *ėglė* f. ‘fir’),

³⁸ Cf. LIV² 273; IEW 69.

³⁹ Cf. Duridanov 1969: 90.

Žalesỹs (Lith. *žālias* ‘green’) etc.⁴⁰ But we have the problem that there is no way to make up an inner-Lithuanian connection for the element *at-*. On the other hand, hydronyms with the suffixal element *-es-* are mainly known from Eastern Lithuania.⁴¹

3.2.4. So in the end we have to say: The connection between *Atesỹs* and *Athesis* ‘Etsch’ does exist most probably, but it is not a direct one, as *Atesỹs* is a lake-name. The primary connection is with Lith. *Atesẽ* < PBalt. **at-es-iġā*- which might be an inner-Baltic restructuring of an older **at-es-i-*, which might also be preserved in *Athesis/Etsch*.

4. CONCLUSIONS

What can we learn from all that which has been presented here? Mainly three things:

1. The analysis and explanation of names is always a diachronic affair, synchronic linguistics hardly ever explains anything.

2. It is worth while to look closer at the semantics and structure of subgroups of names which have so far been often treated together: The comparative analysis of the two subgroups of hydronyms, the potamonyms and limnonyms of the Dzūkija-region showed significant differences in the percentage of the types of name-formation found. Further research concerning the rest of Lithuania is needed to find out, whether this is a normal feature all over Lithuania or something special. More research in that vein might be done: comparing amongst the microtoponyms the agronyms with the leimononyms might also bring nice results.

3. It is always worth the work and often even necessary to check, whether old etymologies are still valid. The older the etymologies are, the more so.

ABBREVIATIONS

Al – Alytaus seniūnija

Croat. – Croatian

CSlav. – Common Slavic

dimin. – diminutive

Germ. – German

Ka – Kapčiamiestis (Rayon Lazdijai)

⁴⁰ Cf. Vanagas 1970: 137f.; Vanagas 1981a: 99, 397; Vanagas 1981b: 91.

⁴¹ Cf. Skardžius 1943/1996: 311–313; Vanagas 1970: 136–138.

No – Noragelis (Rayon Lazdijai)
 Kr – Krokialaukis (Rayon Alytus)
 Ku – Kučiūnai (Rayon Lazdijai)
 Lith. – Lithuanian
 Lp – Leipalingis (Rayon Druskininkai)
 Lz – Lazdijai (Rayon Lazdijai)
 Mrs – Miroslavas (Rayon Alytus)
 NHG – New High German
 ORuss. – Old Russian
 PGerm. – Proto-Germanic
 PBalt. – Proto-Baltic
 PItal. – Proto-Italic
 PLith. – Proto-Lithuanian
 Pol. – Polish
 Pl. – Plural
 PIN – place-name
 PN – personal name
 PSlav. – Proto-Slavic
 Se – Seirijai (Rayon Lazdijai)
 Serb. – Serbian
 Sg. – Singular
 Si – Simnas (Rayon Alytus)
 Še – Šeštokai (Rayon Lazdijai)
 Šl – Šlavantai (Rayon Lazdijai)
 Šv – Šventežeris (Rayon Lazdijai)
 Te – Teizai (Rayon Lazdijai)
 Ve – Veisiejai (Rayon Lazdijai)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adamonytė Veronika 2019: Ursprung und Bildung der mit menschlicher wirtschaftlicher Tätigkeit verbundenen Agronyme der Gemeinden Kapčiamiestis und Veisiejai. – Grasilda Blažienė, Laimutis Bilkis (eds.): *Litauische Orts-, Flur- und Gewässernamen im europäischen Kontext*. (Schriftenreihe der Gesellschaft für baltische Studien 2). Hamburg: Baar 2019, 287–313.

ALEW – *Altlitauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Vol. 1: A-M. Vol. 2: N-Ž. Unter der Leitung von Wolfgang Hock und der Mitarbeit von Elvira-Julia Bukevičiūtė und Christiane Schiller bearb. von Rainer Fecht, Anna Helene Feulner, Eugen Hill und Dagmar S. Wodtko. Bd. 3: *Verzeichnisse und Indices*. Unter der Leitung von Wolfgang

Hock und der Mitarbeit vieler anderer bearb. von Rainer Fecht. (Studien zur historisch-vergleichenden Sprachwissenschaft 7), Hamburg: Baar 2015.

Bezljaj France 1956–1961: *Slovenska vodna imena. I. del (A-L). II. del (M-Ž)*, Ljubljana: Slovenska Akademija Znanosti in Umetnosti.

Bichlmeier Harald 2014: Caland System and Greek. – Georgios Giannakis (ed.): *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics [EAGLL]*, Leiden, Boston: Brill, 256–260.

Bichlmeier Harald 2019a: Morphologische und semantische Analyse der Gewässernamen des westlichen Südauskštaiten (Teil 2). – *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 80, 195–263. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.35321/all80-09>

Bichlmeier Harald 2019b: Morphologische und semantische Analyse der Gewässernamen des westlichen Südwestaukštaiten. – Grasilda Blažienė, Laimutis Bilkis (eds.): *Litauische Orts-, Flur- und Gewässernamen im europäischen Kontext*. (Schriftenreihe der Gesellschaft für baltische Studien 2), Hamburg: Baar 2019, 13–83.

Bichlmeier Harald 2020: Die häufigsten Suffixe in Familiennamen slawischer Herkunft: ein etymologischer Überblick. – *Namenkundliche Informationen* 111 (2019[2020]), 123–152.

Bilkis Laimutis 2019: Ursprung und Motivation der Helonyme. – Grasilda Blažienė, Laimutis Bilkis (eds.): *Litauische Orts-, Flur- und Gewässernamen im europäischen Kontext*. (Schriftenreihe der Gesellschaft für baltische Studien 2), Hamburg: Baar 2019, 85–123.

DGNB – Greule Albrecht 2014: *Deutsches Gewässernamenbuch. Etymologie der Gewässernamen und der zugehörigen Gebiets-, Siedlungs- und Flurnamen*. Unter Mitarbeit von Sabine Hackl-Rößler, Berlin, Boston: de Gruyter.

Duridanov Ivan 1969. *Thrakisch-dakische Studien. Erster Teil: Die thrakisch- und dakisch-baltischen Sprachbeziehungen*, Sofia: Verlag der Bulgarischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

EDLIL – de Vaan Michiel 2008: *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages*. (Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 7), Leiden, Boston: Brill.

ESSZI – Snoj Marko 2009: *Etimološki slovar slovenskih zemljepisnih imen*, Ljubljana: Modrijan / Založba ZRC.

IEW – Pokorny Julius 1959: *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* I, Band. München, Basel: Francke.

Kačinaite-Vrubliauskienė Dalia 2019: Ursprung und Motivation der südwestaukštaitischen Oronyme. – Grasilda Blažienė, Laimutis Bilkis (eds.): *Litauische Orts-*,

Flur- und Gewässernamen im europäischen Kontext. (Schriftenreihe der Gesellschaft für baltische Studien 2), Hamburg: Baar 2019, 185–220.

Kühebacher Egon 1995: *Die geschichtlich gewachsenen Namen der Täler, Flüsse, Bäche und Seen.* (Die Ortsnamen Südtirols und ihre Geschichte 2), Bozen: Athesia.

LitEW – Fraenkel Ernst 1962–1965: *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch.* 2 vols. (Indogermanische Bibliothek: 2. Reihe Wörterbücher), Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.

LIV² – Rix Helmut et al. 2001: *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen.* Zweite, verb. u. erw. Aufl, Wiesbaden: Reichert.

LVŽ¹ – Bilkis Laimutis (ed.) 2008: *Lietuvos vietovardžių žodynas I*, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.

LVŽ² – Bilkis Laimutis (ed.) 2014: *Lietuvos vietovardžių žodynas II*, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.

LVŽ³ – Bilkis Laimutis (ed.) 2018: *Lietuvos vietovardžių žodynas III*, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.

Mickienė Ilona 2019a: Südwestauktštaitische Drymonyme. Entstehung und Bildung. – Grasilda Blažienė, Laimutis Bilkis (eds.): *Litauische Orts-, Flur- und Gewässernamen im europäischen Kontext.* (Schriftenreihe der Gesellschaft für baltische Studien 2), Hamburg: Baar 2019, 221–249.

Mickienė Ilona 2019b: Die Onyme der Region Südwest–Aukštaitija: Überblick über Ursprung und Bildung der Wiesennamen. – Grasilda Blažienė, Laimutis Bilkis (eds.): *Litauische Orts-, Flur- und Gewässernamen im europäischen Kontext.* (Schriftenreihe der Gesellschaft für baltische Studien 2), Hamburg: Baar 2019, 251–286.

PKEŽ – Mažiulis Vytautas 1988–1997: *Prūsų kalbos etimologijos žodynas 4*, Vilnius: Mokslo.

PKEŽ² – Mažiulis Vytautas 2013: *Prūsų kalbos etimologijos žodynas.* Antrasis pataisytas ir papildytas leidimas, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos centras. Available at: <http://www.prusistika.flf.vu.lt> [without the pagination of the print version].

Pupkis Aldonas (ed.) 2002: *Vietovardžių žodynas*, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.

Savukynas Bronys 1960: Ežerų vardai [A]. – *Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai 3*, 289–299.

Savukynas Bronys 1961: Ežerų vardai [B]. – *Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai 4*, 216–226.

Savukynas Bronys 1962: Ežerų vardai [Č–D]. – *Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai* 5, 191–198.

Savukynas Bronys 1966a: Ežerų vardai [E–G]. – *Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai* 8, 183–194.

Savukynas Bronys 1966b: K probleme zapadnobaltijskogo substrata v jugozapadnoj Litve. – *Baltistica* 1/2, 165–176.

Savukynas Bronys, Vanagas Aleksandras, Vitkauskas Vytautas, Vosylytė Klementina, Ermanytė Irena 1963: *Lietuvos TSR upių ir ežerų vardynas*, Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla.

Schmid Wolfgang P. 1971: Zum litauischen Flussnamen *Aitra*. – *Baltistica* 7/1, 37–42.

Schmid Wolfgang P. 1972: Baltische Gewässernamen und die Vorgeschichte Europas. – *Indogermanische Forschungen* 77/1, 1–18.

Skardžius Pranas 1943/1996: *Lietuvių kalbos žodžių daryba / Die Wortbildung im Litauischen*, Vilnius/Wilna: Lietuvos mokslų akademija, Lietuvių kalbos institutas / Litauische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Institut für litauische Sprachforschung 1943. [Reprint: Rosinas Albertas (ed.): Skardžius Pranas: *Rinkiniai Raštai 1. Lietuvių kalbos žodžių daryba*, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas, 1996.]

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

Vanagas Aleksandras 1981a: *Lietuvių hidronimų etimologinis žodynas*, Vilnius: Mokslo.

Vanagas Aleksandras 1981b: Lietuvių hidronimų semantika. – *Lietuvių onomastikos tyrinėjimai = Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai* XXI, 4–153.

Zinkevičius Zigmantas 2008: *Lietuvių asmenvardžiai*, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.

Lietuvių toponimijos morfologija – įvairių vardų grupių skirtumai ir paralelės

SANTRAUKA

Straipsnio pradžioje kritiškai analizuojama ir tikslinama lietuviškų žodžių ir tikrinių vardų darybos terminija, pavyzdžiui, galūniniai vediniai ‘Endungsableitung’, priešdėliniai vediniai ‘Präfixableitung’ ir konversija ‘Konversion’. Antroje dalyje atliekama pietvakarių aukštaičių (dzūkų) upių ir ežerų vardų lyginamoji analizė, iš kurios aiškėja, kad abiejų

vandenvardžių grupių darybai būdingi tie patys darybos būdai, tik jų dažnumas kiekvienoje grupėje gana stipriai skiriasi. Stambiau klasifikuojant vedinius pastebima ta pati sintaksinių vedinių ir dūrinių hierarchija – ežerų vardų, kaip vedinių, žymiai daugiau, o dūrinių atvirkščiai – proporcingai mažiau negu upėvardžių. Mėginant detaliau klasifikuoti darybos principus, gaunami įvairesni rezultatai. Trečiojoje straipsnio dalyje pateikiamas upėvardžio *Nėmunas* ir ežerų *Atesys* bei *Atesė* patikslintas etimologinis aiškinimas ir susiję komentarai.

Įteikta 2020 m. kovo 6 d.

HARALD BICHLMEIER

Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg

Orientalisches Institut

Seminar für Indogermanistik und Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft

Ludwig-Wucherer-Str. 2

D-06099 Halle (Saale)

harald.bichlmeier@indogerm.uni-halle.de

Sächsische Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig

Arbeitsstelle Jena: Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Althochdeutschen

Zwätzengasse 12a

D-07743 Jena

harald.bichlmeier@uni-jena.de