

ANNALES
UNIVERSITATIS MARIAE CURIE-SKŁODOWSKA
LUBLIN – POLONIA

VOL. XXXVII

SECTIO FF

2-2019

WŁADYSŁAW MAKARSKI

John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Poland

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8275-5778>

e-mail: makarskiw@kul.lublin.pl

From the Methodology of Onomastic Research on Toponymy and Hydronymy Material¹

Z metodologii badań onomastycznych na materiale toponimii i hydronimii

The research problems related to anthroponymy, described in a previous article published in “Annales UMCS. Sec. FF” (2019, No. 1), are part of a broader context of onomastic study with a parallel methodology of research of the second most important stream of own nomenclature – toponymy and related hydronymy. I will show these mainly on the example of the selected local nomenclature of the eastern Lublin region, including especially the Zamość region – to a large extent the western part of the historical part of the Belz Voivodeship – with reference to analogous structures from a closer or further onymic context, especially the southern part of the Belz Voivodeship and the former Ruthenian Voivodeship: Chełm, Przemyśl, Sanok, Lwów and Halicz. Due to the historical and settlement-related history, the place and water nomenclature in this area is genetically heterogeneous: Polish or hybrid Polish-Ruthenian, with phonetically, less frequently morphologically, adapted names of Old Ruthenian or later Ukrainian origin. The choice of the analysed names was determined primarily by the methodological directives related to their effective analysis, which are indicated in the headings of individual parts of the article.

¹ In the first part of this article, concerning the oldest settlements in the historical territory of the Cherven Cities: Czerwień, Wołyń and Belz, no internal source and bibliographical footnotes are introduced. The detailed elaboration of the names of these settlements, with the reference to the entire text structure of this type, has an equivalent in a separate, extended study, which in this summary is signalled by a footnote at the end of the analysis of each of these names.

These toponyms were treated as examples and were extracted from a full naming-settlement map of Poland within its historical and contemporary borders. This map should be treated as a *text* in the full sense of the word (cf. Latin *tekstilis* “woven”, “knitted”, *textiles*) – a structure that, unlike a linear written text, retains a spatial feature, woven from many elements growing in time, as well as vanishing, proprial elements connected with threads to similar detailed and more general types of meaning and form created on the basis of analogy (the law of language economy, often resulting in undesired homonymy) and contrast (the law of polarization, arising from the need for social communicativeness of the used nomenclature) (Makarski, 1986, p. 9). From this rich “multi-layered fabric”, for the purposes of this article, elements have been arbitrarily selected, which form an artificial open collection, subordinated to accepted research tasks of a metatextual character (text with onomastic text). There are examples illustrating certain research issues, names which, due to certain shortcomings in their past and present interpretation or ambiguity of the examined matter of lexicalized or petrified forms, hiding unknown toponymic bases, constitute an intriguing subject of research.

IMMERSED IN A DISTANT PAST: IN SEARCH OF A SETTLEMENT TIME RECORDS AND ITS NOMINATION IN TRIBAL AND EARLY HISTORY – POLITICAL-HISTORICAL AND SETTLEMENT-ETHNIC IMPLICATIONS

The research problem that appears at the beginning of the analysis of a local name is often its actual record. In case of lack of the source base or its insufficient exploration by the researcher, the biography of a given name may be incomplete, and in physiographic cases the names of places² derived from microtoponyms or hydronyms may be shifted to the unspecified past, which makes it difficult to determine the proper stratigraphy of such toponyms.

In the studied material, this can be shown on the example of the oldest certified toponymic layer from the 10th–11th centuries in the territory of the so-called Cherven Cities – the term referring to a geographical-political land with unspecified borders, related with the tribal and early historical conflict between the Polish-Ruthenian

² In my works, I use the term *physiographic name* instead of the traditional *topographic name*. *Topography* is a term derived from Greek *topos* (“place”, “region”) and *graphein* (“to draw”, “to write”) (Kopaliński, 1989, p. 516). It means “description of the place” without specifying its properties, as indicated by the term *physiography* with a clear indication of its natural features: “natural description of the country, including geology, geomorphology, river network, climate, soil, vegetation and animal world” (SJPSzym, 1, p. 593).

Lendians (called *Lachy* in Ruthenian) and Ruthenians at the end of the 10th and beginning of the 11th century. There are three town names connected with this period: *Czerwien* (981), *Wołyń* (1018) and *Belz* (1030).

Czerwien in Tomaszów District near Tyszowce, recorded in Nestor's chronicle under the year 981 as *Červenъ*, and under 1136 as an expression *kolo Čbrvъna*, has a name with the structure of a simple adjective *godzien* (Eng. "worthy"), *pevien* (Eng. "sure"). It wrongly functions in Polish and Ruthenian historiography as the noun *Czerwień* (Eng. "red"), gen. *Czerwienia* instead of *Czerwien*, *Czerwna*, cf. *Gnieździen* > **Gniezno**, genitive *Gniezna*, in the form deduced from the adjective segment of the Ruthenian expression *gorody červenъskyja* from 1018. After the fall of the stronghold system in the 13th century, this settlement, after its disurbanization, had been known from the second half of the 15th century as **Czermno** 1463 in the neuter inflectional variant adjusted to the male root defined no longer as Ruthenian *horod* (Pol. *gród*) but Ruthenian *selo* (Pol. *siodło*), also with *ø* sound in a weak yer position, with the element *czerm-*, which is variant to the *czerv-* in the name *Czerwien*. The earlier name of this place in the masculine gender is probably a repetition of the name of the upper section of present Huczwa River or its left-bank tributary – Sieniochy, in the vicinity of which this place is located. It could have denoted a red-bottomed river. Such an initial hydronymic stage in the biography of the studied toponym does not allow to determine its proper records, probably dating back to tribal times, and consequently makes it impossible to determine its genetic linguistic status: whether East Slavic or West Slavic. This makes it impossible, first of all, for the linguistic forms of the onym, which, as Ruthenian *Červen* (Pol. *Czerwien*) are faithful translation correlates (Makarski, 2010b, pp. 146–150).

The toponym **Wołyń** near Hrubieszów, known since 1018 and written in Ruthenian sources as *Volynъ* or *Velynъ*, hides the now illegible Old Slavic element **Vol-* / **Vel-* with hypothetical meaning "damp" or "hill". This root, common to the Polish and Ruthenian languages, occurs in the derivation with the suffix *-yn* < Old Slavic **-ynъ* with a suffixal soft *-n'* characteristic for Old Ruthenian hydronymy and toponymy in such names as in the river **Horyń** in Volhynia or in the nominations of Old Ruthenian towns **Iskorosten'**, **Korsun'**, **Ksnajatyn'**, **Rjazan'** and others, which is clearly confirmed by the East Slavic appellatives, such as *belyn'* ("glade in a dark forest"), *gołyn'* ("a bare place"), *mokryn'* ("a wet place"). However, there are also some Polish toponyms for *-yn*, *-yn* < *-iń* such as **Budzyń**, **Cedyń**, **Dobrzyń**, **Modryń**, and even **Wołyń** in Lublin and Łódź voivodeships (Jakus-Borkowa and Nowik, 2010, p. 356), some of which, however, may turn out to be secondary to the original model for *-yn*, such as e.g. **Budzyn**, **Dobrzyn** (Jakus-Borkowa and Nowik, 2010, p. 348, 349), and in the Lublin region *Szlatyn* > **Szlatyń**, *Telatyn* > **Telatyń**, *Teratyn* > **Teratyń** and others (Czopek, 1988, p. 126). This means that the

word-forming model is less characteristic of the Polish than the Ruthenian onymy. In such a case, a typical Old Ruthenian *Wołyń* would have been a Ruthenian settlement in the early historical period. Its initial date of origin, like Czerwno discussed above, is, however, difficult to determine. If we were to accept Kazimierz Moszyński's suggestion that the name of the castle is a reiteration of the name of the *Wołyń* River – ambiguous, meaning a marshy river or in an upland environment – today it is *Huczwa* maybe from *huczeć* (Eng. “to buzz”) – then the name of the settlement would reach into the unspecified past, and linking it in this form to the period documented at the beginning of the 11th century would indicate a village and probably a region inhabited by Ruthenians at that time, which would exclude the presence of West Slavic Lachs, with whom Vladimir had waged war not long before in 981. According to Nestor's note, the area of these combat would include the Bug River and the San belt located south of Wołyń: from Czerwien in the north to Przemyśl in the south (Makarski, 2010b, pp. 150–154).

Wołyń, just like Czerwien, was disurbanized in the 13th century and for some time disappeared from the naming and settlement map. It appeared again after an unspecified period at the end of the 15th century (1400) as an ex-stronghold settlement *Gródek*, marking with such a nomination only the memory of the stronghold character of this place without mentioning its probably forgotten original name. Such a secondary nameless ex-stronghold nomenclature has numerous nationwide settlements named *Nowogród*, *Nowogródek*, *Grodzisko*, *Zamczysko*. Such an origin is also present in *Horodel*, a settlement on the Bug River Hrubieszów District, as recorded in 1287 (Janeczek, 1991, p. 138), later *Horodło*, and such a settlement reference can be found even in the name in the ethnic form of *Grodysławice* in Tomaszów District, first listed as Polish-Ruthenian *Hradzysławicze* (1444), *Hrodslawice* (1531) (Czopek, 1988, p. 166), to denote the inhabitants of a once mating place, using an anthroponymic neologism created according to a popular model of names with *-sław*.

The third of the above-mentioned settlement names is *Belz* with Old Ruthenian notations of *Bělzь* (1030, 1188, 1190) or *Belzь – u Belza* (1150), present-day *Belz* (pronounced as *Bełz*). It has been listed in Polish sources since the second half of the 14th century in the form of *Belz*, then *Belz*. Unlike the previously discussed Czerwien and Wołyń, this settlement was not disurbanized and, having been granted town rights in 1377, it became the capital city of the voivodeship during the Commonwealth period. Today, it is a peripheral town situated a few kilometres beyond the Polish border in Lviv Oblast in Ukraine; until 1951, it was still a part of Poland in Hrubieszów District. Although it is not present on our map today, it left its mark on the history of religious life in Poland: it was from Belz, in 1384, that Władysław Opolczyk, a governor of King Ludwig of Hungary in Rus, transported

the Byzantine icon of the Mother of God to the Pauline monastery founded in Częstochowa by him two years earlier.

The toponym *Belz* shares a common feature with the previous primary stronghold names: similarly to them, it has in its biography an initial “hydronymic” stage. The name *Belz*, similarly to *Czerwien*, is the original form of a simple adjective, such as *rad* (Eng. “glad”), *wesól* (Eng. “cheerful”), based on Old Slavic element **bьlz-* (with soft sonantic *l*) used to denote a glossy white stream flowing in an open, bright, unspoiled space or having a clean, sandy bottom, cf. the dialectal *belz(-z)y się* “[it] whitens – third pers. sg.”, as well as a variant of this element, Old Slavic **berz-* in Polish noun *brzoza* (Eng. “birch”, “tree with white bark”) (Brückner, 1927, p. 45). The hydronym *Belz* is related to the water name and the secondary place name ***Błozew*** (1370) in the region of Sambor (Ukr. *Bolozov* 1370 > *Bolozv(j)a*) (Makarski, 1999a, p. 37) based on the Old Slavic root **bolz-*, apophonic to **bьlz-* (cf. Brajerski, 1976, p. 88). The water name *Belz*, like the hydronyms *Czerwien* and *Wołyń*, has not been preserved either. Today, it is ***Solokija*** in an illegible, lexicalized form.

The *Belz* form discussed above, first hydronymic, then toponymic, occurs in the Polish language in phonetic form as *Belz*, for which the expected Ruthenian equivalent, in accordance with the law concerning the development of sonantic soft *l* after labial consonant before the dental one, should be **Bolz* as in *polnyj*, *volna*. On this basis, Tadeusz Lehr-Splawiński categorically states that this is one of the strongest philological arguments confirming the Western Slavic character of *Belz* and its surroundings – the settlements of Lachs, who were the target of Ruthenian invasive actions in the late 10th and early 11th centuries (Makarski, 2010b, pp. 154–158).

INSTABILITY OF THE SPOTS OF THE NAMING-SETTLEMENT MAP

The above-mentioned processes of settlement destabilization can be observed on the example of the later toponymy.

Medieval historical sources often record settlement processes similar to the above – situations of settling in deserted places as *loca deserta*, *pustynia* (Eng. “desert”), which can be shown by such places in the Sanok region as *loca deserta Dydnia* (1361); *pustynia [...] Hodle Pole* (1377); *silva vulgaritur dicta Poras* (1373) – then inhabited again with the preservation of the original names: ***Dydnia*** < Old Ruthenian **Dědnja* : **dědnij* (“belonging to the grandfather”); Old Ruthenian *(to) Hodlje*, then Polish *(te) Hadle* (***Szklarskie*** and ***Kańczuckie***) from Ruthenian personal name **Hodel’* / **Hodlja*: settlement name with Old Ruthenian root **Hodi-* > Ukrainian **Hody-* (Polish *Godzi-*, cf. *Godzimir*, *Godzislaw*) + *jь*; ***Poraż*** < Old Ruthenian *Poraż* : personal name **Porad* + *jь* (Makarski, 1986, pp. 61–62, 69, 129).

An illustration of such settlement instability at a later stage may be *Rachodoszcze* in Zamość District, recorded as a settlement name until the 18th century (Bondyra, 1992, p. 93). In this form, it is illegible. It becomes understandable only after the reconstruction of its initial form as Ruthenian **Radohošč(e)* > Polish-Ruthenian **Radochoszcze* (Polish **Radogoszcze*), submissive to phonetic metathesis as, e.g. in the case of Old Polish *žerucha* > *reżucha* > *rzeżucha*, which should be interpreted as possessive with archaic suffix *-j(e)* from the old type of Ruthenian compound personal name **Radogost* > **Radohost*, Polish *Radogost* (Malec, 1982, p. 73). All in all, it turns out that we are dealing here with an archaic, Old Ruthenian name of a village which disappeared, retaining its trace in the field name, then probably used in a changed, illegible form in the name of a newly established village. In NMP (10, pp. 9–10), this name, recorded since the beginning of the 19th century, was derived from the Polish name, and its mixed Polish-Ukrainian phonetic features were treated as a manifestation of late mutual interference.

Reactivation of the names of lost old settlements was sometimes associated with a change in their settlement status, such as establishing a village under Wallachian law in an old settlement, which in the Zamość region, for example, most probably concerned a village known today as *Lubycza (Królewska)* in Tomaszów District, originally *Lubicz* (more about that name later), listed on this settlement law at the beginning of the 15th century (Janeczek, 1991, pp. 145–146), and in Subcarpathia the above-mentioned *Hadle* in Przeworsk District – the oldest Wallachian village in today's Poland, established on the site called *Hodle Pole*, originally an Old Ruthenian settlement (Makarski, 1986, p. 69).

The instability of the naming and settlement map may manifest itself not only in the disappearance and establishment of a village with a renewed name in the same place. Often it is an irreversible process, when the reflections of previously established settlements after their disappearance were field or water names of places without settling reactivation. For example, in the Łęczna-Włodawa Lake District, such traces of lost villages with possessive names can be found: *Cieszacin*, *Luboviž*, *Sielubl* with *-in* and Old Slavic *-*jb*, derived from Old Slavic anthroponymic bases of Polish-Ruthenian **Cieszata* < Ruthenian **Tešata*, Polish *Cieszęta* (Malec, 1982, p. 67) + *in*, Ruthenian **Ljubovid* + *jb*, Ruthenian **Seljub* + *jb*, these name of lakes located near these former towns and villages has been preserved, which proves that the local naming memory has been maintained despite the visible no-settlement periods (Makarski, 1997/1998b, pp. 64–65). The microtoponymic traces of places once inhabited are the collective names that mark them: ethnic, craft-derived, patronymic and family names, which with their etymological meaning suggest the historical presence of the inhabitants of the settlements, later disappeared. For example, such names, of the type Polish-Ruthenian *Berestowicze* (Pol. **Brzostowice*),

Polish-Ruthenian *Dębowicze* (Pol. **Dębowice*), *W Tołyszkach*, *Za Bystrakami* in the eighteenth-century microtoponymy of the former Chelm region are included in an unpublished doctoral dissertation from 2006 by Mariusz Koper.

THE ETHNIC STATUS OF THE SETTLEMENT AND THE LINGUISTIC STATUS OF ITS NAME

An important element of linguistic analysis of names in ethno-linguistic mixed areas, where two systems of onomastic communication functioned until the Second World War, as in the case of the mentioned material from the southern wide strip of the Polish-Ruthenian borderland, is determining the linguistic origin of the name – Polish or Ruthenian. The names presented here may be genetically Ruthenian: Old Ruthenian and then Ukrainian from the second half of the 14th century, with their own linguistic, phonetic, morphological and lexical characteristics (Makarski, 1979, pp. 5–13), or genetically Polish after that period. As Ruthenian, they were properly adapted to Polish language, creating forms similar to the original, such as *Dydnia*, *Horodło*, *Poraż*, or clearly hybrid Polish-Ruthenian *Berestowicze*, *Cieszacin*, *Rachodoszcze*. The names in the purely Polish forms did not have to be of Polish origin, as they could be a faithful translation of Ruthenian forms. They could also be independent of them as parallel names. Therefore, they were not absolute in terms of the ethnos of the inhabitants of the settlements they designated, as shown by the example of the name of the early historic town of *Czerwien*, when the ethnos of the inhabitants of the village could have been determined by political and settlement-related extra-linguistic factors. I call such names studied in terms of their linguistic origins *neutral* (Makarski, 1999a, pp. 405–410). The absolutely Polish origin of toponyms can be found primarily among the forms with lexical appellative distinguishing features such as *Buda*, ethnic – *Masuria*, anthroponymic with names of the Latin church – *Banachy*, *Serafiny*, which, for example, can be illustrated by their participation in a rich, containing over 300 oikonyms (part of the village) and anoikonyms (field names), toponymic map of Kamionka Wołoska on the Rawa Ruska (today in Ukraine) (Makarski, 2003b, pp. 123–125). The types of toponyms distinguished in this way, because of their linguistic origins, are presented globally in the monographs of names of towns of the former Przemyśl (Makarski, 1999a, pp. 371–410) and Lviv (Czapla, 2011, pp. 272–298) regions. In other similar earlier works on the Sanok region and now the Polish part of the Chelm region and the Polish part of the former Belz region, only the Ukrainian nomenclature was evaluated statistically, treating the rest as the Polish nomenclature without any reference to settlement conditions (Makarski, 1986, pp. 214–222; Czopek, 1988, pp. 127–140).

RESIDUAL RECORDS OF THE NAME: POSTULATE OF
RECONSTRUCTION OF THE INITIAL FORM AND/OR INDIRECT
LINKS AND CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER OF RECORDS – POSTULATE
OF THE PROPER LESSON OF HISTORICAL RECORDS. ROLE OF
NAMING CONTEXTS

We have already dealt with residual records of the toponym above in connection with the analysis of the name *Rochodoszcze*, which requires reconstruction of the initial form of Ruthenian **Radohošče*, which has yet to be properly interpreted. The reconstructions are based on the analysis of a number of long illegible other toponyms such as *Obsza* < **Obsza*, *Obroc* < Ruthenian **Obvoroča*, which will be mentioned when these names appear in a different research context.

Wrong research path may sometimes be triggered by an incorrectly accepted chronological order of available notations of the name, as is the case with *Dolhobyczów* in Hrubieszów District, with the oldest notation *Dolobieczowo* (1436, 1548) (Czopek, 1988, p. 164), which in fact is secondary to the later listed form of *Dolhobyczów*, which can be properly interpreted as a possessive name with *-ów* derived from the patronymic anthroponym Ruthenian **Dolhobyč* : **Dolhobyt* + *jb* (Polish **Długobyc* : *Długobyt* + *jb*, cf. *Długomił* [Malec, 1982, p. 67]). This oldest written form of the toponym, like other transformed notations, such as *Dolobiczow* (1531), is a secondary sign of the early desemantization of this name, which has been unclear for a long time. The failure to determine the correct order of its entries led Barbara Czopek (1988, p. 84) to assess the name as unclear, but NMP (2, p. 395) already contains an ambivalent interpretation by the same author: “Perhaps from the Ukrainian expression *dolho byty* «to be somewhere for a long time» or from the name **Dolhobycz*”. Stanisław Rospond, who analyses the form *Dolhobyczów* as primary, wrongly sees a double toponymic suffixation: possessive from personal name **Dolhobyt* with **-jb* and secondary form with added viable suffix *-ów* (Rospond, 1984, p. 75).

It sometimes happens that the historical form of the name is wrongly interpreted and as such leads to a wrong research path. The lesson of the oldest records is used to resolve the problem, which, in the case of a lexicalized, illegible toponym, requires launching a complex research instrumentarium, referring to the foundations of reconstructed and naming analogous structures. Let the illustration of such action be the local name *Świerze*, indicating a village near Dorohusk in Chełm District, recorded since 1443 as *Swirze*, in 1564 as *Swierze*, then, like today, as *Świerze*. In accordance with the contemporary norm, these notations should be read as *Świrze* > *Świerze* with the group *rż* < *rg*, which is also preserved in the local form of the name *Świerze* (Czopek, 1988, p. 196). Therefore, it is wrongly interpreted

as *Świrze* > *Świerze* with ancestral meaning from personal name *Świrz* > *Świerz* (SNWsp, 9, p. 467, 459), which is included by Czopek (1988, p. 76) in the group of names derived from appellatives, without, however, a detailed interpretation of its basis. In fact, the examined local name is a plural form derived from the base of the appellative base **świrz* > **świerz* with thematic -g- and hidden suffixal Old Slavic *-jb. This lexeme is related to the onomatopoeic verb *świrgotać* > *świergotać* alternative to *świrkotać* > *świerkotać*. The latter is used in the derivation *śwircz* / *świercz* > *świerszcz* to denote an insect, with the Old Slavic suffix *-jb that forms the names of actors (Boryś, 2005, pp. 622–623). Similarly to this noun, the derivation *świrgotać* > *świergotać* formed an unconfirmed in sources noun **świrz* > **świerz*, used in the studied toponym in plural to describe a settlement with a tangle of Bug-adjacent streams, ponds or springs with indication of their “chirping” acoustic properties. The name of the tributary of San, *Świerz*, treated by Janusz Rieger (1969, p. 166) as unclear, is in fact secondary to **Świrz* > **Świerz* with the above-mentioned meaning.

They indicate the acoustic properties of the waters present in a given place, corresponding with equally metaphorical names, such as *Świerszczów* in Hrubieszów District, commonly known *Szczebrzeszyn* or *Szczekarzów* > *Krasnystaw*, which will be discussed in more detail, **rozgdykana Gdyczyna* in Brzozów District (Makarski, 1999b, pp. 115–125) (earlier treated by me as possessive name [Makarski, 1986, p. 65]), **belgoczacy (belkoczacy) Belwin* < *Bielgina* near Przemyśl (Makarski, 2001, pp. 115–127), **skomlejace (skamlejace) Skomielno(-e)* Lake in the Łęczna-Włodawa Lake District (Makarski, 1997/1998b, p. 60). Similar are also the onomatopoeic hydronyms in the Roztocze region, such as *Sopot*, *Szum(y)*.

IN SEARCH OF LOST TOPONYMIC FOUNDATIONS: ONOMASTIC ARCHAEOLOGY

The names *Belz*, *Rachodoszcze*, *Dołhobycze*, *Świerze* and others, discussed above, generate a separate research case related to decrypting appellative and anthroponymic bases hidden in the lexicalized names and preserved in them. As fossils, they are the subject of exploratory research, namely “onomastic archaeology”. I tried to discover several dozen of such petrified lexemes in Polish and Ukrainian varieties on the naming-settlement map of Przemyśl Region. These include such names as Polish **bybel* in the toponym *Bybel* in Staryi Sambir Raion, with a *byb-* element as alternative to *bab-* and *beb-*, cf. *babrać*, *bablać*, *beblać*, to indicate “mud”, “moor”; **kocierz* in the toponym *Kocierzyn* in Mostyska Raion, in connection with the Old Slavic element **kot-* / **kotj-* used in the appellative *kocanki*,

kocenki (“catkins”), to mark lowland areas covered with bushes with flowers called figuratively *catkins*; **wywłoka* to mark the river bed, literally land dragged out of water, signalling the non-existing village of *Wywłoka* in the area of Kuryłówka in Leżajsk District, or **dymnia* in the name of the village *Dymnia* in Skole Raion which meant a primitive industrial plant (Makarski, 2003c, pp. 215–232).

Lexis concealed in the toponymy is not limited only to noun bases. These can also include unknown verbs and / or their derivatives. Let the illustration of this be the names of two villages from the Przemyśl Region: *Ożomla* in Yavoriv Raion (present Ukraine) and *Ożanna* in Leżajsk District. Among the oldest records of the first toponym: *Oschomla* (1441) and a little younger *Ożehomlya* (1479), the latter is the initial form. It has Ruthenian origin as *Ożehomlja* (Pol. **Ożegomia*) > **Ożomlja* (disappearance of intervocalic *h*, then *eo* > *o*). It was built on the historical form of the past participle with the suffixal *-m-* **ożehomyj* : **ożehati* > **ożehaty* (Pol. **ożegomy* : **ożegać*, cf. present day adjectives *ruchomy*, *lakomy*, *znikomy*), substantivized by the suffix *-ja* (Makarski, 1996/1997, pp. 389–396). The second name – *Ożanna*, originally **Ożżona*, with the notation *Osszona* (1458) – is a form of another past participle, with *-n-* **ożżona* from the Old Polish verb *ożec* < **ożęti* “to burn”. The form of the toponym with a double *-nn-* and thematic *-a-* is a manifestation of alignment with the adjective pattern on the *-anna* as in regional *szklanna*, *słomianna* (Makarski, 1999a, p. 196). According to Rieger (1969, p. 118), the name derives from *ożyna* (“blackberry”). Both these cultural toponyms indicate that the forest area is being developed by burning.

FROM THE LIFE OF NAMES: THEIR PHONETIC-MORPHOLOGICAL-LEXICAL DEVELOPMENT

The etymology of a name, discovered after greater or lesser difficulties, does not have to exhaust its description. Registered in various forms, it may present itself as an unstable form in terms of phonetics and morphology, which reflects its linguistic development, conditioned by systemic and optional historical processes of language, and in the case of borderland toponymy, also by Ukrainian interference. Let this be illustrated by the formal evolution of the toponym *Lubycza Królewska* in Tomaszów District, recorded as *Lubicz* (1420) (Bondyra, 1992, p. 64). Originally as a masculine gender form with *-icz*, it was inflectionally transformed into a feminine noun, adjusting to the pattern of feminine nouns with a soft consonant ending (historically or permanently), cf. types of alternatives *ten goleń* (incorrect) / *ta goleń*, *ten oręż* / *ta oręż* (incorrect), and then to an unambiguous model of feminine nouns ending with *-a*, cf. *wesz* > dialectal *wsza*, *mysz* > dialectal *myszka*. These processes

were accompanied by a phonetic exchange of Polish *bi* into Ukrainian *by*, hence not **Lubicza*, but *Lubycza*, and at the initial stage of the name in Polish, a change from soft *l'* to neutral *l* occurred: *L'ubicz* > *Lubycza*. The originally synthetic name *Lubicz* > *Lubycza*, due to the development of the village, the appearance of a new one next to the older village of a different legal status, was lexically differentiated by means of new attributive elements, such as *Lubycza Królewska* (private) and *Lubycza Kameralna*, also known as: *Lubycza Wieś* and *Lubycza Kniazie* (Koper, 2014, pp. 77–89). This kind of analyses of the development of the linguistic form of the name, “mistreated” in the dictionary parts of toponomastic monographs, and sometimes even omitted, deserves more attention. Although they do not condition the solution of the name’s origin, which is sought after as a priority, they emphasize the varied life of a name when appropriately taken into account.

TOPONYMIC HOMONYMY

The source of research discomfort, along with the above-mentioned source deficiencies, erroneous lessons of the oldest records, deficiencies in the recognition of lost bases, is the language system itself – word-formation homonymy, when a given linguistic form, toponymic in this case, can be attributed with an ambiguous meaning, due to different functions of the same suffix and different meanings of the basis. This applies above all, as Witold Taszycki noted a long time ago, to models with suffixes, *-ów*, *-owa*, *-owo* or with physiographic names based on these models (traditionally called *topographical*), which are very distinct in our toponymy (Taszycki, 1937, pp. 104–111). A dichotomy of this kind was noticed in relation to toponyms with stems that could be understood as derivatives from the bases of appellative or appellative anthroponyms, connected – in the first case directly, in the second indirectly – with flora and fauna. The researchers’ proposals for any of the options were different. For Mazovian names such as *Brzostowo*, *Brzozowo*, Karol Zierhoffer (1957, p. 20) takes priority to qualify them as topographical, while names such as *Turowo* are treated by him as possessive, which the author explains by the fact that an animal, unlike plants, as a moving element of nature, is of little use for describing a place. However, this may be contradicted by not necessarily possessive names, such as *Żurawłów*, *Komarów* in Zamość District, *Sumin* in the Łęczna-Włodawa Lake District, associated with a permanent marshy or watery environment. The appreciation of the animal world in personal naming – secondarily toponymic: possessive, patronymic, ancestral – gained in Aleksandra Cieślukowa (1998, p. 73) the rank of a separate nomination principle, which is teriomorphism, visible even in comparisons such as *głupi*, *więc baran*; *powolny*, *więc żółw*.

As far as plants are concerned, place names are generated by Czesław Kosyl (1978, p. 36) within the framework of the discussed model of toponyms with *-ów*, *-owa*, *-owo* in the Lublin region, following statistical principle, generally included in the topographical, because personal names such as *Bez*, **Bór*, **Trześnia*, *Wiśnia*, as potential bases are rare or there is no confirmation for them. However, this view is not entirely correct, as we can recall the names of the most popular trees, such as *dąb*, *brzoza*, *buk* or *grab*, which constitute an important anthroponymic base of great morphological diversity (Makarski, 2010a, pp. 119–155), and consequently also toponymic (including the possessive name next to the patronymic or ancestral) (Makarski, 2006, pp. 57–100).

Within the examined toponymic model with *-ów*, *-owa*, *-owo*, *-in-*, greater problems than the arboreal or floristic nominations are caused by the names with other stems, which can be shown on the example of names of the Bug River villages in the Hrubieszów region, such as **Czumów** (*Czumow* 1400) (Czopek, 1988, p. 163), **Kosmów**, with the oldest record with *-owo* – in reality a secondary element – as *Kosmowo* (1376) (Czopek, 1988, p. 173), **Kryłów** listed since 1430/1431 (Bondyra, 1992, p. 60), **Swierszczów** (*Swierszczow* 1419) (Czopek, 1988, pp. 195–196), **Rogalin** (1921) (Czopek, 1988, p. 189). These names can be associated with a possessive meaning from the appropriate personal name derived from appellative: *Czuma* (SNWsp, 2, p. 309), **Kosm* or *Kosma* (SNWsp, 5, p. 187), Ruthenian **Krylo* (Pol. *Skrzydło*) (SNWsp, 7, p. 477), *Świerszcz* (SNWsp, 8, p. 120), *Rogal(a)* (SNWsp, 9, p. 458) (cf. Czopek, 1988, pp. 58–61), or with the same suffix *-ów* in a structural function to be treated as physiographic, if the toponyms are based on an appellative in a metonymic or metaphorical sense. Then: **Czumów** would mean unhealthy place, plagued by disease after frequent floods of the Bug River, **Kosmów** would be a place situated in *kosmy* – a dense network of Bug tributaries, **Kryłów** – a place flanked by a river, **Swierszczów** would be located near a murmuring stream with the metaphorical use of the name *świerszcz* as a source of sound similar to the delicate sound of river water (cf. the above-mentioned name *Świerże*), and **Rogalin** would mean a settlement in a deep bend of the river.

The physiographic model of dehydronymic acoustic toponyms also includes the old stronghold of **Szczebrzeszyn**, recorded as *Szczebressyno* (1352) under the post-Ruthenian rule of Poland (Czopek, 1988, p. 195) in a neuter form secondary to *Szczebrzeszyn*, with a name denoting a place in the **szczebrzeszący* section of the Wieprz River, derived from the verb **szczebrzeszyć* – a contaminated form of the verb *szczebiotać* and *brzechać* (*brechać*) – to denote the peculiar acoustic effects of flowing and/or churning water. (Therefore, the beetle, which sounds in reeds and is associated with *Szczebrzeszyn* in a Polish rhyme, finds a sensible complement in “*szczebrzeszący Wieprz*”). This onym with the *-in* model corresponds with the

nearby, also “acoustic” *Kawęczyn* 1567 (Bondyra, 1992, p. 53) from *kawękać* (about frogs), meaning a marshy area on the same river. In NMP (4, p. 381), it is a possessive name from the personal name *Kawęka* : *kawęczyć* (“to complain”).

In the above meaning type of water-derived names, this time with the structure based on *-ów-*, we can also include the old *Szczekarzów*, recorded in Ruthenian chronicles as *Ščekarevŭ* (1219) (PSRL, 2, p. 162), from the second half of the 14th century *Krasnystaw*, located on the *szczekający* (Eng. “barking”) section of the same Wieprz River at the mouth of the *Żółkiewka*. The name of this city includes a double multi-level derivation: first a form was created with *-arz* for the microhydronym **S(-s)zczekarz*, as in *świegotarz* (Klemensiewicz, Lehr-Spławiński and Urbańczyk, 1965, p. 198), *zwońiarz* (GramPol, 2, p. 42), derived from the verb *szczekać* (Eng. “to bark”) for metahprocial marking of the loudly “barking” part of the river, and then a toponymic figure appeared in the form of *Szczekarzów* with the structural *-ów*. Therefore, the toponyms *Szczekarzów* and *Szczebrzeszyn* did not have to be possessive names (Czopek, 1988, p. 59, 60) created from the personal name **Szczebrzesz* or **Szczebrzecha* or from **Szczekarz*, in both cases without source records.

Homonymy may also result from the morphological unclarity of the name’s ending, which can be interpreted in different ways. This applies, for example, to the formations with *-cze* in the area of the Zamość region, which is clearly present in this preferred area. Such names are used by the Old Ruthenian settlements on the Bug River, and among them: *Matcze* (1436) near Horodło (Bondyra, 1992, p. 71) and *Ślipcze* (Ruthenian *Slepčė* 1376) near Hrubieszów (Czopek, 1988, p. 195), and outside the Bug valley communal *Mircze* (1411) (Czopek, 1988, p. 181) in Hrubieszów District, which can all be treated as possessive (Czopek, 1988, p. 58), if one looks at the particle *-cze* to see the possessive suffix *-je* added to the corresponding anthroponyms: Old Ruthenian **Mat’ko*, **Slěpko* > Ukrainian **Slipko*, Old Ruthenian **Mirko* > Ukrainian **Myrko*, or as physiographic derivatives with suffix *-cze* from appellative bases. Then *Matcze* would mean a muddle of streams, *Ślipcze* – a place situated over a blind branch of the Bug, *Mircze* – a secluded place exposed from the winds (from *mir* – “peace”, “calm”). About 15 km south of Mircze is *Żabcze*, listed since 1492 (Bondyra, 1992, p. 143), with the name derived from *żaba* (Eng. “frog”) (not from *żabka* or the personal name *Żabka*) to mark a marshy area rich in frogs. Not far from this village is *Hulcze* < *Holcze* (*Holczye* approx. 1449) (Czopek, 1988, p. 169) **Holcze* (Pol. **Gorcze*), denoting bare places. Near Bełż (today in Ukraine), we find a phonetic variant of this name as *Hijče* < *Hujče* < *Holče* with *l* > *j* as a result of the disturbance of the distribution of these sounds in Ukrainian dialects (Polish pre-war *Hujcze* with Ukrainian *u* as in *Hulcze*, showing an intermediate stage of development of Ukrainian *o* > *i* in a closed syllable). The names of the lakes in the Łęczna-Włodawa Lake District with names with *-cze*, such

as **Lukcze**, have an unambiguous, also physiographic, meaning: *luk(a)* – “curved lake”, **Bikcze** from Ukrainian *bik* (Pol. *bok*) to indicate the lateral location of the lake, probably in relation to the inhabited area, or **Rotcze** : Ukrainian *rot (usta > ujście)* (Eng. “mouth of the river”) (Makarski, 2002, pp. 55–64).

Here, also as a physiographic names, and not as possessives with *-j-*, names with suffix *-icz* can be implemented, like already mentioned **Lubicz** > **Lubycza** (**Królewska**), derived previously from personal name *Lubik* : *Lubomir* (NMP, 6, p. 226), also treated as a Mazovian heraldry-derived name or a name of Romanian (Wallachian) origin, while this toponym can be explained as a form based on the Old Slavic element **l'ub- / *lub-* meaning “liber” > “trough, ditch, sewage” or “wetland with dense grass” (Makarski, 2017b, pp. 152–168), corresponding to the local names such as *Lubynia* (*Lubynya* 1359), then **Lubenia** near Rzeszów (Makarski, 1986, p. 101), or water names in the basin of the San River, **Lubienia**, **Lubnica**, **Lubinka** (Rieger, 1969, pp. 89–90). In the same sense as the root *lub-*, its variant *tub-* was used in the place name **Lubcza** (*Lupcza* 1409), formerly also **Lubcze** (*Lupcze* 1491) (Czopek, 1988, p. 177), in Tomaszów District, where the model for *-cze / -cza* (Makarski, 2017b, pp. 164–167) was made. Confirmation of the physiographic character of the original onym **Lubicz** can be found in the analogous structure of the name of an Old Ruthenian settlement on the Rawa Ruska (today on the Ukrainian side) **Potelicz** (1262) > **Potylicz** (Janeczek, 1991, p. 211) derived from the name of the **Telicz** River with the Old Ruthenian element *těl-* (Polish *cial-o*) to denote the marshy river. An even older realisation of this type of onyms is the name of the Old Ruthenian town of **Halicz** (1113), the capital of the Principality of Halych and Halych-Volodymyr (IM, 134), which has a physiographic motivation connected, among other things, with the meaning of “bare” (Czyżewski, 2010, pp. 103–119). The later reflection of this name is the Polish-Latin macrotoponym *Galiczyja* > **Galicja**. Such an interpretation of **Lubicz** would also fit into the national model of a large number of dozens of Polish topographic names with *-icz* such as **Dębicz**, **Grabicz**, **Wiśnicz** or cultural names such as **Trzebicz** : *trzebić* – “to cut (forest)” or **Łowicz** : *łowić* – “to fish” (Jakus-Borkowa and Nowik, 2010, p. 507), which do not have such a clear quantitative equivalent among appeals, where the suffix is “extremely rare” (GramPol, 2, p. 73).

The degree of difficulty in etymological analysis of a name may depend on the complexity of its morphological structure. Let us demonstrate it on the example of the village of **Radecznicza**. **Radecznicza** is the name of an old village in Zamość District, noted since 1399 as **Rodecznicza** (in the 18th-century copy) (Czopek, 1988, p. 189) and under this form in 1564 (Rospond, 1984, p. 319), but also **Radecznicza** (1827) (Czopek, 1988, p. 189) as today. This naming formation has been interpreted differently. Stanisław Rospond, taking **Radecznicza** as the initial form of this toponym, and **Rodecznicza** as a secondary one (with dialectal pronunciation *a* as

o), associates it with the lexeme of *rad*, *radosny* (Eng. “joyful”) to describe the picturesque location of this place, without conducting a word-formation analysis of this name, commented with a casual statement that it is an artificial structure (Rospond, 1984, p. 319). Czopek (1988, p. 64) tackles this problem by taking as the initial form of the examined name the previously cited *Rodecznica* and interpreting it as possessive name with anthroponymic base *Rodek* : *Rodosław* (NMP, 10, p. 28), with an unusual, let us add, possessive formant *-nica*, which would assume a two-stage process of derivation: in the first stage with a rare possessive suffix *-no(-e)*, as in *Ambroźno*, *Pawliczne* (Borek, 1968, p. 347), and in the second stage with a nominalization of this form by means of the suffix *-ica*.

Referring to both variants of the studied name, i.e. *Rodecznica* and *Radecznica*, one can recall yet another interpretation of the name – as a dehydronymic form, which referred to the Old Indo-European alternative character of elements **rod-* / **rad-* (**red-*) having the meaning of “scrape” / “scratch”, suitable for fast rivers, as in the nationwide *Radęca*, *Radawa*, *Radawka* (Rospond, 1984, p. 456), and *Rada*, *Radawica*, *Radzica* in the San basin (Rieger, 1969, pp. 134–135). In the studied onym, this element in the *rad-*, and not in the *rod-* variant, as in the earlier records of this name, could be permanently used first to create a water name **Radeczna* by means of a complex formant *-eczna*, isolated from structures of the *taneczna*, *śloneczna*, *święteczna* type, and then in the name of the settlement formed on the river with the name formally contrasted with this hydronym by means of the nominal suffix *-ica*, cf. similar processes noted by Aleksander Wilkoń (1963, p. 119): *Rokitnica* from *Rokitna*, *Sępolnica* from *Sępólna*. The name of the **Radeczna* river, on which *Radecznica* is situated, has been changed to *Por*, while maintaining a significant link with the old hydronym, because *Por* is also a fast river, cf. *prąca* – “pressing” / “thrusting”. In this way, the discussed local name would become a type of toponyms based on hydronyms, which are a large semantic group indicating the dynamism of water – in a legible way, as in the names such as *Bystra*, *Bystrzyca*, *Ryjka*, or metaphorical, as in the nominations of *Świńcza* > *Świlcza*, *Wieprz*, or less obvious, as in the descriptions of *chodliwy Chodel*, *władcza* < **włocza Włodawa*, *zabierająca brzegi Bircza*, or in a completely concealed way, as in the name of the village in Sanok District, *plująca Pielnia* < *Pelwel* (Makarski, 2000, pp. 141–145).

DEANTHROPONYMIZING THE TOPONYMY

I am aware that the option presented by me, which leads to a contestation of the etymological findings of the toponyms often discussed here as personal within the framework of specific word-forming models, may raise a methodological accusation

of overinterpretation, a desire to match the results of research to the thesis of the physiographic nature of this kind of nomenclature adopted in advance. I would like to defend my research attitude, based not only on the proven detailed philological principles of etymological analysis, but also on a more general epistemological measure, which concerns the choice and content of the linguistic understanding of reality, when man in his sensualistic approach to the world around him first described what he saw, heard, felt, touched. Hence, the priority of physiographic interpretation over any other etymology, including personal interpretation. Among the various elements of nature, the inhabitants of a given place paid particular attention to life-giving water, especially freshwater rivers and lakes, which marked out the oldest settlement routes, hence its reflection in hydronymy, which belongs to the oldest geographical naming layer, reused in oikonymy.

By attaching such importance to this kind of interpretation of geographical nomenclature, an attempt was made here to realize a postulate demanded long time ago by Rospond (1983, p. 26) to deanthroponymize toponymy in order to “topographize” it, which entails the requirement that onomastic analyses should not be conducted only in offices, but also – as in the case of impressionists – accompanied by a bit of fieldwork. If the autopsy is not always possible, we should use very detailed maps, descriptions of the place in tourist guides or recently natural science Internet data (Makarski, 2017a, pp. 39–81).

FIELD CONDITIONS AS A NAMING FACTOR

Closer identification of the natural conditions of the area, as in the case of many toponyms indicated above, allows to determine the significance of mysteriously de-classified names of places with a blurred morphological structure, such as, e.g. *Obsza* or *Obroc.* **Obsza** is the name of a village in Biłgoraj District, listed as *Psy* (1426), *Psze* (1508), *Pscha* (1589) (Makarski, 1999a, p. 190). Noted in NMP (8, pp. 26–27) as ambiguous, in reality it was formed from the name of a section of the river today nicely called *Złota Nitka* (“a golden thread”), with an extraordinary twisting course, pushing itself around on all sides. Originally, it was named **Obpsza* < Old Slavic **Obъръчja*. Unjustifiably, because of the distorted oldest record, I explained it as the name of a field which is hard to cultivate, as suggested by Rospond concerning the name of the Wrocław municipal district **Psie Pole** (Makarski, 1999a, p. 190). Although it was first recorded in this form in 1580 (Bondyra, 1992, p. 82) and later in 1603, 1827 (NMP, 8, p. 22), **Obroc.**, a name denoting a village near Zwierzyniec, could have had its distant prehistory as a field name after the lost settlement, which is evidenced by its high degree of lexicalization. Declared in

NMP (8, p. 22) as unclear – maybe from the verb *broczyć* (“to spray”, “douse”), it can be interpreted as originally from Old Ruthenian **Obvoroča* (Pol. **Obwroca*) < Old Slavic **Obvortja*, meaning an unusually winding section of the Wieprz River, on which the village is situated. The present form of *Obroc* < **Obrocza* was formed as a result of contamination of the Ruthenian **Oboroč(a)* < **Obvoroč(a)* and Polish **Obroc(a)* < **Obwroc(a)*.

In a camouflaged way, the physiographic content, also dehydronymic in a way, more precisely the “marshy” type, is hidden by the complex toponym *Tarzymiechy* in Krasnystaw District, with the oldest notation as *Tharszmechi* (1419) (Bondyra, 1992, p. 117), which is not a collective nickname for people trading in bellows “bags”, as Cieślíkowa wrote in her Internet answer to an Internet user’s question about the meaning of the name [*Poradnia Językowa PWN*], but a humorous term for rural residents – men wallowing their “bellows” (scrotum) in the swamp. The author reads the first part of this name written down as above as *Tarżymiechy* with *ż*, treating this consonant as a reflection of the palatalized *g* in the base *targować*, while it is actually an element of the grapheme *rż* < Old Slavic **rʹ*, later simplified into phonetic *ż*, although written in the old way as *rz*, in another verbal base of the discussed toponym – *tarzać*, which was pronounced in the Old Polish way also with the group *rż* as *tarzać*. The name of the village *Kanofosty* < **Kalnochfosty*, in the Lviv region, has a similar meaning. The indicated meaning of the toponym *Tarzymiechy* is confirmed by the natural conditions of the place: the village lies on the branch of Wieprz with its marshy surroundings (Mieg, 2015).

In a funny way, it characterizes the muddy terrain and people moving there in an isolated name of the village *Hopkie* in Tomaszów District, recorded since 1409 (Bondyra, 1992, p. 42), derived from the verb *hopkać* (“to jump”) (Ukr. *hopkaty* ‘ts.’) to mark a marshy area, which requires an appropriate jumpy movement to traverse it. The form of the name, adjusted to the adjectival model with *-kie*, as in *lekkie*, *lepkie*, *słodkie*, in NMP (3, p. 490), was wrongly – even hypothetically – treated as a possessive name from the German personal name *Hoppe* or Ukrainian *Hopko*.

It happens that the dehydronymic names analysed herein motivate each other. This coincidence can be seen in the change of the already discussed name of *Szczekarzów* to *Krasnystaw* – in relation to the Old Ruthenian settlement of *Szczekarzów*, which was named after the famous section of the flowing Wieprz, and in relation to the newly founded, in 1394, town of *Krasnystaw*, by contrast, the nomination was based on standing water in the pond. Kazimierz Rymut (1987, p. 119) assumed that: “Perhaps the pond was a natural river basin at the tributary of the Żółkiewka River to the Wieprz River”. It would therefore be the same place first called **Szczekarz*, with acoustic motivation, and then *Krasnystaw* – a colour-related motivation from a pond characterized by *krasny* (“red”) colour of its water or

bottom. However, the researcher attributes a different meaning to the name, namely “a beautiful pond”, according to the meaning of the attributive *krasny* (“beautiful”), which would assume an aesthetic approach to geographical nominations, which are much less frequent than physiographic neutral ones. Meanwhile, this name fits in very well with the “colourful” names of rivers, lakes and ponds and secondary settlements located by them, present in the whole of Poland: names containing red colour, such as *Krasnobród*, *Krasne*, *Kraśnik*, *Ruda*, *Rudka*, *Rudnik*, *Róża*, *Różanka*, *Różany Stok* “pink spring” (and not “rose slope”), *Rusawa*, *Czermna* and the aforementioned *Czerwien*, or in another “colour” variety, such as *Biała*, *Biale*, *Białystok* (“white spring”), *Bielsko-Biała* or the aforementioned *Betż* and *Czarne*, *Czarna*, *Czersk*, Baltic-Slavic “black” *Krzna*, *Złociec* > *Złojec* in Zamość District, *Złota Nitka* – a tributary of Tanew, *Żółkiew* in Krasnystaw District and near Lviv, distant-borderland *Żółte Wody* described by Henryk Sienkiewicz, or *Modryń* in Hrubieszów District.

PHYSIOGRAPHIC NAMES WITH DOMINANCE OF DEHYDRONYMIC NAMES

The physiographic group of names presented above reveals itself as a set of numerous dehydronymic names inscribed in the naming-settlement map, diversified in terms of form and meaning. In some natural conditions it can be a dominant nomenclature, as it can be seen in the toponymy I studied along the Bug riverside strip (on the Polish side) with a width of up to several kilometres from Wola Uhruska in Włodawa District to Dołhobyczów in Hrubieszów District (in the text not yet published), where out of 90 names of settlements located there over 20, or nearly 1/4 of the total number, is a nomenclature related to water (with some toponyms that have already been discussed here), such as *Cichobórz* < *Cichobuże*, *Czumów*, *Janostrów*, *Kosmów*, *Kryłów*, *Krynica*, *Matcze*, *Mircze*, *Ostrów*, *Rogalin*, *Ruda*, *Ślipcze*, *Świerszczów*, *Świerże*, *Turka*, *Uchanka*, *Uhrusk*, *Wołyń* > *Gródek*, *Wołynka*, *Zareka* or marsh-derived *Mastomęcz*, which are explained by a dense network of large and small left-bank tributaries of the Bug River, blind river branches, ponds and the marshy character of this waterside area.

A compact naming nest of physiographic names with dominant dehydronymic names can be shown, for a change, on the example of a mountain region – the upper Dniester River basin in the Przemyśl region. This nomenclature was registered in one document from 1397, concerning the location of the villages of Skola and Tuchla. The source text reads: *in campis desertis [...] cum omnibus agris, pratis [...], silvis [...], gays, borris [...], lacubus, palludibus, Horewa, Buthomla,*

Zyelyemyanka, Libochora, Rozanka et Slawka dictis, stagnis que Scharzyny dicuntur. The above-mentioned names of field and water objects seem to be preserved in the memory of the 14th century inhabitants of this area as signs of older settlements destroyed as a result of Polish-Hungarian-Ruthenian fights, Tatar invasions or natural disasters. This broken tradition of settlement and old nomenclature is later referred to by local Boyko villages with Wallachian law, such as **Butla** (1665) < *Butomla* (1397), **Libochora** < *Lubochorza* (1565), *Orawa* (1629) or **Oriawa** (1886), **Rożanka** (1574), **Slawsko** (1483) and **Zelemianka** (20th century) (Makarski, 2004, pp. 59–69; 2005, pp. 119–121). They illustrate the (already discussed above) problem of toponymic instability associated with settlement fluctuation, shown here on the example of settlements with not dispersed but compact locations. All these physiographic patters show a connection with water and its marshy environment: *Butla* < *Butomla* as a nominalized form with suffix *-ja* of Ruthenian participle **butomyj*: Old Slavic *butěti* (“to rot”) (Makarski, 1996, pp. 103–108); *Libochor(z)a* < Ruthenian *Ljubohorja*: *ljubity* > *ljubyty hory* + *ja* (a sign of a narrow mountain river?); *Or(i)awa* in connection with the element **or(z)-* “fast”; *Slawsko* from the water name *Slawka* in connection with the Old Slavic element **slav-* / **slov-* (“to run”, “to flow”), *Rożanka* / *Różanka* to mark the reddish colour of the river bed. This dehydronymic toponymic semantic field contains the names of the oldest settlements in the region, which were founded in 1397: **Tuchla** < Ruthenian **Tuchla* + *ja* in connection with Old Slavic **tuch-* / **tačh-*, cf. Pol. *stęchły*, and *Skola* > **Skole** in connection with the Old Slavic element **skol-* / **skal-* / **skel-* (“to split”, “to cleave”, “to crack”) with the most probable physiographic significance of “splitting a stream” (Makarski, 1999c, pp. 255–267), i.e. the kind attributed to numerous, especially in the mountainous regions, **Roztoki** “mountain torrents”.

Discontinuing this onomastic narrative, I treat it as an open text, with the possibility of its explicatory and exemplary completion and verification by the Reader on the basis of his onomastic knowledge.

Finally, returning to the question posed at the beginning of what the analysis of the names presented here teaches us, it is necessary to answer, with reference to the second part of this article concerning toponymy and hydronymy, the need to sharpen the methodological awareness of the research on the subject concerning: a) proper collection of the source base, b) proper reading of historical records of the name, c) reconstruction of the original form and missing links in the name history, necessary in case of incomplete documentation, d) taking into account phonetic,

morphological and lexical variants of names in order to determine their linguistic development line and possible deviations from it, e) correct semantic and formal analysis with recognized homonymy and fundamental and metaphorical meaning of the bases, f) recalling analogous closer and further toponymic or hydronymic context, g) taking into account ethnic and linguistic conditions which determine the linguistic (here Polish or Ruthenian) and extra-linguistic, historical and settlement, genesis of names, h) in the case of ambiguous names, taking into account the frequency of anthroponymic bases, in an attempt to indicate the priority of any of the possible etymological interpretations. All these aspects of the analysis of toponymic and hydronymic nomenclature are not a discovery (cf. Kaleta, 1998, pp. 45–81). While present in the rich onomastic research, they are only a record of requirements, which gives rise to an appeal for their inclusion, sometimes with the use of a multi-threaded “detective” attitude of tracing the source of the name through its meticulous, “microsurgical” analysis within the framework of the traditional “hard” (from a structural point of view) linguistics. Such a maximalist research challenge should be a response to the old warning of Kazimierz Moszyński, who wrote: “While all scientific research requires great caution and criticism, this caution and criticism must be at least tripled for onomastic research, especially toponymic research” (Moszyński, 1939, p. 1605). Effective decryption, while maintaining this research attitude, of unclear, ambiguous or misinterpreted onyms, though insignificant for social communication, has for me, and may also have for those interested, the value of illumination, a cognitive surprise, and reading all the names in an onomastic text, thanks to such “flavours”, may be an interesting lecture indeed.

The research results obtained with the use of optimal methodological requirements have a significant impact on synthetic conceptualizations of any analysed naming and settlement map: statistics and stratigraphy of semantic and morphological types of toponyms, where physiographically significant oikonyms may be a reflection of the earlier field and water nomenclature with an unspecified metric. This also applies to deanthroponymic names, with records delayed in relation to the time when the settlement was established, without a preserved locating act concurrently with its nomination.

The methodological and substantive content presented in this article gives rise to a pragmatic postulate. Insufficient consideration of the above-mentioned analytical conditions may have resulted in erroneous or doubtful analyses in onomastic particular works and synthetic studies, which were partially verified through reviews of these works (in the above text, I admitted to some mistakes made earlier in etymological analysis of names). In the output of Polish toponymic thought, a special position due to its universal audience is occupied by a dictionary publication entitled

Nazwy miejscowe Polski, in which some toponyms are interpreted differently or treated as unclear, and should be confronted with other interpretative proposals that have appeared in literature since its publication (from 1996 to 2017, with the final headword beginning with *Sn-*), and published in a supplement to that compendium.

The analysis presented here, based on selectively excerpted material from the personal and geographic naming area, oriented, first of all, towards its etymological research, fits within the wide range of more or less traditional onomastic studies in the following aspects: a) taxonomic related with the classification of names in terms of form and meaning (Makarski, 1986, pp. 17–22; 1997–1998a, pp. 39–50; 1999a, pp. 22–24), b) functional – their use in literature, e.g. in the *Roman Triptych* by John Paul II (Makarski, 2005, pp. 161–170), in *Pan Tadeusz* by Adam Mickiewicz (Makarski, 2007b, pp. 89–111), in *Prawda starowieku* by Stanisław Vincenz (Makarski, 2008a, pp. 51–71), in the literary output of Juliusz Słowacki (Makarski, 2015, pp. 109–120), in the patrocina (Makarski, among others, 2008b, pp. 163–205), iconography, chapel inscriptions (Makarski, 2009, pp. 311–333) or cemetery inscriptions, c) genology – the use of proper names as determinants of types of literary and office-related messages (birthdays, weddings, deaths, evidence formulas, etc.), maps, catalogues, telephone directories, indices, vehicle timetables, etc. (Makarski, 2007a, pp. 38–46), or d) translation (Makarski, 2003a, pp. 105–127). This rich area of onomastic research is broadened by such sections as zoonymy and phytonymy, and above all by the recently “top”, content-rich chrematonymy, which introduces onomastics into the field of sociolinguistics, a new electronic space of information and Internet communication, oriented towards the present day, and which are in my research, rather immersed in the past, and sometimes very distant, absent. These are new research challenges, which does not mean that they are reversed from the “onomastic classics” that I tried to present here in my own way.

Translated into English by Marek Robak-Sobolewski

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- GramPol – Łoś, Jan. (1922–1925). *Gramatyka polska*. Cz. 1: *Głosownia historyczna*. Cz. 2: *Słowotwórstwo*. Lwów: Drukarnia Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego
- NMP – Rymut, Kazimierz, Czopek-Kopciuch, Barbara, Bijak, Urszula. (1996–2017). *Nazwy miejscowe Polski. Historia. Pochodzenie. Zmiany*. Vol. 1–14. Kraków: Instytut Języka Polskiego PAN
- PSRL – *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisej*. Vol. 1–2. (1845–1846). Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografiâ Ėduarda Praca. [*Полное собрание русских летописей*. Т. 1–2. (1845–1846). Санкт-Петербург: Типография Эдуарда Праца.]

- SJPSzym – Szymczak, Mieczysław (ed.). (1978–1981). *Słownik języka polskiego*. Vol. 1–3. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN
- SNWsp – Rymut, Kazimierz (ed.). (1992–1994). *Słownik nazwisk współcześnie w Polsce używanych*. Vol. 1–10. Kraków: Instytutu Języka Polskiego PAN

REFERENCES

- Bondyra, Wiesław. (1992). *Słownik historyczny miejscowości województwa zamojskiego*. Lublin–Zamość: s.n.
- Borek, Henryk. (1968). *Zachodniosłowiańskie nazwy toponimiczne z formantem -ьн-*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Boryś, Wiesław. (2005). *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.
- Brajerski, Tadeusz. (1976). *Język staro-cerkiewno-słowiański*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego.
- Brückner, Aleksander. (1927). *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*. Kraków: Krakowska Spółka Wydawnicza.
- Cieślíkowa, Aleksandra. (1998). Miejsce przezwiska w systemie antroponimicznym. Historia a współczesność. In: Stefan Warchoń (ed.), *Przezwiska i przydomki w językach słowiańskich*. Cz. 1 (pp. 71–80). Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Czapla, Anna. (2011). *Nazwy miejscowości historycznej ziemi lwowskiej*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego.
- Czopek, Barbara. (1988). *Nazwy miejscowe dawnej ziemi chełmskiej i belskiej (w granicach dzisiejszego państwa polskiego)*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich. Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk.
- Czyżewski, Feliks. (2010). W sprawie mikrotoponimu *Hały*. In: Dagmara Nowacka, Maria Borciuch, Albert Nowacki, Mateusz Jastrzębski (eds.), *Z lubelskich badań nad Słowiańszczyzną Wschodnią. Księga dedykowana Profesorowi Michałowi Łesiewiczowi* (pp. 103–119). Lublin: Wydawnictwo Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego.
- Jakus-Borkowa, Ewa, Nowik, Krystyna. (2010). *Nazwy miejscowości w Polsce. Układ a tergo*. Opole: Wydawnictwo Nowik.
- Janeczek, Andrzej. (1991). *Osadnictwo pogranicza polsko-ruskiego. Województwo belskie od XIV do początku XVII wieku*. Wrocław–Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk.
- Kaleta, Zofia. (1998). Kierunki i metodologia badań. Terminologia. In: Ewa Rzetelska-Feleszko (ed.), *Polskie nazwy własne. Encyklopedia* (pp. 45–81). Warszawa–Kraków: Wydawnictwo Instytutu Języka Polskiego PAN.
- Klemensiewicz, Zenon, Lehr-Splawiński, Tadeusz, Urbańczyk, Stanisław. (1965). *Gramatyka historyczna języka polskiego*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Kopaliński, Władysław. (1989). *Słownik wyrazów obcych i zwrotów obcojęzycznych*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Wiedza Powszechna.
- Koper, Mariusz. (2014). *Nazwy geograficzne gminy Lubycza Królewska. Słownik historyczno-onomastyczny*. Lubycza Królewska: Fotopia. Wydawca.
- Kosyl, Czesław. (1978). *Nazwy miejscowe dawnego województwa lubelskiego*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Łoś, Jan. (1922–1925). *Gramatyka polska*. Cz. 1: *Głosownia historyczna*. Cz. 2: *Słowotwórstwo*. Lwów: Drukarnia Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

- Makarski, Władysław. (1979). Z metodologii badań toponomastycznych obszarów językowo mieszanych (na przykładzie toponimii historycznej ziemi sanockiej). *Roczniki Humanistyczne*, 27(6), pp. 5–13.
- Makarski, Władysław. (1986). *Nazwy miejscowości dawnej ziemi sanockiej*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego.
- Makarski, Władysław. (1996). Z toponimii bojkowskiej: *Butla i Butelka*. *Slavia Orientalis*, 45(1), pp. 103–108.
- Makarski, Władysław. (1996/1997). Z toponimii pogranicza polsko-ruskiego: Ożomla. *Annales UMCS. Sectio FF*, 14/15, pp. 389–396.
- Makarski, Władysław. (1997/1998a). O klasyfikacji nazw miejscowych raz jeszcze. *Roczniki Humanistyczne*, 45/46, pp. 39–50.
- Makarski, Władysław. (1997/1998b). Pojezierze Łęczyńsko-Włodawskie w świetle nazw jezior, stawów i bagien. *Roczniki Humanistyczne*, 45/46(6), pp. 51–68.
- Makarski, Władysław. (1999a). *Nazwy miejscowości dawnej ziemi przemyskiej*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego.
- Makarski, Władysław. (1999b). Rozgładkana Gdyczyna. *Roczniki Humanistyczne*, 47(6), pp. 115–125.
- Makarski, Władysław. (1999c). Z toponimii bojkowskiej: Skole. *Slavia Orientalis*, 48(2), pp. 255–267.
- Makarski, Władysław. (2000). Z toponimii i hydronimii łemkowskiej: Pielnia. In: Ewa Wolnicz-Pawłowska, Wanda Szulowska (eds.), *Kontakty językowe polszczyzny na pograniczu wschodnim. Prace ofiarowane Profesorowi Januszowi Riegerowi* (pp. 141–145). Warszawa: Semper.
- Makarski, Władysław. (2001). Z toponimii pogranicza polsko-ruskiego: Bełwin. In: Feliks Czyżewski (ed.), *Język i kultura na pograniczu polsko-ukraińsko-białoruskim* (pp. 115–127). Lublin: Instytut Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej.
- Makarski, Władysław. (2002). Łukcze, Bikcze, Rotcze i inne zagadkowe nazwy wodne na Pojezierzu Łęczyńsko-Włodawskim. *Poznańskie Spotkania Językoznawcze*, 10, pp. 55–64.
- Makarski, Władysław. (2003a). Adaptacja nazw własnych w tekstach i językach naturalnych. In: Richard Sokolowski, Henryk Duda, Konrad Klimkowski (eds.), *Warsztaty Translatorskie 3* (pp. 107–127). Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego.
- Makarski, Władysław. (2003b). Obraz onomastyczny jednej wsi na pograniczu polsko-ukraińskim. *Roczniki Humanistyczne*, 51(6), pp. 101–131.
- Makarski, Władysław. (2003c). W poszukiwaniu starych rzeczownikowych apelatywów fizjograficznych i kulturowych w nazewnictwie miejscowym pogranicza polsko-ukraińskiego (na przykładzie toponimii dawnej ziemi przemyskiej). In: Dmytro Buczek, Hanna Martynowa (eds.), *Język ukraiński: współczesność – historia* (pp. 215–232). Lublin: Instytut Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej.
- Makarski, Władysław. (2004). Onomastyczny obraz regionu Skolego w świetle pewnego dokumentu z końca XIV wieku. *Drohobyc'kyj Krajeznawčyj Zbirnyk*, 8, pp. 59–69.
- Makarski, Władysław. (2005). Onimiczny kształt *Tryptyku rzymskiego* Jana Pawła II. *Język Polski*, 85, pp. 161–170.
- Makarski, Władysław. (2006). Nazwy najpopularniejszych drzew w Polsce jako baza toponimiczna. *Roczniki Humanistyczne*, 58(6), pp. 57–100.
- Makarski, Władysław. (2007a). Nazwy własne jako wyznacznik typu wypowiedzi. In: Danuta Ostaszewska (ed.), *Gatunki mowy i ich ewolucja*, Vol. 3, Cz. 2 (pp. 38–46). Katowice: Wydawnictwo Gnome.
- Makarski, Władysław. (2007b). Przestrzeń w *Panu Tadeuszu*. Jej onomastyczne i inne wyznaczniki. In: Władysława Książek-Bryłowa, Małgorzata Nowak (eds.), *Język polski. Współczesność. Historia* (pp. 89–111). Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego.

- Makarski, Władysław. (2008a). Czytanie nazw geograficznych w *Prawdzie starowieku* Stanisława Vincenza. In: Magdalena Graf, Stanisław Mikołajczak (eds.), *Spisane słowa, formy i myśli. Prace ofiarowane Profesorowi Zygmuntowi Zagórskiemu w 80. rocznicę urodzin* (pp. 51–71). Poznań: Wydawnictwo Poznańskie Studia Polonistyczne.
- Makarski, Władysław. (2008b). Wezwania świętyń na Kresach wschodnich. In: Mirosława Oldakowska-Kuflowa, Mirosława Kawecka (eds.), *Poznawanie sąsiadów. Z zagadnień religijnych w polskiej i ukraińskiej kulturze* (pp. 163–205). Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego.
- Makarski, Władysław. (2009). Kapliczki, figury i krzyże przydrożne – deskrypcje, nominacje, inskrypcje. In: Władysława Książek-Bryłowa, Henryk Duda, Małgorzata Nowak (eds.), *Język polski. Współczesność. Historia*, Vol. 7 (pp. 311–333). Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Makarski, Władysław. (2010a). *Dąb* jako baza antroponimiczna. *Roczniki Humanistyczne*, 58(6), pp. 119–155.
- Makarski, Władysław. (2010b). Z dziejów mapy osadniczo-nazewniczej współczesnej Zamojszczyzny. Najstarszy stan jej onimii (X–XI w.). In: Henryk Duda, Władysława Książek-Bryłowa (eds.), *Język polski. Historia. Współczesność* (pp. 143–162). Zamość: Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego.
- Makarski, Władysław. (2015a). Szkic o tytułach utworów Juliusza Słowackiego. *Dialog Dwóch Kultur*, 10, pp. 109–120.
- Makarski, Władysław. (2015b). Z metodologii badań nazw niejasnych i niejednoznacznych. In: Feliks Czyżewski, Marek Olejnik, Alicja Pihan-Kijasowa (eds.), *Pogranicza słowiańskie w opisie językoznawczych* (pp. 215–226). Lublin–Włodawa: Polihymnia Wydawnictwo.
- Makarski, Władysław. (2017a). Odantroponimizować toponimię. Na przykładzie odrzecznych i odbagiennych nazw miejscowych Zamojszczyzny. In: Marcin Kojder, Marek Olejnik (eds.), *Onomastyka na pograniczach językowo-kulturowych* (pp. 39–81). Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Makarski, Władysław. (2017b). Nazwa miejscowa *Lubycza* oraz jej onimiczne bliższe i dalsze konotacje. In: Mariusz Koper (ed.), *Ziemia Lubycza. Geografia, historia, język, kultura* (pp. 143–179). Lublin–Lubycza Królewska: Fotopia, Urząd Miejski.
- Malec, Maria. (1982). *Staropolskie skrócone nazwy osobowe od imion dwuczłonowych*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk.
- Mieg, Friedrich von. (2015). *Galicja na józefińskiej mapie topograficznej 1779–1783, Vol. 8, part A and B, Warszawa, na podstawie rękopisu F. von Mieg, Karte des Königreichs Galizien und Lodomerien, 1:28000, 1779–1783*. Warszawa: Instytut Archeologii i Etnologii PAN.
- Moszyński, Kazimierz. (1939). *Kultura ludowa Słowian. Cz. 2*. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności.
- Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisj*. Vol. 1–2. (1845–1846). Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografiâ Èduarda Praca. [Полное собрание русских летописей. Т. 1–2. (1845–1846). Санкт-Петербург: Типография Эдуарда Праца.]
- Rieger, Janusz. (1969). *Nazwy wodne dorzecza Sanu*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Rospond, Stanisław. (1983). *Słowiańskie nazwy miejscowe z sufiksem -jъ*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Rospond, Stanisław. (1984). *Słownik etymologiczny miast i gmin PRL*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Rymut, Kazimierz. (1987). *Nazwy miast Polski*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Rymut, Kazimierz (ed.). (1992–1994). *Słownik nazwisk współcześnie w Polsce używanych*. Vol. 1–10. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Instytut Języka Polskiego PAN.

- Rymut, Kazimierz, Czopek-Kopciuch, Barbara, Bijak, Urszula. (1996–2017). *Nazwy miejscowe Polski. Historia. Pochodzenie. Zmiany*. Vol. 1–14. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Instytut Języka Polskiego PAN.
- Szymczak, Mieczysław (ed.). (1978–1981). *Słownik języka polskiego*. Vol. 1–3. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Taszycki, Witold. (1937). Rzekomo dzierzawcze nazwy miejscowe (znaczenie przyrostków *-ów, -owa, -owo, -in, -ina, -ino*). *Język Polski*, 22, pp. 104–111.
- Wilkoń, Aleksander. (1963). Polskie nazwy miejscowe od nazw wodnych. *Onomastica*, 8, pp. 87–124.
- Zierhoffer, Karol. (1957). *Nazwy miejscowe północnego Mazowsza*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.

ABSTRACT

The subject of the article are toponyms with different morphological structures, with the suffix *-ów*, such as *Szczekarzów > Krasnystaw, Czumów*, with the suffix *-in*, such as *Szczebrzeszyn*, names with the suffix *-cz-*, such as *Mircze, Matcze, Łowicz, Lubicz > Lubyca* or others, such as *Belz, Czerwien, Wołyń, Radecznica, Obrocz, Obsza, Tarzymiechy*. These include renewed or derived water names. The main objective of the analysis is to reflect on the methodology of toponymic and hydronymic research. The author attempted to decrypt localised names, to verify their etymology, pointing to the sources of their ambiguity (source shortages, deficiencies in discerning the properties of natural named places, omitting the toponymic context and explaining local names, erroneous reading of the morphological structure of the onyms and its base without considering its historical, often metaphorical meaning, incorrect choice of the initial form of the name on the basis of incomplete source documentation, and erroneous reading of old name entries). In the case of naming homonyms (ambiguous names), the postulate of establishing the hierarchy of the degree of credibility of the proposed etymologies was pointed out, taking into account structural linguistic determinants, name records, its geography, seriality or uniqueness, closer and further naming contexts and preferences in nominations of elements of the perceived world – people and places – by man.

Keywords: methodology of toponymic research, methodology of hydronymic research, explaining local names, naming homonyms, etymology

ABSTRAKT

Przedmiotem artykułu są toponimy o różnej strukturze morfologicznej, z sufiksalnym *-ów*, takie jak *Szczekarzów > Krasnystaw, Czumów*, z sufiksalnym *-in* w rodzaju *Szczebrzeszyn*, nazwy z sufiksalnym *-cz-* typu *Mircze, Matcze, Łowicz, Lubicz > Lubyca* czy jeszcze inne, takie jak *Belz, Czerwien, Wołyń, Radecznica, Obrocz, Obsza, Tarzymiechy*. Wśród nich są ponowione nazwy wodne lub od nich derywowane. Nadrzędnym celem prowadzonych analiz jest refleksja nad metodologią badań toponimicznych i hydronimicznych. Autor podjął próbę deszyfryzacji nazw miejscowych zleksykalizowanych, weryfikacji ich etymologii, wskazując na źródła ich dwuznaczności (niedostatki źródłowe, braki w rozeznaniu właściwości naturalnych miejsc nazywanych, pomijanie kontekstu toponimicznego i objaśniania nazw miejscowych, błędne odczytanie struktury morfologicznej onimu oraz jego podstawy bez uwzględnienia jej historycznego, nierzadko metaforycznego znaczenia, niewłaściwy wybór formy wyjściowej nazwy na podstawie „dziurawej” dokumentacji źródłowej, błędne odczytanie starych zapisów nazwy). W wypadku homonimii nazewniczej (nazw dwuznacznych czy wieloznacznych) wskazano na postulat hierarchizowania stopnia wiarygodności proponowanych

etymologii, biorąc pod uwagę wyznaczniki strukturalno-językowe, metrykę nazwy, jej geografę, seryjność lub wyjątkowość, bliższe i dalsze konteksty nazewnicze oraz preferencje w nominacjach elementów postrzeganego świata – ludzi i miejsc – przez człowieka.

Słowa kluczowe: metodologia badań toponimicznych, metodologia badań hydronimicznych, deszyfryzacja nazw miejscowych, homonimia nazewnicza, etymologia

Article submission date: 11.07.2019

Date qualified for printing after reviews: 04.09.2019