EWA ORONOWICZ-KIDA

University of Rzeszów, Poland
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7646-2023
e-mail: oronowicz@o2.pl

Topographical Names in Polish Plateonymy – Scope and Evolution of the Term

Nazwy topograficzne w polskiej plateonimii – zakres i ewolucja terminu

INTRODUCTION

Topographical names, also called *topographical-type names* or *names with topographical motivation*, were introduced to Polish linguistics in a publication entitled *Słowiańskie nazwy miejscowe* by Witold Taszycki (1946). However, this term had already appeared much earlier in the works of historian Tadeusz Wojciechowski, who, as a result of research into Polish toponomastic material undertaken for historical and settlement purposes, divided Polish place names into five semantic groups. Apart from patronymic, possessive, craft-derived and family names, there are also topographical onyms expressing, according to the author, the natural properties of the terrain and constituting, from the very beginning of its existence, its term (Taszycki, 1946, p. 11).

The classification of local names proposed by Wojciechowski was accepted not only in Polish historical literature, but also in linguistic literature. It was also mentioned by Taszycki, who created a semantic classification of Polish local names. With full recognition of the advantages of Wojciechowski's proposal, he expanded and improved it, and topographical names became an important part of it. Expressing the topographical or geographical property of the settlement, e.g. *Biała*, *Zagórze*, *Żabno*, they were included in the group of local names, which are always the names of the village. Topographical names in Taszycki's view refer to the

location of the village, its geological resources, flora and fauna; they are "a concise characteristic of the landscape", and "an expression of one or another characteristics of the land", they "contain a descriptive element", and "refer to a certain characteristic recognizable by means of the senses" (Taszycki, 1946, pp. 42–54).

In Taszycki's view, topographical names reflect the landscape, natural or geographical features of the settlement.[1] From the very beginning, Taszycki's classification found followers among the researchers of Polish urban naming, although

---

[1] Such an understanding of topographical names directly refers to those dictionary definitions in which *topography* is defined by referring only to natural objects of a terrain, e.g. as "details related to the surface of a country or terrain, e.g. mountains, valleys, rivers, forests" (*Nowy słownik języka polskiego*, 2002, p. 1036). It should be noted that in the general dictionaries of the Polish language published in the 20th and 21st centuries, definitions taking into account not only natural, but also artificial objects of the terrain, are predominant. For example, *topography* is "an accurate description of the location of a small town, taking into account the properties of soil, water, trees, roads, bridges, railway lines, telegraphs, buildings and population" (*Słownik języka polskiego*, Vol. 7, 1953, p. 82); "all external features of the terrain concerning its sculpture, location of objects, roads, etc." (*Słownik współczesnego języka polskiego*, Vol. 5, 2000, p. 57) or "a set of external attributes of the area: its sculpture, trees, watercourses, roads, buildings, etc." (*Słownik języka polskiego*, Vol. 4, 2003, p. 834). Against this background, a distinctive standpoint is that of Witold Doroszewski, for whom *topography* is "the shape of the surface, including its objects" (*Słownik języka polskiego*, Vol. 9, 1967, p. 187) without a clear indication what type of objects is involved. The type of objects is also not specified in the online version of *Wielki słownik języka polskiego PAN*, where *topography* is defined as "the location of various objects located in a specific, separated area" (https://www.wsjp.pl). The encyclopaedic definitions are similarly diversified, and can be divided into general ones, e.g. "a set of external features of the terrain, i.e. sculpture and mutual location of terrain details" (*Wielka Encyklopedia PWN*, Vol. 27, 2005, p. 484) and more precise, e.g. "a set of external attributes of the area, such as: sculpture, hydrography, types of applications, buildings, roads, etc." (*Nowa encyklopedia powszechna PWN*, Vol. 6, 1996, p. 415). Both dictionaries and encyclopaedias also refer to the understanding of *topography* as a scientific term in geography, geodesy or cartography. From this point of view, it is assumed that *topography* is a "technical discipline which is a branch of geodesy, and simultaneously cartography, dealing with methods of topographic photographs of the Earth's surface, as well as with methods of making topographic maps and their updates" (*Słownik pojęć geograficznych*, 1973, p. 504) or in short "a branch of geodesy dealing with methods of preparing topographical maps and updating them" (*Podręczny leksykon terminów kartograficznych i geodezyjnych*, 2003, p. 54). The word *topographical* as an adjective, on the other hand, boils down to "referring to topography, concerning land relief" (*Słownik języka polskiego*, Vol. 9, 1967, p. 187), "referring to topography, used in topography" (*Słownik współczesnego języka polskiego*, Vol. 5, 2000, p. 57) or "meaning the location of something, presenting on a plane the relief of the terrain, concerning the place, the location of something" (*Nowy słownik języka polskiego*, 2002, p. 1036). In onomastic works, the scope of understanding of the notion of topography is diverse. For example, a broad approach is proposed by Kwiryna Handke, according to whom the term *topography* includes both elements of open space: fields, meadows, forests, roads, waters, hills, etc., as well as elements of the area within urban development – all types of buildings, various fragments of fortifications, such as ramparts, walls, keeps, towers, gates and monuments, squares, markets, parks, estates, parts of the city, districts, *jurydyki* – if they were not separate towns, and streets (Handke, 1970, p. 60).

not all of his semantic classes specific to place names were reflected in Polish urbanonymy. The productive categories in both collections included topographical names, next to cultural and possessive onyms. While classifying the urbanonyms chosen for scientific scrutiny according to semantic and lexical criteria, representatives of successive generations of onomasticians studying urban naming use the term applied in relation to place names[2], but they also propose their own concepts. The analysis of numerous linguistic proposals in this respect, starting from the 1960s and ending with the latest works published in the second decade of the 21st century[3], gives grounds for the statement that over the years two understandings of the term *topographical names* have crystallized in relation to Polish urbanonyms: the first one of a narrow nature, and the second of a broad nature. For the sake of order, it should be noted that in *Urbanonimia Rzeszowa* (Myszka, 2016), one of the latest monographs on Polish urban naming, the term *topographical names* does not appear at all. It adopted a division based on naming archetypes occurring in the nomenclature of ancient Rome, supplemented by models created in medieval European cities (localizing, directional, characterizing, possessive, commemorative names and names associated with intangible cultural heritage) (Myszka, 2016, pp. 94–95). Topographical names (in the broad sense) were absorbed in this classification by localizing, directional and characterizing names. Formally, then, this classification does not contain any of them.

NARROW AND BROAD UNDERSTANDING
OF TOPOGRAPHICAL NAMES

The first approach is exemplified by the definition of Mieczysław Buczyński (1966, pp. 140–149), who in the mid-1960s, when discussing the names of streets and squares in Lublin, placed them both in the group of old names (formed until the end of the 19th century) and in the group of new names (formed since the beginning of the 20th century). He introduced for them the term "names derived from topographical terms" and determined that they are proper topographical names because they indicate the appearance or location of an object (street) depending on the characteristics of the site. Among the proper topographical names, Buczyński

---

[2] Topographical names, as a branch of local names according to the encyclopaedic definition, express the natural property of the place where the settlement was established and they were probably originally only names of places. Testifying to the original character of the site, they enable reconstruction of the former range of forests and their types, detection of dried water reservoirs, marshes, etc. (*Encyclopedia języka polskiego*, 1994, p. 220).

[3] The literature is listed in the references section.

distinguishes: names that define the shape and size of the street directly, e.g. *Krótka* (from short), *Prosta* (from straight), but also indirect, metaphorical *Bagatela* ("small street" from the word "trifle"), *Błotniki* (from "mud"), *Pochyła* (from "slant"), *Nadłączna* (from "meadow"), *Zastawna*, *Przy stawie* (both from "pond"); names defining the aesthetic appearance of the street (the names describe the aesthetic values of the street perceived visually, the overall impression it makes on passers-by), e.g. *Czysta* (from "clean"), *Miła* (from "nice"), *Jasna* (from "bright"); names determining the location of the street (in relation to other streets, downtowns, or generally determining the location of the street in some part of the city), e.g. *Odległa* (from "distant"), *Obwodowa* (from "by-pass"), *Ustronie* (from "private"/"secluded"); names determining the temperature (adjectival descriptions referring to temperature, indirectly determining the location or appearance of the street), e.g. *Ciepła* (from "warm") (lies above pipes with hot water flowing through them).

A very broad understanding of topographical names is proposed by Danuta Kopertowska, who, while discussing the nomenclature of the city of Kielce, distinguishes 7 types of meaningful place names among historical names (extinct or removed in the more or less distant past) and contemporary (official and colloquial). Topographical names, after cultural names, are the second category in terms of frequency (Kopertowska, 2001, pp. 292–293). In this respect, it is stressed that this is a very old and still productive naming type. The onyms that form these names have, since time immemorial, referred to the specific, characteristic topography of the place, especially to the shape, specificity of the location, flora, fauna, type of substrate, vertical differentiation, water system, etc. The consequence of such an understanding of the term *topographic name* is the classification of the following names into this meaning category: those which refer to the quality of the place, inform about the character, function and location of the object (with an internal division into situational names, e.g. *Krzywa*, *Wielka Łąka*, *Boczna*, *Przejazd*, *Pod Lasem*, *Rzeczna*, *Podzamcze*, *Za Torem*, *Pod Karczówką* (*Karczówka* – proper name); directional names, e.g. *Warszawska*, *Białogońska*, *Piotrkowska*; transferred names (they take over the existing toponyms in a given area without changing their structure), e.g. *Aleksandrówka* (street names from the name of the district), *Psie Górki* (name of the city district from the name of local hills); names referring to plants, e.g. *Akacjowa*, *Grabina*, *Chabrowa*, *Śliwkowa*; names referring to animals, e.g. *Jaskółcza*, *Rybna*, *Żabia*; names informing about the type of soil, e.g. *Piaski*, *Ługi*, *Kamionki*; names reflecting the terrain, e.g. *Dolinki*, *Górki*, *Rozdole*; names motivated by the water system, e.g. *Stary Staw*, *Źródłowa*, *Stawisko* (Kopertowska, 2001, pp. 293–332).

On the basis of these definitions and the accompanying comments and examples, the most important features distinguishing topographical names in narrow terms from the same names in broad terms can be formulated.

Table 1. Narrow and broad understanding of topographical names

Topographical names	
in narrow terms:	in broad terms:
Are semantically motivated	Are both motivated and not motivated semantically
Are derived from appellative names	Are derived from both appellative and proper names
Include natural (plant, animal) names	Include motivated and unmotivated natural names
Refer only to natural objects of the land	Refer to natural and cultural objects of the land
Reflect the objective properties of the object	Reflect the objective and subjective properties of the object

Source: Author's own study.

DEBATABLE DEFINITION ISSUES

As can be seen from the table, discrepancies in the narrow and broad view of topographical names boil down to several important issues: motivation, status of natural names, taking into account natural or artificial objects of the area, appellative or proper name basis, references to subjective or objective properties of the object.

Motivation

Place names (names of districts, squares, streets, physiographic objects, etc.) within a city make up a very diverse linguistic material. In its classification, in Polish onomastic studies, the predominant criterion is the semantic side related to the motivation of the onym. The factor of motivation is used in three ways in the description of urban onyms: as a superior criterion deciding about the dichotomous division of naming material into two sets, i.e. motivated and unmotivated[4] names, which are internally differentiated into subcategories of meanings (e.g. Handke, 1970, pp. 57–58; Bieńkowska and Umińska-Tytoń, 2012, pp. 208–213); as a subordinate criterion for the separation of subcategories within semantic[5] categories

---

[4] According to Handke, the division into (basic, model, primary) names having real and meaning value, documented genesis, and (derivative, secondary) names not having real and meaning value or documented genesis, formed on the basis of convention, based on previous patterns, is indispensable for the classification of street names. It is of extra-linguistic, historical-genetic nature, and provides a very important basis for further linguistic analysis (Handke, 1970, pp. 57–58).

[5] In her publications, Handke repeatedly expressed her conviction that the divisions of urban naming she had proposed over the years were not fully satisfactory and could be modified (e.g. Handke, 1992, pp. 62–63). It should be presumed that within such modifications there was a proposal to distinguish motivated and commemorative names (i.e. without real-meaning motivation) within the main semantic types (e.g. names from personal names or from human names). It seems that the introduction of the unmotivated names of the latter, very controversial term, did not have a positive impact on the clarity of classification and only deepened the terminological chaos.

(Handke, 1998, pp. 44–45); as a factor characterizing names but having no significance for their categorization (e.g. Kopertowska, 2001, pp. 304–305).[6]

Taking into account the motivation aspect, depending on the research perspective adopted, topographical names are treated as: subcategory within motivated names, e.g. topographic names next to directional, possessive and localizing names (Bieńkowska and Umińska-Tytoń, 2012, pp. 208–210); independent semantic category (separated on the basis of other factors than motivation) with internal division into names with or without motivation, i.e. topographical motivated names, e.g. *Długa*, *Podwale*, *Rzeczna* and unmotivated names, e.g. *Laskowa*, *Sadowa*, *Żwirowa* (Handke, 1998, p. 45); a name for which motivation may or may not be one of the factors taken into account in the characteristics of the names of such type. Linguists are not unanimous about the role of motivations in the classification of onyms into categories of topographical names. Opinions vary greatly from the assumption that it is a factor determining the recognition of an onym as topographical, e.g. Buczyński assumes that motivated natural names (even in a historical perspective) are topographical, while non-motivated natural names are classified as secondary or complex (Buczyński, 1966, p. 139), to omitting motivation as an important factor in recognising the name as topographical (e.g. Kopertowska recognises both motivated and unmotivated names (related to flora and fauna, e.g. *ul. Skowronki* and characterizing names, e.g. *ul. Śliska*) as topographical.

Natural names

The review of the definitions of topographical names proves that one of the main contentious issues that arise in them is the problem of natural names. It boils down to their status – an independent semantic category (e.g. Handke, 1992, p. 62; Borek, 1989, p. 52) or a subcategory of topographical names (e.g. Kopertowska, 1989, p. 154). Treating Buczyński's proposals, concerning the understanding of topographical names, as a starting point for subsequent, chronologically differentiated definitions, it should be noted that he placed natural names in the group of proper topographical names, while among secondary names (transferred, not having any direct connection with the area and created mechanically according to some formula) and complex names (concentration of names of one type in one place) he placed, among others, names derived from the appellative terms of plants and animals, without recognizing them as topographical names. Karol Zierhoffer (1989,

---

[6] When analysing the urban nomenclature of Kielce, Kopertowska often provides information about the current or historical justification of the name in extra-language reality, but these remarks have no influence on the classification of the name to a specific semantic type.

p. 59)[7] also expressed the view that names referring to fauna and flora belong to the category of topographical names, recognizing that the world of animals and plants is an inseparable element of topography, and historically speaking, natural names are a continuation of the type of topographical names. Originally, they indicated elements of topography, such as the area covered with specific trees (*Lipowa*) or the place where animals were sold (*Krowia*). In this respect, therefore, all names associated with nature are topographical, regardless of whether they have a justification in the terrain or not.

The difference in definitions between topographic names and natural names, which results in treating them as separate semantic categories, is connected with a later period and the creation of natural names without real motivation, i.e. imitating a pattern, which becomes only a carrier of specific names of plants and animals. This is often accompanied by a new association motivation and grouping of such onyms in suburban areas close to nature (Handke, 1998, p. 281; Bieńkowska and Umińska-
-Tytoń, 2012, p. 210). It is worth noting that natural names are sometimes divided into disputable semantic groups, as it is difficult to indicate the reason for treating street names from tree, shrub and fruit names (*Ananasowa*, *Jałowcowa*, *Kasztanowa*) and street names from mushroom names (*Kurkowa*, *Muchomora*, *Trufle*) separately from street names derived from plant names (*Arbuzowa*, *Barwinkowa*, *Szpinakowa*), since they all refer to the world of flora (Handke, 1998, pp. 282–286).

A completely separate position is taken by Stanisław Kania, who classifies street names derived from animal names, tree names and fruit names as being the product of fantasy (Kania, 1989, p. 98).

Natural or artificial terrain objects

Taszycki noticed this problem many years ago, critically evaluating the division of Wojciechowski that preceded his classification proposal, in which names such as *Gródek*, *Kościelec*, *Karczmiska*, or *Mosty* were classified as topographical names because they reflect "thoughtful work", which resulted in changing the landscape by the work of human hands, i.e. artificial objects of land made and clearly indicated in a certain area (Taszycki, 1946, p. 20). Taszycki recognizes, however, that similarly to the names such as *Wola*, *Środa* or *Targowisko*, these are cultural

---

[7]   In determining semantic types of the street names of Ostrów, Zierhoffer refers to the classification of Handke, which she presented in *Semantyczne i strukturalne typy nazw ulic Warszawy*. The only difference to this division is the recognition of natural names as a subgroup of topographical names, based on the suggestions of Bubak and Buczyński contained in the reviews of *Semantyczne i strukturalne typy nazw ulic Warszawy* (Zierhoffer, 1989, p. 59).

onyms that owe their origin to the progress and cultural development of a given society (Taszycki, 1946, p. 23).

In urban toponymy, topographical names indicate, define and name either only natural terrain objects or both natural and artificial, i.e. man-made, objects created during the construction of the city. The first standpoint, agreeable with views of Taszycki, is represented, for example, by Mieczysław Buczyński (1966, pp. 140–149), Hubert Górnowicz (1964, pp. 160–161), Maria Biolik (1982, p. 58), Danuta Bieńkowska and Elżbieta Umińska-Tytoń (2012, p. 209), for which examples of topographical names are, e.g. *Źródlana*, *Podgórna* and *Nadrzeczna*, while *Cmentarna*, *Sądowa* and *Uniwersytecka* exemplify cultural names. In turn, according to, for example, Henryk Borek (1989, p. 52), Handke (1998, p. 238), and Kania (1989, p. 97), topographical names indicate both natural objects of the area, e.g. *Leśna*, as well as objects created by humans during the construction of the city, e.g. *Fabryczna*, *Apteczna* or *Szkolna*.

It is, therefore, problematic to classify names indicating the urban objects of land and urban space, i.e. to recognize them as cultural names or topographical names. The fact that these names are troublesome and ambiguous in interpretation is also proved by the fact that they are characterised separately from both topographical and cultural names and that they are recognised as localizing names, i.e. motivated by the location of the street near a significant or characteristic object whose name becomes the basis for the street name. They are, therefore, names that can be assigned to three separate semantic categories: topographical, cultural or localizing.

Taking into account the above-mentioned opinions of Polish linguists, the topographical names, as Buczyński puts it, could be regarded as proper topographical names, which refer only to natural objects of the area (Buczyński, 1966, p. 140), i.e. *proper topographical names* is a term associated with natural objects, not artificial ones. However, names such as *Kościelna*, *Pocztowa* and *Dworcowa* could be considered as mixed topographical names. It is an extension of the scope of application of the term originally proposed for complex names based on two word-forming themes (Dzikowski and Kopertowska, 1976, pp. 38–39), in which each segment presents a different semantic type. Kopertowska, when analysing the names of the parts and physiographic objects of Kielce, defined such onyms as mixed names, exposing the semantic side of the whole name, which results from the meaning of its individual parts. Among the distinguished subcategories of mixed names, as many as four have one topographical segment. There are actually four structural variants of two semantic types. They are topographical-possessive names, e.g. *Górka Wszelakiego* – name of the hill; the distinguishing element in the form of the name of the owner of the hill, and possessive-topographical names,

e.g. *Czarnowskie Łąki* – meadows owned by peasants of the village of Czarnów; topographical-cultural names, e.g. *Wielka Niwa* – the name of the part of the city associated with agriculture; and cultural-topographical names, e.g. *Żelazna Góra* – the modifier *Żelazna* is connected with iron ore mining. However, the mixed semantic character of a name does not necessarily depend on its structural complexity. Names based on a single theme, in which two semantic components (on motivational basis) are clearly marked – primary and secondary – can also be ambiguous. Hence, in the case of the names *Stadionowa*, *Muzealna*, *Licealna*, associated with urban buildings and urban space, the location factor, i.e. topographical motivation, is certainly the primary factor, and cultural motivation – the secondary one. They would, therefore, be topographical names mixed with a cultural element.

Common name or proper name in the base

The main criterion for the division of names in the form of their appellative or proprial base is used primarily by those linguists who refer to the semantic classification of Handke. The overriding principle of organising name-formation material in the form of division of the whole collection into names derived from common names and names derived from other proper names is consistently present in older and newer works of Handke devoted both to the nomenclature of Warsaw and city names in general. According to the author, such a division allows to create naming types with capacious and non-restrictive boundaries, and allows for comparisons in the scope of semantic types of other onomastic, mainly toponomastic, systems (Handke, 1992, p. 62). In Handke's division, topographical names are in the group of names derived from common names. The same is also true, for example, when discussing the urban naming of Opole (Borek, 1989). The division into names derived from proper names and names derived from common words is also used by authors analysing the local nomenclature of Łódź (Bieńkowska and Umińska-Tytoń, 2012, p. 212), but only in the group of non-motivated names. This division does not apply to motivated names, which include topographical names. Adopted definition of topographical names as characterizing an object by: the reference to the natural elements of the land, the shape or size of the street, indication of the type of surface and features of buildings, indication of the place among other objects, its function and location in relation to them and by means of a metaphor describing the overall impression made by the street or association it evokes, and the examples illustrating this definition (Bieńkowska and Umińska-Tytoń, 2012, p. 209) allows to assume that only common words are formed on the basis of topographical names. However, this is not a finding that is repeated without exception in other classifications, where the base words for topographical names can only

be referred to on the basis of an analysis of their definitions and given examples. Assuming such a procedure, one can say that topographical names are based not only on common words, but also on proper names, as evidenced by e.g. Biolik (1982, p. 58) – *Agrestowa*, *Warszawska*; Edward Breza (1989, p. 87) – *Okrężna*, *Pucka*; Kania (1989, p. 97) – *Krótka*, *Krośnieńska*; and Kopertowska (2001, p. 302) – *Szeroka*, *Sandomierska*. Expanding the appellative bases of topographical names with proper names occurs mainly in the works of those linguists who consider the names of directional character as topographical names, i.e. those indicating the town to which the communication route leads. However, the recognition of directional names as topographical names seems to be an abuse of terminology, as these names are rather linked to the communication system of the locality.

Subjective or objective properties of an object

This issue primarily concerns the topographical recognition of the names defined as: "determining the aesthetic appearance of the street" (Buczyński, 1966, pp. 45–146), "mood" (Górnowicz, 1964, p. 161), "having mood-related content" (Biolik, 1982, p. 59), "characterizing – emphasising attributable traits, abstract"[8] (Handke, 1998, p. 238), "metaphorical" (Borek, 1989, p. 52; Zierhoffer, 1989, p. 63), "mood-aesthetic or accidental" (Mrózek, 2010, p. 44) or treating them as an independent semantic category. These are the names that appeared on a large scale in the second half of the 20th century due to the tendency to duplicate topographical names, but with a simultaneous modification of the type towards street characterization based on properties attributed to, and not resulting from, objective properties of the object, e.g. *Chlubna*, *Cudna*, *Przytulna*, *Skromna* (Handke, 1998, p. 271, 316). This concerns stereotypical names, usually of a metaphorical character, devoid of semantic motivation, created in a typically conventional way.

These are names that are troublesome in terms of semantic division. They are treated as an independent semantic category, sometimes placed in a group of names from different thematic areas, the foundations of which cannot be included in a larger thematic group (Bieńkowska and Umińska-Tytoń, 2012, p. 213). They are either included among topographical names as names characterizing the mood of the street, such as *Cicha*, *Dobra*, *Jasna*; formed from times of day and seasons of the year *Poranna*, *Wiosenna*; or derived from colour names *Biała*, *Zielona* (Handke, 1998, p. 27; Biolik, 1982, p. 59). They are also considered cultural names referring to particular human values (Kopertowska, 2001, p. 348).

---

8 In her other publications, Handke also uses synonymous terms: *metaphorical* and *expressive* street names.

CONCLUSIONS

In the latest studies produced and published in the 21st century, classifications and descriptions of contemporary and historical onomastic material, as well as related terminology, are still diverse. This is related to individual research assumptions and the specificity of the developed material, as well as to the conviction that this is a procedure conducive to solving the most complicated naming issues (Zagórski, 2008, p. 16). This can be seen, e.g. in *Nazewnictwo geograficzne Poznania* (2008), where topographical names are discussed by the authors of particular chapters of this valuable publication. Accordingly, Zygmunt Zagórski, when writing about the names of parts of the city (districts, housing estates, villages, urban settlements), introduces terminological differentiation into topographical names in a narrower sense of the word (motivated, synthetic), topographical names with a segment specifying the location (motivated, analytical) and topographical elliptical names (motivated, synthetic) (Zagórski, 2008, p. 39). Małgorzata Rutkiewicz-Hanczewska, in turn, when analysing water names, described them in groups established, among others, by Taszycki, hence topographic names separated from the research material, internally divided into locative onyms (indicating the location of the object or the direction of the denotation) and the name determining the characteristics of the object (Rutkiewicz-Hanczewska, 2008, pp. 291–292).

The existing divisions are not fully satisfactory, because too many elements intersect and in many cases it is not possible to make definite distinctions (Handke, 1992, p. 62). However, in the perspective of the definition of contentious issues that have arisen over the years, an attempt may be made to pre-arrange the proposals published by Polish onomasticians for understanding topographical street names.

Taking into account the motivational and etymological criterion, it is justified to separate the proper and mixed topographical names. Topographical names can be either motivated realistically or not motivated in this way. Originally, all topographical names were referred to in extra-language reality. Nowadays, however, taking into account the civilisation changes and the now widespread tendency to introduce conventional names, we should also consider topographical names formed on the basis of the original, and, therefore, motivated, topographical names. At this point, we should agree with the assumption made in the semantic classification of urban names of Rzeszów that "names with realistic motivation (and originally all names of places were motivated in real terms) developed certain semantic types (models), which over time were filled not only with names justified by terrain realities, but also with names with indirect or conventional motivation" (Myszka, 2016, pp. 94–95). In addition, the proper topographical names: refer only to natural terrain features; are derived from plant or animal names because fauna and flora are

an integral part of the landscape; and refer to the objective, sensually recognisable, sometimes metaphorically expressed, real characteristics of the terrain.

On the other hand, topographical names mixed with a cultural element refer to artificial, i.e. man-made, terrain objects. They are also characterized by proper name bases, which are always the result of the creative activity of people. If, on the other hand, only motivational and semantic criteria are taken into account when classifying names, then the most justified is the recognition that topographical names refer either to characteristic features of a street (resulting from its broadly understood appearance), or to its location (in relation to natural or man-made terrain objects) (e.g. Mrózek, 2016, p. 42). In the first case we are dealing with character-izing topographic names, in the second case – with localizing topographic names.

Translated into English by Marek Robak-Sobolewski

REFERENCES

Bieńkowska, Danuta, Umińska-Tytoń, Elżbieta. (2012). *Nazewnictwo miejskie Łodzi*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.

Biolik, Maria. (1982). Typy semantyczne współczesnych nazw ulic i placów Olsztyna. *Komunikaty Warmińsko-Mazurskie*, *1–2*, pp. 51–61.

Borek, Henryk. (1989). Nazewnictwo miejskie Opola dawniej i dziś. In: Stanisław Urbańczyk (ed.), *Nazewnictwo miejskie* (pp. 45–53). Warszawa–Poznań: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Breza, Edward. (1989). Nazwy ulic w miasteczkach Pomorza Gdańskiego. In: Stanisław Urbańczyk (ed.), *Nazewnictwo miejskie* (pp. 79–92). Warszawa–Poznań: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Buczyński, Mieczysław. (1966). Nazwy ulic i placów Lublina. *Onomastica*, *11(1–2)*, pp. 136–181.

Doroszewski, Witold (ed.). (1967). *Słownik języka polskiego*. Vol. 9. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Dubisz, Stanisław (ed.). (2003). *Uniwersalny słownik języka polskiego*. Vol. 4. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Dunaj, Bogusław (ed.). (2000). *Słownik współczesnego języka polskiego*. Vol. 5. Kraków: SMS.

Dzikowski, Władysław, Kopertowska, Danuta. (1976). *Toponimia Kielc*. Warszawa–Kraków: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Górnowicz, Hubert. (1964). Toponimia Gdyni. *Gdańskie Zeszyty Humanistyczne*, *6*, pp. 135–169.

Handke, Kwiryna. (1970). *Semantyczne i strukturalne typy nazw ulic Warszawy*. Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków: Wydawnictwo PAN.

Handke, Kwiryna. (1992). *Polskie nazewnictwo miejskie*. Warszawa: Slawistyczny Ośrodek Wydawniczy.

Handke, Kwiryna. (1998). *Słownik nazewnictwa Warszawy*. Warszawa: Slawistyczny Ośrodek Wydawniczy.

Kania, Stanisław. (1989). Z badań nad urbanonimami Zielonej Góry. In: Stanisław Urbańczyk (ed.), *Nazewnictwo miejskie* (pp. 93–101). Warszawa–Poznań: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Karłowicz, Jan, Kryński, Adam, Niedźwiecki, Władysław. (1953). *Słownik języka polskiego*. Vol. 7. Poznań: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.

Klimko, Ryszard Jan. (2003). *Podręczny leksykon terminów kartograficznych i geodezyjnych*. Słupsk: Wydawnictwo Pomorskiej Akademii Pedagogicznej.

Kopertowska, Danuta. (1989). Współczesna mikrotoponimia miejska na przykładzie Kielc. In: Stanisław Urbańczyk (ed.), *Nazewnictwo miejskie* (pp. 151–162). Warszawa–Poznań: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Kopertowska, Danuta. (2001). *Kielce. Historia i współczesność w nazewnictwie*. Kielce: Wydawnictwo Akademii Świętokrzyskiej.

Mrózek, Robert. (2010). *Miejski krajobraz nazewniczy Cieszyna w perspektywie diachronicznej*. Katowice–Cieszyn–Ustroń: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.

Mrózek, Robert. (2016). *Sfera onimiczna języka i jej właściwości kategorialno-funkcjonalne*. Kraków: Instytut Języka Polskiego PAN.

Myszka, Agnieszka. (2016). *Urbanonimia Rzeszowa. Językowo-kulturowy obraz miasta*. Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego.

Nowa encyklopedia powszechna PWN. (1996). Vol. 6. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Pietkiewicz, Stanisław, Żmuda, Stefan. (1973). *Słownik pojęć geograficznych*. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna.

Rutkiewicz-Hanczewska, Małgorzata. (2008). Nazwy terenowe. In: Zygmunt Zagórski (ed.), *Nazewnictwo geograficzne Poznania* (pp. 167–426). Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu.

Sobol, Elżbieta (ed.). (2002). *Nowy słownik języka polskiego*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PAN.

Taszycki, Witold. (1946). *Słowiańskie nazwy miejscowe (Ustalenie podziału)*. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności.

Urbańczyk, Stanisław (ed.), (1994). *Encyklopedia języka polskiego*. Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków: Ossolineum.

Wielka Encyklopedia PWN. Vol. 27. (2005). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Zagórski, Zygmunt. (2008). Wprowadzenie. Nazwy części miasta. In: Zygmunt Zagórski (ed.), *Nazewnictwo geograficzne Poznania* (pp. 11–166). Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Adama Mickiewicza.

Zierhoffer, Karol. (1989). Nazwy ulic i placów Ostrowa Wielkopolskiego. In: Stanisław Urbańczyk (ed.), *Nazewnictwo miejskie* (pp. 55–65). Warszawa–Poznań: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

ABSTRACT

The aim of the article is to present the current understanding of the term *topographic names* in relation to Polish urban names, especially street names. The material for analysis has been extracted from numerous linguistic works published during the period between the 1960s and the second decade of the 21st century. Topographical names were introduced to Polish linguistics by Witold Taszycki, who considered them an important semantic category of local names. This term was later used in the divisions of the urban nomenclature. For years, however, it has not been possible to create a generally accepted definition of topographical street names. All proposals in this respect oscillate between a narrow (represented e.g. by Mieczysław Buczyński) and a broad (accepted e.g. by Danuta Kopertowska) understanding of this group of onyms. The review of chronologically diversified linguistic approaches to the discussed category of the title leads to the conclusion that the disputable

definition issues boil down to the following questions: motivation, status of natural names, taking into account natural or artificial objects of the area, appellative or proprial basis, referring to subjective or objective properties of the object. Taking them all into account, the article eventually proposes the introduction of a new division into topographical names proper and mixed topographical names.

Keywords: urbanonyms, street names, topographical names

ABSTRAKT

Celem artykułu jest zaprezentowanie rozumienia terminu nazwy topograficzne w odniesieniu do polskich urbanonimów, a szczególnie do nazw ulic. Materiał do analizy został wyekscerpowany z licznych prac językoznawczych opublikowanych w okresie, którego ramy stanowią lata 60. XX wieku i druga dekada wieku XXI. Nazwy topograficzne wprowadził do polskiego językoznawstwa Witold Taszycki, uznając je za ważną kategorię semantyczną nazw miejscowych. Termin ten znalazł następnie zastosowanie także w podziałach nazewnictwa miejskiego. Przez lata nie udało się jednak stworzyć ogólnie przyjętej definicji topograficznych nazw ulic. Wszystkie propozycje w tym względzie oscylują między wąskim (reprezentowanym np. przez Mieczysława Buczyńskiego) i szerokim (przyjętym np. przez Danutę Kopertowską) rozumieniem tej grupy onimów. Przegląd zróżnicowanych chronologicznie językoznawczych ujęć omawianej kategorii mian prowadzi do wniosku, że dyskusyjne kwestie definicyjne sprowadzają się do następujących zagadnień: motywacji, statusu nazw przyrodniczych, uwzględniania naturalnych lub sztucznych obiektów terenu, apelatywnej lub proprialnej podstawy, odwoływania się do subiektywnych lub obiektywnych właściwości obiektu. Biorąc je wszystkie pod uwagę, ostatecznie w artykule zaproponowano wprowadzenie nowego podziału na nazwy topograficzne właściwe i topograficzne mieszane.

Słowa kluczowe: urbanonimia, nazwy ulic, nazwy topograficzne