AGNIESZKA MYSZKA

University of Rzeszów, Poland
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1324-7948
e-mail: agnieszka.myszka.urz@wp.pl

Cultural Names of Streets – the Scope and Evolution of the Term

Kulturowe nazwy ulic – zakres i ewolucja terminu

PRELIMINARY REMARKS

The first typologies of urban naming were more or less inspired by Witold Taszycki's (1946) classification of place names, so it is not surprising that attempts were made to find the same semantic types in city names as those used in his work. However, urban naming (as a system) turned out quite quickly to not be a simple copy of naming localities. While the division of Taszycki could be applied to the names of housing estates (especially older, historical ones)[1], it was more difficult to apply it to the analysis of the names of streets, squares, so-called points of interest, etc.

A very small group of urbanonyms includes names that would be names of persons transferred to this class. However, topographical, cultural, relational[2] and (after many systemic modifications) primarily possessive names are productive, as they evolve towards property names on the one hand, and commemorative names on the other. The aim of this article is to define the scope of the term *cultural names*

---

[1] Even in the case of housing estate names, the matter was not so obvious, because urbanonyms considered to be patronymic, craft-derived or loan words were in most cases the primary names of villages, transferred to the names of other objects, and thus already relational or possibly (depending on the interpretation assumptions) commemorative in respect of old localities.

[2] However, relativity is understood broadly here, as encompassing names derived from toponyms: renewed, transferred, and even directional.

in relation to urban naming, to determine the place of cultural names in the typology of urban names and to describe the evolution of both the term and its scope[3].

The observations made in this article are based on analyses of urban names of Polish cities, conducted from the 1960s to the present day. Out of necessity, only the most important items, most frequently referred to in other publications, mainly monographs but also articles, have been included. They are listed in the references section.

1. DEFINITION OF THE TERM AND PLACE OF CULTURAL NAMES IN URBAN NAMING TYPOLOGIES

1.1. Cultural names of Witold Taszycki

A group of cultural names was noticed and distinguished by Taszycki. However, before he proposed his own classification of place names, he first provided a critical overview of the existing names. He noted that some researchers regarded names motivated by workmanship (e.g. *Kościelec*, *Gródek*, *Karczmiska*) as topographical (e.g. Wojciechowski). He stated that this action was in a sense justified, because: "Works of craftsmanship in a certain area, made and clearly indicated (*gród* [castle], *kościół* [church], *karczma* [tavern]), made their mark on it, changing its appearance. These names contain a concise description of the landscape, so we can describe them as topographical" (Taszycki, 1946, p. 20). However, he strongly opposed the similar treatment of names related to non-material culture, such as *Wola*, *Lgota*, *Piątek*, *Ujazd*. According to Taszycki (1946, pp. 21–22), these are "in the closest connection with the social culture of our ancestors, they are one of its manifestations", and treating them as topographical "involves too far-reaching a classification freedom".

As a result, the researcher proposed the term *cultural names* for all names related to what a person can create, i.e. the so-called material cultural heritage, as well as for names related to what a person believes in, how they organize their lives, how they manage the land. Importantly, these names have never been the names of other designations (especially of persons), but from the beginning of their existence they have meant "a piece of land"; they have been the names "connected with certain devices, institutions and products of material, social and spiritual culture" (Taszycki, 1946, p. 23).

---

[3] Other types of urban names are dealt with in separate studies (cf. Myszka, 2018; Oronowicz-Kida, 2019).

1.2. Cultural names in the classifications of the 1960s

In the 1960s, works analysing urban naming began to be emerge. Especially two of them deserve to be mentioned. The author of the first one, Hubert Górnowicz (1964, pp. 151–162), distinguished as many as 20 types. The cultural names are not mentioned here until 15th place. Citing the author, these are the names that: "speak of human handicrafts, most often public buildings that stand at or are led to by these streets" (Górnowicz, 1964, p. 161), e.g. *Cmentarna*, *Dworcowa*, *Folwarczna* (motivated by the location next to a cultural objects), but also: *Wiejska* (rural in nature) and *Urszulanki* (near the monastery of this order). A separate group of researchers included, among others, mood names (*Słoneczna*, *Spokojna*, *Miła*) and names with maritime reference (*Bursztynowa*, *Masztowa*).

Mieczysław Buczyński (1966), on the other hand, divided street names into historical and contemporary (without realistic motivation). The first group included names derived from: 1) topographical terms, 2) names of buildings, 3) proper names, 4) expressions related to the traditional material, social and spiritual culture (*Plac Musztry*, *Nowy Rynek*), 5) groups of people from one guild or nationality (Buczyński, 1966, p. 139). Two issues deserve to be emphasised: first, cultural names have been claimed historical (which, in Buczyński's work reflected, as it seems, realistically motivated names); second, Buczyński separated the names derived from building names and from other cultural facilities (second group, e.g. *Browarna*, *Fabryczna*, *Farbiarska*, *Krochmalna* – leading to dye and starch works) – these were not included by him (unlike in Górnowicz) among the cultural ones, nor did he place them in the topographic group (although he did not explicitly exclude them from any of the groups – he simply created a separate class for them). In group 4, the researcher included names describing the former functional character of the street (*Mały Rynek*, *Plac Targowy*, *Plac Zebrań Ludowych*), names related to communication and traffic (*Cicha*, *Piesza*, *Przesmyk*) and onyms from expressions defining the age of the street (*Projektowana*, *Świeża*, *Stary Targ*). Buczyński's great intuition is visible in this division – the names from groups 2 and 4 are differentiated motivationally – the first one shows only the location, while the second one shows customs, beliefs, methods of management, etc. The problem of classifying localizing names into topographical or cultural groups will be recurring many times in the works of later researchers.

Buczyński (1966, p. 174) noticed one more important element of urban naming, namely the existence of secondary names that were not motivated by the reality of the street, i.e. names transferred from other cities – although they are the product of culture, they were not included in this group.

1.3. Cultural names of Kwiryna Handke

The term *nazwy kulturalne* was quickly replaced by the term *nazwy kulturowe*. This change in urbanonymy was popularised and its scope was established by Kwiryna Handke, who wrote:

> […] the notion of cultural names has here [in ubranonymy – A.M.] a slightly narrower scope than commonly used. In principle, this type of street names falls within the scope of cultural names established by W. Taszycki for place names, meaning works of human hands and devices, institutions and products of social and spiritual culture. However, in the case of street names it was reduced by excluding names referring to the objects of the area, which were treated as a separate group of topographical names (Handke, 1970, pp. 60–61).

The researcher therefore clearly separated the names indicating the location of the cultural elements from the names preserving various aspects of culture. She also noticed a certain difference in the bases of the urbonyms and urbanonyms. She stated that the latter are derived "not only from the names of specific products of craftsmanship, but also from products of broadly understood production and social activity of people, e.g. on the one hand, such names as *Beczkowa*, *Blaszana*, *Mączna*, and on the other – *Komitetowa*, *Przemysłowa*" (Handke, 1970, pp. 127–128). She emphasized that the motivation of these names may be direct (from the name of a cultural object) or indirect (e.g. from a product manufactured in a given facility or from another thing associated with the facility). She also pointed out the existence of structures created "as a result of ellipsis, by eliminating part of the initial name, e.g. *Towarowa* from a freight train station" (Handke, 1970, p. 128) and the resulting classification difficulties (see below).

In the proposed typology of urban naming, Handke (1970, pp. 63–115) placed cultural names in a group of names without semantic motivation, a subgroup of names derived from common names.

1.4. Cultural names of Danuta Kopertowska

A few years after Handke's work, another dissertation appeared, which was a milestone in Polish urbanonymy. Its authors were historian Władysław Dzikowski and linguist Danuta Kopertowska. The latter used a different description for the names of city districts, and a different one for the names of plateonyms. Among the former, she divided as many as 8 groups (Dzikowski and Kopertowska, 1976, pp. 38–40), which were the echoes of Taszycki's division. Different, however, was her approach to the names of streets and squares. Here, Kopertowska left only two groups: topographical and cultural names, the latter divided into: motivated (names

associated with former or existing objects of material culture) and unmotivated (1) commemorative names given to commemorate people, facts and institutions, 2) commemorating literary and legendary characters, 3) commemorative names created from toponyms, 4) characteristic without motivation in the land, including those transferred from other cities) (Dzikowski and Kopertowska, 1976, pp. 123–124).

Therefore, the term *cultural names* in relation to urban naming is treated very broadly by the researcher from Kielce, who classifies in this group both the traditional onyms already included in this group (i.e. related to material and intangible cultural heritage), but also names commemorating authentic persons and fictional characters (commemorative), referring to place names (e.g. localizing and directional) and relational names (transferred). It is a justified action, because all the names mentioned here result from rooting in culture, including naming culture. However, such an approach is too wide. In the analytical part, the researcher herself uses the term *cultural names* mainly to refer to a realistically motivated term.

1.5. Cultural names in urban naming typologies in the last forty years

In numerous studies developed at the end of the 20th and at the beginning of the 21st century, cultural names were assigned a scope similar to that of Handke (1970 and subsequent, especially 1992 and 2011[4]), although not always identical. However, there were also those who were closer to the approach of Kopertowska.

An important voice in the discussion on cultural names came from Maria Biolik (1982). Referring to the wide concept of Kopertowska, the researcher separated the commemorative-cultural names from the proper cultural names (Biolik, 1982, p. 53). A kind of reference to this approach is Zygmunt Zagórski's (2008b, p. 38) thesis, which in the classification of housing estate names distinguished cultural names in a narrower sense – motivated, synthetic and cultural names with topographical, localizing, commemorative and possessive elements.

Many years later, the main assumptions of Handke were referred to by researchers from Poznań. Thus, e.g. Józef Chojnacki (2008, pp. 502–511) separated 2 large groups: motivated names and non-motivated names. He included cultural names in the first of these groups (next to topographical, localizing, directional and relational names). Magdalena Graf (2008, pp. 607–609) also placed cultural onyms in the genetically-onymically motivated group, derived from appellatives, but she also pointed out that they can be synthetic and analytical.

---

[4] Handke (2011, pp. 34–35) uses the division into: 1) names derived from proper names, 2) names derived from appellatives. The second group includes: 2.1) names derived from personal appellatives, 2.2) cultural names linked to human activity, 2.3) topographical names, 2.4) natural names, 2.5) metaphorical names, 2.6) names derived from historical places and events.

Echoes of Handke's division can be found in classifications where the main criterion is the genetic material of the urbanonyms. Cultural names have been included in the works of Henryk Borek (1984), researchers of street names from Bydgoszcz (Czachorowska, Czaplicka-Jedlikowska, Jaracz, and Paluszak-Bronka, 2008) and Łódź (Bieńkowska and Umińska-Tytoń, 2012), as well as in the book by Ewa Oronowicz-Kida (2014) who analysed street names in rural areas. As far as motivational subdivisions are concerned, cultural names are usually mentioned alongside topographical and possibly other names[5].

The division of Kopertowska was referenced to by Edward Breza, who distinguished two main types of urbanonyms: topographical names (characterizing the street itself and directional names) and cultural names. However, he added two smaller classes to the above: names derived from trees and commemorative names (Breza, 1989, pp. 86–87). All in all, with time, the researcher from Kielce herself extended her typology and separated the following names: 1) topographical, 2) cultural[6], 3) anthropogenic (including possessive), 4) chronologically motivated by earlier toponyms, 5) ambiguous (having two or more meanings), 6) unclear, 7) mixed (Kopertowska, 2001, p. 292).

However, there were also some researchers who did not use the term *cultural names* at all (e.g. Supranowicz, 1995), or, using different classification criteria, did not divide cultural names into separate classes. For example, in the typology proposed by Czesław Kosyl (2001, pp. 50–55), we can find interesting onyms both among conventional names, especially those with axiological and relation-associative motivation, as well as among realistic names motivated by inherent and relational features of objects. Robert Mrózek (2010, pp. 38–45) referred to this division.

---

[5] Cf. e.g. Aleksandra Belchnerowska, Tadeusz Białecki (1987) use the following division: 1) topographical, 2) possessive, 3) cultural, 4) pseudo-patronymic, 5) ethnic, 6) pseudo-family, 7) foreign, 8) ambiguous, 9) unclear; Franciszek Nowak (1989, pp. 141–143): 1) from locality names, 2) topographical, 3) from personal names, 4) natural, 5) from human names, 6) metaphorical, 7) cultural, 8) commemorating contemporary facts, phenomena, organizations, persons; and Stanisław Kania (1989, pp. 97–99): 1) topographical names (characterizing the street itself and directional), 2) commemorative names, 3) cultural names, 4) professional names, 5) names being the product of fantasy.

[6] Kopertowska (2001, pp. 332–333) emphasized the thematic diversity of cultural names. In this way, she distinguished among them names motivated by: 1) organization and life of the settlement, 2) thinning out of forests, 3) farming and horticulture, 4) livestock management, 5) processing of natural resources, 6) various areas of material culture (names of secular and sacral buildings and names motivated by historical and contemporary buildings), 7) traces of old social and legal relations, 8). spiritual culture (names associated with a specific symbolism, literature, referring to selected values – here *Braterska*, *Miła*, *Ciepła*, *Dobra*, "mineral" names and names associated with the history of the soil, commemorating places of struggle, topogenic, from the names of military formations, professional, commemorating characters and historical facts), 9) joke and nickname names.

A different typology was proposed for the analysis of the nomenclature of Rzeszów. It was assumed that realistically motivated names developed certain semantic types (models), which over time were filled not only with names justified by regional realities, but also with names of indirect or conventional motivations, therefore, all names of urban objects were divided into 6 classes: 1) localizing, 2) directional, 3) characterizing, 4) possessive, 5) commemorative, 6) connected with intangible cultural heritage (cf. Myszka and Wisz, 2012, pp. 17–20; 58–65; Myszka, 2016, pp. 94–98). Each of these groups included names derived both from appellatives and proper names. Cultural names within Taszycki's concept (including occasional names such as *Wisielok*) are part of the characterizing names. On the other hand, names connected with intangible cultural heritage are the result of the evolution of a group of commemorative names; they refer to abstract concepts and people connected with culture, to ideas, ideologies, dates of events, traditions, faiths and beliefs.

2. CHARACTERISTICS OF CULTURAL NAMES

2.1. Productivity

Cultural names are not the most productive type in urbanonymy, but they occupy a very important position in the onymic subsystem. After the analysis of works created in the 1960s and 1970s, Biolik (1982, p. 53) stated that they are the most numerous types, after topographical names. Similar conclusions were reached more than 20 years later by Zagórski (2008b, p. 33). Presently, however, they give way to commemorative names more and more often.

Unfortunately, due to the low accuracy of the term, it is difficult to compare data presented in different studies. However, it is worth giving a few examples. In the city nomenclature of Olsztyn, cultural names included 9.2% of all surveyed onyms (Biolik, 1982, p. 57). For Opole, the share was 11% in the 1980s (Borek, 1984, p. 73). Slightly more of them were found at the beginning of the 21st century among regional names in Poznań – 12.4% (Rutkiewicz-Hanczewska, 2008, p. 199), and an even higher percentage (about 14%) was recorded among municipal names in Rzeszów (Myszka, 2016). In a very broad perspective of Kopertowska's (2001, p. 361) cultural names, which also included commemorative and metaphorical names, the analysed names constituted almost half of the total. Much less of them can be observed in the official street names in villages – in the Podkarpackie voivodeship it is less than 3% (Oronowicz-Kida, 2014, p. 57).

2.2. Motivation

Researchers of urban naming have not agreed on whether cultural names are realistically or rather conventionally motivated. Buczyński (1966) classified them as historical, i.e. – in his opinion – motivated. The same approach was taken many years later by Poznań researchers: Chojnacki (2008, pp. 502–511) and Graf (2008, pp. 607–609). Handke (1970, pp. 63–115) took the opposite direction, and placed cultural names in a group of names without semantic motivation. Kopertowska, on the other hand, pointed out that cultural names include both motivated (associated with former or existing objects of material culture) and unmotivated names (Dzikowski and Kopertowska, 1976, pp. 123–124; Kopertowska, 2001). Also in the typology proposed by Kosyl (2001, pp. 50–55), cultural names are among both conventional and realistically motivated names. A similar approach can be found in other works from the last dozen or so years (Czachorowska et al., 2008; Bieńkowska and Umińska-Tytoń, 2012; Oronowicz-Kida, 2014; Myszka, 2016).

2.3. Genetic material

The discussion (admittedly, not very heated) on the genetic material of cultural names has been ongoing practically since the 1970s. It was initiated by the opposing opinions of two researchers, important for urban nomenclature: Handke and Kopertowska. The former stated that cultural names were based solely on appellative material (Handke, 1970), while the latter claimed that these names could be created both from appellatives and from proper names (Dzikowski and Kopertowska, 1976). The difference of views was mainly due to the fact that each researcher set a different scope for cultural names.

Successive researchers of urban naming tended to support the thesis that cultural names are derived from appellatives, created from the products of craftsmanship, institutions, management methods, values, etc. (cf. e.g. Biolik, 1982, p. 57; Borek, 1984, p. 73; Czachorowska et al., 2008; Oronowicz-Kida, 2014).

3. BOUNDARIES OF CULTURAL NAMES

3.1. Cultural names and cult names

The term *cult names* was popularized by Buczyński[7] and applied by many other linguists. Among the Polish names, however, onyms associated with religious cult, be it Christian or pagan, are not very common. As regards street naming, the only popular type is the one exemplified by *ul. św. Marka*; other structures and motivations are less common. Nevertheless, it is worth distinguishing cult names, but not as a separate group, only as a very interesting subgroup of cultural names, not only because of their relatively low frequency, but also because, like other cultural names, they are an image of the values they profess, which is in fact a manifestation of our spiritual culture. Similar opinions have already been expressed by other researchers (cf. e.g. Rutkiewicz-Hanczewska, 2008, p. 292; Graf, 2008, p. 562).

However, as far as the names such as *Diabelska Góra* or *ul. Światowida* raise no classification doubts, the problem is to determine the typological affiliation of onyms motivated by their location next to an object. In my opinion, if it is not a sacred object and the motivation is based on beliefs, attributes of saints, etc., then such names should undoubtedly be left in a cultural group (cult subgroup), e.g. *ul. św. Nepomucena* – a street leading to a bridge (St. John of Nepomuk – patron saint of bridges, the drowning, supporter during floods), *ul. św. Floriana* – near fire station (St. Florian – patron saint of fire-fighters), *ul. św. Walentego* – a hill which is a favourite place for evening meetings of young people (St. Valentine – patron saint of lovers).

Slightly different is the case of street names or squares motivated by the neighbourhood of churches, chapels, figures, e.g. *ul. św. Jana* at St. John's Church, *ul. Świętej Trójcy* at the church under this invocation (Holy Trinity). There are three solutions: 1) church may be considered as inseparable to the region, and street names that duplicate church auspices can be treated as a certain type of localisation (with potential additional culture – cult group), 2) the name can be considered as renewed from the church *patrocinium* and placed in the relational group, 3) it is finally possible to see in this process a specific manifestation of the spiritual culture of man and classify the names in the cult group (with additional localizing motivation). The third solution presented here seems to be the most appropriate.

---

[7] By the term *cult names*, Buczyński (1997, pp. 37–69) encompassed names derived from the terms related to God and the Holy Trinity, from the names of saints, evil and good spirits, biblical figures, from religious objects and symbols, names of church holidays, names of places and localities associated with religious life, etc. Cf. also Małgorzata Rutkiewicz-Hanczewska (2008, p. 175).

3.2. Cultural names and topographic names

After Taszycki, it is worth repeating that the names indicating human interference in the appearance of land should be distinguished from names motivated by what nature has created. The separation of topographical and cultural names therefore seems to be an obvious intention and does not give rise to any doubts.

The problem arises in the case of names localizing in relation to material culture objects, especially prepositional ones, such as: *Za Kościołem*, *Podegródek*, *Zamoście*, etc. Some researchers place them in a group of topographical names, others include them in the composition of cultural names, and others yet separate them, adding to them such terms as *Katedralna* (next to the cathedral), and even *Krowia* (next to the slaughterhouse). This onymic type was placed in the group of topographical names by, among others, Handke (1970; 1992), Kopertowska (2001, p. 295) and Borek (1984, p. 73). However, the above-mentioned researchers included only prepositional names; types such as *ul. Katedralna* were classified among cultural names[8]. The following researchers were inclined to include prepositional onyms in the group of cultural names: Górnowicz (1964, p. 161), Biolik (1982, p. 59)[9], Breza (1989, p. 87), Mirosława Sagan-Bielawa (2004, p. 224), Graf (2008, p. 553). A separate class of localizing names (both with respect to topographic and cultural objects) was distinguished, among others, by: Buczyński (1966), Danuta Bieńkowska, Elżbieta Umińska-Tytoń (2012) and Agnieszka Myszka (2016).

It should be stressed, however, that while in the group of microtoponyms, prepositional names (*ul. Do Dworca*) are very common structures, they do not constitute a large share among city names. There are more adjective and noun names in this subsystem (*ul. Dworcowa*, *ul. Dworzec*), and these are more often classified as cultural names (cf. e.g. Sagan-Bielawa, 2004, p. 224; Rutkiewicz-Hanczewska, 2008, p. 199; Graf, 2008) than as topographical names (e.g. Oronowicz-Kida, 2014, pp. 52–53; Czachorowska et al., 2008, p. 81). It should be noted, however, that despite structural differences, the motivational type is homogeneous and localizing the named object. Therefore, it seems appropriate to distinguish between those that characterize (whether topography or culture) and those that localize – regardless of their linguistic form (although the location may also be considered in terms of characteristics) – among the urbanonyms. The history of research of this group of names provided a separate term for them: Stanisława Sochacka called them

---

[8] The researchers from Bydgoszcz (Czachorowska et al., 2008) refused to follow, as they placed among topographical names both prepositional as well as adjective and noun names motivated by their location.

[9] The researcher places the names indicating the location of topographic objects in a topographic group, but those next to cultural objects – in a cultural group.

secondarily topographical onyms (1970, p. 107)[10], while Borek (1988) defined these names, depending on whether the landmark was specified by proper name or an appellative, as *relational localizing* or *topographical localizing*.

3.3. Cultural names and commemorative names

Collective memory is an element of our culture, a determinant of our identity. The fact that cultural and commemorative names have a lot in common has been noted long ago (cf. Myszka, 2018), with emphasis put on the mutual interpenetration of both groups (Graf, 2008, p. 585). Noticing the problem, Biolik (1982, p. 53), already in the 1980s, proposed separating memorial and cultural names from the proper cultural names. This separation was also made by Kopertowska (2001, p. 8), separating numerous subgroups among cultural names.

It should be emphasized that although commemorative (or rather discretionary) names are a testimony of our culture, they are in terms of genetics and motivation a group completely separate from the traditionally understood cultural names. They do not reflect the history of the objects, but the preferences of the nominators; therefore, the motivation behind the nomination is different: it comes from the creator of the name and not from the so-called object. For this reason alone, the two groups should be treated separately, as is generally the case.

3.4. Cultural names and metaphorical, occasional names

Typological problems appear in the names defined by Handke as metaphorical at first (Handke, 1970), later as expressive (Handke, 1992), by Górnowicz (1964) as mood names, and by Kopertowska (2001) as names associated with a specific symbolism or referring to specific values. These studies concern conventional names such as *Bosa*, *Mylna*, *Spokojna*, *Miła*, *Ciepła*, *Dobra*. Górnowicz and Handke (and after her, those who adopted her typology) divided them into separate classes; Kopertowska placed them among the cultural names, while in the studies of the nomenclature of Rzeszów they were placed within the range of characterizing names (of course, only apparently, because these were names without realistic motivation).

Undoubtedly, these names appeared in a given culture and they carry information about it (first of all about the naming culture, which prefers the names

---

[10] I analysed the semantics of prepositional names in a different place in more detail (Myszka, 2005). I quoted there the opinions of those researchers who claimed that prepositional names did not fit into any semantic class distinguished by Taszycki, as well as those who were inclined to classify some of these names as topographical and others as cultural. However, the vast majority of researchers analysing prepositional names placed them (all!) in the topographical group.

"pretty", "good" and "nice"), but it is difficult to consider them as cultural names in the traditional understanding of this term.

3.5. Cultural names and possessive names

Possessive names are a very outstanding type in the naming of towns and villages. It is clearly distinctive in urbanonymy, whereas in this subsystem, not only synthetic names, but also (or perhaps above all) analytical names such as *Dom Tramwajarza*, *Dom Esterki*, *Willa Wangów* should be included in the group of possessive onyms.

Anthropogenic names are usually situated in the group of possessive names, although other solutions also occur. A bigger problem appears with names that mark groups of people associated around some idea, religion, organization, profession, nationality, e.g. *Królewski Konsystorz Ewangelicki*, *Dom Kupiectwa*, *Izba Rzemieślnicza* (examples after: Graf, 2008, p. 566), *Stary Cmentarz Żydowski*, *Ruska Wieś*, *Staw Pański* (examples after: Myszka, 2016). In such cases, it is often difficult to decide whether the name is rather possessive or rather cultural (indicates the owner or preserves a cultural element). Interpretation is largely dependent on the researcher's opinion, but more often such opinions are classified in the possessive group, although they can also be treated as possessive-cultural.

3.6. Cultural names and relational names

Early attention was drawn to the existence of names transferred from one locality to another (Buczyński, 1966, p. 174). The duplication of street names from older agglomerations in younger urban centres was particularly popular during the communist era, but these transfers were not motivated by the characteristics of the objects; they did not characterise, but artificially enriched the range of names in individual cities (by multiplying the number of objects bearing the same name in different locations).

For names derived from other toponyms, the term *relational names* has become established over time (Borek, 1988), but in urbanonymy these "relations" have a different character than in toponymy. In this subsystem, there are fewer transferred names with metaphorical function (transfers are often mechanical, without realistic motivation), repetitions have a specific character, because they are more often related to the change of the rank (type) of an object (e.g. a housing estate is created in the place of a hamlet) than extending the scope of the name to a new object, there are few names with a differential function (names with *nowy* [new], *stary* [old] segment are dominant here), names commemorating villages (such as

ul. Słocińska, *ul. Zaleśna* established on new housing estates developed on the grounds of the former villages of Słocina and Zalesie) are used relatively rarely; however, the type of directional and localizing names with respect to towns, rivers, mountains, etc. is popular.

The creator of the term *relational names* did not recommend placing the names classified in this group either among cultural or topographical names (although, for example, some transferred names characterize an object, and repeated names inform about its location – Borek, 1988, p. 47). However, this is rather isolated in urbanonymy – few researchers distinguish a group of relational names[11]. Most of the transferred names are classified as cultural (e.g. Dzikowski and Kopertowska, 1976, pp. 123–124; Belchnerowska and Białecki, 1987; Myszka, 2016), while the renewed names are classified as topographical or localizing (Kopertowska, 2001, p. 305; Myszka, 2016). Names with differential components (*stary* [old], *nowy* [new], *bliski* [near], *daleki* [distant], *krótki* [short], *wielki* [big], *najwyższy* [the highest]) can be classified either as topographical (if they indicate a site – location or appearance), or as cultural (if they indicate a rank of an object) (cf. Rutkiewicz- -Hanczewska, 2008, p. 361).

In urbanoynymy, names must be treated differently from those in urbonymy. Some of them will be in the group of directional names, others in the group of localizing names. A disputable subgroup consists of secondary names in the group of urbanonyms, originally being cultural names of towns, villages, hamlets. They should be distinguished from cultural names primarily naming a space in the city, or at least treated as a separate, specific subgroup – names preserving the memory of generations, a specific cult of the past (regardless of the etymology of each of such names, which could primarily be cultural, but also topographical, ancestral or other).

FINAL REMARKS

Finally, it is worth defining the term *cultural names* in relation to urban naming. Unlike cultural urbonyms, these onyms are very rarely motivated by the following elements: 1) organisation and life of the settlement, 2) forest management, 3) agriculture and horticulture, 4) livestock management, 5) former social and legal relations. Cultural urbanonyms primarily naming the space in the city most often have a connection with:

– craftsmanship and trade,

---

[11] This is what Graf (2008, p. 553) does, for example, with regard to directional names: *Brama Berlińska*, *Brama Bydgoska*.

– industry and the economy,

– military and defence,

– sports culture and leisure (cf. Biolik, 1982, p. 59),

– entertainment and gastronomy,

– elements of spiritual culture (literature, art, beliefs, magic, traditions, and recently also elements of pop culture – quotation-names, language games, inter-texts, etc.),

– exploration and processing of natural resources,

– human activity in a given area (formerly: construction of dykes, bridges, wells, burial sites, presently: parks, entertainment places, campuses, etc.),

– the purpose of individual objects, their main functions (including communication functions – cf. Buczyński, 1966),

– legal and proprietary relations (e.g. types of land leased, someone's endowment, property to be sold – cf. Rutkiewicz-Hanczewska, 2008, p. 199),

– individual events, circumstances (situational names),

– age and meaning of objects (names with relational elements such as "new", "old", "big", "general", etc.)

The inclusion of the following groups in the cultural names seems disputed: 1) expressive names (e.g. *Dobra* [good], *Miła* [nice], *Łagodna* [gentle]), 2) conventional thematic names, e.g. "mineral", "geological", from names of spices, elements of polygraphy, geometry, astronomy, names of months, seasons, etc., 3) discretionary names, including names referring to historical events, dates, 4) parts of relational names (secondary urbanonyms created by transferring names from one subsystem /urbonymy/ to another /urbanonymy/), 5) localizing names such as: *Podkościółek*, *Kościelna*, *Kościelisko*.

Translated into English by Marek Robak-Sobolewski

REFERENCES

Belchnerowska, Aleksandra, Białecki, Tadeusz. (1987). *Toponimia miasta Szczecina*. Szczecin: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Szczecińskiego.

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*, *26(1–2)*, pp. 51–61.

Borek, Henryk. (1984). Nazwy ulic i dzielnic Opola. *Kwartalnik Opolski*, *30(3)*, pp. 67–74.

Borek, Henryk. (1988). Nazwy relacyjne w toponimii. In: Karol Zierhoffer (ed.), *V Ogólnopolska Konferencja Onomastyczna. Księga referatów* (pp. 43–51). Poznań: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Adama Mickiewicza.

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*, pp. 136–181.

Buczyński, Mieczysław. (1997). *Pamiątkowe nazwy miejscowe w językach słowiańskich*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.

Chojnacki, Józef. (2008). Nazwy ciągów i obiektów komunikacyjnych (ulic, alei, placów, mostów itp.). In: Zygmunt Zagórski (ed.), *Nazewnictwo geograficzne Poznania. Zbiór studiów* (pp. 427–537). Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Adama Mickiewicza.

Czachorowska, Magdalena, Czaplicka-Jedlikowska, Maria, Jaracz, Małgorzata, Paluszak-Bronka, Anna. (2008). *Słownik toponimów miejskich Bydgoszczy*. Bydgoszcz: Bydgoskie Towarzystwo Naukowe.

Dzikowski, Władysław, Kopertowska, Danuta. (1976). *Toponimia Kielc. Nazwy części miasta i obiektów fizjograficznych oraz nazwy ulic i placów*. Warszawa–Kraków: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

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

Graf, Magdalena. (2008). Nazwy budowli i miejsc wydzielonych. In: Zygmunt Zagórski (ed.), *Nazewnictwo geograficzne Poznania. Zbiór studiów* (pp. 541–611). Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Adama Mickiewicza.

Handke, Kwiryna. (1970). *Semantyczne i strukturalne typy nazw ulic Warszawy*. Wrocław: Ossolineum.

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

Handke, Kwiryna. (2011). *Dzieje Warszawy nazwami pisane*. Warszawa: Biblioteka Warszawska.

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

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

Kosyl, Czesław. (2001). Modele onimiczne w nazewnictwie ulic. In: Aleksandra Cieślikowa, Barbara Czopek-Kopciuch (eds.), *Toponimia i oronimia* (pp. 49–57). Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe DWN.

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

Myszka, Agnieszka, Wisz, Piotr. (2012). *Nazwy ulic Rzeszowa. Historia i współczesność*. Rzeszów: Stowarzyszenie Literacko-Artystyczne „Fraza".

Myszka, Agnieszka. (2005). Miejsce nazw przyimkowych w toponimii (na przykładzie mikrotoponimów powiatu strzyżowskiego). *Zeszyty Naukowe UR, Seria Filologiczna, Językoznawstwo*, *2*, pp. 36–54.

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

Myszka, Agnieszka. (2018). Pamiątkowe nazwy ulic – rozważania terminologiczne. *Onomastica*, *62*, pp. 113–128. DOI: 10.17651/ONOMAST.62.6 [onomastica.ijp.pan.pl/62/pl_06.html].

Nowak, Franciszek. (1989). Semantyczne i słowotwórcze typy nazw ulic Bydgoszczy. In: Stanisław Urbańczyk (ed.), *Nazewnictwo miejskie* (pp. 139–149). Warszawa–Poznań: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Oronowicz-Kida, Ewa. (2014). *Oficjalne nazwy wiejskich ulic w województwie podkarpackim. Studium językowo-kulturowe*. Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego.

Oronowicz-Kida, Ewa. (2019). Topographical Names in Polish Plateonymy – Scope and Evolution of the Term. *Annales UMCS. Sec. FF*, *37(1)*, pp. 135–148.

Rutkiewicz-Hanczewska, Małgorzata. (2008). Nazwy terenowe. In: Zygmunt Zagórski (ed.), *Nazewnictwo geograficzne Poznania. Zbiór studiów* (pp. 167–423). Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Adama Mickiewicza.

Sagan-Bielawa, Mirosława. (2004). Obraz miasta w toponimii dawnego Przemyśla. In: Halina Kurek, Janina Labocha (eds.), *Studia Linguistica Danutae Wesołowska oblata* (pp. 223–231). Kraków: Universitas.

Sochacka, Stanisława. (1970). Wyrażenia przyimkowe jako struktura nazewnicza. *Zeszyty Naukowe WSP w Opolu, Językoznawstwo*, *4*, pp. 77–128.

Supranowicz, Elżbieta. (1995). *Nazwy ulic Krakowa*. Kraków: Instytut Języka Polskiego PAN.

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

Zagórski, Zygmunt (ed.). (2008a). *Nazewnictwo geograficzne Poznania. Zbiór studiów*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Adama Mickiewicza.

Zagórski, Zygmunt. (2008b). Nazwy części miasta (dzielnic, osiedli, wsi, osad miejskich). In: Zygmunt Zagórski (ed.), *Nazewnictwo geograficzne Poznania. Zbiór studiów* (pp. 31–164). Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Adama Mickiewicza.

ABSTRACT

The aim of the article is to determine the place of cultural names in the typology of urbanonyms and to provide a description of the evolution of both the term and its scope. The observations presented here are based on the analysis of urbanonyms carried out from the 1960s until modern times. The author then discusses various definitions of cultural names that can be found in the subject-related literature and their place in typologies of urban nomenclature, characteristic features of this group of onyms (their productivity, nomination motives, genetic nature), and finally presents some debatable issues related to classifying names from cultural and cult, topographic, commemorative, metaphorical, possessive and relational areas. Finally, the author attempts to determine the scope of the term *cultural names* in relation to urban terminology.

Keywords: urbanonymy, cultural names, terminology, classification

ABSTRAKT

Celem artykułu jest ustalenie miejsca nazw kulturowych w typologii urbanonimów i opis ewolucji zarówno terminu, jak i jego zakresu. Spostrzeżenia tu poczynione są oparte na analizach urbanonimów prowadzonych od lat 60. XX wieku po czasy współczesne. Autorka w kolejnych częściach tekstu omawia różne spotykane w literaturze przedmiotu definicje nazw kulturowych oraz ich miejsce w typologiach nazewnictwa miejskiego, cechy charakterystyczne tej grupy onimów (ich produktywność, motywy nominacyjne, tworzywo genetyczne), wreszcie przedstawia kwestie dyskusyjne dotyczące klasyfikowania mian z pogranicza typu nazw kulturowych i innych typów semantyczno-motywacyjnych (kultowych, topograficznych, pamiątkowych, metaforycznych, posesywnych i relacyjnych). W zakończeniu podejmuje próbę wyznaczenia zakresu terminu *nazwy kulturowe* w odniesieniu do nazewnictwa miejskiego.

Słowa kluczowe: urbanonimia, nazwy kulturowe, terminologia, klasyfikacja