

J. ZEPS

LATVIAN TOPONYMS BASED ON GK.-ORTH. THEODORE & PHILIP

This paper consists of a clearly delimited minor contribution to Latvian onomastics, namely the identification of Latgalian placename components *čūdar-* and *čilip-* with their Greek congeners *Theodoros* and *Philippos* & the listing of the attestations of Latvian placenames based on these components. This initial contribution is followed by excursions into potentially more important topics, such as the question of the Finno-Ugric substratum in Latgola and Latgalian church history.

The eastern variant of Latvian names for Theodore was borrowed from a Russ. dial. *x'odor* < *xv'odor* < *f'odor* (assuming commonplace Russ. dialectal developments; whether or not *akan'e* is involved does not matter). It is easiest to assume that the Latvian form originally borrowed was **kūodars*, and that other forms are explained by two High Latvian sound laws: (1) the monophthongization of *uo* to *ū*, as shown in the transitional *Kūderi*; and (2) the passage of *k* to *č*; and by the assimilation, in several instances, of the *-ars* ending to the relatively frequent ending *-eris*. The above assumption is not the only one possible, but in my opinion other assumptions are more cumbersome, involving the invocation of the process of hyperurbanism [*k* from *č*, as in *kigāns* 'Gypsy' from *čigāns*]. Not all forms can be fully explained (e. g., *kūdra*), but this state of affairs is hardly unusual in onomastic (or for that matter zoological, botanic, and other semantic) sets.

Closest to the hypothetical **kūodari*, are the forms most readily summarized by the phonetic [kūoderi], namely: *kūodere*, meadow, Graši, Lvv.; *kūoderes* & *kūoderes kruogs*, farm, Suntaži, Lvv.; *kūoderes*, village, Krizborga, Lvv.; *Koderes*, RKr. 3.43; *Koderi*, A75; R Tjuder, T126; R Kedary [lege: Kēdary – vjz], T420; R Kioder, village on r. Likup, Spis.; *kūoderes*, farm, Liezēre, Lvv.; *kūoderi*, farm, Ikšķile, Aduliena, and Tirza, Lvv.; *kūoderi*, farm, Lizums, Lvv.¹ For lack of better, the attestation *Kūdras*, farm, Atašīne, CK; R Kiodra, Spis., has been adduced here.

Three attestations are best subsumed under a phonetic [kūderi], namely: *kūderi*, farm, Baldone, Lvv.; "kūdur(u)-sils", forest (?), Mēris, Lvv.; and **[kūderi]*, farm,

¹ All forms are cited as they appear in their sources, except that accent marks have been omitted as not germane to this topic. Abbreviations are explained at the end of this article.

Mālupe, Lvv. Of these, the last attestation "belongs" in its phonetic territory; the other two, however, are too far west to be indigenous to the counties of their attestation².

The easternmost set is characterized by the *k/č* change, and includes the following names within the area of the *k/č* change: Čūdarīne, Baļtinova, PL; Čudarina, A75; R F. Čudarany, T126; R Čudarojna, 1784; P Czudorowo, 1765; P Czudorynie, 1770; Čudarīne, Dzeive 119.14; R Bolšija Čudorjany/z Bolšoj Čudorjanoj, on 1. Stagoršnja, Bēržgaļs, 1784; R Malija Čudorjany/z Maloj Čudorjanoj, Bēržgaļs, 1784; Čūdri, Kōrsova, PL; Čūduri, A75; Čudori, ALatg. 5.214; Čūdarāni, Makašāni, PL; Čudarina, A75; R Nudaranskaja, T126; R Čudaranova, na levoj Drebenki & B. & M. Čudorjany, 1784; Čodorāni, Mērdzine, A75; R Čadarova, T126; R Čudorojki, 1784; Sārņi, Nautrāni, PL; P Sarn albo Czuderow, 1738; Čudrans, farm, Rugōji, A75; R Čudarini/Čudarjana, Sylajōņi, 1784 — same as *čadrinieki* E II 187? Čudarīne, Viļaka, PL; Čudarina, A50; R Čudarina, T126; P Czodos, 1770; P Czodoś, 1765.

More than half of the *č*-forms, however, occur well outside of the historical *k/č*-change area, in the districts of Bauska and Jelgava: *čūdari*, Panemune, Ozolnieki, Lielauce, Lvv.; *čūderi*, Tetele, Stelpe, Bārbele, Lvv.; *čūderi*, Taurkalne, Lvv.; "čūdaru"-strauts, Džūkste, Lvv. The number of these forms is too large and the area too compact to be left without a special explanation; concerning these later.

An isolated form *ķudra* occurs in Launkalne, Lvv.

Reminiscent of the above but not here considered are forms such as *Kuderi*, Gaigolova; R Kudory, Dricāni; Kuduri, Makašāni; etc.

A smaller set of names attest the eastern Latvian variant for Philip, and are borrowed from Russ. dial. *x'il'ip* < *f'il'ip*. The Latvian form originally borrowed was *ķilips; other forms are explained by the *k/č* change and by the reshaping of the ending to *-ups*: *ķilups [analogous to Kozups]. The latter shape has nothing to do with the Lithuanian river name *Kilupis* (as suggested in Lvv. s. v. *ķila*) — a cognate Latvian form would have to start in *cil-*.

The following forms are attested with an initial [k]: *ķilupnieki*, Ikšķile, Lvv.; *ķilupji*, Litene, Lvv.; and *ķilupi*, Kalncempji, Lvv. A fourth form cited in the same

² I prefer to work with real, rather than hypothetical forms. Since this is at odds with the practice of much of Latvian linguistic writing, I am often faced with problems of interpretation. The attestation at hand is a case in point. The entry in Lvv., which is my only source for the Mālupe form, reads in its entirety: "ķūderi² z Mālupe E I 80 un p (un ķūdermale² pļ pie Ķūdeņu² robežas)". There is no way to reconcile the hypothetical "ķūderi²" and the attested "ķūdermale²". Accordingly, I have to assume that the Mālupe form is [ķūderi], by way of a compromise between the cited forms and what one would expect in the dialect.

dictionary article in Lvv. (s. v. *ķila*) is “*ķilupaļava*“ in Bēržgaļš. While I suspect that this is a transposition from [čilup-], I have left this form under *ķ-*, as cited.

The following forms show an initial [č]: R Čilupi/Čilupy, Sylajōņi, 1784; Čilpīne/Čilpīne, Škilbāni, LP; Čilipina, A50; R Pilipino, T126; R Illipina, T420; R Čilipina, 1784; P Czylipinie, 1770; P Czylipin, 1765.

The above two names are illustrative of an ancient Greek Orthodox naming tradition in eastern Latvia. Other old Orthodox names reflected in the onomastic landscape of Latgola may include Akramas (Efraim), Bareisi, Cīmōtnīki (Timofej), Eisāgi (Isakij), Gauri/Gavari (Gavriil), Grigi/Griguļi/Grišāni/Greiškōni (Gregorij), Īvāni/Īvuļi/Īvulāni/Vulāni (Ivan, Julian), Kareitōni (Xariton), Lauri (Lavr), Laduši (Ladislav), Leļi (Lel’), Makašāni/Makši/Makuži (Maksim), Meikulāni (Mixail), Meirāni (Miron), Meitras (Dmitrij), Neikuri/Mičuri (Nikifor), Oponosi, Peilōri (Filaret), Piļcine (Felician), Rokuļi (Rafail), Salmeņi (Solomon), Samuši (Samuil), Sauši/Saveļi/Sauliši (Savelij), Sondori (Aleksandr), Stapuļi (Evstafij), Steivanči (Mstislav), Teivāni (Tiva), Trūpi (Trofim), Vōseļi (Vasilij).

This ends the substantive contribution of this paper. A number of loose ends can still be pursued, to a degree, without exceeding the limits of space.

Starting with the most specific ancillary topic, one may ask, what is the origin of the phonologically “wrong“ *čūdari* near Bauska and Jelgava. Migration is the obvious answer; however, we do not know of a massive Latgalian migration to the districts of Bauska and Jelgava. The known historical dislocation of population to that area is the settlement of Krieviņi (“Russians“ – war deportees from Russia, presumably Greek Orthodox at the time of capture) in 1445 in some 13 counties of Bauska, Jelgava, and Jaunjelgava. While it is well known that these “Russians“ were in fact the Finno-Ugric Votes, only scanty records exist of their speech. Such records as exist, however, indicate that the Krieviņi around Bauska spoke a *k*-dialect (rather than a *č*-dialect), and thus do not support a hypothesis that the forms in *čūdari* are of Votic origin. There the matter must rest. While there are numerous possibilities that could still involve the Krieviņi in the origin of the name *čūdari* (e. g., arguing that the deportations could not have been selective between *k*-dialects and *č*-dialects, and that by mere chance only the *k*-dialects survived), arguments along such lines are too far in the realm of speculation for my taste³.

In a recent article, A. Breidaks has raised the possibility that the *k/č*-change is due to a Finnic substratum⁴. While no-one doubts some Finnic presence at least in

³ Wiedemann F. J. Über die ... Kreewinen in Kurland. – Mémoires de l’académie Impériale des sciences de St-Pétersbourg. VII^e série, 1871, t. 17, N 2; Ariste P. Vadja keele grammatika. – Tartu, 1948.

⁴ Breidaks A. Über das ostseefinnische Sprachsubstrat in Ostlettland. – Baltistica, 1977, t. 13(1), p. 245–249.

the Latgalian north, the extent of that presence and its chronology have not been worked out⁵. Latgalian placenames are disappointingly uninformative with respect to the absolute chronology of the *k/č* change. The earliest forms in *č* known to me are P jez. Czum, Bēržgaļs, 1583 & villa Czernaus, Malta, 1583; there is, however, no guarantee that either of the two names ever started in *k*. The oldest known form positively showing a *k/č* change is very late: P jez. Czuderan, Dist. of Rēzekne, 1712. If anything, there is some evidence that, at least in its periphery, the *k/č*-change is recent: *Džereņi*, Jōsmuiža, PL; R Gereni, 1784 & T420. Also: *Urči/Vurči*, Preiļi, PL – but R Urki, Jōsmuiža, T126; T420. (Jōsmuiža, according to Breidaks, is in *č* territory.)

We return to the main point of potential conceptual difficulty. What are Greek Orthodox names doing in an area traditionally regarded as Roman Catholic par excellence? That the 13th c. Latgalians/Latvians were at least partially Greek Orthodox is beyond dispute. We are dealing, however, with near-contemporary names. Can the Greek Orthodox naming tradition (based on an implied folk Orthodox church) have survived five centuries of German colonial rule? In fact, what evidence there is, supports just such survival.

Before tackling the problem head-on, there has to be some basic understanding as to what is involved. At the risk of boring some readers, let us note that Lutherans are former Catholics; that Uniates (Christians of the Eastern Rite acknowledging the Pope as head of the Church) are invariably former Greek Orthodox; and that Counterreformation, if successful, when directed against Lutherans (and Calvinists) had the result that “the heretics were restored to faith”⁶. The effects of proselytizing activity (under the cover of Counterreformation) of the Roman Church among the Greek Orthodox were much more complex. One possible goal was to persuade Greek Orthodox parishes to acknowledge the authority of the Pope, i. e., to turn Uniate (“adducing schismatics to Union”)⁷.

In principle, the newly-established Uniate churches were full-fledged Catholic churches, and as such exempt from further pressures from the Roman establishment. In point of fact, however, and not without cause, the Uniates stayed under a cloud of suspicion; the suspicion was, of course, that they would prefer a status under a

⁵ E. g., Breidaks A. Pribaltijsko-finskie nazvanija rek v Latgalii. – LZAV, 1913, N 2, p. 97–102; Rudzīte M. Somugriskie hidronīmi Latvijas PSR teritorijā. – LUZR, 1968, 86, p. 175–197; Zeps V. J. A Critique of Proposed Finnic Hydronyms in Latgola. – In: Studies in Finno-Ugric Linguistics in Honor of Alo Raun (Indiana Univ. Uralic and Altaic Series, 131). Bloomington, 1977, p. 427–440.

⁶ E. g., Kleijntjenss J., ed. Latvijas vēstures avoti Jezuitu ordena archivos, I (Latvijas vēstures avoti, 3). – Rīga, 1940, p. 190.

⁷ Kleijntjenss, passim.

Greek Orthodox hierarchy, given a chance. A document testifying to the disaffection of east Latvian Uniates is the 1654 petition⁸. (Whether the petitioners were Uniates resisting further Romanization, or Greek Orthodox wishing for an Orthodox rule, is by no means clear.) At any rate, Uniates could not be trusted; the ultimate answer was full Latinization⁹.

The Counterreformation in Latgola started with the arrival of the Jesuits in Daugovpiļš and their acquisition of properties in Auļa and Izvolts, starting with 1625. Their proselytizing among the Greek Orthodox had two periods of modest success, both well after the short-lived incursion of Aleksej Mixajlovič in 1654–56. During the first twenty-year period (1674–93) only over 700 joined the Catholic church; many accepted the Western rite. During another twenty-year period (1720–42) over 1000 joined. (By way of contrast, more than 4000 “pagans” joined the church in 1720–42 as a result of the Jesuit efforts)¹⁰. It should be noted, however, that the Jesuits were operating in an area of Latgola where Catholicism (before Reformation) and subsequently Lutheranism had made the greatest inroads against Greek Orthodoxy and “pagan” religion; accordingly, the major part of Jesuit efforts were directed against the “heretics”; more substantial numbers of these were “ad fidem ab haeresii revocati”.

In contrast to the Jesuits, whose main target may have been the Lutherans, the Dominicans, established at Pasīne in late 17th c., operated in purely Greek Orthodox (Uniate?) territory¹¹. Their location at Pasīne was not an accident — it was in the midst of the area from which the signers of the 1654 petition had been drawn. The Dominicans were very effective — they were able to establish missions, promote them to parish status, and consolidate them into a diocese¹². Jesuit successes, at least at the outset, were decidedly less systematic.

After a century and a half of Jesuit effort and a century of Dominican (and Bernardine) activity, the north, east, and south of Latgola were under Roman control. All Lutheran churches (except for Krizborga) were now Roman Catholic (primarily

⁸ Brežgo B. 1654. goda, Piscovaja kņiga' Latgalē. — FBR, 1927, sēj. 7, p. 101–119; Zeps J. Kū licynoņ 1654. goda Piscovaja kniga par Latgolū. — Acta Latgalica, 1972, sēj. 4, p. 124–127.

⁹ “... a schismate Graeco ad unitatem fidei orthodoxae recessere triceni; totidem fere a ritu Graeco ad Latinum transiere”. Kleijntjenss, p. 357.

¹⁰ Kleijntjenss, p. 386–406.

¹¹ A small but persistent error in Latvian historiography is the observation that the church built in 1694 at Pasīne had been planned for the nearby Sledz'i. Pasīne, however, is in the larger territory formerly administered by Sledz'i, and used to be known as Słoboda Sledziowa or Nowa Słoboda (by way of contrast to Vacsloboda, in Istra). Thus, the church was planned for Pasīne from the very outset.

¹² Manteuffel G. Z dziejów Kościoła w Infalntach i Kurlandyi. — Kwartalnik historyczny, 1902, t. 16, p. 401–427, esp. p. 419–420.

in extreme southern and western Latgola). Churches of the Eastern rite survived only in the center of the region, notably in the Dist. of Rēzekne. The 1784 cadastre is, however, the last and only document available to me that inventories Uniate churches. The eventual fate of the Latgalian Uniates still awaits description.

The main thrust of the above comments has been to emphasize the point that Latgola was Greek Orthodox at the time of German colonization, and remained Orthodox while under the nominal hegemony of the Livonian Knights. There were Catholic (and subsequent Lutheran) inroads from the west and the south; but the center, north, and east remained Orthodox until long after the demise of the Livonian Federation.

Once the above is understood, a number of previously vexing questions are laid to rest. What is the origin of the ancient Orthodox toponymy in Latgola (Čūdari, Neikuri, Steivanči)? (The answer is now obvious.) How did the Livonian Knights defend the eastern border, given that they had next to no castles in the area? (We probably will never know, but the notion that the border was defended by armies raised by Orthodox Latgalian princes, under the nominal hegemony of the Knights, becomes a real possibility.) Why is the Reformation in Latgola so underdocumented? (It is not; Reformation could spread only among Catholics, who were not that numerous in Latgola.) Is the 1654 document an inventory of conquered lands? (No, it is not; it is a petition [probably and ill-conceived one] from an Orthodox or ex-Orthodox population to an Orthodox tsar.)

Returning to the beginning of the paper: Latgalian *Čūdars* and *Čilips* are two small pieces of evidence in the larger picture of Latgalian onomastics; their linguistic importance is not trivial; they are more interesting, however, in the wider context of east Latvian history.

ABBREVIATIONS

- 1583 — Revizija starostva Rēžickago 1583 goda. — Istoriko-juridičeskie materialy ... xranjašcixsja v central'nom arxive v Vitebske ... 1898, 27, p. 69–95.
- 1712 — Inventar' starostva Rēžickago, sostavlennyj v 1712 godu, Ist.-jur. mat., 27, p. 147–165.
- 1738 — Inventar' starostva Rēžickago, sostavlennyj v 1738 godu, Ist.-jur. mat., 27, p. 166–195.
- 1765 — Inventar' Rēžickago starostva ... 1765 goda, Ist.-jur. mat., 1903, 31, p. 91–207; Inventar' Mariengauzskago starostva, sostavlennyj v 1765 godu, Ist.-jur. mat., 31, p. 208–289.
- 1770 — 1770 g. marta 20: Inventar' Mariengauzskago starostva ..., Ist.-jur. mat., 31, p. 289–393.
- 1784 — The 1784 Cadastre of Latgola, as published by B. Brežgo in Latgolas inventari un generalmēreišonas zem'u aproksti (Daugovpiļš, 1943), p. 69–400.
- A50 — Maps of the scale of 1 : 50 000, published by Armijas galvenā štāba ģeodēzijas topografijas daļa.

- A75 — As A50, scale of 1 : 75 000.
- CK — Latvijas ceļu karte (Rīga, 1940), scale of 1 : 200 000.
- E — Endzelīns J. and others. Latvijas vietu vārdi. — Rīga, 1925, 2. sēj.
- Lvv — Latvijas PSR vietvārdi. — Rīga, 1956—1961, 1. sēj.
- P — In Polish orthography.
- PL — Zeps V.J. The Placenames of Latgola (in press).
- R — Transliterated from Cyrillic.
- RKr — Dreimanis P. Krustpils ... draudzes apgabalā apdzīvoto vietu nosaukumi. — Rīgas latviešu biedrības Zinību komisijas rakstu krājums, 1885, 3. sēj., p. 40—47.
- Spis. — Spisok naselennyx mest Vitebskoj gubernii (Vitebsk, 1906). Cited after M. Vasmer, ed. Russisches geographisches Namenbuch. — Wiesbaden, 1962.
- T126 — (Voenno-)Topografičeskija karty Rossijskoj Imperii (SPb., 1839—71), scale of 1 : 126 000.
- T420 — As T126, scale of 1 : 420 000.