

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18524/2307-4558.2025.43.336625>

UDC 811.16/38

**ILIADI Alexander Ivanovich,**

Doctor of Philological sciences, Full Professor of the Department of Translation, Theoretical and Applied Linguistics, South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University named after K. D. Ushynsky; 34 Staroportofrankivska Str., Odesa, 65020, Ukraine; mob.: +38 095 0812119; e-mail: alexandr.iliadi@gmail.com; ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5078-8316>.

**ETYMA SLAVICA: TOPONIMIA**

**Summary.** The paper aims to address specific challenges in etymologisation of a group of Slavonic toponyms. The toponymy, introduced in the scientific use, is interesting because it preserves the lexical units lost in the appellative vocabulary and also archaic words, derived without appellative stage (the genuine formations), therefore their importance for Slavonic etymology and the reconstructed of Proto-Slavonic vocabulary can hardly be overestimated. Suggested paper sets the *goal* to give the etymological explanation of several Slavonic geographical names. Achieving this goal involves addressing four *objectives*: 1) to treat the historical morphology of the toponymic lexemes under consideration; 2) to characterize the toponymic lexemes in derivational terms; 3) to reconstruct the origin form and semantics of the words preserved in the toponymy; 4) to determine the internal Slavonic relations of the toponyms under analysis. *The objects* of proposed study

are Slavonic onomastic (toponymic) lexemes with unclear inner form or not entirely clear word-forming structure. **The subject** — etymological, phonetic, morphological, lexico-semantic features and the area of historically attested words and prototypes reconstructed while the analysis. **The results** of the study: 1) the sum of ancient lexemes, which presumably belonged to Proto-Slavonic vocabulary, got the etymological interpretation (\**bugarъ*, \**čvršakъ* (= \**čvrzjakъ*), \**malozda*, \**morozda*, \**myrorěň*, \**strugarъ*, \**vodotyjъ*, \**vrzota*); 2) it is clarified (expanded) geography of the reflexes of the prototype \**molky*, -*zve* early restored in the special literature; the reflexes of other prototypes that are reconstructed in the study manifest the isoglosses of complex configuration. **Conclusions** summarize the results of the reconstruction of the Proto-Slavonic vocabulary elements, generalizing the achievements of the procedure of the reconstruction and the etymological interpretation of the material. **Prospects** for further research in the field of Slavonic etymology are obvious.

**Key words:** reconstruction, comparative-historical linguistics, prototype, etymology, derivative, word-formation, toponymy, lexeme.

## I. Introduction

**Formulation of the problem.** The etymologisation of Slavonic vocabulary has been and remains one of the leading directions in the Indo-European comparative and historical linguistics. Modern linguistic Slavonic studies draw on the fundamental researches on the history and geography of Slavonic vocabulary carried out in the light of the comparative and historical investigation, on the etymological dictionaries of the separate languages and the dictionaries of Proto-Slavonic lexical reconstruction etc., however, a new material, that is introduced in the scientific use, is outside the early published reference books on etymology. The new lexical data are valuable both the history of the vocabulary, morphology and the old dialectal relations of the separate Slavonic languages as well as the reconstruction of the Proto-Slavonic language condition. The onomastic vocabulary that is used in the practice of the etymological studies often preserves what was lost in the appellative lexicon or just keeps the archaic derivatives, formed without the appellative stage (the genuine formations). Thus, the data of onomastic have own scientific value, therefore their analysis will always be **relevant**.

**The aim and objectives of the study.** The *aim* of this paper is the etymological analysis of the group of presumably Slavonic toponyms. The *objectives* of the study are: 1) to treat the historical morphology of the toponymic lexemes under consideration; 2) to characterize the toponymic lexemes in derivational terms; 3) to reconstruct the origin form and semantics of the words preserved in the toponymy; 4) to determine the internal Slavonic relations of the toponyms under analysis.

The following **methods** are applied in the research: *comparative-historical, etymological, method of linguistic reconstruction*.

**References to the previous studies.** The referencies to the works of our precursors as well as the indication of the **material of this study** are given directly during the analysis. Further in the text of the paper data such widely known source as «*Etymological Dictionary of Slavonic Languages: Proto-Slavonic Lexical Stratum*» edited by O. N. Trubačev, A. F. Zhuravlev, and J. J. Varbot (short. — ESSA) is used.

**Analysis of the latest research and publications.** By virtue of the practical specificity of the selected type of research, we provide a critical review of our predecessors' scientific versions directly in the process of work with every analyzed example, if necessary.

## II. Etymologies

### 2.1. Ukr. *Byžáp* : Bulg. dial. *byžáp*

*Byžáp*, -*y*, *Býžap* — the river, the left tributary of the Zgar river, the right tributary of the South Bug River and *Býžap* — the swamp in the region of the current of the river [7, p. 73]. To the best of our knowledge there is one unsuccessful attempt to explain the hydronym. Cf. in [2, p. 19]: «Unclear name. May be, it is from the stem *Byž* (see *Південний Byž*), however, the nature of the final element of the hydronym is problematic. It can be made an assumption about its suffixal nature, cf. [...] a variant of the hydronym *Сіб* (*Соб*) of our basin — *Sobar*. However, those separate river names in other regions of Ukraine, having the similar outcome, do not give sufficient reasons for the treatment of this final element as a suffix».

There are two reasons for the failure in interpreting the hydronym: 1) isolation of *Býžáp* from the materially identical to Slavonic appellative vocabulary; 2) underestimation of the resources of Slavonic derivation, namely — the model with the suffix -*ar-*, that is very productive as a mean of word-formation of the geographical terms, which often become toponyms. The hydronym *Býžáp* reproduces Proto-Slavonic \**bugarъ* as the extension of the root \**bug-* in \**buga* by the suffix -*ar-*, cf. Bulgarian dial. *býža* 'humid, swampy place', Russian dial. *byžá* 'coastal forest and shrub, flooded with the spring overflow' ~ Latvian *bauga* 'swampy place by the river' (ESSA 3: 78). The old chronology of the forming *Byžap* is confirmed by its literal analogy in the Bulgarian language, comp. here dial. *byžáp* 'fount, protected by people from pollution' (when the underived *býža* 'a small dig, filled with the water', 'boggy swampy place', 'swampy soil') (Bulgarian word is taken from: «The Dictionary of Local Geographical Terms of Bulgarian and Macedonian Languages» by Ė. A. Grigorian, 1975, p. 25).

As regards word-formation cf. Proto-Slavonic terms of the topographical nomenclature (including the water nomenclature):

\**močvar̥* (: Slovenian dial. *mòčvar* ‘swamp, puddle’) < \**močva* ‘swamp, quagmire’ ([17, p. 652]; see also: ESSĀ 19: 85);

\**sozar̥* ‘forked branch’ : \**soxa*; Bulgarian *възра̀п* ‘mountain peak’ : *въп* ‘top’ etc. [13, p. 20–21];  
 \**strugar̥* ‘river rapid’ < \**struga* ‘current, flow’ (see below).

So, we have an old isogloss, linking the hydronymy of the South Bug to Bulgarian hydrographical terminology.

## 2.2. Croat. *Čeršak*

Croat. *Čeršak* — the name of a tributary of the Zelina river. E. Dickenmann wonders whether the form of the hydronym is reliable, and defines it as unclear [10: I, 89]. In our view, doubts about the reliability of the form of this water name are superfluous, and it is convincingly explained as a reflex of Proto-Slavonic \**čvršak̥* < \**čvr̥x-jak̥* — suffixal derivative from the color name \**čvr̥x̥* ‘black’ (: Bulgarian *чep* ‘the same’). This last lexeme as an archaism is derivationally primary to \**čvr̥n̥* < \**čvr̥x-n̥* (see, for example, in: (ESSĀ 4: 156–157: with the literature; \**čvr̥x̥* and \**čvr̥xn̥* reproduces still Indo-European word-forming relations: \**krs-* : \**krs-nó-* [Ibid.; 16, p. 694]), therefore and its derivative with *-jak-* turns out to be older, than \**čvr̥n-jak̥* (the semantics of the reflexes see: [14: II, p. 228–229]). To the pattern «adj. → subst. with *-jak-*» cf. also \**běl’ak̥* = \**běl-jak̥* [14: I, p. 242–243]. I. e. there are two word-forming pares: \**čvr̥x̥* > \**čvr̥x-jak̥* VS \**čvr̥n̥* > \**čvr̥n-jak̥*, the second (innovative) of which supplanted the first pare in the appellative vocabulary almost everywhere. It is curious distribution of the elements of the etymological cluster of Proto-Slavonic \**čvr̥x-* on the areas: the primary adjective is kept in Bulgarian, while derivative noun is preserved in Croatian hydronymy.

Root *e* reflects the dialectal development of the reduced vowel in the word built following the pattern of *t̥rt*, cf. \**čvr̥viti* > *cerviti* (the example is taken from: [12, p. 276] and [14: II, p. 266]: \**č̥rviti*).

## 2.3. Old Croat. *Mirorien*

The document of 1272 about the area of border delineation between Topusk abbey and the lands of highlanders contains the fragment «ubi sunt due mete terree, de quibus directe descendendo versus orientem venit ad caputu cuiusdam fontis, *Mirorien* vocati [...]», where some fount or wellspring *Mirorien* is mentioned [15, p. 11]. E. Dickenmann very sparingly characterises this hydronym as «Isolated. Reading is not trustworthy, hence is impossible. The derivative from *Mir-*; otherwise is unclear» [10: II, p. 39].

Singling out the *Mir-* here is doubtful, especially when uncertainty of the second part. We consider the written form to be quite correct, and reading *Mirorien* is proved by preserving Proto-Slavonic dial. \**myro-rěn̥* in the hydronym. PSlav. \**myro-rěn̥* is the nominal composite of the stem, attested in \**myr̥* (: Russian dial. *мыр* ‘place, where the water cockles, swirls (because of the sunken snags or stone)’, cf. also feminine form *мырь*, *-u* ‘a faint ripple on the water surface in low winds’), \**myriti* (: Russian dial. *мы́рѣтъ* ‘to swirls in the maelstrom; to ripple (of the water surface)’, *мы́рѣтъ вода* ‘the water foams around the rapid of the river over the stone’; ESSĀ 21: 42–43), and \**rěn̥* (: Old Russian *рѣнь* ‘shoal, sandbank’). It is permissible to understand the semantics as ‘waves on the water surface, ripple in shallow water, sandbank’ or ‘sandbank, shallow water, where the water swirls over the stone or sanken snag’. If this etymology is correct, then Croatian hydronymy keeps the etymological correspondence for PSlav. verb \**myriti* and its derivative noun, which were previously reconstructed purely due to Russian dialectal data (ESSĀ 21: 43).

Digraph *ie* very accurately renders the dialectal pronunciation of the reflex of Proto-Slavonic \**ě* as *ije*, close to its articulation in the modern iyeavian dialects.

## 2.4. Russ. *Малозды*

Russian *Малозды* (plural) — hydronym, the right tributary of the Losvina river, the left tributary of the Dnieper river («Linguistic Analysis of the Upper Dnieper Region Hydronyms» by V. N. Toporov and O. N. Trubačev, 1962, p. 150). It is an example of the rarely used Proto-Slavonic word-derivative model with suff. *-ozd-* (the variant to *-ezd-*), cf. \**glem-ezd̥*, \**glom-ozd̥* (ESSĀ 6: 119–120, 137–138), \**bol-ozda* (as a part of Russian hydronym *Болоздина* ~ \**bol-*, Lithuanian *balà* ‘swamp’ [11, p. 8–9]: here the prototype \**bolzda* is proposed for *Болозд-*, however, in light of the above this reconstruction needs to be clarified as \**bol-ozda*), and also \**mor-ozda* (see further).

By itself, the fact of singling out this word-formative element is the indicator of antiquity of the word, i.e. its belonging to Proto-Slavonic lexical heritage. PSlav. \**malozda* is the derivative from the root stem \**mal-* ~ Greek *μέλας* ‘black’, cf. also Russ. *Малина* — the river in the Dnieper basin (ESSĀ 17: 159).

## 2.5. Russ. *Малохва, Молохва*

Russian *Малохва, Молохва, Молофа, Молохова* — the river, the right tributary of the Vehra river, the right tributary of the Sozh river. V. N. Toporov and O. N. Trubačev draw the conclusion: «The outcome of the word shows the same relations as in the *Волхва, Волфа*. As for the rest it is unclear» (see: «Linguistic Analysis of the Upper Dnieper Region Hydronyms» by V. N. Toporov, O. N. Trubačev, 1962, p. 225). We recognize here Proto-Slavonic \**molky*, *-zve*, i.e. the form of the oblique cases of the *ū*-stem that turned into *ā*-declension, cf. its reflexes represented in the hydronymy: Serbian, Croatian *мл̑кѡ* ‘the river or puddle that does not freeze in winter’, ‘puddle’, *mlakva* ‘puddle, pond’, dial. *мл̑хва* ‘puddle’ (ESSĀ 19: 187–188). This name is a trace of existence of \**mol-* on Eastern Slavonic terri-

tory, where, apart from *ū*-stem in *Молохва* the only *ā*-stem is preserved, cf. Belorussian dial. *мóлока* ‘swampy place in the meadow, in the marsh’, ‘quagmire, mire’ (ESSĀ 19: 188). The disappearance of the *\*molk-* in the appellative use resulted the vagueness of the inner form of the hydronym.

Regarding relatively late change of *кѣ > xѣ* cf. above Serbian examples. The sound *ѣ* on the place of *xѣ* is attested in Russian dialectal speech, cf. *ѣост* ‘tail’, *ѣáтум* ‘enough’.

#### 2.6. Maced. *Морозда*

Macedonian *Морозда*, XVI century — oikonym (Kočanska nahija) [8: V/2, p. 290]. The genuine formation with the suff. *-ozd-* from the root *\*mor-* ‘dark’, cf. above *\*mal-ozda < \*mal-* ‘black’. We may confidently talk about a significant age of this lexeme, i.e. about Proto-Slavonic *\*mor-ozda*, because its suffix lost productivity still in Proto-Slavonic, for which a small number of words with *-ezd-/ozd-* (see above) are reconstructed. The supposed topographical meaning of the word may be reconstructed due to semantics of its cognate with suff. *-og-*, i.e. *\*mor-ogъ/\*mor-oga*, comp. Ukrainian dial. *моріє* ‘lowland at all’ (ESSĀ 19: 237–238).

#### 2.7. Ukr. *Стругар* : South Slav. *strugar*

Ukrainian *Стругар*, 1971 — the name of the water body in the Dnestr river basin [5]. Its exact equivalents are found in the hydronymy of Southern Slavs, cf.: Bulgarian *стругар* (as a part of the derivative with *-ън-ица* *Стругарница* — the river, the left tributary of the Brzj [4, p. 135]), Serbian *\*стругар* (in the derivative hydronym *Стругарски*; the basin of the Danube river [6, p. 311]), Slovenian *\*strugar* (in the form with the late vowel reduction, cf. *Strgar* — the name of the streams (in the region of Ljubljana and Krško) [9, p. 225]).

The word under consideration is Proto-Slavonic term of the hydrographic nomenclature *\*strugarъ* ‘river rapid’ (?), derived utilizing suff. *-arъ* from *\*struga* ‘current, flowing water’ (: Ukrainian dial. *струга* ‘stream, creek with fast current’, Slovenian *struga* ‘riverbed, ditch’ [3: V, 450]). Regarding the word-formation see above *\*bugarъ*.

#### 2.8. Old Ukrainian *Водомы*

Ukrainian old *Водомы* — oikonym in the modern-day Zhitomir region [1, p. 143], today’s *Водомуї* — the village (it founded in 1415). We deal with the composite, where the first part is the root stem *вода*, while the second component is the noun, derived from praes. *\*tyjo ~ \*tyti* ‘to swel’, ‘to grow fat’. May be the oikonym is toponymised plural form of the anthroponym, as is the case with *Гладуни*, *Вовкоїду* and so on. But it is not excluded, that it is about the toponymisation of the plural form of the hydrographic term *\*водо-мыи*, that arose based on the set expression, comp. dial. (Podolie) *водá мѣє* ‘the water comes (about high water, flooding)’ (2019; in our record). The reflexes of IE *\*teu-* : *\*tū-* ‘to overflow’, ‘to overflow the banks’ are attested in Lithuanian hydronymy (cf. *\*Tauja > Taujėnis* [18, p. 341] etc.), hence *\*мыи* in *Водомы* could well be an old geographical term. It can not be ruled out that the composite itself is a part of Proto-Slavonic heritage in the local dialects, i.e. it is PSlav. *\*vodo-tyjъ* ‘[place of] flood of the river/water’. Cf. typologically close plural oikonyms: *Ставки*, *Розтоки* etc.

#### 2.9. Serb. *Брзума*

Serbian *Брзума* — the mountain in the south of Montenegro (see: «Modern Montenegro» by Frilley G., Vlahović I. (Frilley and Vlohit) (1876), p. 16: given as *Берзума*). The toponymised participle of praes. act. (fem.) from *врзем се* (inf. *врѣти се*) ‘to spin, swirl in one place’ (*\*vьrзѣta-\*vьrзѣ*). The basis of motivation is the visual image of the road or path that serpentine twists around the mountain (like it «wraps» the mountain). There is an example that is close to *Брзума* in semantic term; we mean Ukrainian *Говерла* — the mountain in the Wooded Carpathians ~ Serbian, Croatian *đvrlj* ‘a kind of female headwear’ (strip of cloth, that wraps round the head) *< \*ob-vьrtla* (see: «Notes on Etymology of Some Common and Proper Names» by O. N. Trubačev in: *Etymology* 1971, p. 85).

### III. Conclusions

1. The etymological analysis of the group of Slavonic toponyms enables to introduce a range of new objects into practice of the Proto-Slavonic vocabulary reconstruction, cf.: *\*bugarъ*, *\*čvršakъ* (= *\*čvrъ-jakъ*), *\*malozda*, *\*morozda*, *\*myrorěнь*, *\*strugarъ*, *\*vodotyjъ*.

2. The structure of the words under consideration points the type of the model of their derivation, namely: the model with suff. *-ar-*, the model with suff. *-jak-*, the model with suff. *-ozd-*, and the model with the suffix of participles *-ot-*. PSlav. *\*malozda*, *\*morozda* expand the small list of known derivatives with *-ozd-*, and Serb. *Брзума* contrary to the relevant word-forming relations with *врзем се* reproduces the old participle fem. *\*vьrзѣ-ota*.

3. Several of the proposed etymologies uncover the separate inner Slavonic relations of the reflexes of common prototype, cf.: *\*bugarъ* (Ukrainian-Bulgarian isogloss), *\*čvršakъ* (Croatian-Bulgarian (Bulg. *чep*) isogloss), *\*molky*, *-ъve* (Russian-Serbian isogloss), *\*myrorěнь* (Russian-Croatian (PSl. *\*myr-*) isogloss) and *\*strugarъ* (Ukrainian-Southern Slavonic isogloss).

Prospects for further research in the field of Slavonic etymology are obvious.

## References I

1. Акти Житомирського гродського уряду: 1590 р., 1635 р. [підгот. до вид. В. М. Мойсієнко; [відп. ред. В. В. Німчук]. Житомир: [б.в.], 2004. 249, [3] с.
2. Масенко Л. Т. Гідронімія Східного Поділля. Київ: Наукова думка, 1979. 102 с.
3. Мельничук О. С. (ред.). Етимологічний словник української мови. Київ: Наукова думка, 1982–2012. Т. 1–6.
4. Михайлова Д. Местните имена в Берковско. София: БАН, 1986. 161 с.
5. Ономастичний архів Інституту української мови НАН України (Київ).
6. Павловић З. Хидроними Србије. Београд: Ин-т за српски језик САНУ, 1996. 421 с.
7. Словник гідронімів України / [ред. А. П. Непокупний, О. С. Стрижак, К. К. Цілуйко]. Київ: Наукова думка, 1979. 780 с.
8. Турски документи за историјата на македонскиот народ. Општирни пописни дефтери од XVI век за Кустендилскиот санџак / [прев., ред., комент. М. Соколски]. Скопје: Универзитетска печатница «Кирил и Методи», 1980–1983. Т. V, кн. 1–3.
9. Bezljaj F. Slovenska vodna imena. Ljubljana: SAZU, 1961. D. II. 365 s.
10. Dickenmann E. Studien zur Hydronymie des Savsystems. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1966. Bd I–II.
11. Iliadi A. I. Etymological Notes on Slavonic Vocabulary. 65–77. *Studia semasiologica*. Кіровоград: РВВ ЦДПУ ім. В. Винниченка, 2017. Р. 3–25.
12. Skok P. Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika. Knj. I: A–J. Zagreb: JAZU, 1971. 788 s.
13. Sławski F. Zarys słowotwórstwa prasłowiańskiego. *Słownik prasłowiański* / [Pod red. F. Sławskiego]. Wrocław etc.: PAN, 1976. T. II. 367 s.
14. Sławski F., Jakubowicz M. (red.). *Słownik prasłowiański*. Wrocław etc.: PAN, 1974–2024. T. I–XI.
15. Smičiklas T. (ured.) *Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae*. Vol. VI: *Diplomata annorum 1272–1290*. Zagreb: Tisak dioničke tiskare, 1908. 815 s.
16. Smoczyński W. *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego* [współpraca redakcyjna M. Osłon; wydanie drugie, poprawione i znacznie rozszerzone, na prawach rękopisu]. 2019. Available at: [www.rromanes.org/pub/alii/Smoczyński W. Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego.pdf](http://www.rromanes.org/pub/alii/Smoczyński%20W.%20Słownik%20etymologiczny%20języka%20litewskiego.pdf).
17. Vaillant A. *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves*. Tome IV: *La formation des noms*. Paris: Éditions Klincksieck, 1974. 809 p.
18. Vanagas A. *Lietuvių hidronimų etimologinis žodynas*. Vilnius: Mokslo, 1981. 408 p.

## References II

1. Legal Acts (2004), *Zhytomyr the City Government: 1590, 1635 years* [*Akty Zhytomyrskoho hrods'koho uriadu*], Zhytomyr, 249, [3] s.
2. Masenko, L. T. (1979), *Hydronymy of Eastern Podolie* [*Hidronimia Shkhidnoho Podillia*], Naukova dumka, Kyiv, 102 p.
3. Melnychuk, O. S. (ed.) (1982–2012), *Etymological Dictionary of Ukrainian Language* [*Etymolohichnyi slovnyk ukrainskoi movy*], Naukova dumka, Kyiv, Vol. 1–6.
4. Mikhaylova, D. (1986), *Local Names in Berkovsko* [*Mestnite imena v Berkovsko*], BAN, Sofia, 161 p.
5. *Onomastic Archive of Institute of Ukrainian Language NAS of Ukraine* [*Onomastychnyi arkhiv Instytutu ukrainskoi movy NAN Ukrainy*], Kyiv.
6. Pavlović, Z. (1996), *Hydronyms of Serbia* [*Hidronimi Srbije*], Institut za srpski jezik SANU, Beograd, 421 p.
7. *Dictionary of Hydronyms of Ukraine* (1979) [*Slovnyk hidronimiv Ukrainy*], Naukova dumka, Kyiv, 780 p.
8. *Turkish Documents (1980–1983), about the History of Macedonian People* [*Turski dokumenti za istorijata na makedonskiot narod*], Univerzitetska pečatnica «Kiril i Metodi», Skopje, T. V, vol. 1–3.
9. Bezljaj, F. (1961), *Slovenska vodna imena*, SAZU, Ljubljana, D. II, 365 s.
10. Dickenmann, E. (1966), *Studien zur Hydronymie des Savsystems*, Carl Winter, Heidelberg, Bd I–II.
11. Iliadi, A. I. (2017), “Etymological Notes on Slavonic Vocabulary. 65–77”, *Studia semasiologica*, RVV CDPU im. V. Vinnichenko, Kirovohrad, P. 3–25.
12. Skok, P. (1971), *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, Knj. I: A–J, JAZU, Zagreb, 788 s.
13. Sławski, F. (1976), “Zarys słowotwórstwa prasłowiańskiego”, *Słownik prasłowiański* [Pod red. F. Sławskiego], PAN, Wrocław etc., T. II, 367 s.
14. Sławski, F., Jakubowicz, M. (red.) (1974–2024), *Słownik prasłowiański*, PAN, Wrocław etc., T. I–XI.
15. Smičiklas, T. (ured.) (1908), *Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae*, Vol. VI: *Diplomata annorum 1272–1290*, Tisak dioničke tiskare, Zagreb, 815 s.
16. Smoczyński, W. (2019), *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego* [współpraca redakcyjna M. Osłon; wydanie drugie, poprawione i znacznie rozszerzone, na prawach rękopisu], available at: [www.rromanes.org/pub/alii/Smoczyński W. Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego.pdf](http://www.rromanes.org/pub/alii/Smoczyński%20W.%20Słownik%20etymologiczny%20języka%20litewskiego.pdf).
17. Vaillant, A. (1974), *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves*, T. IV: *La formation des noms*, Éditions Klincksieck, Paris, 809 p.
18. Vanagas, A. (1981), *Lietuvių hidronimų etimologinis žodynas*, Mokslo, Vilnius, 408 p.

**ІЛІАДІ Олександр Іванович,**

доктор філологічних наук, професор кафедри перекладу і теоретичної та прикладної лінгвістики факультету іноземних мов Державного закладу «Південноукраїнський національний педагогічний університет імені К. Д. Ушинського»; вул. Старопортофранківська, 34, м. Одеса, 65020, Україна; тел.: +38 095 0812119; e-mail: alexandr.iliadi@gmail.com; ORCID ID: 0000–0001–5078–8316

## ETYMA SLAVICA: TOPONIMIA

**Анотація.** Статтю присвячено проблемам етимологізації групи слов'янських топонімів. Топонімія, введена в науковий обіг, цікава, оскільки зберігає лексичні одиниці, втрачені в апелативному словнику, а також архаїчні слова, утворені без апелативної стадії (генуїнні утворення), тож, їхню важливість для слов'янської етимології та реконструкції праслов'янського словника навряд чи можна переоцінити. Пропоноване дослідження має на **меті** дати етимологічне пояснення кільком слов'янським географічним назвам. Досягнення цієї мети передбачає розв'язання таких **завдань**: 1) пояснити історичну морфологію розглядуваних топонімів; 2) характеризувати лексеми з позицій словотворення; 3) реконструювати питому форму та семантику слів, збережених у топонімії; 4) визначити внутрішньослов'янські відношення аналізованих топонімів. **Об'єкт** пропонованої студії становлять слов'янські ономастичні (топонімічні) лексеми із затемненою внутрішньою формою або не зовсім зрозумілою словотвірною структурою. **Предмет** — етимологічні, фонетичні, морфологічні, лексико-семантичні властивості й ареал історично засвідчених слів і прототипів, реконструйованих у процесі аналізу. **Результати** студії: 1) сума давніх лексем, які, гадаю, належали праслов'янському словнику, дістали етимологічну інтерпретацію (\**bugarъ*, \**čъršaĭkъ* (= \**čъrxjakъ*), \**malozda*, \**morozda*, \**myrorěнь*, \**strugarъ*, \**vodotyjъ*, \**vъrzqta*); 2) уточнено (розширено) географію рефлексів прототипу \**molky*, -*ъve*, раніше відновленого у спеціальній літературі; рефлексі решти прототипів, реконструйованих у студії, маніфестують ізоглоси складної конфігурації. У **висновках** підбито підсумки результатів реконструкції елементів праслов'янського словника, узагальнено досягнення процедури реконструкції та етимологічної інтерпретації матеріалу. **Перспективи** подальших досліджень у галузі слов'янської етимології очевидні.

**Ключові слова:** реконструкція, порівняльно-історичне мовознавство, прототип, етимологія, похідне, словотворення, топонімія, лексема.

*Статтю отримано 28.04.2025 р.*