

VARIA ONOMASTICA: SARMATO-ALANICA (*DANAPRIA, BOHUS*)**Varia Onomastica: Sarmato-Alanica (*Dniepras, Bugas*)**

ALEXANDER I. ILIADI

The State Institution “South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University named after
K. D. Ushinsky”

E-mail: alexandr.iliadi@gmail.com

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5078-8316>

Fields of research: etymology, comparative-historical linguistics, general and typological linguistics.

<https://doi.org/10.35321/all92-05>

ABSTRACT

The research is aimed at singling out the Iranian language heritage in the toponymy of the Dnieper and the Bug regions. In particular, it dwells upon the reconstruction of the Sarmatian-Alanian lexical stratum, whose existence does not run counter to the data of the history and archaeology of the areas under investigation. The research has resulted in the reconstruction of 20 lexemes supposed to be affiliated with the vocabulary of Sarmatian and Alanian. Such a conclusion is substantiated by the etymology of the reviewed toponyms, explained due to the vocabulary of the Ossetian language. The latter, in its turn, being the only surviving descendant of the Alanian language, has inherited the typical features of the Sarmatian and Alanian dialects on one side, and the old Eastern Iranian dialects closely related to the dialects of the Alans and Sarmatians, on the other side. A strong argument in favour of the Sarmato-Alanian origin of the reconstructed lexical fund is grounded by a range of exclusive whole-lexical Alanian-Ossetian parallels. Lexical reconstruction is confirmed with certain phonetic and morphological peculiarities inherent only in the structure of the assumed Alanian prototypes and the words from the Ossetian language.

The parallels in the reconstructed Sarmato-Alanian vocabulary and the vocabulary of the other Iranian languages are also described.

KEYWORDS: etymology, the Sarmato-Alanian language relic, reconstruction, prototype, reflex, toponymic area.

Copyright © 2025 Alexander I. Iliadi. Published by the [Institute of the Lithuanian Language](#). This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution Licence](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited. // Išleido Lietuvių kalbos institutas. Šis straipsnis yra atviros prieigos, platinamas pagal „Creative Commons“ priskyrimo licencijos sąlygas, leidžiančias neribotai naudoti, platinti ir atkurti turinį bet kokioje laikmenoje, nurodant autorių ir šaltinį.

Received: / **Gauta:** 2025-04-18. **Accepted:** / **Priimta:** 2025-05-28.

ANOTACIJA

Tyrimo tikslas – išskirti iranėnų kalbos paveldą Dniepro ir Bugo regionų toponimijoje. Ypač daug dėmesio skiriama sarmatų-alanų leksinio sluoksnio, kurio egzistavimas neprieštarauja tiriamų vietovių istorijos ir archeologijos duomenims, rekonstrukcijai. Tokią išvadą pagrindžia apžvelgtų toponimų etimologija, paaiškinta osetinų kalbos žodynu. Pastaroji, būdama vienintelė išlikusi alanų kalbos palikuonė, iš vienos pusės paveldėjo sarmatų ir alanų tarmėms būdingus bruožus, iš kitos pusės – senosioms rytų iranėnų tarmėms, glaudžiai susijusioms su alanų ir sarmatų tarmėmis. Svarų argumentą rekonstruoto leksikos fondo sarmatų-alanų kilmės naudai pagrindžia visa eilė išskirtinių alanų-osetinų leksikos paralelių. Leksinę rekonstrukciją patvirtina tam tikros fonetinės ir morfologinės ypatybės, būdingos tik spėjamų alaniškų prototipų ir žodžių iš osetinų kalbos struktūrai.

Straipsnyje taip pat aprašomos rekonstruotos sarmatų-alanų žodyno ir kitų iranėnų kalbų leksikos paralelės.

ESMINIAI ŽODŽIAI: etimologija, Sarmatijos alanų kalbos reliktas, rekonstrukcija, prototipas, refleksas, toponiminis arealas.

1. INTRODUCTION: THE IRANIAN LANGUAGE RELICS IN THE TOPO- NYMY OF THE DNEPER AND THE BUG REGIONS

1.1. The issue of language relics is commonly based upon the implication of the traces of the earlier existing peculiarities of the language under investigation, preserved in the toponymy. Due to various reasons, *toponymy* retains archaisms, while in the *appellative* lexicon, competition between the older and the more recent units the old vocabulary is often displaced. Therefore, toponymy preserves what was lost in the appellative vocabulary. The same peculiar lexical periphery retains the pieces of evidence of the former presence of speakers of the other languages (substrate, superstrate) in the areas of the modern languages. The scholars have recently traditionally referred the term *language relic* specifically to the onomastic substrate (works by academician Oleg N. Trubačev, as well as several publications by Vladimir E. Orel, Alexander K. Šapošnikov, Alexander V. Ivanenko). Contemporary comparative-historical Indo-European linguistics has data on the Slavonic language relics (Slavica, Sclavania) in the area of the Greek and German toponymy, Baltic relics (Baltica) in the hydronymy of the Dnieper River region, the Indo-Aryan language heritage in the Northern Black Sea region (Indoarica), Iranian (Scythica, Sarmato-Alanica, Alanica) component in the toponymy of Crimea, the Northern Black Sea region, the Don River region, the Volga River region, the Dnieper River region, the Bug River region, in the onomastics of Europe.

1.2. The markers of the last of the above-mentioned categories of language relics (Iranica) are discussed below. The focus of the study is the heritage of the Iranian dialects, which were once common on the territory along the course of the Dnieper and in the Ingul and Bug interfluvium. The previous experience of description of the Iranian lexical antiquities in the Dnieper region enabled to partly delineate the boundaries of their area on the *left bank of the Dnieper* (Moszyński 1957; Toporov, Trubačev 1962: 222–228; Trubačev 1968: 276; Orel 1986: 111; Šapošnikov 2007: 291, 309; the review of etymologies see also in: Stryżak 1981: 31). The Iranian lexical units in the hydronymy of the right bank of the Dnieper are

less frequent (Orel 1986: 111). However, there have recently been added six relics to the list, three of which are attested in the Ros River basin (Iliadi 2021). Incidentally, the Iranian relics are absent per se in the special investigation by Irina M. Železniak on the hydronymy of the Middle Dnieper Left Bank, while the foreign names from the Turkic, Baltic, Illyrian, Celtic, and Thracian languages in the Ros basin are described in detail. This might be due to the focus on the conclusions, previously made by O. N. Trubačev, in particular his idea that the “south Iranisms are in the basins of the left bank Dnieper tributaries – the Sula, Psel, Samara and near them; only the *Sura*, *Domotkan* and *Samotkan* flow in the Dnieper on the right, close proximity to the mouth of the Samara river. However, otherwise the Right Bank Ukraine, in a broad sense, turns out to be free of the Iranian traces in hydronymy” (Trubačev 1968: 276).

The search of the Iranian hydronymy in the Bug region has passed two conditional stages. The first one resulted in the assumption of the Iranian lexemes' omission (Trubačev 1968: 276), while further etymological research did not ground this hypothesis (Orel 1986: 112; Lučyk 1999: 9–10, 12–13). However, today the list of Iranian words in the hydronymy of the Bug region, as well as the corpus of the etymologies of the Iranian hydronyms in the Dnieper region, need to be substantially revised. Cf. known Iranian etymology of the name of the left tributary of the Sula River *Армополот* (*Арманополотъ*), to which the authors of the studies on the Dnieper hydronymy appellate uncritically: from **Apmanopoδ* = Iranian **Arta-pord* ~ Alanian *αρδ* ‘God’ and Ossetian *ford* ‘big river’ (Stryžak 1963: 83–84). We would suggest treating one as an element of the Baltic stratum in the local onomastics, i.e. as **arta-palta* ‘close/nigh stream’ ~ Lithuanian *artūs* ‘close, nigh’, *arti* ‘near, beside, next to’ and Latvian *palts*, *palte* ‘puddle’, ‘rain flow’.

2. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

The **purpose** of the proposed study is to single out the Sarmato-Alanian lexical stratum as part of the Iranian language heritage in the toponymy of the Dnieper and Bug region. The stated purpose is achieved by solving several **tasks**:

- 1) The formulation of the phonetic, lexical and morphological criteria of the Sarmato-Alanian/Alanian language affiliation of the reconstructed Iranian forms;
- 2) The etymological analysis of the lexical material selected for the research and the revision of the etymological versions previously introduced;
- 3) The reconstruction of a fragment of the vocabulary of Sarmato-Alanian/Alanian dialects of the Dnieper and Bug regions in its etymological connection with the Ossetian vocabulary;
- 4) The distinction of some isoglosses linking the Sarmato-Alanian vocabulary with the lexicon of the other Iranian languages.

3. MATERIAL AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. The known corpus of Iranian lexemes in onomastics of the Dnieper and Bug regions today encompasses a few dozens of units; however, it cannot be regarded as final until

all available sources have not yet been involved. The introduction of new findings affects the initial outlook on the area and several Iranian lexemes. The **research basis** is formed by toponymes, presumably of Iranian origin, taken from historical documents (chronicles, maps, geographical descriptions), and the sources of the onomastic vocabulary of the Slavonic and Iranian languages. These geographical names in their phono-morphological characteristics are correlative not with the archaic Slavonic, Baltic or Turkic lexemes but with the structurally close or identical Iranian onomastic and appellative vocabulary. In other words, they are explained solely based on the Iranian language material, which is characterised by a certain form of roots and affixes.

3.2. In our view, further searches of the Iranian language antiquities in the onomastics of the Dnieper and Bug regions require adherence to the following three important conditions:

1) The analysis of the data from the above-mentioned areas should not be limited to hydronymy, i.e. *the object of research should be units of all toponymic classes*. This may significantly extend the range of opportunities for the researchers, because the names of areas, landforms (hills, mountains, rocks, mountain passes, river rapids, isles), etc., in some cases also save lexical substrate;

2) The Iranian vocabulary, reconstructed based on the Dnieper and Bug toponymy, should be viewed not from the perspectives of the Old Iranian language condition with some phonetic features of “Scythia or Ossetian type” but as the part of the vocabulary of the Sarmato-Alans/Alans, that settled on the mentioned territories much later. There is essential linguistic evidence, supported by the archaeological and historical findings (cf.: (a) the settlements of the Sarmatian epoch in the Low Dnieper region; Viazmitina 1962; (b) the Alans on the Dnieper; Kazanskij, Mastykova 1999: 119);

3) The prototypes should be restored in the form corresponding to the Middle Iranian language condition with the features peculiar to the Eastern Iranian dialects. The parsed lexemes are mostly Sarmato-Alanian innovations; therefore, the Old Iranian reconstruction, carried out in the previous studies, is not always appropriate.

3.3. The methods used in the proposed study are as follows: etymological and comparative-historical (in particular, the following techniques are relevant for: establishing the genetic identity of the compared forms, determining the relative chronology of language phenomena, reconstruction of prototypes).

3.4. The Iranian prototypes given below are reconstructed, etymologised and verified mainly by taking into account the vocabulary of the Ossetian language, i.e. the genetic successor of the languages of the Sarmato-Alans and Alans. On this basis, the restored Iranian forms are determined as Alanian or Sarmatian-Alanian. Thus, we have Alanian lexemes, preserved in the toponymy; these are the prototypes, i.e. forms, reflecting the old phonetic and morphological condition of Ossetian vocabulary.

Linguistic constructions are matched with historical data. The name Alano-Sarmats was commonly employed by scholars to denote all the Iranian-speaking tribes of the steppe

and adjacent territories, descendants of the antique Sarmats and Alans. “At the Black Sea Coast by the beginning of the Great Migration period most of them were already known as the Alans” (Kazanskij, Mastykova 1999: 119).

Criteria of the Sarmato-Alanian or Alanian affiliation
of the reconstructed vocabulary

Lexical:

a) The restored Iranian form has the whole-lexical analog in the Ossetian vocabulary;
b) The reconstructed composite does not have the *whole-lexical* etymological counterpart in the Ossetian vocabulary, however Ossetian analogs are found *separately for each part* of the composite;

c) The whole-lexical etymological parallels are found in the Pamir languages, belonging to the Eastern Iranian group. In this case it is about the units of archaic vocabulary, common for the dialects of the Sarmato-Alans and ancestors of Pamiris;

d) The Sarmato-Alanian prototype, reconstructed with reference to the complete correspondences in the Western Iranian vocabulary, reproduces the archaic parallel from the group of the separate Sarmato-Alano-Western Iranian isoglosses (preliminary conclusion).

Phonetic (peculiar to the historical phonetics of the Alanian and Ossetian languages):

a) Monophthongization of diphthongs **ai > i*, **au > u* before *n*;
b) Syncope of short *a*, *i*;
c) Changing **k > x* under the influence of *i* in the next syllable;
d) Changing **p > f* before *i*;
e) Changing **t > c* before *i*;
f) Sporadic dropping *w* in the inlaut after sonants and consonants before *ā*, *a*;
g) Changing the phonetic group “t + i + č” into geminated whistling affricate (after syncope of *i*): *tič > cic > cc* (> Slavonic *y* [ts]);

Derivational and morphological: the presence of suffixes and suffixal complexes *-ak-/ -āk-*, *-čī-*, *-al-/ -el-*, *-ag-ān-*, *-i-či-ā*, *-ič-a-* in the reconstructed words.

4. SARMATO-ALANIAN LANGUAGE RELICS: ETYMOLOGY AND AREA

4.1. The area of the Dnieper region

**ǎf-sarak* (< **ǎpi šar-aka-*)

Авсорок, Овсорок – the left tr. of the Bolva River, the left tr. of the Desna River. V. N. Toporov and O. N. Trubačev recognise the Iranian character of this hydronym with reference to the Ossetian *ǣfsūrǧ* ‘filtrate of beer’ (literally – ‘red water’) (Toporov, Trubačev 1962: 222 (*ǣvsurǧ*): while not excluding the possibility of the local Slavonic formation either). While accepting this etymology, we nevertheless consider the opportunities of the treatment of the hydronym genesis not exhausted yet. For example, to the same extent, this noun may be treated as the Alanian word **ǎf-sarak* (< **ǎf-šarak*) ‘[river with] water rapids/rifts’, that

arose based on the collapsed phrase **āpi šar-aka-* = *water, that flows/falls with the noise*. In its composition, the reflex of **āpi-* as the female form of the Proto-Iranian **āp-* ‘water’ (it is attested in the Ossetian appellative vocabulary (Abaev 1949: 153; 1958: 84) and hydronymy) is recognised. The second part is probably the suffixed (-*ak-*) Iranian onomatopoeic stem **šar-* ‘the murmur of water’, cf. Wakhi *šor-šor* ‘the same’, *šaršarā* ‘waterfall’, ‘river threshold’, Persian *šārīdan* ‘to flow with the noise’, Tajik *šorīdan* ‘to flow’, ‘to flow like a river’ (Abaev 1958: 220; Steblin-Kamensky 1999: 328, 329). The probable Alanian prototype **āf-sarak* (> contemporary *Авсорок*) corresponds to the suffixless Persian *ābšār* ‘waterfall’ (Abaev 1958: 220) with **āpa-*.

**dūr-astur* or **dūr-ustur*

Дупéхмуп – the stone at the entrance to the Dnieper rapid Vovniga. In onomastic literature this name is treated due to folk etymology as a dialectal form for *дупéктор*, because, according to the stories, “an incident happened to one *дупéхмуп*” near this stone (Čabanenko 2008: 42). We believe that modern form of the toponym is the result of rethinking non-Slavonic name in the local Slavonic speech. Presumably, it is Alanian **dūr-astur* or **dūr-ustur* ‘big stone’. Comp. Ossetian *dūr*, *dor* ‘stone’ and (*æ*)*stur*, (*u*)*stur* ‘big’ (Abaev 1958: 376; Abaev 1979: 158), toponyms with inversion of parts *Stur-dor* “Big Stone” (Abaev 1958: 376), *Усмуп доруп цор* “Near the Big Stone” (Tsagaeva 1975: 363), i. e. with the same *усмуп дор*.

The reconstruction of the variant prototypes is dictated by quite unclear quality of the prothesis (*a-* or *u-*?) in Alanian adj. **stur*; the antiquity of the forms with the vowel prothesis is indirectly confirmed by the etymology of the modern *Днестр* as Scythian **Dan-æst(u)r* or **Dan-ust(u)r* ~ Ossetian *ustur-don* ‘big river’ (Kambolov 2006: 114).

The composite contains the name of stone, borrowed from the Caucasian languages, hence, it is logical to conclude the belonging **dūr-astur*/**dūr-ustur* to the vocabulary of the Alans, whose ancestors came from the Fore-Caucasus.

The etymology in (Iliadi 2018) needs to be substantially revised.

**lakand*

Lochany, 1594 – the name of the third rapid on the Dnieper (Lassota 1866: 209). Later forms are: *Лоханноу*, 1627: «А ниже Сурского 2 версты порог *Лоханноу*» (Книга 1950: 111), *Порогъ Лоханѣй*, 1697 (Veličko 1855: 473), *Luchan*, 1736–1737 (РТТ 1736–1737), *Luchanskoy*, 1769 (NAM 1769), *Порогъ Лаханский*, 1779, (on the map of the Low Dnieper by Ê. Арапов) *Порогъ Лоханинь*, 1780 (DPND 1779–1780), now it is *Лоханський* – a rapid on the Dnieper above the island Strelčatyi. The version of its origin in the literature on onomastics is as follows: the stem of this toponym is related to the Ukrainian dial. *лóхнути* ‘to hit desperately’, because water stream “was desperately crashing against the granite threshold in its path” (Čabanenko 2008: 95). However, the difference in the position of stress in the compared forms is not commented.

The variants of the toponym demonstrate labile root vocalism (*o* : *y* : *a*), the difference of the derivational structure and grammar properties, cf.: *-o* || *-ы* (*-y*) || *-н-ой* || *-ей* or *-уй* (*-һуй*) || *-ский* (*-skey*) || *-ун*. Such cases are common for deetymologized vocabulary: the obscurity of the inner form of the word leads to its convergence with phonetically similar heterogeneous words and then results in its morphological change. In the case of *Лохань* we have the result of folk etymological rethinking of the foreign toponym. There is a reason to believe that it comes from the Middle Iranian **lakand* as a reflex of the Proto-Iranian part. act. **lakant-*, cf. Yazghulami *lakánd* ‘overhanging rock’ ~ Proto-Iranian **¹lak-* < PIE **lek-* ‘to bend, bow, flex’, ‘to dangle’, ‘to jump’, ‘to leap’ (Stebline-Kamensky 1999: 223; Edelman 2015: 57, 59, 60). It is about a visual image of the stones rising over the water, a steep gradient, causing an increase in water velocity or turbulence. The water “jumps” and this metaphor plausibly explains the usage of the Middle Iranian **lakand* ‘rock, stone into the rapids’ as the name of the river threshold. For the structure and semantics of **lakant-* cf. part. **barž-ant-* or **br̥ž-ant-* ‘towering, high’ (: Avestan *bərəzant-* ‘high’, Ossetian *bærzond* ‘high’) < **barž-* ‘to rise’ (Abaev 1958: 254).

The atypicality of the final *-d* (and generally outcome *-nd*) for the Slavonic toponymy contributed to the formal modification of this name in the Slavonic language: this sound was eliminated, and the clipped form **Лакан* assimilated with the dial. *лох́аня, лох́ань* ‘clay bowl’, ‘jug’, ‘bucket’, whence is the substitution of primordial **a* > *o* (however, **a* for a while was still retained, comp. above *Порогъ Лаханский*) and **k* > *x*.

The etymology in (Iliadi 2018) needs to be substantially revised.

As regards PIE etymon see: (Pokorny 1959: 673; LIV 2001 [1998]: 411). According to Helmut Rix’s dictionary the root **lek-* is uncertain. However, this etymon is attested not only in the Baltic and Germanic languages (LIV 2001 [1998]: Ibid.), but also in Slavonic (ESSJ XIV 147–148: with the detailed parsing of the known versions) and Greek (Beekes 2010: 856: **lek-* ‘jump’) primordial vocabulary. PIE **lek-* is recognised in the recent studies too, cf., for example, (Edelman 2015: 57–60: the vast Iranian etymological cluster with a broad semantic spectrum) and (Adams 2013: 613: *lyak*), where it is one of the possible sources of Tocharian words.

**sāg-barz*

Сазбарца – the local name in the area of the village Zolotaja Balka in Novovorontsovskij district of Kherson region (the lower course of the Dnieper, the right bank) (recording of 1973; OA). Probably, it is the result of the evolution of the primordial **Сазбарз* in the foreign environment. **Сазбарз* reproduces the Alanian word **sāg-barz* ‘deer hill’, cf. Ossetian *Сазбарз* = “Deer Hill” from *сaz* ‘deer’ + *барз* ‘hill’, ‘bump’, ‘upland’ (Tsagaeva 1975: 429).

**san-ford/*sān-ford*

Old Russian *Снопородъ*, 1169 («слышѣвшѣ же князи, оже Половци побѣгли и оставивше кошѣ свои поидоша по них вборзѣ, оставивше у възѣ своихъ Ярослав

Всеволодича. Пришедше же взяша вежи Половецкы на Угль рѣцѣ, а другыє по Снопороду, а самѣхъ постигоша у Черного лѣса, и ту избиша...»; Moskovskij svod 1949: 77), *Снепородъ*, 1187 («кнѣзи Роускиѣ поидоша по Днѣпроу <...> и доидоша до Снепорода»; Ipatievskaja letopis 1962: 653), *Снепородъ*, 1552 (*Литовская метрика*: «Князь великий Литовскій Гедиминъ, завоевавши надъ моремъ Кафу и весь Перекопъ и Черкасы Питигорское, и приведши Черкасовъ часть з княгинею ихъ, посадилъ ихъ на Снепородѣ а иншихъ на Днепре»), *Слѣпородъ*, 1887 (Lazarevskij 1887: 39), *Sliporok*, 1665, now it is *Слѣпори́дъ*, -о́ду (the form with *Слѣн*- appears since the beginning of the 18th century) – river, the right tr. of the Sula, the left tr. of the Dnieper (SHU 1979: 510).

The previously stated (see: Iliadi 2021: 504–505) review of the accepted etymology by O. N. Trubačev *Снопород*, *Снепород* as evolution of Middle Iranian **san-pord/*san-ford* ‘confluence, confluent’ < **san-parata-* (the composition of Aryan prefix **san-* and **parata-* ‘big river’) spares us the necessity to dwell upon the historic part of the issue. There should be noted only two important points: 1) Aryan prefix **san-* already in Proto-Iranian sounded like **han-* (!), therefore we need to search another explanation for **san-*; 2) Proto-Iranian prototype for Middle Iranian *-pord/-ford*, according to recent studies, is **paud-ra-* ‘(big) river’ (← ‘something moving’), that is not related to **parata-*, Scythian Πόρατα (see: Dzitsoity 2021: 265).

The new etymology of the hydronym as Middle Iranian **[a]sang-pord/*[a]sang-parat* ‘stone river/water’ (Iliadi 2021: 504–505) needs to be clarified. In particular, Prof. Yury A. Dzitsoity in the oral discussion (2021) pointed to the possibility of the genetic relation of the first part of the composite to Proto-Iranian **san-* ‘to mount, ascend’, ‘to rise’ (in detail about this ethymon see: Bailey 1979: 419; Steblin-Kamensky 1999: 307; Cheung 2007: 330–332).

Regarding this interpretation, the explanation of this hydronym as of Sarmato-Alanian origin does not seem contradictory **san-ford/*sān-ford*, consisting of: 1) the reflex of Proto-Iranian **san-a-* (part. act.) or **sān-* (caus.) ~ **san-* ‘to mount, ascend’, ‘to rise’; 2) Sarmato-Alanian **ford* (: Ossetian *ford* ‘big river’).

For a clearer understanding of the semantics of **san-/*sān-* it’s useful to pay attention to it cognates, cf. Avestan *sanaka-* ‘river mouth’ (or ‘place, where [coastline of river] rises’), Ossetian topographical term *sæn* ‘mountainside’ in *Sæna* (oronym) and *Dorgin-sæn* (Dzitsoity 2018a: 100; 2020: 105–107). Perhaps **san-ford/*sān-ford* was the descriptive designation of the river, where the water level rises because of natural obstacles, or just the river with cascades.

The definition of the hydronym as a unit of the Sarmato-Alanian vocabulary is due not only to the data of the languages closely related to Sarmato-Alanian dialects. Inclusion of **san-ford/*sān-ford* in the list of Sarmato-Alanian lexical relics is indirectly confirmed by its geography: the area of this name (the right bank of the Sula) coincides with the area of Sarmatian burials of I–II centuries AD (Priimak 2022: 224: the map) and borders with the

area of the Alano-Sarmatian burials of III–IV centuries AD, a part of which is found in the Vorskla River basin (Kazanskij, Mastykova 1999: 119, 126).

*wār-dax-āl or *wār-dax-el (< *wār-tax-āl/-el)

Вордахель – the right tr. of the Molohva River, the right tr. of the Vehra, the right tr. of the Sozh. In a classic study by O. N. Trubačev and V. N. Toporov, this hydronym is given as a variant to *Ведрихан*. The latter is determined as unclear, but the conclusion is accompanied by the assumption about the similarity of the ending of the word to the river name *Хан* (basin of the Seim River) = Iranian *χan-* ‘well, source’ and labiality of *dr* : *rd* (as in Ossetian), peculiar to certain dialects, although the absence of the other Iranian hydronyms in this area reduces the likelihood of Iranian etymology (Toporov, Trubačev 1962: 223).

Вордахель and *Ведрихан* are the heterogeneous formations with the minimum phonetic similarity. We should leave aside *Ведрихан* before clarifying the details of its morphology and genetic relations and focus on *Вордахель*. The structural evolution in isolation from the native language environment has changed the form of the word, but there seem to be some traces of its etymological composition. We mean preservation of Sarmato-Alanian *wār-dax-āl < *wār-tax-āl ‘river with rapids’ in the hydronym. The composite consists of: *wār < Proto-Iranian **uar-*/**ūr-* ‘rain’, ‘water’ (: Avestan *vairi-* ‘lake’, *vār-* ‘rain’; Bartholomae 1904: 1364, 1410; *Var* (differently – *Danabri*) – the river in Scythia (in Jordanes); Jordanes 2001: 166; Ossetian *waryn*, *warun* ‘it rains’; Abaev 1989: 52) and *tax- ‘rapids’, ‘rapid current’ (: Ossetian *tæx* ‘rapids in river’, ‘rapid, fast current’, ‘fast’, ‘rapid’, ‘stormy’ (< Proto-Iranian **taxa-*); Abaev 1979: 284; *mæx* ‘stormy, strong, rapid current of river’, ‘rapids’; Takazov 2015: 528). Extension of the second part by *-āl* is the suffix, comp., for example, representation of unproductive *-a-l* and variant *-e-l-* in Ossetian toponymy: *Xiz-al-a*, *Met-el-a-skæ* etc. (Dzitsitsoity 2018a: 103; see also Gabaraev 1977: 59). Thus, it is permissible to reconstruct not only the form *wārdaxāl, but also variant *wārdaxel with taking into account *Met-el-a-skæ* and similar Ossetian examples. In principle, we deal with the lexeme, whose form *wārdæxal (**уардæхал*) or *wārdæxel (**уардæхел*) is quite typical for the Ossetian language.

The typology of nomination is proved, cf. Ossetian (Digorian) *tæx don* ‘stormy river’ (Abaev 1979: 284), *Тæхгæ дон* “Flying Water” – the left tr. of the Zakadon River (Tsagaeva 1975: 16, 212).

The uniqueness of this Iranian name in the area of the Slavonic hydronymy is explained by its transfer in the Sozh basin by *Slavs*, who came from the territory where Iranian names are attested. V. E. Orel sees a similar case in the secondary “replant” of Iranian hydronym *Морожа* in the basin of the Pripyat River from more southern areas (Orel 1986: 109–110: does not deny and Baltic etymology).

*xati-či-ā (> *xaccā?) or *xat-iča

Xaya (*Xumej*, *Xamej*, *Xučej*) – the right tr. of the Osma River, the left tr. of the Dnieper. V. N. Toporov and O. N. Trubačev conclude: “May be from **Xam̐ya*, which, however, does not clarify the etymology” (Toporov, Trubačev 1962: 227). It is phonetically likely to explain one as **xati-či-ā* or **xat-iča* with suffixal extension of Proto-Iranian etymon **kati-* (**k̐ti-*), which is the zero grade to **kanta-ka-*, **kanti-ka-* ‘moat, ditch, pit’ (Kurdish (Sorani) *kandak* ‘moat, ditch’, Sogdian *kntyk*, (Christian) *qnty* ‘grave’) (Edelman 2011: 206). Transition of the initial consonant **k-* > **x-* in **xat-* is explained by the presence of *i*, like in Ossetian *xəʒar* ‘house’ < **kat-ja-* (Dzitsoity 2017: 22–23); *xəfs* | *xəfsə* ‘frog’ < **kašjapa-* ~ Avestan *kasyapa-*, Old Indian *kaśyapa-* (Abaev 1989: 162–163).

Both formants are attested in the Eastern Iranian toponymy and appellative vocabulary with a topographic meaning, cf.: Ossetian *Gob-yc-a* with probable Old Iranian suff. *-iča-* and *balacc* = **barja-(a)ti-či-ā* (Dzitsoity 2018a: 101: with the literature). In Slavonic outcome *-(i)č-* was transformed as *-ьч* (cf. the variant *Xamej*) and *-ьса* (*Xaya* < **Xam̐ya*), having been comprehended as the corresponding formant. However, the variant *Xaya* indicates the possibility of reconstruction of the phonetically more advanced form of the prototype with geminated whistling affricate **xaccā*, i. e. it is about the phonetical condition close to Ossetian *acc* || *accə* ‘wild duck’ < **ati-či-ā*, *balacc* etc. (Dzitsoity Ibid.).

**xur-sin* or **xur sin*

Хурсинъ, 1697 – an island on the Dnieper River in the direction from the city Perevoločnaja (Veličko 1855: 473). The data of the Slavonic and Turkic languages are still not sufficient to advance in etymologization of this name. The Alanian etymology is permissible in the framework of the working hypothesis with reference to the Ossetian (Digorian) *xurə* ‘coarse sand’, ‘gravel’, ‘shingle’ and *urə* ‘(river, coastal) pebbles’, ‘shingle’ (of their formally-etymological relations see: Abaev 1989: 119, 266–267) and Alanian **sin* ‘ledge’, ‘top’, ‘bulge’ < **saina-* (with natural monophthongisation of *ai* > *i* before *n*), cf. Ossetian (Ironian) *synæg*, (Digorian) *sinæk*, *sinæg* (from **śainaka-*) ‘side’, ‘bosom’, ‘ledge (of the mountain, rock)’, Avestan *saēni-* ‘sharp, sharpened’, ‘top’ (see: Bailey 1957: 59; 1960: 32 (with some comments to semantics); Abaev 1979: 199–200: **sainaka-*). In this way, presumably Alanian **xur-sin* (the form yet untouched by assimilation *rs* > *ss*), perhaps was a topographic term, name of the stone/stony hill, which is logical and with respect to the isle as a stone ledge above the water. Semantically similar case is represented in Old Norse *hólmr* ‘hill’ and ‘isle (in bay, lake, river)’ (Cleasby 1874: 280) ~ Old English *holm* ‘hill’, ‘upland’ (Bosworth 1921: 550). However, the lack of assimilation can have another reason: behind the documented form is not the composite, but the word combination **xur sin* ‘stone/stony hill/ledge’.

Cf. Ossetian toponyms Digorian *Хурə кьулдун* “Stony Hill, Hillock” (Tsagaeva 1975: 305), Ironian *Хуырзæнг* “Stony Hillock” (Tskhovrebova, Dzitsoity 2015: 542) and exact

opposite in meaning Ironian *Хуырнук* “Stony cavity” = *хуыр* ‘stone’, ‘crushed stone’ + *нук* ‘depression (in the ground)’, ‘hollow’, ‘cavity’ (Tsagaeva 1975: 119).

4.2. The area of the Bug region

*ars-warm[ā]

Разварма – the bed of dried flow from the right bank of the Ingulets River (Belozerskij district of Kherson region; Černega 1981: 11). The similarity of the initial segment *Раз-* to Slavonic prefix *раз-* does not give grounds for their correspondence: prefix *раз-* would imply the composition to a certain verbal stem **варм-*, however, such a base is not known in the Slavonic languages. It would be possible to reconstruct such a semantically abstract Slavonic etymon **vǫrm-*, but with some degree of doubt, since the traces of its verbal usage are not detected. Such etymology is adduced in (Iliadi 2001: 80–81): the version is based purely on onomastic lexemes, whose genetic homogeneity is not reasoned.

There are reasons to view *Разварма* as the result of the evolution of a non-Slavonic name in the Slavonic language, where its initial segment was comprehended by association with the prefix *раз-/роз-*. We mean Alanian **ars-warm[ā]* ‘bear’s gully’ ~ **ars* (: Ossetian *ars* ‘bear’) & Alanian *wǣrm* (: Ossetian *wǣrm*, *wǣrmæ* ‘pit, cavity’, ‘cellar’; Abaev 1958: 69; 1989: 95). For Ossetian lexeme and its Alanian antecedent semantics ‘pit, cavity’ is attested, however, their whole-lexical cognates in other languages have a wider range of meanings, including hydrographic, cf.: Khotan Saka *bārman-* ‘reservoir’, Pahlavi (Zoroastrian) *warm* ‘the same’, Persian *barm* ‘the same’ (Bailey 1979: 278), Balochi *gwarm* ‘puddle in the river bed’ (Abaev 1989: 95), ‘pool’ (Dashti 2021: 708).

As we see, the meanings ‘depression in the ground’, ‘pit, cavity’, ‘cave’ (go back to ‘to enclose’, ‘to shut’), attested in Iranian representatives (Bailey 1979: 278; Abaev 1989: 95), in the Iranian languages early enough (cf. Middle Iranian examples) developed in ‘water reservoir’, ‘natural water reservoir (puddle, pool)’. The development of the “water” semantics was contributed by realities of hydromorphology: small rivers, creeks often flow at the bottom of ravines, gullies, i.e. natural hollows, depressions in the ground, “hiding”, “shutting” the water. An example of such semantic evolution is precisely Alanian *wǣrm* ‘pit, cavity’ → *‘gully/ravine with small river’.

Examples of the use of *ars* ‘bear’ in Ossetians toponyms-composites are: *Æрсхуынкъ* “Bear’s Lair” = *арс* ‘bear’ + *хуынкъ* ‘holle’, ‘burrow’, *Æрсбадæн* “Dwelling place of bears” = *арс* + *бадæн* “place, where there are” etc. (Tsagaeva 1975: 78, 139). Examples of toponymic use of *wǣrm(æ)*: *Уæрмыты ком* “Gorge with pits/cavities”, *Гыццыл уæрмытæ* “Small Pits” (Tskhovrebova, Dzitssoity 2015: 535, 647), etc.

The ending *-a* can be both a Slavonic means of grammatical adaptation of the foreign name (it was aligned with *река*, *вода*), as well as Alanian suffix *-ā-* (**ars-warm-ā-*; cf. Ossetian suff. *-a-* in toponymy; Dzitssoity 2018a: 107), interpreted by the Slavs as the flexion of the feminine form. The etymological and functional identity of Alanian *-ā* and Ossetian final *-a* in toponyms (of this *-a* see: Tsagaeva 1971: 58–61) is also plausible.

*aspa-xāg (< *aspa-xāk)

Cnacxazy Cy [*Spashagu Su*] – the upper tributary of the Ingul, whose name is unsu-
rely compared (Šapošnikov 2015: 98) to *Cnacubózoza* – gully, the right tr. of the Gruzka River,
the right tr. of the Mozh River, the right tr. of the Seversky Donets, the right tr. of the Don,
1863, *Cnacucozoza* (SHU 1979: 523; Otin 2012: 185). For etymologically unclear *Cnacxazy*
Cy the following is noted: “despite adaptation utilizing the barbarism *cy* ‘water’ [the hydro-
nym] may be non-Turkic by origin” (Šapošnikov 2015: 98).

In our view, the mentioned names from basins of the Ingul and Don (the latter was
analysed in another study) resulted from the adaptation of Iranian lexemes in Slavonic and
Turkic usage (with a complex of processes, accompanying folk etymology). They have ety-
mologically common first component – Scythian, Sarmatian *aspa* ‘horse, mare’ (form, pre-
ceding Ossetian *æfsæ*), however, the second part, despite repetitive sounds *c* – *z* in both hy-
dronyms, has a different origin. In the case of the *Cnacxazy* it is *xāg – a late form of *xāk
‘creek, source, fount’ with voicing of *k* > *g* in the Middle Iranian epoch, cf. its correspondences
in other languages: Ormuri *xākə* ‘fount, well’, Sogdian (Buddhistic) γ’γh, (Manichaean) x’x
‘source, creek’, Yaghnobi *xok* ‘spring, creek, water’ etc. < *xāka- (are given according to:
Edelman 2011: 215). With that said, we can assume *Cnacxazy* to be a corrupted Sarmato-
Alanian composition *aspa-xāg (< *aspa-xāk) ‘horse river, water’, ‘horse source, creek’, cf.
Slavonic names of the left arm of the Dnieper *Конские Воды*, *Konsca Uoda*, *Konska Woda*,
Конские источники (SHU 1979: 251). Very valuable for the reconstruction of the local Iranian
lexeme and its areal connections is Yaghnobi hydronym *Aspi xok* “Fount of Horses”
(Yaghnobi *xāx* // *xāk* // *xok* ‘fount, spring’) (Turaev 2010: 13) and Tajik water names *Acnu*
хоки чаума [*Aspi xoki čašma*], (with extension of the first part) *Acnmu xok* [*Aspti xok*] “Fount
of Horses” (Tajik *xok* ‘fount, spring’) (Khomidov 2018: 19) with etymologically identical
composition and order of the components.

The element -c- between the parts of *Cna-c-xazy* does not fit into the given analysis
of the names. If we accept this etymology, it can hardly be explained as the etymological
component of word structure. Most likely, its presence in the word is the result of the
corruption of the name in the foreign environment due to the different associations with
formally similar words.

*be-gan (< *baj-kana-)

Беган – dried creek, the right tr. of the Bol’shaja Vys’, the left tr. of the Siniukha
River, the left tr. of the Southern Bug (Krivulčenko 2011: 30). It would be possible to talk
about the reference of the names to the Slavonic hydrographical terms like Polesie *біжок*,
бігучка ‘running water’ (Čerepanova 1983: 188), however, the term *беган is unknown in the
Eastern Slavonic appellative vocabulary. The assumption of affiliation *Беган* of Turkic hydro-
nyms with suff. -γan is not confirmed given the lack of clarity of initial *Бе-*.

We presuppose here Middle Iranian origin **be-gan* < **be-kan* < **baġ-kana-* ‘place where the river branches out into forks’, ‘arm of the river’ – nominal compound of Proto-Iranian **bai-* ‘two’ (in compound words, see: Rastorgueva, Edelman 2003: 481, 489) & **kana-* (: Avestan late *kanai-* ‘moat, ditch’, (with prefix) Sogdian *prkn* ‘moat filled with water’ and so on; Edelman 2011: 206). Voicing of old *k* > *g* is usual for the phonetics of the Middle Iranian languages (cf. below **sarda-gan*). As for this type of nominal composition, the same postpositive **kan* is present in *Мордогонова* (the right-bank tributary of the Dnieper) too, as the development of Proto-Iranian **mr̥ta-xan-* > **mard(a)-xan-* ‘dead well’ (Orel 1986: 109) or **mardaganu-* ‘dead source’ (Šapošnikov 2007: 304) with the same voicing of velar.

**dāčī-kāθ*

Дачухотка, 1868–1869 – the river (dried creek), the right tr. of the Kamianka, the left tr. of the Ingul, the left tr. of the Southern Bug (Krivulčenko 2011: 57). We were unable to find phonetically similar words in the sources of dialectal vocabulary, somehow connected with the geographical realities. The coincidence with the Russian dial. *дача* ‘reserve forest; woodland’, once used in local dialects (hydronym *Дачи* (the river in the Ingulets basin) is oriented on this appellative in: Krivulčenko 2011: 57), is coincidental; in addition, its involvement in the analysis does not clarify the second part.

The hydronym may be treated as the result of the degradation of the Middle Iranian Eastern **dāčī-kāθ* in foreign-language usage. The first part here is the Middle Iranian form to Proto-Iranian **dāta-čī-* (> **dātčī-* > **dāčī-*, cf. **rāθa-čī-* > **raca-*; Cheung 2008: 280), cf. the variant with the prefix **ui-dāta-čī-* in Shughni *wiḍāc* ‘holle in the wall, unlocking irrigation canal’ (Morgenstierne 1974: 88: **wi-dāta-čī-* or **wi-dāθrī-*; in detail of this etymon see: Rastorgueva, Edelman 2003: 438–439). The second part **kāθ* continues Proto-Iranian **kāθa-*, i.e. a phonetic form to **čāθ-*, **čāt-* ‘pit, cavity’, ‘well’, cf. regarding the semantics Wakhi *čot* ‘leak’, ‘washout’ (in irrigation canal) (Rastorgueva, Edelman 2003: 252; Steblin-Kamensky 1999: 130). In this way, **dāčī-kāθ* ‘ditch with weir’ points out practical use of the water body, closed by a primitive hydraulic structure. The correlation of **kāθa-* : **čāθ-*, **čāt-* reflects a result of the dialectal nonsequential “secondary palatalization” **k* before **a*, **ā*, which are from the syllabic variants of **m*, **n* (in detail see: Edelman 1986: 30–31).

Suffix *-ka* reflects late derivational adaptation of the foreign name by the Slavs, because the outcome *-at* is not common for their toponyms. The word was extended with *-ka* and thereby **Дачикат-ка* was likened to such a structural type of geographic names as *Гороховатка*, *Комишуватка*, *Лозоватка* etc. As regards sound change, cf.: (*a* > *o*) *Большой Катлабугъ* and *Большой Котлабугъ* (SHU 1979: 91); (*κ* > *х*) *Кашлагач* and *Хашлахачь* (SHU 1979: 243).

**frās-sāyan* (= **frān-sāyan*) or **fars-san*

Фрассань, 1794 – the river in the interfluvium of the Bug and Dniester, which, already in Meyer’s land description, was assigned to the drying rivers, that had no underground

sources and were filled with rain and snowmelt in spring only (Šmidt 1863: 238). We might be dealing with the Alanian lexical relic **frāssāyan* – the form with the result of assimilation *ns > ss* in the older **frān-sāyan*, cf.: Scythian *Μασσαγῆται* – Massagetae (a Scythian tribe in Herodotus) = Ossetian old *man-sag-a-ta* ‘men-deers’; Ossetian *xussar* < *xunsar* (Abaev 1949: 172); Ironian *yssad* : Digorian *insad*; Ironian *yssæʒ* : Digorian *insæj* < **winsati*; Ironian *ysson* : Digorian *insojnæ* < **han-sāna-* (Abaev 1989: 276–278). Alanian **frān-sāyan* – nominal compound, consisting of the reflexes of the following Proto-Iranian prototypes: 1) **frāna-* ‘even, flat’ (→ ‘wide’, ‘spacious’; Rastorgueva, Edelman 2007: 78–79), cf. its preservation in Ossetian toponym *Rovvændag* = **Ron-vændag* (Dzitstsoity 2018b: 124); 2) **sājana-* ‘bed’, ‘which lies’ (: Ossetian. *sajæn* (= Old Indian *śayana-* ‘bed’), Sogdian **šāyan-* (š’yn-) ‘bed’; Abaev 1979: 60, 204; Abaev 1995: 52: *śayana-*; Steblina-Kamensky 1999: 427: entry *yišir*). Thus, the presumed semantics of descriptive **frāssāyan* (= **frān-sāyan*) was ‘wide [river] bed’, or rather – ‘[river with] broad bed’. Typologically, semantic development *bed* → *river bed* is confirmed not only with English *river bed* or *bed of the river* but also with Russian *ложе реки* or *речное ложе* ‘river bed’ (*река* ‘river’ & *ложе* ‘bed’).

In the Slavonic usage, this foreign-language word underwent syncope: the syllable *āy* was dropped.

On the other hand, water bodies often are named by the nature of the surrounding landscape, therefore, it would also be acceptable to explain the first part as corrupted **fars* ‘side’ (> Ossetian *fars* ‘the same’; Abaev 1958: 423), and **-san* as the reflex of Proto-Iranian part. act. **san-a-* ~ **san-* ‘to ascend’, ‘to rise’ in a similar way to Ossetian topographic term *sæn* ‘mountainside’ in *Sæna* (oronym) and *Dorgin-sæn* (Dzitstsoity 2018a: 100; 2020: 105, 106). As a result, Alanian **fars-san* (**Φαρссан > Φρассан*), changed in the foreign-language environment, may be treated as ‘a part of fluvial landform, where one bank overhangs the water’ (the right bank of the river is always higher than the left).

**kard-āf*

Kapḏána [*Kap|ḏana*], -u, fem., 1988 – the name of shoaled flow (the Siniukha basin) and the gully, by which it flows (settlement Novoarkhangelsk of Novoarkhangelsk district in Kirovograd region; Hromko 2017: 253). Probably, it is the relict name, reproducing Alanian **kard-āf* ‘mud water’ – the compound, consisting of Alanian reflexes of Proto-Iranian **kard-* ‘to muddy up, smear’, ‘mud, dirt’ & **āpa-* ‘water, stream, flow, river’, and more specifically – fem. **āpi-*, whence final -f as in Ossetian *æf* as a part of hydronym *Æræf* (see: Dzitstsoity 2023: 359). As regards the first part cf. Ossetian *læk’ærdæ* ‘moisture’, ‘dumpness’, ‘mud, dirt’, ‘muddy, dirty’ < **fra-karda-* ~ Old Indian *karda-* ‘swamp, mursh’ (Abaev 1973: 27; Mayrhofer 1992: 317: *kardama-* ‘silt’, ‘mud’ as “unclear”, however, Ossetian word seems to be the evidence of a potential common Iranian-Indo-Aryan heritage). Morphologically variant composite is represented in Pashto *xərob* ‘irrigated, watered’ < **xər-* (*xəra* ‘sediment’) + **āp(a)-* (Edelman 2011: 290).

The substitution of etymological Iranian *f* by sound *p* (*n*) occurred in the Slavonic language, which initially had no corresponding phoneme (i.e. *f*), and after its stabilisation in the consonant range of the Eastern Slavonic dialects, the position of *f* remained limited to the initial syllable or inlaut. The final *-a* is Slavonic flexion, a means of grammatical adaptation of foreign words, aligned with the appellatives *река*, *речка/річка*, *балка*, *вода*, etc.

**mār-wārā* or **mār-rār-*

Mapapa (the first half of the 19th century) – the river at the right bank of the Ingul (Šmidt 1863: 166), *Mapápa*, *-u*, 1968 – gully in the area of the village Syrovoje in the Vradievskij district of Nikolaev region (SHU 1979: 352: with the examples of rethinking of the grammatical form of this name when its transfer to the adjacent geographic objects). The hydronym might be treated as the compound word with the stem **mār-* < Proto-Iranian **māra-* ‘weir’ (< **mār-* ‘bar the way, interfere with’ → ‘to partition off, to dam’), represented in Sarmato-Alanian and Ossetian water nomenclature, cf. potamonyms with the same root:

Sarmatian *Marabius* (in Ammianus Marcellinus, XXII, 29; Ammianus Marcellinus 1874: 280: at Sauromats of the Tanais) = **Mār-āb* from Old Iranian **māra-āpa-* ‘the river with weir’, Ossetian **Raw-mar-don* ‘water of weir of the big river’ (B. A. Alborov), *don-mar-æn* ‘dam, weir’ (Dzitstsoity 2018b: 120–121);

Alanian **mār-āf* ‘the river with weir’ (Iliadi 2020: 54) < **māra-āpi-*;

Alanian **mār-want* (< **māra-ṽanta-*) – denomination of the river or flow, dammed by the dam (literally – ‘[the river] with weirs’) (Iliadi 2022: 519–520).

The second part of the composite is etymologically ambiguous. Phonetic processes caused the initial sound to drop in the second part of the word, therefore *-ara* is equally likely expained both as **wār* < Proto-Iranian **uar-*/**uār-* ‘rain’, ‘water’ (cf. Avestan *vairi-* ‘lake’, *vār-* ‘rain’; Bartholomae 1904: 1364, 1410; *Var* (other name – Danabri) – the river in the area of Scythia (in Jordanes); Iordanes 2001: 166) as well as the word **rār-*, that is kept in Ossetian oikonym *Papo* and Munji hydronym *Laro* – the left tr. of the Munjan river (Tskhovrebova, Dzitstsoity 2013: 378–379: with the comparison *Papo* and *Laro*). In both cases, it is about a hydrographic term; therefore, the reconstructed semantics ‘the river/water with weir’ (literally – “Weir-River/Water”) is equally acceptable for the two supposed prototypes.

As for the interpretation of the phonetics of the postpositive component, in case of acceptance of **wār* there should be mentioned the dropping *w* after *r* as in Ossetian toponym *Byzyrat* with *-at* < *-wat* (Dzitstsoity 2018a: 95, 100). It is about the process, which began in the Scythian and is peculiar to the Ossetian language: this is inconsistent loss of inlaut *w* after consonants and sonants before *ā*, *a*, cf. *bunat* < *bun-wat*, *fudag* < *fud-wag* (Abaev 1949: 208). Flexion *-a* in the form *Mapapa*, known from the documents, may be both a properly Slavonic morphological element as well as Alanian suffix *-ā-* (**mār-[w]ār-ā*), cf. above *Разварма*.

The reconstruction of the form **mār-rār-* implies simplification of geminated *rr* > *r* by the Turks or Slavs: such gemination is not peculiar to them.

*sarak or *sarāk

Сорока – the river (village Kitajgorod in Alexandrovskij district of Kirovograd region) (Krivulčenko 2011: 176) & *Сорока* – the small river in hydrosystem of the Valuj River (basin of the Don) (Otin 2012: 263), *Соро́ка* – name of the rivers: 1) the left tr. of the Southern Bug; 2) the right tr. of the Dnieper; 3) the left tr. of the Dniester; 4) the left-bank tr. of the Western Bug River; 5) the left-bank tr. of the Desna River (SHU 1979: 521).

Hydronyms are hardly related to the name of the bird, otherwise, we would deal with the adjectives *Сорочий*, *Сорочья*, *Соро́ча*, and *Сороча́ча*. The stem *Сорок-* also can not be oriented on Turkic source like *са:ры* (< *са:рыг*) ‘yellow’, ‘white, light-coloured’ (full spectrum of its meanings see in: ESTJ VI 220–222), because in the Eastern Slavonic use this lexeme always preserves *a* in the root, cf., for example, in Russian *Са́ратов* ~ *са́ры* ‘yellow’ (see etymological literature).

It appears to us a case of the phonetically, morphologically and semantically substantiated etymology *Сорок-* as the Eastern Iranian lexeme (in its Middle Iranian form) *sarak or *sarāk (: Sogdian *sry* /*sarē*/, *sr’k* ‘head’, ‘main’, ‘first’ (Gharib 1995: 362) < *saraka-, Ossetian *sæjrag* ‘main’ < *sarāka-; Abaev 1979: 59–60) < *śara-ka-, *śar-āka- from *śarah- ‘head’, represented in Ossetian and Sogdian (and not just) toponymy in the meaning ‘beginning’, ‘headwater’. Cf. Ossetian *Доны́сæр* (*Донисар*) = “Headwaters of the River” from *доны* – gen. sing. *дон* ‘water’ + *сæр* ‘headwater’, ‘head’, and also *Доны́ сæр* = “Above the River”, “Water-heads of the River” (Tsagaeva 1975: 184, 232, 337, 453, 518). Cf. also Persian, Tajik *sar* ‘head’, ‘beginning’ and ‘fount’ (Abaev 1979: 75). Flexion *-a* is the means of grammatical adaptation of Middle Iranian Eastern *sarak, *sarāk ‘the main tributary’, ‘headwater’ in Slavonic patterned on the nomenclatural terms *rěka, *voda.

In the areal terms, the Iranian origin of the hydronym is substantiated by the localisation in the basins of the Southern Bug, Don and Dnieper of other names of Iranian origin. They are toponymic markers of the area of archaeological cultures that are linked to the Sarmats and Alans.

*sarda-gan (< *sarda-kan) or *sard-ag-ān

Сандаган, -a, 1988 – the name of the fount and dried flow (the right tr. of the Ingul in the area of village Kalinovka in Vitovskij district of Nikolaev region; Hromko 2017: 253). We suppose the evolution of the original **Сардаган* on Slavonic grounds, where the hydronym was subject to regressive assimilation *p – н > н – н*, to be sporadically noted in the dialects. Hypothetically, this might be the case of the preservation of the Eastern Iranian compound *sarda-gan (from *sarda-kan) ‘summer fount’, ‘warm fount’, consisted of the reflexes of Proto-Iranian *śarda- ‘summer’ and *kana- ‘well, spring, fount’ (of the first stem see: Abaev 1979: 80; Bailey 1979: 421–422: *sala*). Voicing of **k-* > *g-* in the second part of the composites is an old innovation, peculiar also to the Alanian and Ossetian languages. Both components are frequently used in the Ossetian toponymy, cf. *Сæрды́ дон* “Summer Water”, *Сæрды́ ком* “Summer Gorge”, *Сæрды́ фæндаг* “Summer Road” with *сæрды́* – gen. sing. *сæрд*

‘summer’ and *Æндæрхæн* “Other Fount” with *хæн* ‘fount’ (Tsagaeva 1975: 62, 78, 211, 255). The latter circumstance impels us to belong **sarda-gan* to the Alanian stratum in the local toponymy.

Understanding the morphology of **Capðagan* as the complex suffixal derivative leads to an alternative reconstruction of **sard-ag-ān* with the counterpart in Ossetian *Сæрдыгон дарæн* (*сæрд* ‘summer’ + suff. *-ыгон*; Tsagaeva 1975: 39) = **sard-ug-ān*? The toponyms with suffixal complex *-ag-ān* (< Old Iranian *-ak-āna-*) occur in the area of the Ossetian language, where this suffix naturally has developed in *-æg-on* (examples see: Dzitstsoity 2018a: 99).

**un[i]-gul* (< **un[i]-kul*)

Ингул – the river, the left tr. of the Southern Bug: «простуючи чрезъ *Ингули* до Очакова», 1673 (Veličko 1851: 341), «Пятій отпочивокъ на рѣчцѣ <...>, которая зъ правой руки припадаетъ отъ Чорного лѣса, а котить въ *Инкгуль*, на которой лози и терни есть и вода плесами, а ити по надъ нею не переходячи до *Инкгула*», «Шестій отпочивокъ на рѣчцѣ *Инкгуль* <...>, на которой два броди шляховіи <...>, а опрочъ тихъ бродовъ на иншихъ мѣстцахъ переправи робыти трудно для плесь многихъ и крутихъ береговъ», 1697 (Veličko 1855: 484), *Ingul*, 1882 – the left tr. of the Bug liman (in Tatar *Jeni-geł*; SG III 291), *Angul*, *Angulet Wielki*, *Ингуль*, now *Ингу́л*, -у (SHU 1979: 222).

The linguistic interpretation of this hydronym has its history. As far as it’s known, Max Vasmer was the first to put forward the Turkic etymology: particularly, he linked *Ингул* with Turkish *āngül* ‘quiet, lazy’ or Turkish, Crimean Tatar, Kipchak, etc. *in* ‘cave, cavern’ or Turkish, Uighur *ān* ‘broad’ with the second part Turkish *göl* ‘lake’ (Vasmer 1986 [1967]: 131). Later, O. N. Trubačev suggested his version of the Slavonic origin of this word, in which the scholar recognised Turkic phonetic adaptation of Old Russian *Уголь*: «Turks of the southern Russian steppes in their turn, probably, borrowed and assimilated this Old Russian local name *Уголь* or even its older form – **Qgľb*, having converted it in the hydronym *Ингул* (variant is *Angul*)» (Trubačev 1968: 206). See also the development of the idea about the Slavonic origin of the hydronyms *Ингул*, *Ингулеу* < **Qgľb* with subsequent Turkic phonetic treatment in: (Lučyk 1996: 132–135).

However, the notion “angle”/“corner” applies to the great rivers (for example, in the place of their confluence with others water arteries), therefore the “angle/corner of the river” is hardly an attribute, distinguishing the river from other similar rivers, whose stream also forms “angle/corner” relative to the shoreline of the other water object. “Angle/corner” in geographical meaning is more related to the *terrain*, squeezed in between two confluent rivers or between the river floodplain and a mountain range. A possible example of the reflection of Slavonic **qgľb* in *old* historical toponymy of Europe is the name of the territory along the estuary of the Danube River Ὀγγλος, Ὀγκλός, *Onglos*, mentioned by Patriarch Nicephorus. This area, occupied by Bulgars, is mentioned under 660 in relation to their retreat under the onslaught of the Khazars (SSS I 203), and in the scientific literature this name is usually referred to the language of the Asparuh Bulgarians and explained as “Ten Rivers (Lakes)”. It

is presumed that the toponym contains a Turkic numeral *on* (Georgiev 2002: 74) (apparently, the reflex of Turkic *qo:l* ‘river’, ‘valley’ or *kö:l* ‘lake’ is implied in the second part). However, located somewhere between the Carpathian slopes and the floodplain of the Danube *Онгл* by that time already had been settled by Slavs, with the leaders of which Asparuh came into contact (KIB 1987: 41), therefore this toponym is preferably explained as a Slavonic word, aided by its documented forms.

In our opinion, the hydronym is the result of Turkic *assimilation* (phonetic and morphological) of the pre-Turkic name. It is about **un[i]-gul* < **un[i]-kul*, that reproduces a Middle Iranian compound word (the reflex of Proto-Iranian **auni-kula-*?), consisting of:

1) **un-i-* < Proto-Iranian **aun-i-* (*au* > *u* before the nasal sonant), i.e. suffixed Iranian (Eastern) **au-* : **u-* : **uā-* ‘to flow’ (?). Cf. Khotan Saka *vañi* ‘streams’ (< **u-an-* or with root diphthong **au-*, where initial sound *a-* later was lost, cf. Old Indian *avāni-* ‘stream’), *vāma* ‘sea, flood’ (Bailey 1979: 373, 383: to PIE **au-* : **u-* ‘be watery’) and Sogdian *”w’nh* [*āwāñ*] ‘river’ (?), cf. *”w’n ”p* (Sims-Williams 1983: 46; Rastorgueva, Edelman 2000: 256), which are variant to **un-i-* in characteristics of vocalism of the formant and root;

2) **kul* (> **gul* with voicing of *k* in the compound word) from **kula-* ~ **kau-l-* ‘deep’, ‘cavity, pit’, cf. Middle Persian *kōl* {*kwl*} ‘pit’, Kurdish (Kurmanji) *k’ōl* ‘pit, cavity, moat’, *k’ūl* ‘deep’, Lurish *kol* ‘hollow, cavity, pit’, Talysh *xvl* ‘maelstrom; deep place’ (Edelman 2011: 356, 357). The variant stem **čau-l-* is kept in Ossetian toponymy, cf. *Cul-ægon* (Dzitstsoity 2018a: 99, 109).

The meanings of both components of the analysed hydronym make it possible to reconstruct general contours of the semantics of nomination as ‘stream from the pit or gully’ (then the name initially referred to the sources of the river, cf. Ossetian *Донадаг* “River Ravine”, “Ravine of the water” = *дон* ‘water’, ‘river’ + *адаг* ‘ravine’; *Ададжы дон* “River of the Ravine”; Tsagaeva 1971: 61, 131) or just ‘stream with maelstroms’.

Semantically, such etymology looks more plausible than “Quiet/Lazy Lake” (there is no reason to state that the lexemes like Turkish *āṅgöl* ‘quiet, lazy’ were used in toponymy) or “The Broad Lake”. Two factors contributed to Turkic reinterpretation of the Iranian hydronym as *Jeni-gel*: 1) the presence of relict suffix *-i-* in **uni-gul* (cf. above Khotan Saka *vañi* ‘streams’, Old Indian *avāni-*); 2) the external sound similarity of postpositive **gul* with Turkic *göl*. The variants *Ingul*, *Angul* result the attempts to interpret the structure of this name in relation to other Turkic vocabulary, see above M. Vasmer’s examples.

Toponyms *Χιγγυλούς*, *Χιγγιλούς*, adduced by A. K. Šapošnikov, are of great interest. The scholar likens them to modern *Жёлтые воды* (source of the Small Ingul or the Ingulets) and explains them as the corruption of Sindo-Meotian **hingul-* ~ Old Indian *hiṅgula-* ‘scarlet paint, dye’, choronym and hydronym *Hiṅgulā* (Šapošnikov 2015: 35: as *Hiṅgulā*). However, previously he referred *Χιγγιλούς*, *Συγγούλ* (the river in the country of Khazars and Hungarians, “probably, the Ingul or the Ingulets”) to the Sarmato-Turanian language relics and reconstructed for these toponyms the prototype **hingilu-* ‘red’? (~ Old Indian hydronym *Siṅgula-*) (Šapošnikov 2007: 298: *Singula-*). But the lack of the other names with argued

“Sindo-Meotian” etymology in the toponymy of the Southern Bug causes doubts in the correctness of the explanation Χιγγυλούς, Χιγγιλοῦς as **hingul-*, as well as Sarmato-Turanian **hingilu-*.

Accepting the historical identity of all the forms (with initial X- and without it) as fixations of a single Iranian **hingilu-* encounters objections of a formal nature. It can not be ruled out that the difference of anlaut Χι- : I-, A- in Χιγγυλούς, Χιγγιλοῦς VS *Ингул*, *Ingul*, *Angul* indicates the dialectal variants, which arose in Turkic speech: they phonetically correlated like Nogai, Tatar *izan* ‘arable land’, ‘border’ ~ Cuman *hizan* ‘border’ (Sevortian 1974: 647), Turkish *ryldymaq* ~ *hyryldamaq* ‘to grumble, roar’, Khalaj *aγač* ~ *hagač* ‘tree’ (Tenišev 1984: 396). If sound X- is a foreign-language phonetic “layering”, then we come to original **Ιγγυλούς*, *Ιγγιλοῦς*.

**waran*, **wārān*

Βορόνα, -u – the river (dried creek), the right tr. of the Sugokleja-Kamenovata, the right tr. of the Ingul, the left tr. of the Southern Bug (Krivulčenko 2011: 48) & *Worona*, 1736–1737 (PTT 1736–1737), *Worona R.*, 1769 – the river, the right tr. of the Dnieper (the region of the rapids; NAM 1769; under 1779–1780 as *речька Вороная*; DPND 1779–1780), *Βόρον*, -a – the rivers in the basins of the Dnieper (*Воронь*, 1898, *Воринь*) and the Black Sea in the Crimea (*Ворона*) (SHU 1979: 121). The names are not related to the adj. *воронóй* as well as the ornithonym *ворόνα* (otherwise it would be expected *Воронья*, *Вороний* or *Вороняча*, *Воронячий*). Rather, the modern form of the nomen is the result of adaptation of Sarmato-Alanian **waran*, **wārān* ‘rain, rain stream’ (cf. Pahlavi *wārān* ‘rain’, Kurdish *waran* ‘the same’; Abaev 1989: 52) in Slavonic speech, cf. eloquent Ossetian word combination *waryny don* ‘rainwater’ (applicably to drying up river) related to the hydronym in the Crimea (Šapošnikov 2007: 317). On the other hand, it is worth paying serious attention to Proto-Iranian **uarana-* as a part of prefixal formation **apa-uarana-* ~ **uar-* ‘to water out’ (Rastorgueva, Edelman 2000: 314).

Final -a is a Slavonic flexion, adapting this Iranian word to Slavonic grammar (may be, as a part of **Ворона река*).

**xūs-dān*

Хуздан [*Хуз¹дан*], 1988 – gully, the right tr. of the Ingul (Alexandrovskij district of Kirovograd region; Hromko 2017: 253). It is **xūs-dān*, i.e. phonetically changed in Slavonic use (natural voicing of *c* > *z* before *ð*), relic of the language of the Sarmato-Alanian population of this territory. The compound word was coined as the lexicalisation of the attributive word combination **xūs dān* ‘drying up river’, ‘shallowed river’. This etymology is evidenced by the Ossetian *Хусдон* = “Drying up River” from *хус(кь)* ‘dry’ + *дон* ‘river’ (Tsagaeva 1975: 415). Due to the preservation of *a*, the word was borrowed by the Slavs (utilizing Turkic mediation?) before the change of Alanian *ā* > *o* before *m*, *n*, i.e. before the late in 14th century.

5. CONCLUSION

5.1. In our opinion, the etymologies described in this paper enable us to conclude the Iranian origin of several toponyms in certain areas of the Dnieper and the Bug regions. These etymologies are important as the linguistic evidence of the residence of the Iranian ethnoses there. The criteria formulated above of genetic affiliation of the distinguished iranisms allow to identify them as the elements of the Sarmato-Alanian vocabulary. Due to the absence of trustworthy Ossetian lexical parallels relevant for Alanian reconstruction, the suggested prototypes are defined as Sarmato-Alanian regarding the phonetic features peculiar to the Ossetian language.

5.2. The phonetic and derivational features of the attested iranisms, their structural-etymological analogues in the Iranian vocabulary, suffice to prove the Sarmato-Alanian language affiliation of 20 lexemes. These include the toponyms firstly introduced in the scientific use (**ars-warm*[ā], **be-gan*, **frās-sāyan* or **fars-san*, **mār-wārā* or **mār-rār-*, **xur-sin* or **xur sin*), names with previously assumed Turkic (*Ингул* = Sarm.-Alan. **un[i]-gul* < PIran. **auni-kula-*), Slavonic (*Лакан-*, *Лохан-* = Sarm.-Alan. **lakand*) etymology or words with previously insufficiently reasoned Iranian etymology (*Снопород* = Alan. **san-ford*/**sān-ford*; *Сандаган* = Alan. **sard-ag-ān* or **sarda-gan*; *Вордахель* = Alan. **wār-dax-āl* or **wār-dax-el*).

5.3. The reconstruction of the part of the vocabulary of the relict Iranian language reveals the nature of the relationship of these words and the Ossetian vocabulary. Cf.:

a) The whole-lexical Alano-Ossetian equivalents (Alano-Ossetica): Alan. **dūr-astur* or **dūr-ustur* : Osset. (inverted) *устур дор*, *Stur-dor*; Alan. **sāg-barz* : Osset. *Сагбарз*; Alan. **sard-ag-ān* : Osset. *Сæрдыгон* (*дарæн*) **or** Alan. **sarda-gan* : Osset. *Сæрды дон*; Alan. **xūs-dān* : Osset. *Хусдон*;

b) Alanian composite words without the whole-lexical etymological analogues in Ossetian, but explained due to Ossetian vocabulary: Alan. **ars-warm*[ā] : Osset. *ars* & *wærm*(æ); Alan. **frās-sāyan* (= **frān-sāyan*) **or** **fars-san* : Osset. **ron* (in **Ron-vændag*) & *sajæn* or *fars* & *sæn*, *Sæna*; Alan. **kard-āf* : Osset. *læk'ærdæ* (< **fra-karda-*); Alan. **mār-wārā* **or** **mār-rār-* : Osset. *mar* in **Raw-mar-don*, *don-mar-æn* & Osset. *waryn*, *warun* (< **wār*) **or** *Papo*; Alan. **san-ford*/**sān-ford* : Osset. *sæn*, *Sæna* & *ford*; Alan. **wār-dax-āl* **or** **wār-dax-el* : Osset. *waryn*, *warun* & *tæx* & suff. *-āl* or *-el*; Alan. **xur-sin* **or** **xur sin* : Osset. *xuræ* & Digor. *sinæk*, *sinæg*.

5.4. External relations of the vocabulary of Sarmato-Alanian dialects of the Dnieper and the Bug regions within the Iranian group are represented by the following isoglosses:

a) Alanian-Eastern Iranian: (as for 1th part) Sarm.-Alan. **dāčī-kāθ* : Shug. *wiḍāc*; Sarm.-Alan. **lakand* : Yazg. *lakánd*; Alan. **sarak* or **sarāk* : Osset. *sæjrag*, Sogd. *sry* /*sarē*/, *sr'k*; (as for 1th part) Alan. **un[i]-gul* (< **un[i]-kul*) : Khot. *vañi*, Sogd. **w'nh* [*āwān*];

b) Alanian-Western Iranian: Alan. **āf-sarak* : Pers. *ābšār*; (as for 2th part) **un[i]-gul* (< **un[i]-kul*) : M. Pers. *kōl* {*kwl*}, Kurd. Kurm. *k'ōl*, *k'ūl* etc.;

c) With a broad geography of counterparts: Alan. **aspa-xāg* (< **aspa-xāk*) : Yagn. *Aspi xok*, Taj. *Acnu xoki čašma* [Aspi xoki čašma], *Acnmu xok* [Aspti xok]; Alan. **waran*, **wārān*.

It should be pointed out that the reconstructed lexemes with geographical meaning have counterparts not only in the appellative vocabulary of the other Iranian languages but also in their toponymy.

REFERENCES

- Abaev Vasilij I. 1949: *Osetinskij jazyk i folklor* [Ossetian Language and Folklore] 1, Moskva, Leningrad: Izdatelstvo AN SSSR.
- Abaev Vasilij I. 1958: *Istoriko-etimologičeskij slovar osetinskogo jazyka* [Historical and Etymological Dictionary of Ossetian Language] 1: A–K, Moskva, Leningrad: Izdatelstvo AN SSSR.
- Abaev Vasilij I. 1973: *Istoriko-etimologičeskij slovar osetinskogo jazyka* [Historical and Etymological Dictionary of Ossetian Language] 2: L–R, Leningrad: Nauka.
- Abaev Vasilij I. 1979: *Istoriko-etimologičeskij slovar osetinskogo jazyka* [Historical and Etymological Dictionary of Ossetian Language] 3: S–T, Leningrad: Nauka.
- Abaev Vasilij I. 1989: *Istoriko-etimologičeskij slovar osetinskogo jazyka* [Historical and Etymological Dictionary of Ossetian Language] 4: U–Z, Leningrad: Nauka.
- Abaev Vasilij I. 1995: *Istoriko-etimologičeskij slovar osetinskogo jazyka. Ukazatel* [Historical and Etymological Dictionary of Ossetian Language. Index], Moskva: RAN.
- Adams Douglas Q. 2013: *A Dictionary of Tocharian B. Revised and Greatly Enlarged* 1–2, Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi.
- Ammianus Marcellinus 1874: *Rerum gestarum libri qui supersunt* 1, recensuit notisque selectis instruxit V. Gardthausen, Lipsiae: in aedibus B. G. Teubneri.
- Bailey Harold W. 1957: Dvārā matīnām. – *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 20(1/3), 41–59.
- Bailey Harold W. 1960: Arya II. – *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 23(1), 13–39.
- Bailey Harold W. 1979: *Dictionary of Khotan Saka*, Cambridge, London, Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- Bartholomae Christian 1904: *Altiranisches Wörterbuch* [Old Iranian Dictionary], Lex 8⁰, XXXII, Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner.
- Beekes Robert S. 2010: *Etymological Dictionary of Greek* 1, with the assist. of L. van Beek, Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Bosworth Joseph, Toller Thomas N. 1921: *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary: Based on the Manuscript Collections of the Late Joseph Bosworth. Supplement (Classic Reprint)*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Cheung Johnny 2007: *Etymological Dictionary of the Iranian Verb*, ed. by A. Lubocky, Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Cheung Johnny 2008: *Očerki istoričeskogo razvitija osetinskogo vokalizma* [Studies in the Historical Development of the Ossetic Vocalism], Vladikavkaz: Izdatelsko-poligrafičeskoe predpriatie im. V. Gassieva.
- Cleasby Richard 1874: *An Icelandic-English Dictionary*, enlarged and completed by G. Vigfusson, M. A., Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Čabanenko Viktor A. 2008: *Porožystyj Dnipro. Istoryko-toponimičnyj slovnyk* [Rapids Dnieper. Historical and Toponymic Dictionary], Zaporizžia: ZNU.
- Čerepanova Evgenija A. 1983: Geografičeskaja terminologija Černigovsko-Sumskogo Polesja (opyt semantičeskoj klassifikacii) [Geographical Terminology of Chernigov-Sumsky Poles'ja (Attempt at Semantic Classification)]. – *Polesskij etnolinguističeskij sbornik: materialy i issledovanija*, pod red. N. I. Tolstogo, Moskva: Nauka, 173–189.
- Černega Andrej T. 1981: *Počvy bassejna reki Ingulets (dokladnaja zapiska i karta)* [Soils of the Ingulets River Basin (Report and Map)], Kirovograd: [b. i.].
- Dashti Naseer 2021: *English-Balochi Dictionary* (Engliš-Balóci Labzbalao), Trafford: Trafford Pub.
- DPND 1779–1780: *Dva plana nižnego Dnepra (konec XVIII v.) iz sobranija D. I. Javornickogo. 1779–1780* [Two Plans of the Lower Dnieper (Late 18th Century) from the Collection of D. I. Javornickij. 1779–1780], available online. Internet Access: https://papacoma.narod.ru/maps/dnepr_earnickiy.htm.
- Dzitstsoity Yury A. 2017: *Voprosy osetinskoj filologii* [Questions of Ossetian Philology] 1, Cchinval: Respublika.
- Dzitstsoity Yury A. 2018a: Slovoobrazovatelnye tipy osetinskoj toponimii [Derivational Types of Ossetian Toponymy]. – *Izvestija SOIGSI* 27(66), 94–111.
- Dzitstsoity Yury A. 2018b: O nekotorych relikhtach drevneiranskoj leksiki v toponimii Osetii [On Some Relics of Ancient Iranian Vocabulary in the Toponymy of Ossetia]. – *Izvestija SOIGSI* 29(68), 117–128.
- Dzitstsoity Yury A. 2020: Toponimija kak istočnik po etničeskoj istorii: osetinskoe *Sæna* / russkoe *Сону* [Toponymy as a Source of Ethnic History: Ossetian *Sæna* / Russian *Sonya*]. – *Tomskij žurnal LING & ANTHRO* 3(29), 102–114.
- Dzitstsoity Yury A. 2021: Etimologičeskij slovar iranskich jazykov [Etymological Dictionary of Iranian Languages 6. – *Nartamongæ* 16(1/2), 260–287.
- Dzitstsoity Yury A. 2023: K istorii labialnych fonem v osetinskom jazyke [On the History of Labial Phonemes in the Ossetian Language]. – *Indoevropskoe jazykoznanie i klassičeskaja filologija* 27(1) (čtenija pamiati I. M. Tronskogo): *materialy meždunarodnoj konferencii*, prochodivšej 26–28 ijunia 2023 g., gl. red. N. N. Kazanskij, Sankt-Peterburg: ILI RAN, 354–367.

- Edelman Džoj I. 1986: *Sravnitel'naja grammatika vostočnoiranskich jazykov. Fonologija* [Comparative Grammar of Eastern Iranian Languages. Phonology], Moskva: Nauka.
- Edelman Džoj I. 2011: *Etimologičeskij slovar iranskich jazykov* [Etymological Dictionary of Iranian Languages] 4, Moskva: Vostočnaja literatura.
- Edelman Džoj I. 2015: *Etimologičeskij slovar iranskich jazykov* [Etymological Dictionary of Iranian Languages] 5, Moskva: Vostočnaja literatura.
- ESSJ XIV: *Etimologičeskij slovar slavjanskich jazykov. Praslavjanskij leksičeskij fond* [Etymological Dictionary of Slavic Languages. Proto-Slavic Lexical Fund] 14: **labati – *lěteplъjъ*, pod red. O. N. Trubačiova, Moskva: Nauka, 1987.
- ESTJ VI: *Etimologičeskij slovar tiurkskich jazykov. Obščetiurkskie i mežtiurkskie osnovy na bukvy "L", "M", "N", "P", "S"* [Etymological Dictionary of Turkic Languages. Common Turkic and Inter-Turkic Stems with the Letters "L", "M", "N", "P", "S"] 6, E. V. Sevortian, Moskva: Nauka, 2003.
- Gabaraev Nikolaj J. 1977: *Morfologičeskaja struktura slova i slovoobrazovanie v sovremennom osetinskom jazyke* [Morphological Structure of the Word and Word Formation in the Modern Ossetian Language], Tbilisi: Mecniereba.
- Georgiev Pavel 2002: Imeto Karvuna i prabalgarite [The Name Karvuna and the Proto-Bulgarians]. – *Palaeobulgarica-Starobalgaristika* 2(26), 70–82.
- Gharib Badr al-Zamān 1995: *Sogdian Dictionary: Sogdian-Persian-English*, Tehran: Farhang Publications.
- Hromko Tetjana V. 2017: Materialy do slovnyka hovirok ukrajinskoji movy [Materials for the Dictionary of Idioms of the Ukrainian Language]. – *Naukovi zapysky*, vyp. 160, Kropyvnycky: RVV CDPU im. V. Vynnyčenko, 239–253.
- Iliadi Olexandr I. 2001: *Etimologične gnizdo z korenem *ver- u praslovjanskij movi* [Etymological Cluster with the Root **ver-* in Proto-Slavonic], Kyjiv, Kirovograd: DLAU.
- Iliadi Alexander I. 2018: Areas of Iranian Lexical Relicts in Toponymics of the Dnieper and the Bug Basins. – *Paradigm of Knowledge* 1(27), 101–123.
- Iliadi Alexander I. 2020: Alanica v toponimii Dona [Alanica in the Don Toponymy]. – *Acta Onomastica* 61(1), 48–60.
- Iliadi Alexander I. 2021: Iranica v toponimii Podneprovja ["Iranica" in the Dnieper Region Toponymy]. – *Indoeuropejskoe jazykoznanie i klassičeskaja filologija* 25(1) (čtenija pamiati I. M. Tronskogo): *materialy meždunarodnoj konferencii*, prohodivšej 21–23 ijunia 2021 g., gl. red. N. N. Kazanskij, Sankt-Peterburg: ILI RAN, 502–513.
- Iliadi Alexander I. 2022: Alanskije sledy v toponimii Posavija [Alanian Traces in the Sava Region Toponymy]. – *Indoeuropejskoe jazykoznanie i klassičeskaja filologija* 26(1) (čtenija pamiati I. M. Tronskogo): *materialy meždunarodnoj konferencii*, prohodivšej 27–29 ijunia 2022 g., gl. red. N. N. Kazanskij, Sankt-Peterburg: ILI RAN, 512–523.

- Iordanes 2001: *De origine actibusque Getarum*, vstup. statja, per., komment. E. Č. Skržinskoj, Sankt-Peterburg: Aletea.
- Ipatievskaja letopis 1962: Ipatievskaja letopis [Hypatian Codex]. – *Polnoe sobranie russkich letopisej* 2, Moskva: Izdatelstvo vostočnoj literatury.
- Kambolov Tamerlan T. 2006: *Očerki istorii osetskogo jazyka: učebnoe posobie dlja vuzov* [Essay on the History of the Ossetian Language: A Textbook for Universities], Vladikavkaz: Ir.
- Kazanskij Michail M., Mastykova Anna V. 1999: Alany na Dnepru v epochu Velikogo pereselenija narodov: svidetelstvo Markiana i archeologičeskie dannye [Alans on the Dnieper During the Great Migration Period: Marcian's Testimony and Archaeological Data]. – *Rossijskaja archeologija* 4, 119–130.
- Khomidov Dilmurod R. 2018: *Lingvističeskoe issledovanie gidronimov regiona istoričeskogo proživanija tadžikov v Maverannachre: Avtoreferat dissertacii na soiskanie učenoj stepeni doktora filologičeskich nauk* [Linguistic Study of the Hydrological Region of the Tajik Historical Research in Maverannachre: Author's Abstract of a Dissertation for Obtaining a PhD in Philology], Dušanbe: TGPU im. S. Ajni.
- KIB 1987: *Kratkaja istorija Bolgarii. S drevnejšich vremen do našich dnej* [A Brief History of Bulgaria. From Ancient Times to the Present Day], otv. red. G. G. Litavrin, Moskva: Nauka.
- Kniga 1950: *Kniga Bolšomu Čertežu* [Book of the Big Drawing], podg. k pečati i red. K. N. Serbinov, Moskva, Leningrad: Izdatelstvo AN SSSR.
- Krivulčenko Anatolij I. 2011: *Vodni objekty Kirovogradskoj oblasti. Častyna I. Slovník vodnych objektiv. Častyna II. Atlas geografičnoji mreži. Klasifikator vodotokiv. Vodoschovyščja* [Water Bodies of the Kirovograd Region. Part I. Dictionary of Water Bodies. Part II. Atlas of the Geographical Network. Classifier of Watercourses], Kirovograd: Imeks.
- Lassota Erich 1866: *Tagebuch des Erich Lassota von Steblau: Nach einer Handschrift der von Gersdorff-Weicha'schen Bibliothek zu Bautzen herausgegeben und mit Einleitung und Bemerkungen begleitet von Reinhold Schottin* [Diary of Erich Lassota von Steblau: Edited from a Manuscript in the Gersdorff-Weicha Library in Bautzen and Accompanied by an Introduction and Remarks by Reinhold Schottin], Halle: Verlag von G. Emil Barthel.
- Lazarevskij Alexandr M. 1887: *Archivnye otryvki dlja istorii Poltavskoj jeparchii* [Archival Excerpts for the History of the Poltava Diocese] 1, Poltava: Tipografija N. Pigurenko.
- LIV 2001 [1998]: *Lexikon der Indogermanischen Verben: Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen* [Lexicon of Indo-European Verbs: Roots and their Primary Stem Formations], unter Leitung von H. Rix, bearb. von M. Kümmel, T. Zehnder, R. Lipp, B. Schirmer, 2., verbesserte Aufl., Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Lučyk Vasyľ V. 1996: *Avtochtonni hidronimy Serednioho Dnipro-buzkoho mežyriččja* [Autochthonous Hydronyms of the Middle Dnieper-Bug Interfluvium], Kirovograd: Narodne slovo.

- Lučyk Vasyl V. 1999: *Inšomovni hidronimy Serednioho Dnipro-buzkoho mežyriččia* [Foreign Language Hydronyms of the Middle Dnieper-Bug Interflue], Kirovograd: RVG ITS KDPU im. V. Vynnyčenko.
- Mayrhofer Manfred 1992: *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen* [Etymological Dictionary of Old Indo-Aryan] 1, Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Morgenstierne Georg 1974: *Etymological Vocabulary of the Shughni Group 6*, herausg. von G. Redard, Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Moskovskij svod 1949: Moskovskij letopisnyj svod konca XV veka [Moscow Chronicle Collection of the Late 15th Century]. – *Polnoe sobranie russkich letopisej* 25, Moskva, Leningrad: Izdatelstvo AN SSSR.
- Moszyński Kazimierz 1957: *Pierwotny zasięg języka prasłowiańskiego* [The Original Range of the Proto-Slavic Language], Wrocław: PAN.
- NAM 1769: A New & Accurate Map of the Krim Tartary, the Sea of Azof, and Parts of the Rivers Dneper, Bog and Kuban. Taken from Original Drawings & Memoirs, London, available online. Internet Access: <https://www.swaen.com/listing/a-new-accurate-map-of-the-krim-tartary-the-sea-of-azof-and-parts-of-the-rivers-dneper-bog-and-kuban/14232>.
- OA: *Onomastičeskij archiv Instituta ukrainskogo jazyka NAN Ukrainy* [Onomastic archive of the Institute of Ukrainian Language of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine], Kyiv: Institute of the Ukrainian Language of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine.
- Orel Vladimir E. 1986: K voprosu o reliktach iranskoj gidronimii v bassejnach Dnepra, Dnestra i Južnogo Buga [On the Issue of Relics of Iranian Hydronymy in the Basins of the Dnieper, Dniester and Southern Bug]. – *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 5, 107–113.
- Otin Evgenij S. 2012: *Gidronimija Dona 2: Nižnij Don* [Hydronymy of the Don 2: The Lower Don], Doneck: Jugo-Vostok.
- Pokorny Julius 1959: *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* [Indo-European Etymological Dictionary] 1, München, Bern: A. Francke AG Verlag.
- Prijmak Viktor V. 2022: Pogrebenija sarmatskogo vremeni bassejnov verchnej Suly i verchnego Psla (načalo I tys. n. e.) [The Burials of the Sarmatian Period in the Basins of Upper Sula and Upper Psla (The Beginning of the 1st Millennium AD)]. – *Druzej medlitelnyj uchod... Pamiati Olega Šarova / The footsteps of my friends leaving... Ad memoriam Oleg Sharov*, sost. i otv. red. M. M. Kazanski, A. V. Mastykova, Kišinio: Stratum Plus, 221–234. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.55086/SL23VAD649>.
- PTT 1736–1737: *Provinciarum Turcico tartaricarum inter Tanaim Borysthenem et Bogum sitarum quas duobus an[n]is viz. 1736. et 1737. Anna augustissima russorum autocratrix subegit ex prototypo petropolitano concin[n]ata accuratissima delineatio: in qua simul occupatio peninsulæ Crim[m] et Cuban nec non expugnatio Assow et Oczakow exhibentur*

- [studio Ant. du Chaffat, circ. Suevici et civ. imp: august. capit. et rei fortific. præf.], available online. Internet Access: <https://ryhiner.ub.unibe.ch/de/world/volume/390/image/9545>.
- Rastorgueva Vera S., Edelman Džoj I. 2000: *Etimologičeskij slovar iranskich jazykov* [Etymological Dictionary of Iranian Languages] 1, Moskva: Vostočnaja literatura.
- Rastorgueva Vera S., Edelman Džoj I. 2003: *Etimologičeskij slovar iranskich jazykov* [Etymological Dictionary of Iranian Languages] 2, Moskva: Vostočnaja literatura.
- Rastorgueva Vera S., Edelman Džoj I. 2007: *Etimologičeskij slovar iranskich jazykov* [Etymological Dictionary of Iranian Languages] 3, Moskva: Vostočnaja literatura.
- Sevortian Èrvand V. 1974: *Etimologičeskij slovar tiurkskich jazykov (Obščetiurkskie i mežtiurkskie osnovy na glasnye)* [Etymological Dictionary of Turkic Languages (Common Turkic and Inter-Turkic Vowel Bases)], Moskva: Nauka.
- SG III: *Słownik geograficzny Królestwa Polskiego i innych krajów słowiańskich* [Geographical Dictionary of the Kingdom of Poland and Other Slavic Countries] 3, pod red. F. Sulimierskiego, B. Chlebowskiego, W. Walewskiego, Warszawa: Wiek, 1882.
- SHU 1979: *Slovnyk hidronimiv Ukrajiny* [Dictionary of Hydronyms of Ukraine], Kyjiv: Naukova dumka.
- Sims-Williams Nicholas 1983: Chotano-Sogdica. – *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 46(1), 40–51.
- SSS I: *Słownik starożytności słowiańskich: encyklopedyczny zarys kultury słowian od czasów najdawniejszych do schyłku wieku XII* [Dictionary of Slavic Antiquities: An Encyclopedic Outline of Slavic Culture from the Earliest Times to the End of the XII Century] 1: A–E, cz. 1, red. W. Kowalenko, G. Labuda, T. Lehr-Spławiński, Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków: Ossolineum. Wyd. PAN, 1961.
- Stebline-Kamensky Ivan M. 1999: *Etimologičeskij slovar vachanskogo jazyka* [Etymological Dictionary of the Wakhi Language], Sankt-Peterburg: Peterburgskoe Vostokovedenie.
- Stryżak Olexij S. 1963: *Nazvy ričok Poltavščyny* [Names of the Rivers of Poltavschyna], Kyjiv: AN URSSR.
- Stryżak Olexij S., ed., 1981: *Hidronimija Ukrajiny v jiji mižmovnych i miždialektnych zv'jazkach* [Ukrainian Hydronymy in Interlanguage and Interdialect Connections], Kyjiv: Naukova dumka.
- Šapošnikov Alexandr K. 2007: Sarmatskie i turanskie jazykovye relikty Severnogo Pričernomorija [Sarmatian and Turanian Linguistic Relics of the Northern Black Sea Region]. – *Etimologija. 2003–2005*, Moskva: Nauka, 255–322.
- Šapošnikov Alexandr K. 2015: Novorossija pervonačalnaja. Toponimičeskie i topografičeskie svidetelstva (po sostojaniju na 1774/5 g.) [Novorossiya Initial. Toponymic and Topographical Evidence (as of 1774/5)]. – *Rekviem filologičeskij. Pamiati E. S. Otina*, Kiev: Izdatelskij dom Dmitrija Burago, 51–109.

- Šmidt Alexandr O., compil., 1863: *Materialy dlja geografii i statistiki Rossii, sobrannye oficerami Generalnogo štaba. Chersonskaja [gubernija]* [Materials for the Geography and Statistics of Russia, Collected by Officers of the General Staff. Kherson [Province]] 1, Sankt-Peterburg: Voennaja tipografija.
- Takazov Fedar M. 2015: *Digorsko-russkij slovar. Russko-digorskij slovar* [Digor-Russian dictionary. Russian-Digor dictionary], Vladikavkaz: Pervaja Obraztsovaja tipografija.
- Tenišev Edchjam R., ed., 1984: *Sravnitelno-istoričeskaja grammatika tiurkskich jazykov: Fonetika* [Comparative-Historical Grammar of the Turkic Languages: Phonetics], Moskva: Nauka.
- Toporov Vladimir N., Trubačev Oleg N. 1962: *Lingvističeskij analiz gidronimov Verchnego Podneprovija* [Linguistic Analysis of Hydronyms of the Upper Dnieper Region], Moskva: Izdatelstvo AN SSSR.
- Trubačev Oleg N. 1968: *Nazvanija rek Pravoberežnoj Ukrainy: Slovoobrazovanie. Ètimologija. Ètničeskaja interpretatsija* [Names of the Rivers of Right-bank Ukraine: Word Formation. Etymology. Ethnic Interpretation], Moskva: Nauka.
- Tsagaeva Anastasija Dz. 1971: *Toponimija Severnoj Osetii* [Toponymy of North Ossetia] 1, Ordžonikidze: Ir.
- Tsagaeva Anastasija Dz. 1975: *Toponimija Severnoj Osetii 2: Slovar geografičeskich nazvanij* [Toponymy of North Ossetia 2: Dictionary of Geographical Names], Ordžonikidze: Ir.
- Tskhovrebova Zamira D., Dzitstsoity Yury A. 2013: *Toponimija Južnoj Osetii 1: Dzauskij rajon* [Toponymy of South Ossetia 1: Dzauski District], Moskva: Nauka.
- Tskhovrebova Zamira D., Dzitstsoity Yury A. 2015: *Toponimija Južnoj Osetii 2: Znaurskij rajon, Cchinvalskij rajon* [Toponymy of South Ossetia 2: Znaursky District, Tskhinvali District], Moskva: Nauka.
- Turaev Burchon B. 2010: *Leksiko-semantičeskoe i slovoobrazovatelnoe issledovanie mikrotoponimii doliny Jagnob: avtoreferat dissertacii na soiskanie učionoj stepeni kandidata filologičeskich nauk* [Lexical-Semantic and Word-Formation Study of Microtoponymy of the Yagnob Valley: Abstract of a Dissertation for the Degree of Candidate of Philological Sciences], Dušanbe: TGPU im. S. Ajni.
- Vasmer Max 1986 [1967]: *Ètimologičeskij slovar russkogo jazyka* [Etymological Dictionary of the Russian Language] 2: *E–Muž*, perevod s nemeckogo i dop. čl.-kor. AN SSSR O. N. Trubačeva, izd. 2, Moskva: Progress.
- Veličko Samoil 1851: *Letopis sobytij v Jugo-Zapadnoj Rossii v XVII-m veke* [Chronicles of Events in South-Western Russia in the 17th Century] 2, sost. S. Veličko, Kiev: Lito-tipografičeskoe zavedenie Josifa Valnera.
- Veličko Samoil 1855: *Letopis sobytij v Jugo-Zapadnoj Rossii v XVII-m veke* [Chronicles of Events in South-Western Russia in the 17th Century] 3, sost. S. Veličko, Kiev: Lito-tipografičeskoe zavedenie Josifa Valnera.

Viazmitina Marija I. 1962: *Zolota Balka (poselennia sarmatskoho času na nižniomu Dnipri)* [Zolota Balka (Sarmatian Settlement on the Lower Dnieper)], Kyjiv: Vydavnytstvo AN URSR.

Železniak Iryna M. 1987: *Ros i etnolingvistyčni procesy Serednionaddnyprianskoho Pravoberežžia* [Russian and ethnolinguistic processes of the Middle Dnieper Right Bank], Kyjiv: Naukova dumka.

Varia Onomastica: Sarmato-Alanica (Dniepras, Bugas)

SANTRAUKA

Atlikus Dniepro ir Bugo regionų toponimijos etimologinę analizę, skirtingose abiejų upių vagų ruožuose, aptiktas iranėnų vardų sluoksnis (20 vienetų). Šias iranėnų kalbų leksemas pagrįstai galima priskirti alanų kalbos paveldui. Prielaidą patvirtina kai kurios rekonstruotų prototipų fonetikos ir morfologijos ypatybės bei ypatingos jų paralelės su osetinų kalbos, kaip alanų tarmių palikuonės, žodynu. Tariamą alanų substrato žodžių, išlikusių minėtų vietovių slaviškoje toponimijoje, sąrašą sudaro šie elementai: **āf-sarak* (< **āpi šar-aka-*) ‘[upė su] vandens slenksčiais / tarpekliais’, **dūr-astur* arba **dūr-ustur* ‘didelis akmuo’, **lakand* ‘uola, akmuo skersai upės’, **sāg-barz* ‘elnių kalva’, **san-ford*/**sān-ford*, **wār-dax-āl* arba **wār-dax-el* ‘upė su slenksčiais’, **xati-či-ā* (> **xaccā*?) arba **xat-iča*, **xur-sin* arba **xur sin* (Dniepro srities teritorija); **ars-warm[ā]* ‘lokio dauba’, **aspa-xāg* (< **aspa-xāk*) ‘arklių upė, vanduo’, **be-gan* (< **baḡ-kana-*) ‘vieta, kur upė išsišakoja’, ‘upės atšaka’, **dāčī-kāθ* ‘griovys su užtvanka’, **frās-sāyan* (= **frān-sāyan*) arba **fars-san* ‘plati [upės] vaga’, arba ‘[upė su] plačia vaga’, **kard-āf* ‘purvo vanduo’, **mār-wārā* arba **mār-rār* ‘upė / vanduo su užtvanka’, **sarak* arba **sarāk* ‘pagrindinis intakas’, ‘aukštupys’, **sarda-gan* (< **sarda-kan*) arba **sard-ag-ān* ‘vasaros šaltinis’, ‘šiltas šaltinis’, **un[i]-gul* (< **un[i]-kul*) ‘upelis iš duobės ar daubos’, **waran*, **wārān* ‘lietus, lietaus upelis’, **xūs-dān* ‘išdžiūstanti upė’, ‘sekli upė’ (Bugo srities teritorija).

Rekonstruoti prototipai leidžia daryti išvadas dėl Dniepro ir Bugo regionų alanų tarmių leksikos sudėties, fonetikos ir žodžių morfologijos.