

BALTIC LAYER IN THE HYDRONYMY OF THE DNEIPER RIVER REGION

Baltų kalbų sluoksnis Dniepro upės regiono hidronimijoje

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/all94-05>

ANNOTATION

The research aims to identify the Baltic language heritage in the hydronymy of the Dnieper region. In particular, it dwells on the reconstruction of the Baltic lexical stratum, the existence of which is not at odds with the historical and archaeological data for the areas under analysis. The research has resulted in the reconstruction of 50 lexemes that are believed to be part of the vocabulary of the Old Balts. Such a conclusion is substantiated by the etymology of the reviewed water names, explained by the vocabulary of the East and West Baltic languages. Lexical reconstruction is possible due to compliance with some conditions of the etymological procedure: 1) highlighting the stages of Baltic hydronymy Slavization with the description of the phonetic and morphological processes, which accompanied the adaptation; 2) separating Slavonic derivational extension as a mean of adaptation of Baltic words in a foreign language environment; 3) determination of the relationship between the reconstructed “Dnieper” Baltisms and the archaic vocabulary of the East and West Baltic languages. Compliance with these conditions resulted in (a) the singling out of several types of parallels linking Old Baltic hydronyms in the Dnieper area with the toponymy of the different Baltic Languages; (b) the assumption of possible Proto-Lithuanian affiliation of the most numerous group of Baltic lexical relics.

KEYWORDS: etymology, reconstruction, prototype, reflex, the Baltic languages, hydronym, area.

ANOTACIJA

Tyrimo tikslas – išskirti baltų kalbų paveldą Dniepro regiono hidronimijoje. Vykdamas tyrimą ypatingas dėmesys skiriamas baltų leksikos sluoksnio rekonstrukcijai, kurio egzistavimas atitinka analizuojamų vietovių istorijos ir archeologijos duomenis. Tyrimo rezultatas – 50 rekonstruotų leksemų, kurios, kaip yra manoma, susijusios su senuoju baltų žodynu. Šią išvadą pagrindžia apžvelgtų vandenvardžių etimologija, paaiškinta remiantis rytų ir vakarų baltų kalbų žodynu. Leksikos rekonstrukcija įmanoma laikantis kai kurių etimologinės procedūros sąlygų: 1) išryškinant baltų hidronimijos slavinimo etapus, aprašant fonetinius ir morfologinius procesus, lydėjusius adaptaciją; 2) išskiriant slavų kalbos išvestinių formų paplitimą kaip baltų žodžių prisitaikymo svetimos kalbos aplinkoje būdą; 3) nustatant rekonstruotų Dniepro regiono baltizmų ir archajiško rytų ir vakarų baltų kalbų žodyno sąryšį. Šių sąlygų laikymasis lėmė (a) kelių tipų paralelių, siejančių senuosius baltų hidronimus Dniepro srityje su skirtingų baltų kalbų toponimija, išskyrimą; (b) prielaidą, kad gausiausia baltų leksikos relikvų grupė gali būti priskirta prolietuviečių tarmių paveldui.

ESMINIAI ŽODŽIAI: etimologija, rekonstrukcija, prototipas, refleksas, baltų kalbos, hidronimas, sritis.

Copyright © 2026 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:** 2026-05-05. **Accepted:** / **Priimta:** 2026-05-14.

1. INTRODUCTION: THE BALTIC HERITAGE IN THE HYDRONYMY OF THE DNEIPER REGION

The Balts who dwelled on the territory of the Dnieper basin in the second half of the first millennium BC (Vitkūnas, Zabiela 2017: 34–36, with the literature), left here not only the material traces in the form of many archaeological objects, but also a language substrate in the local geographical nomenclature. The most significant experience in studying this problem is presented by the academicians Vladimir N. Toporov and Oleg N. Trubačev's investigations (Toporov, Trubačev 1962) as well as in the works by Anatolij P. Nepokupnyj (1981) and Irina M. Železniak (1987). However, since their publication, new sources have become available to complete the existing list of Baltic lexemes in the toponymy of the Dnieper River region. Unfortunately, this material has not yet been properly assessed as evidence of the preliterate history of the Baltic languages thus far. The reason is that for a long time the complex problem of Slavonic-Baltic *language* contacts in the Dnieper basin and reconstruction of the vocabulary of the old Baltic dialects on this territory by data of the toponymy has remained on the periphery of the Indo-European comparative-historical linguistics, whence comes the lag in its development (unlike, for example, the active search for the old Baltic hydronymy in the Russian Northwest). It is significant that the problem of Baltic-Slavonic language interaction in the Dnieper, Don, Oka, Vistula basins etc. is totally passed over in silence in one of the recent major work on the history of the East Baltic languages by data of their contacts (Jakob 2024), although a similar approach to studying Prussian-German language relations and Old Prussian toponymy as a source of the reconstruction of the lexemes, lost in the appellative vocabulary, has long been practiced in the Baltic linguistic studies (Toporov 1975; 1979; 1980; 1984; 1990; Blažienė 2023). Taking this into account, any research focused on filling the gaps in studying the Baltic stratum in the Dnieper River region hydronymy seems to be **relevant**.

2. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

The **purpose** of the proposed study is to single out the Baltic heritage in the hydronymy of some tributaries of the Dnieper, namely – the Desna, Pripjat, Psel, Teterev rivers, the flow of which partly outlines the boundaries of Baltic archaeological culture areas. The **preconditions** for this are: 1) the hydronyms of the Upper and partly Middle Dnieper region, the genesis of which has already been identified in the works of our predecessors; 2) a large group the geographical names, which early were not introduced into scientific use (for example, they are absent in the special research by I. M. Železniak (1987); they have no Slavonic etymology, however show a strong similarity to the appellative vocabulary and toponymy of the Baltic languages.

The stated purpose is achieved by solving several **tasks**:

- The etymological analysis of the Dnieper River area hydronyms, which, on a number of formal features, tentatively can be genetically correlated with Baltic vocabulary;
- The reconstruction of the Old Baltic lexemes, saved in the Slavonic hydronymy;
- The determination of the phonetic and morphological regularities that accompanied the Slavization of Baltic hydronymy at different times;
- The determination of the place of the reconstructed lexemes in the archaic dialectal vocabulary of the Baltic languages.

We propose a number of etymologies that introduce new data on the language traces left by the Old Balts into the scientific use of Baltic historical linguistics, in the toponymy of the Dnieper area. It is about the reconstruction of the lexical relics of the language of the Baltic population, who lived on the coast of the Desna, Pripjat, Psel and Teterev rivers and their tributaries (see the necessary literature about Baltic archaeological traces in the basins of these rivers in: Toporov, Trubačev 1962; Železniak 1987: 93, 107–109). Accordingly, the **object** of the study is a number of water names, localised in the basins of the mentioned rivers.

The Baltic genesis is identified for:

- a) The Dnieper hydronyms, which were not given attention in the comparative-historical Slavonic and Baltic linguistics;
- b) The lexemes, which were previously explained based on the data of other languages.

3. MATERIAL AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Today, we have a fairly extensive list of Baltic lexemes in the toponymy of the Dnieper region; however, in our view, it can be significantly expanded through the new data. The **research basis** is formed by toponymes, presumably of Baltic genesis, taken from historical documents (geographical descriptions), the materials of dialectological and onomastic expeditions (OA), and the sources of the onomastic vocabulary of the Slavonic and Baltic languages. These toponyms, in their phonomorphological characteristics, are close to, or etymologically identical with, Baltic onomastic and appellative vocabulary. In other words, they are explained solely on the basis of the Baltic language material, which is characterised by a particular form of roots and affixes.

Some methodological prerequisites for etymology and reconstruction of Baltic prototypes. According to V. N. Toporov and O. N. Trubačev, “<...> there are a number of indicators, which [genetically] may be both Baltic as well as Slavonic to the same extent. In this case, only the specific analysis, covering both the root part as well as the very principle of the name, helps identify the old source of this hydronym” (Toporov, Trubačev 1962: 159). This conclusion is relevant for the proposed study. In this context, hydronyms with common “Balto-Slavonic” roots and formants are not considered in the study, given the complexity of identifying their Baltic affiliation. Conversely, we accept for consideration the composites with a set of components (stems) which are typical for Baltic hydronymy, and also suffixal derivatives from the roots, attested in the Baltic, but not found in the Slavonic languages. The “typicality” and “attestation” are confirmed by data from the comparison with Baltic vocabulary.

3.1. Baltic etymology is defined for:

- The hydronyms-composites and the suffixal hydronyms, which have the *full-lexeme* equivalents at least in one of the Baltic languages;
- The hydronyms-composites, which do not have the *full-lexeme* counterparts in Baltic vocabulary, but such analogues are found *separately for each part* of the reconstructed hydronymic composite;
- The suffixal hydronyms, which do not have the lexical identities in Baltic vocabulary; however, here are their equivalents with variant derivational morphology.

So, the Baltic origin of the names is likely, the etymological composition of which is elucidated exclusively by appealing to Baltic-language material. Each case of the genetic correspondence between the reconstructed Baltic lexeme and the historically attested toponyms and appellative lexemes of the Baltic languages is verified by techniques of comparative-historical linguistics.

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, and reconstructing prototypes).

3.2. The chronological aspects of the reconstruction of Baltic hydronymy in the Dnieper area. The acquaintance of the Slavs with Baltic hydronymy was not a one-time event, whence is the variation in the reflection of Baltic sounds and group phonemes during the Slavization of the water names.

3.2.1. The cases of early Slavization are presented by the forms with the following development.

3.2.1.1. Vocalism

Balt. **a* > Slav. **o*: **Rasapē* > *Росопа*;

Balt. **ā* > Slav. **a*: **Mānas* > *Ман*;

Balt. **e* > Slav. **e*: **Upr[a]leiā* > *Воплея*;

Balt. **u* > Slav. **u* (> [o]): **Gur-ap-* > **Гъранъ* > *Гран*; **Igurē* > **Иръна* > *Ирна*.

A similar situation is observed in the suffixes, cf. derivatives with *-*uā*.

Balt. anlaut **u-* was reflected as **u-* in the Old Slavonic language: the vowel **u-* could not stand at the beginning of the word, therefore *u*-prothesis appeared before **u*, cf. **Upr[a]leiā* > **Vъpleja* > *Воплея*;

Balt. **ū* > Slav. **y*: **Krūmas* > *Крымъ*; **Mūkā* > *Мыка*;

Balt. **i* > Slav. **ь* (> [e], [o] depending on the position): **Girdis* > **Жьрдъ* > *Жердъ*; **Pikils-* > **Пьчльсь* > **Пчелсь* etc. The situation is similar in the suffixes, where **ь* < **i* lost in a weak position, cf. examples with *-ir-*, *-in-*.

The initial Balt. **i-* in Slavonic speech got *j*-prothesis because of the impossibility of the initial **ь-* < **i-* here, cf. **Igurē* > **Йьгъра* > *Ирна*;

Balt. **ī* > Slav. **i*: **Aldažīg-* > *Ладожига*; **uīriā-ūadiūā* > *Вуревідва*;

Balt. **ai* > Slav. **u*: **Aušūā* > *Ушва*;

Balt. **ei* > Slav. **i*: **Eisraūā* > *Истровка*; **Leiž-ertas* > *Лизер(ъ)т*; **ueišadaū-* > *Висодова*;

Balt. **ei* > **ē* > Slav. **ě*: **Sētinas* or **Sētina* > *Сѣтное*. It is about Slavization of phonetically developed forms, where Proto-Balt. diphthong **ei* has already turned into narrow **ē*. In this way this diphthong developed in East Baltic speech, where **ē* then was converted to the diphthong *ie*, cf. a similar later development *é* > *ie* in Samogitian dialect (Zinkevičius 1980: 77). The same feature is attested in Baltic borrowings in Russian dialects (Anikin 2005);

Balt. **an* > Slav. **o* (> [u]): **Palangā* > **Paloga* > *Палужа*;

Balt. **in* > Slav. **ę* (> [ʼa]): **Išminč-* > *Смячъ-рѣчка* (= **Смачъ*).

3.2.1.2. Consonantism and clusters

Balt. **k*, **g* before **e*, **ē*, **i* > Slav. **č*, **ž*: **Neuēker-* > *Невечера*; **Kibir-* > *Чибра*; **Pikils-* > **Пьчльсь*; **uers-akis* > *Вересочъ*; **Degē* > *Дежа*; **Gēuē* > *Жерева*; **Girdis* > *Жердъ*;

Balt. **š* > Slav. **š*: **Šaraūā* or **Šerāūā* > *Шарова*;

Balt. **ž* > Slav. **z*: **Leižertas* > *Лизерт*;

Balt. **u* > Slav. **v*: **uar-apē* > *Ворона*;

Balt. **šū* > Slav. **sv*: **Šūeta-* > *Сѣто-*;

Balt. **iā* > Slav. **e*: **uīriā-ūadiūā* > *Вуревідва*.

3.2.1.3. Groupophones

Balt. *TarT* > Slav. *ToroT*: **Dargalis* > *Дороголь*; **Netalduūā* > *Немолодва*;

Balt. *TerT* > Slav. *TereT*: **uers-akis* > *Вересочъ*; **Gēuē* > *Жерева*;

Balt. **ald-* > Slav. **lad-*: **Aldažīg-* > *Ладожига*; **Aldin-* > *Ладинка*.

3.2.2. Examples of late Slavization. Some Dnieper hydronyms have forms that are phonetically close to their Old Baltic prototype (with **a*, **u*, **i*, **art*, *TerT*). These water names were Slavized at a later epoch, when the corresponding phonetic processes (see above) had been completed in Slavonic languages. Cf.:

Balt. **a* > Slav. *a*: **Šūeta-balin-* or **Šūeta-ūalinē* > *Сѣтовалное*;

Balt. **u* > Slav. *u*: **Dulurē* > *Дулюпа*. Similarly is in the suffixes *-ut/-uč-*, *-uti-*, cf. **Rad-utiā* or **Rad-utis* > *Радума* etc.;

Balt. **i* > Slav. *i*: **Žižmā* > *Сизма* (in the early Slavization it would be expected **Съзма* > **Сезма* with vocalization of *ь* > *e*);

Balt. **art-* > Slav. *art-*: **Arta-paltis* > *Артополот*;

Balt. *TerT* > Slav. *TerT*: **terden-* > *Вёрдин*;

Balt. *TarT* > Slav. *TarT*: **Žardenā* > *Жарденя* (in the early adopting it would be expected **Жереденя* or else **Зороденя* with taken into account the complete etymological identity of East Balt. **žardas* : Slav. **zòrdь*, cf.: Derksen 2015: 513);

Balt. **ž*, **š* > Slav. *z*, *s*: **Leizertas* > *Лизерт*; **Išminč-* > *Смячъ-рѣчка*; **Ušnā* > *Юсенка*.

This also includes the forms with the shift of “hissing consonant → whistling consonant” and the further dissimilation on voicing/voicelessness (**Žižmā* > *Сизма*), and the forms with the lack of results of the 1st palatalisation of velar consonants, cf. **Kem-ūlis* > *Кеміль*. In this last example, the rendering of **ū* as Slav. **y* [ы] instead of the expected *y* [у] (like **Кемуль*) in case of late Slavization is caused by the influence of the structural analogy of Slavonic toponymy with the outcome *-иль* widely represented in the Dnieper River basin, cf. *Войтыль* (SHU 1979: 549), *Горбыль*, *Бадиль* (Chernigov region), *Кордиль*, *Бургиль* (Sumy region) etc. (OA).

The phonetic adaptation of Baltic toponymy in Slavonic speech was accompanied by a few more processes.

Aphaeresis (**a-*, **i-*), cf.: **Alarnā* > *Ларна*; **Išminč-* > *Смячъ-рѣчка*.

Prothesis: (*j-*) **Ēpāciā* > *Єнава*; **Ušnā* > **Юсьна*.

Epenthesis: **Eisraūā* > *Истровка*. The sound [t] appeared in the Slavized form of the hydronym as the positional insert, cf.: **osrouv* > **ostrouv*, *срам* > диал. *срам*, *Сретение* > диал. *Стретеніе*. Next, we will point out the example with *l-epentheticum* in **Tarpiā* > *Торопля*.

3.3. The morphological aspects of the reconstruction of Baltic hydronymy in the Dnieper area. The reconstruction of any Baltic lexeme, saved in the hydronymy, is made by taking into account the factor of its derivational and grammatical adaptation in the Slavonic language. Consequently, in some cases, we can restore the primordial form of the Baltic name under the following conditions:

a) when separating Slavonic derivational “layering” from the hydronym, for example, of suffix *-k-* (*Истров-ка*, *Ладин-ка*, *Рон-ка*, *Юсен-ка*), *-ey-* (*Мозуп-еуь*);

b) when taking into account the results of rethinking the morphology of Baltic lexeme in the spirit of Slavonic derivational morphemics, cf. Balt. suff. subst. *-in-*, *-n-* > Slav. suff. adj. *-ьn-*; Balt. *-uā* > Slav. *-ьva*, *-ьva* (after sizzling consonant); *-aiā*, *-āuā* > *-ova*, *-ava*, *-ūlis* > *-yль* (*-ыль*), *-mā* > *-(ь)ма*. It is difficult to differentiate between the Dnieper hydronyms with the formants *-aiā* and *-āuā*, because in Slavonic use they were included both in the category of geographical names with *-ava* as well as *-ova* due to the process of analogy. From here, and the conditional character of the reconstruction of the suffixal part of some substrate Baltic lexemes. In some cases, Slavization of Baltic hydronyms was accompanied by the perception of its singular form as plural, cf. sing. **[A]uslā* > plur. *Вусла*, *-сел*.

Here, it is worth recalling considerations by V. N. Toporov and O. N. Trubačev from the above-quoted investigation: “Generally, when searching for the traces of Baltic hydronyms, it must be taken into account that they may be disguised out of all recognition in Slavonic form. This secondary form in its turn is included in a number of externally close Slavonic names, creating a whole chain of the transitional hybrid forms, concerning which it is difficult to say where Baltic ends and Slavonic form begins” (Toporov, Trubačev 1962: 159). This thesis is well illustrated by the material set out below, cf., for example, the transformation of Balt. **uel-i-ual-* as *Вулива́ло*, *Веливела*, *Веливала*, *Вуливело*, *Вуливала*, *Валивала*; **uida-lakis* as *Видолочь*, *Видоличь*, *Видолочь*, *Witolicz*.

The morphological adaptation of Baltic vocabulary in Slavonic use was made by changing Baltic grammatical indicators with their genetic analogues. The factors determining this process are:

1) Intuitive understanding of native speakers of the affinity of both contacting languages, namely: approximately the same principle of opposition of masculine and feminine gender (Balt. *-as* masc. VS *-ā* fem. = Slav. *-ъ* masc. VS *-а* fem.), genetic relation between the systems of formants in both languages;

2) The condition for Balto-Slavonic bilingualism in a certain era (such is assumed for the Upper Dnieper territory; Toporov, Trubačev 1962: 161, 162).

The examples of the phonetic and morphological substitutions in the Baltic hydronyms are given below:

ā-stems (cf. Proto-Lith. N. sg. **-ā*; Zinkevičius 1980: 189): **Eisr-aiā* > *Истровка*; *Šar-aiā* or **Šer-aiā* > *Шарова*; **Ušnā* > *Юсенка*;

iā-stems (Balt. *iā*-stems, soft type of *ā*-stems; Endzelīns 1971: 141): **Tarpjiā* – *Торóпля*. This also includes the type with **-ē* (Balt. (*i*)*ē*-stems; *ibid.*: 146), cf. Lith. stems with *-ė*):

**Ras-apē* > *Росона*; **uar-apē* > *Ворона* with West Balt. **apiā*, cf. Old Pruss. *ape*;

Dul-upē* > *Дулюна*; **Ir-upē* > *Ирна* (Иръна*) with East Balt. **upē*; **Degē* > *Дежа*.

The indicator *-ē* in view of the fact that it was impossible in the nominative of Slavonic Feminina was replaced by *-a*.

There are more complex cases, in which Slav. flexion *-a* could replace Balt. **-iā* as well as *-is*, cf.: *Велькуча* = **uilkutiā* (then *-ч-* is natural from *tj*) or **uilkutis* (with a late levelling by analogy of the outcome of toponyms with *-ча*, cf. *Вербча*, *Славча*); *Ра́дута* = **Rad-utiā* or **Rad-utis*. The assumption of both forms is due to the presence of several variants of this formant in the Baltic languages.

(i)ō-stems (Balt. N. sg. **-a-s*): **Krūmas* > *Крымъ*; **Leič-ertas* (~ Lith. *eřtas*) > *Лизерт*; **Ragas* > *Розъ*; **Mānas* > *Ман*;

i-stems (Balt. *i*-stems): **Arta-paltis* (~ Lith. *Páltis*) > *Артополотъ*; **Kem-ūlis* > *Кемиль*; **uers-akis* > *Вересочъ*; **uida-lakis* > *Вúдолоч*.

The grammatical indicator of the derivatives with suff. *-(i)n-* is impossible to determine due to comprehension of these names as the adjectives, whose grammatical gender in the Slavonic languages varied depending on agreement with one or the other topographical term. Cf. *Сѣтное* (the lake) behind which are **Sēt-inas* or **Sēt-inā*.

4. BALTIC LEXICAL RELICS IN THE HYDRONYMY OF THE DNEPER RIVER REGION

4.1. The Desna Basin

**Al-arnā*

Ларна: «С. Лотоки при рч. Ларнѣ (притокъ Палужи)», the beginning of the 18th century (Lazarevskij 1888: 366). The hydronym keeps Balt. **Al-arnā* “Flowing *arna*”, distorted in Slavonic verbal use (aphaeresis). Regarding the composition of the word cf.: Lith. *Alys* – the lake, *Al-ùpė*, *Al-upė*, *Al-trakas*, Latv. *Ala* – the rivers ~ Lith. *alėti* ‘to flow’, ‘to trickle’, ‘to drip’ (Vanagas 1981: 38) & Latv. *Ārni*, *Ārnis*, Lith. (derivative) *Arnėnų km.*, Old Pruss. *Arnaw*, 1322 < {**arn-*}, Thrac. Ἄρνη, Καλ-αρνα – toponyms (Toporov 1975: 104). The component **arn-*, apparently, belongs to the type of “Old Indo-European” water names, being a PIE derivative with suff. *-n-* from the root **er-/*or-* ‘set in motion, excite’ (see: Krahe 1964: 45–46: *Arn-*). The semantics of **arn-* is reconstructed as ‘streaming water’ (Woudhuizen 2020: 49, with reference to Jürgen Udolph).

**Alda-žīg-* (?)

Ладожуга, 1786 – the river in Chernigov vicegerency (Šafonskij 1851: 215) = **Alda-žīg-* (?), cf. Lith. *Aldikis*, *Aldos* ~ Thrac. *Alda-*, Dacian *alda* ‘humid place, swamp’) & *Žygis* (Vanagas 1981: 38, 402).

**Ald-in-*

Ладинка: «С. Ладинка, при р. Ладинкѣ», 1765 (Chernigov regiment; Lazarevskij 1866: 38) = **Ald-in-* ~ Latv. *Aldiņi* – hydronym ~ Lith. *Aldonà* (Toporov 1979: 24: **eld-*).

**Arta-paltis*

Артополѡт – name of several rivers: the left trib. of the Mnoga, the right trib. of the Lysogor, the left trib. of the Sula, the left trib. of the Dnieper (*Артополѡтъ*, 1785, 1852; SHU 1979: 24, *Артополѡтъ*, 1786; Šafonskij 1851: 525, 580–581); the left trib. of the Sula and the Dnieper (*Артополѡтъ*, XVI, *Артаполѡтъ*, 1769 etc. (SHU 1979: 24).

Modern science has two etymologies of the hydronym. Now they both need revision, primarily in phonetics.

1. The Iranian version, to which the authors of the studies on the Dnieper hydronymy appellate uncritically. It is about here the primordial **Arta-pord* = Iran. **Arta-pord* ~ Alan. *αρθ* ‘God’ and Osset. *ford* ‘big river’ (Stryžak 1963: 83–84). However, this etymology does not explain the reasons for saving the initial **art-*, which was subjected to metathesis **rot-/rat-* (cf. **orkyta* > *rokuma*, *pakuma*) in Slavonic speech. Moreover, the motivation behind the name “The God’s River” is doubtful.

2. The Slavonic etymology implies reading the hydronym as **Vьrto-poltь* > **Вартополѡт* > *Артополѡт*. Proto-Slav. **polt-*, well presented in Slavonic toponymy, is genetically oriented to PIE **pel-* ‘wide, broad’ (Kazlova 2000: 167–169, 170). The version is argued by appealing to probable aphaeresis of *θ-*. However, firstly, not only the sound *θ-* is dropped in the dialects, but also *κ-* and *χ-*, therefore, to the same extent, the primordial prototypes **Kьrto-poltь* and **Xьrto-poltь* are both likely. Secondly, *θ-* drops **only** before the next labial vowel, **but not before a**. Thirdly, the East Slavonic reflex of Proto-Slav. **vьrt-* (**vьrtěti*) always has *e* but not *a* like in **варп-* (there is only Beloruss. *вярцеуь* with ‘*a* < *e*’). An attempt to substantiate the variant **Vьrto-* by appealing to Pol. *wart* ‘water body’ does not convince, because the Polish word is the reflex of Proto-Slav. **vьrtь* with the normal development **br* > *ar* before the hard *t*.

We would suggest treating *Артополѡт* as an element of Baltic stratum in the Dnieper toponymy, i. e., as Balt. **Arta-paltis* “Close/nigh stream”. Cf. Lith. *artùs* ‘close, nigh’, *arti* ‘near, beside, next to’ & Latv. *palts*, *palte* ‘puddle’, ‘rain flow’, and also reconstructed Lith. **paltis*, and hydronym *Páltis* – name of the river and lake (Smoczyński 2019: 1178–1179). See also (Derksen 2015: 61–62). Preservation of **art-* in Slavonic use without the expected here metathesis of Balt. **art-* > Slav. **ort-* > **rot-* or **rat-* may be explained by the later Slavization of Baltic hydronym, which took place in the period when this phonetic process had been completed in the Slavonic languages. Pleophony in the second component arose not phonetically because the hydronym in view of **art-* preservation was Slavized later, but due to the analogy of Slavonic toponyms with the stem *Полѡт-*.

Previously, the Baltic etymology was set out in general terms in Alexander I. Iliadi (2025: 3).

**Auš-uūā*

Ушв́а, -ú (*Ушва*, XIX) – the river, a tributary of the Sejm, the left trib. of the Desna, the left trib. of the Dnieper (SHU 1979: 582) < **Ушвва* = **Auš-uūā* – the derivative with the formant *-uūā* from **[a]ušē* (vide infra).

**Darg-alis*

Дороголь – the lake: «висше на усте чрезъ Десну реку <...> да по озеро Дороголь» (GS 1901: 256) = Balt. **Darg-alis*, cf. with variant suffixation **Darg-el-* > Lith. *Dárgelė* – hydronym ~ *dargùs* ‘inclement’, ‘disgusting, bad’ (Vanagas 1981: 80), *dargà* ‘rainy weather’, dial. ‘retting’ (Derksen 2015: 115–116). Toponymisation of the appellatives with suff. *-el-*, *-al-* (Lith. *-elis* (*-ė*), *-alis*); one of the meanings of both suffixes in the Baltic languages is the meaning ‘carrier of property, attribute’ (Ambrazas 2000: 176–177). The river names with *-alė*, *-alis* constitute one of the most numerous categories in Lithuanian hydronymy, see: (Vanagas 1981: 80).

**Dul-upē*

Дулюпа – the river: «Д. Ильбовь, на р. Дулюпъ» (Lazarevskij 1866: 422, 428) = **Dul-upē*. Cf. Lith. *Dùlpis* < **Dul-upis*, *Dul-upỹs* ~ Lith. *dùlas*, Latv. *duls* ‘grey, light grey, yellowish’ (Vanagas 1981: 96), and also *dũliava* (ibid.: 95). The second part contains East Balt. (Lith., Latv.) **upē* < **up-iā* ‘river’, ‘flow, stream’ ← ‘river mouth’ (Smoczyński 2019: 1982).

**Eisr-auā*

Истровка: «Х. Истровка, на р. Истровкъ» (Lazarevskij 1866: 420), *Istravka*, *Їстривка* – the river, left trib. of the Snov, right trib. of the Desna, left trib. of the Dnieper (SHU 1979: 224) = Proto-Lith. **Eisr-auā*, cf. Lith. *Éisrava* ~ *Éisra* (Vanagas 1970: 102: *Éisr-ava*; Vanagas 1981: 132). The formant *-auā* (< *-ou-ā*; Zinkevičius 1987: 14; Ambrazas 2000: 50) is singled out in many Baltic hydronyms, part of which is the ancient derivatives (Vanagas 1970: 101).

**Girdis, *Gird-eu-* (?)

«до Жердеви къ Днепру <...>» – the river in the Desna basin (Kiev county in Kiev governorate), variant *Жердь*, *-u* (SNMKG 2005: 45, 241), «до реки Жерду», *Žerdz* (SHU 1979: 195), *Жердя* (*Žerdz*, *Жердь*) – the river, right trib. of the Zhirak, right trib. of the Goryn, right trib. of the Pripyat, right trib. of the Dnieper, «с. Грибовая при впадении рч. Жерду въ р. Горынь», cf. *Жердя* – village in Chemerovetsky district of Khmelnytskyi region (SHU 1979: 195) < **Жьрдь*.

It is possible to preserve Balt. lexeme **girdis*, **gird-eu-*, cf. Lith. *Giřdė* – meadow ~ *girdyti* ‘to water’, *girdupė* ‘the river, from which you can drink’ (Vanagas 1981: 116), *Girdỹs* – local name, Old Pruss. *Girdewithigen* (**gird-ev-it-*) (Toporov 1979: 243). The variant reconstruction of the Balt. prototype is due to a lack of clarity of the hydronymic outcome: whether *-ev-* reflects the etymological Balt. *-eu-* or is it a Slavonic grammatical transformation of Balt. **girdis* by the type of *ū*-stems (stem of the oblique cases is *-vū-* > *-ov-*, dial. *-ev-*)?

**Ir-upē*

Ирна: «С. Сачковичи при р. Ирпъ» (Lazarevskij 1866: 692), *Ирпá* – the river, the right trib. of the Snov, the right trib. of the Desna, the left trib. of the Dnieper (SHU 1979: 223). It is possible the Slavization of Balt. **Ir-upē* > **Иръпа* > *Ирна* (like *Ръжавець* > Ukr. *Иржавець*, cf. «над рѣчкою Иржавцемъ», the beginning of the XVIII; Miakotin 1896: 36). Cf. in Aleksandras Vanagas (1981: 131): Lith. *Ir-upė* is probably related to Lith. *irti* ‘to fall, drop’, ‘to fall apart, desintegrate’, ‘to spoil’, ‘disappear, go missing’, ‘mush up, soak’. Cf. also derivative Lith. *irtis* ‘abyss, bottomless abyss’, ‘maelstrom’ (Smoczyński 2019: 566).

**Iš-minč-*

Смячь-рѣчка, 1714 – the river, the right trib. of the Snov, the right trib. of the Desna (DDH 1993: 229), *Смячь*, *Смяч* (KRU 1957: 94, 99, 183) = **iš-minč-*, cf. Lith. *Miñčia* – the river name with an etymologically ambiguous stem (*mink-*, *ment-*?), see, for example, in A. Vanagas (1981: 216–217).

**Kib-ir-*

Чибра (*Чибра*, 1729–1730) – the river (village Khripovka of Gorodnyansky district in Chernigov region; SHU 1979: 608). This hydronym reproduces Balt. **Kib-ir-* ~ Lith. *kibiras* ‘a small dry branch’ (of this appellative see: Smoczyński 2019: 706). In terms of motivation cf. *Ветка*, *Бабина Ветка* – the left tr. of the Dnieper (SHU 1979: 26) ~ *ветка* ‘branch’ as ‘place, where the river is divided in arms’.

**Lat-auā*

Лотава – the river (village Shabalinov of Koropsky district in Chernigov region; *Лотава*, 1765–1769) (SHU 1979: 327; in Toporov 1990: 125): “needs further research” = **Lat-auā*, cf. Lith. *Latavà* ~ *lat-* ‘to flow’ (Vanagas 1981: 182; Toporov 1990: 124, 125). The reason for the preservation of short suffixal **a* in Slavonic use is the inclusion of this

hydronym in the structural type of geographical names with *-ava*, cf. **Dǫbrava*, **Lǫkava*, **Morava* etc.

**Leiž-ertas*

Лизерт, 1777 – the lake (village Veliky Shchimmel of Shchorsky district in Chernigov region; OA), more accurately is *Лизерт* = Balt. **Leiž-ertas*. In terms of composition cf.: Lith. *Liežys* – the lake ~ *liėžti* ‘wash off (about the river, water)’; Lith. *Ertėja* – the river ~ Latv. *erte* ‘wide place on the lake, where are no islands nereby’, Lith. *eřtas* ‘wide’, ‘broad, extensive’ (Vanagas 1981: 47, 190). About the antiquity of *ert-* see: (Fraenkel 1962: 15; Karulis 1992: 271; LIV 2001 [1998]: 404; Smoczyński 2019: 395). The lack of pleophony in the second part is puzzling (should be **Лизерет*). It is not excluded early convergence with Slavonic geographical vocabulary and toponymy with **rvt-*, cf. **rvtv*, **na-rvtv* ‘top’, ‘top of the mountain’ (ESSJ XXIII 21–22). That is *Лизерт* < **Лизерѣтъ*?

**Mag-upē*

**Мозун* (as a part of demin. *Мозунецъ*, 1786 – the lake, connected to the river Desna in Chernigov vicegerency; Šafonskij 1851: 216) = **Mag-upē*, cf. Latv. *Maģ-upe* – hydronym ~ Latv. *maģs* ‘small, little’ (Vanagas 1981: 201).

**Mānas*

Ман (*Man*) – the river, the right trib. of the Moshnia, the right trib. of the Dnieper (SHU 1979: 351) = **Mānas*, cf. Lith. *Món-a-balė*, Latv. *Māņ-upīte* with the stem *mon-* < **mān-* ~ Lat. *manō*, *-āre* ‘to flow, run’ (Vanagas 1981: 219–220).

**Ne-ūėker-* (?)

Невечера, 1760 – tract (on the river Stary Sejm in Chernigov regiment; Lazarevskij 1866: 224) = **Ne-ūėker-* (?) ~ Lith. *Vėkė*, *Vėko kalnas* ~ Latv. *vėcis* ‘such place, where fishermen leave their breakfast’, Lith. *vekerėti* ‘to plough with uneven furrows’, *vėkeras* ‘kerėpla, plow’ (Vanagas 1981: 370).

**Ne-mald-ūcā*

Немолодѣа: «Д. Нижняя Злобинка при р. Немолодѣѣ», «С. Дымово (куренья Дымовскаго) при рѣчкѣ Немолодѣѣ», but also (twice) «<...> р. Немолодѣѣ» (Lazarevskij 1866: 596, 609, 615) = **Ne-mald-ūcā*, cf. Lith. *malđdas* ‘reed’ and hydronym *Malđ-upis* (Vanagas 1981: 202). The *ū-*stems, with which this hydronym was identified in Slavonic use, often lose their marker, whence is the second variant with the loss of [в].

About Baltic hydronymy with suff. *-ūcā* see: (Vanagas 1970: 211–214).

**Pal-angā*

Палужа: «Д. Кибирщина при р. Палужа», «на рѣчкѣ Полужѣ», «на рѣчкѣ Палужѣ» (Lazarevskij 1866: 747, 761). The name formally corresponds to the Slavonic geographical term *палуж*, cf. Beloruss. dial. *пáлуж* ‘place near meadow’, ‘meadow near the river’, cf. also the river name *Пáлуж* – tributary of the Besed River in the system of the Sozh ~ *пáлуж* ‘place near meadow’ (Jaškin 2005: 485). However, it is not excluded that the treatment of this hydronym as Balt. **Palang-*, cf. Lith. *Palangà* – water name along with the suffixless Lith. *Palà* – hydronym ~ Latv. *palas*, *paļas* ‘marshy shore of the lake’, *pali* ‘flood, low tide, flowage; water overflowing its banks in spring or autumn’ (Vanagas 1970: 91–92: *Pal-angā*; Vanagas 1981: 241). About the appellative and toponymic derivatives with this suffix, see (Endzelīns 1971: 119; Ambrazas 2000: 149, 150, 151).

Balt. **Palangā* in Slavonic verbal use could be identified with the derivatives with pref. **pa-* from **lǫgь*, **lǫž-* ‘meadow’, i. e. as **Палжга* and then – **Палжжа* > *Палужа*. A different view (without specifics) is presented in: (Toporov, Trubačev 1962: 202 and above).

**Pik-ils-* (?)

Пчилсь, 1786 – the lake that is joined by a strait with the lake *Вырь* (Šafonskij 1851: 216, 217). Maybe, it is a write error in **Пчелсь* = **Pik-ils-* (cf. modern *Звиздил* alongside with historical *Звиздель*; SHU 1979: 210). The name is not entirely clear. Regarding the

root cf. Lith. *Pikeliškės* – hydronym (Vanagas 1981: 257); the suffixal part purely formally may be compared to Lith. *-ilsà* in the water name *Ym-ilsà* (Vanagas 1970: 141, 153, 426).

**Ragas*

Рогъ: «С. Пьяный-Рогъ при рѣчкѣ Рогъ», 1765 (the territory of Chernigov regiment; Lazarevskij 1866: 615). The etymological ambiguity of the hydronym comes from several equally possible interpretations.

1. As Balt. **Ragas* based on Lithuanian hydronyms *Rāg-upis*, *Rāg-upỹs* ~ *rāgas* ‘expanse of land, jutting into the sea, lake or wood’, ‘any sharp, curved object’, ‘angle’ (Vanagas 1981: 271).

2. As Sarmatian word **Raya* < **raya* ‘flow, river’ (cf. with regard to the Volga River: Napol’skich 2016: 43).

We cannot exclude a relation to Slav. **rogъ*, which is etymologically identical with Balt. **ragas*. However, in toponymy, this word is used to designate spurs and promontories, but not as a name for water bodies.

**Ranā* (?)

Рона – water object, comp. «С. Пятовскъ на п. Ронъ» (Lazarevskij 1866: 438), cf. *Ронка* – the river, trib. of the Psel, left trib. of the Dnieper (Gadyach in Poltava region), *Ронка*, 1782 (SHU 1979: 474) ~ Latv. *Rāņa-apluoks* (Vanagas 1981: 280: “Unclear”) < **Raniā*.

**Ras-apē*

Росопа – bed of the dried river Stara (village Krasnostav of Borzniansky district in Chernigov region; OA) = **Ras-apē* (< **ras-apiā*): the composite formed by the reflexes of Proto-Balt. **ras-ā-* ‘dew’ & (West) **apiā* (: Old Pruss. *ape* ‘creek, rivulet’). Among Baltic hydronyms with the stem *ras-*, we would specifically point out Lith. *Rās-upis*, Latv. *Rasupi* (Vanagas 1981: 272–273: to Lith. *rasà*, *rasóti*), reproducing the full-lexeme etymological counterpart for the Dnieper name **Ras-apē*. The second part of the written forms **up-* is the old phonetic double of **ap-*.

**Sēt-inas* or **Sēt-inā*

Сѣтное – the lake (near the village Rzhki in the former Nezhin regiment; GS 1901: 73). To Balt. **Sie-t-* > **Sēt-*. Cf. Lith. *Sietas*, *Sieta* – the lakes in the Trakai district. Maybe it is related to Old Pruss. *Seyte* – the river, *Seith* – village ~ Latv. *siets* ‘depth, maelstrom, abyss’, ‘deep place in the river’ (Gerullis 1922: 154), *sietus* ‘depth’ (**sie-tū-s*) (Smoczyński 2019: 1512). Cf. (Toporov, Trubačev 1962: 238; Vanagas 1981: 298).

Balt. **Sēt-inas* or **Sēt-inā* was perceived by Slavs as the adjective with *-bn-* (Slav. **b* = Balt. **i* short) and appropriately morphologized.

**Šar-aiā* or **Šer-aiā*

Шарова [*Шарова*] – the lake (village Nizy of Kremenchuk district in Poltava region) (Hromko 2017: 253). The phonetics of the hydronym allows the duality of the reconstruction for the preserved Baltic word.

1. Balt. **Šar-aiā* – the derivative with suff. *-ai-* from the stem **šar-* as the apophonic variant of **šer-* (Smoczyński 2019: 1751) ‘grey (color of bristle)’ ← ‘bristle’ (sf. the next). Preservation of the root vowel *a* (instead of *o* < Balt. **a*) after the hissing consonant in Slavic pronunciation is quite natural.

2. Balt. **Šer-aiā* “Gray source, wellspring”. As regards the parts of the composite cf. Lith. *Šer-upis*, *Šerýnas* ~ *šerỹs* ‘bristle’, ‘dun-coloured, grey’, *šerýtė* (bot.) ‘foxtail’ and *Ovā* < **Av-a* ~ Latv. *avuots* ‘source, wellspring’ (Krahe 1964: 43; Vanagas 1981: 235, 328–329). Vocalism *o* in the second syllable instead of the expected **ā* > *a* is not of the phonetic, but morphological nature: the hydronym was identified with Slavonic adjectives with *-ov-*.

**Šueta-balin-* or **Šueta-ualinē*

Сѣтовалное – the lake (near the village Rzhki in the former Nezhin regiment) (GS 1901: 73). Cf. Lith. *Švėtė*, Latv. *Svēte* ~ Lith. *nu-švėsti*, *nu-švėto* ‘begin to shine, light up, alight with’, *švísti* ‘dawn’, *švytėti* ‘glow, shine’ (Vanagas 1981: 338). Thus, taking into

account the innovative apophony (Proto-Balt. **šueit-*) *švit-* > *švet-* (according to: Smoczyński 2019: 1832), we can assume here the late Balt. (Proto-Lith.?) **šūeta-balā*, **šūeta-balas* ‘light pond’, where the second part is Balt. word like Lith. *balà*, Latv. *bala*, *balas*, Old Pruss. *balas* ‘swamp’, ‘wet lowland’, ‘puddle’, ‘wet boggy soil’, ‘pond’, etc. (Toporov 1975: 184; Smoczyński 2019: 110–111) with the Slavonic suffixal extension *-bn-* (adjective suffix).

On the other hand, the full-lexeme Balt. **šūeta-balin-*, cf. regarding the second part Latv. *balīna* ‘puddle’ (MEV: https://mev.tezaurs.lv/_/search/bali%C5%86a) and Lith. river name *Balīnis* (Smoczyński 2019: 111) is equally possible.

Then again, the second component *-валн-* is also easily explained as Balt. **uālinē*, cf. Lith. *Valinė* ~ *Valà*, *Vāl-upis* (Vanagas 1981: 361).

**Uš-nā* (?)

**Юсьна* (*Юсенка*, 1786 – the lake, joining with the Desna in Chernigov vicegerency; Šafonskij 1851: 212) = Balt. **Uš-nā* (?), cf. Lith. *Ušnà* – hydronym ~ *áušti* ‘cool down, get chilly’ (Vanagas 1981: 354). In Slavonic speech, the outcome of the noun was interpreted as the adjective with *-bn-*.

**uar-apē*

Ворона – the lake in the basin of the Desna River (lands belonging to Maksakovsky monastery), the territory of the former Kiev regiment (Lazarevskij 1866: 208) = Balt. **uar-apē* ‘the water with weir’ (?), comp. Lith. *vāras* ‘bars to hedge’ ~ Old Russ. *ворь* ‘fence, hedge’ (Smoczyński 2019: 2032), Old Pruss. *ape* ‘river’ = **apē* (Mažiulis 1988: 86). The European hydronymy of the different areas preserves old water names-composites with the PIE stems **uer-*/**uor-*/**ur-* ‘water’, ‘river’, ‘rain’ and **āp-* ‘water’, ‘river’ (Krahe 1964: 38–40, 42–43) without reliable full-lexeme equivalents in the Indo-European appellative vocabulary. This fact impels us to consider Balt. **uar-apē* (PIE **uor-ap-* ‘rain stream’ → ‘pond’, ‘puddle’?) to be an element of the “Old Indo-European” hydronymy.

**uers-akis*

Вепесоч – the river, tributary of the Oster the left trib. of the Desna, the left trib. of the Dnieper; towns *Вепесоч* and *Kladkovka* of Kulikovskij district in Chernigov region; *Вепесочь*, 1765–1769, *Вепесочь* (SHU 1979: 98) ~ Lith. *Vers-akà* – hydronym, which previously was compared to the water name *Virsia*, and also to *viřsti* ‘to fall, tip over’, ‘to hinder’, ‘to rush’, ‘to stream swiftly, flow out, gush, pour’ etc. (Vanagas 1981: 374). Thus, **uers-akis* “Stream from the swamp/lake” or “Flow with maelstrom”? Cf. already in Toporov, Trubachev 1962: 179: “Unclear. Maybe, from Balt. **Versakis*.” The second component here is identical to Lith. *akis* ‘ice hole’, ‘swamp, quagmire’, ‘maelstrom’, ‘small lake’ (LKŽe: <https://ekalba.lt/lietuviu-kalbos-zodynas/akis?paieska=akis&i=238484c2-c471-48d8-a6d9-a0194dff975f>).

**uilk-utiā* or **uilk-utis*

Велькуча – the river, village Guta-Studenetskaja of Shchorsky district in Chernigov region; *Велькуча*, XIX (SHU 1979: 96) < **Вьлкуч-/Вьлкуп’-* = Balt. **uilk-ut-/uilk-uč-*. Cf. Lith. stem *vilkuč-* (as a part of the hydronym *Vilkūčpjaunis*), derived from *vilk-* (*vilkas* ‘predatory forest animal, similar to a dog’) with suff. *-ut-*. Comp. also Lith. hydronyms with the same stem *Vilkūtė*, *Vilkūtis* (Vanagas 1981: 384). A possible full-lexeme equivalent of the Dnieper *Велькуча* is the water name *Волкота* in the Western Dvina basin, which is also explained by appealing to Lith. *Vilkūtis* etc. (Vasilyev 2021: 152).

**Žard-enā*

Жарденя: «Д. Костыревъ, лугъ р. Сейма и рч. Жарденя» (Lazarevskij 1893: 301) = **Žard-enā* with the multi-functional formant (see about it: Ambrazas 2000: 43). Cf. Lith. *Žardėnas*, Latv. *Zārdena*, Lith. *Žarđ-upis*, *Žardà*, Latv. *Zārdi* ~ Lith. *žarđis* ‘fence, enclosure for domestic cattle’, Latv. *zārds* ‘agricultural device for drying of the hay’ (Vanagas 1981: 398; Derksen 2015: 513).

*Žižmā

Сузма – the [dried] river, which flowed through the Northern part of the village Oktiabr'skoje of Koropsky district in Chernigov region (OA). If the record is correct, we can assume here Balt. *Žižmā on the condition that the written form is the result of a two-stage change in the chain “hissing–hissing” → “hissing–whistling” (*Жизма) → “whistling–whistling” (*Зизма or Сузма) in Slavonic speech. The closest parallels to the Dnieper hydronym are found in East Baltic onomastic, cf. Lith. Žižmà, Latv. Zizma – names of the rivers, Latv. Zizmas – swamp, presumably etymologically related to Lith. žižė ‘unpleasant, always angry person’ (Vanagas 1981: 405). As applied to the system of water nomination cf. typologically similar Lith. Pikt-upis ~ piktas, Russ. Лютка ~ лютый = piktas (Vanagas 1981: 402), Ukr. Лютця (SHU 1979: 333).

4.2. The Pripyat Basin

*Degē

Дежа – the river, tributary of the Styr, the right trib. of the Pripyat, the right trib. of the Dnieper (SHU 1979: 166) = Balt. *Degē (< *degiā) ~ Lith. Degė – name of the river and meadow, *Dėg-upis* – the river, *dėgis* ‘burnt-out area’ (Vanagas 1970: 60; 1981: 83; Derksen 2015: 118; Smoczyński 2019: 285).

*Gur-ap-

Гран – the river, the right trib. of the Vilija, the right trib. of the Sluch, the right trib. of the Goryn, the right trib. of the Pripyat, the right trib. of the Dnieper (SHU 1979: 153). If it is from the older *Гъранъ, it is a possible preservation of Balt. *gur-ap-, cf. *gur-up- in Lith. *Gur-upelis* – the river ~ *gūras* ‘hill’, ‘the mountain’s jut’, ‘mountain top’ (Vanagas 1981: 127–128).

*Kem-ūlis

Кеміль – the river, the right trib. of the Zolnia, the left trib. of the Ubort’, the right trib. of the Pripyat, the right trib. of the Dnieper (SHU 1979: 245) = *Kem-ūlis, cf. (with short vocalism in the suffix) Curon. *Kemule*, 1355–1362, derived with Balt. suff. -ul- from the stem of *kem-* (Kiparsky 1939: 381: “this can be only Lith. or Old Pruss., because in Latv. it would be expected *cem-”). The etymon is confirmed by onomastic material in Toporov (1980: 312).

*Tarp-iā

Торопля – swamp (*Торупла*) (Volyn; SMU 2004: 99) = Balt. *Tarp-iā, cf. Lith. *Tárpija* – the river name ~ *tárpas* ‘the space between something’, ‘hole, crack, abyss’ (Vanagas 1970: 146: *Tárp-ija*; Vanagas 1981: 340). The derivative with the formant -iā from **tarpas*. Among the derivatives with this suffix, are lexemes with toponymic semantics, cf. Lith. *plýnija* ‘plain’, ‘smooth surface’, *ármenija* ‘ploughed field’ (Ambrasas 2000: 39). Though the geographic appellatives with -ija now are mainly noted in the samogitian dialects (Ambrasas 2000: 51), nevertheless the hydronyms with the formant -ija are widespread in the Baltic languages (Vanagas 1970: 145–148).

In the special literature, we may find the conclusion about the innovativeness of the words with -iā-/-iā in the Baltic languages (Ambrasas 2000: 40); however, the presence of -iā- in the substrate Baltic toponymy of the Dnieper area indicates the more ancient period of this derivational model activation.

The name was phonetically changed in Slavonic pronunciation, particularly Baltic groupophoneme *TarT* (= Proto-Slav. *TorT*) was transformed as *ToroT*, and iotation of the labial (*pj*) resulted in l-epentheticum (*pl'*). Baltic formant is the exact etymological equivalent of Slavonic -vj- (< PIE -iā-), therefore, during Slavization, the outcome of Baltic words with -iā- was changed according to the laws of the historical phonetics of the Slavic languages, cf. Ukr. dial. *борóв'я* and *борóвля* ‘pine forest’ < **borov-vja* (OA).

**ueiṣ-a-daṡ-*

Búсодова (*Высодова*) – the river, the left trib. of the Svinobychka, the right trib. of the Smilka, the left trib. of the Sluch, the right trib. of the Goryn, the right trib. of the Pripyat, the right trib. of the Dnieper (SHU 1979: 104) = **ueiṣ-a-daṡ-* “Flowing *dava*”? Cf.: Lith. hydronym *Viešà* ~ *vieš-* ‘to flow, run’, etymologically related to Old Island. *veisa* ‘swamp’ (Vanagas 1981: 379), and also Lith. stem *dov-* as a part of the hydronym *Dóvinė*. According to A. Vanagas, “maybe, it is a very archaic place name, the root of which *dov-* is linked with Sanskr. *dhávatē* ‘runs, flows’, <...> Old Sax. *dou* ‘dew’” (ibid.: 89).

**uida-lakis*

Búдолоч, *-i* – the river, the left trib. of the Sluch, the right trib. of the Goryn, the right trib. of the Pripyat, the right trib. of the Dnieper (*Выдолочь*, *Видоличь*, *Видолочь*, *Witolicz*) (SHU 1979: 101). The composite **uida-lakis* with the first part, etymologically related to Lith. *Vid-ùpė*, *Vid-ùpis* – the rivers ~ Lith. *vidùs* ‘the middle part’ (Vanagas 1981: 376). The second part represents the same root as in Lith. *lakmenà* ‘puddle’, ‘deep muddy pond’, (with *e*-vocalism) *lekmėnė* ‘quagmire’, ‘morass’, Latv. *lekmenis* ‘swampy meadow’ < Balt. **lak-/lek-* ~ Old HG *lah(h)a* ‘puddle’, Old Slav. *локы*, *-ъве* ‘the deepening for water storage’ (Vanagas 1981: 376). It is not excluded that the same etymon is represented in the group of Baltic hydronyms, the stem of which previously was defined as unclear (Vanagas 1981: 178), cf. Latv. *Laka*, Lith. *Lakajà* etc. – the river names.

4.3. The Psel Basin

**Ab-aṡā*

Обова, 1973 – gully, right trib. of the Psel (OA) = **Ab-aṡā* – the derivative from **ab-* ‘river’, ‘stream’ (of this etymon see: Vanagas 1981: 35). Cf. its exact equivalent in Latv. *Abava* (Endzelin 1934: 127: “*a-* short!”).

**Up-[a]-leiā*

Воплея, 1973 – the water object in the Psel basin (Sumy district in Sumy region) (OA) = **up-[a]-leiā* ‘the bend of the river’ (?), cf. Latv. *upleja* ‘river valley’ (Mülenbachs 1929–1932: 301) from *upe* ‘river’, ‘creek’ & *leja* ‘valley’, ‘lowland’ (Mülenbachs 1925/1927: 447). About the semantic development ‘curved’ → ‘uneven surface of the earth’, ‘valley’ in Latvian reflexes of PIE **lei-* ‘to bend, curve’ see: (Karulis 1992: 512). The initial *B-* in the written form is Slavonic prothesis before **ṡ-* from Balt. short **u-*, i. e. contemporary *Воплея* continues the older **Vṡpleja*.

**uerd-en-*

Бéрдин – the river, the right trib. of the Grunia, the right trib. of the Psel, the left trib. of the Dnieper (Poltava region), *Вердинь*, 1782 (SHU 1979: 98) ~ Lith. *Verdėnė*, *Verdėnis*, *verdėnė*, *verdėnis* ‘source, wellspring’ (Vanagas 1981: 362, 372).

**ūīr-ia-ṡaduā*

Виревідва – the river, the left trib. of the Dnieper (below the river mouth of the Psel), *Выревидва*, XVI–XVII (SHU 1979: 103). It could be assumed here that the geographical terms like Russ. *виревод*, *выровод*, however, the outcome of the hydronym hints at the presence here of the formant, which is absent in Slavonic derivatives from **voda*. We see in this name the distorted Old Baltic **ūīr-ia-ṡad-uā*, cf. Lith. *vỹris* ‘bubbling, boiling water’, ‘maelstrom’ < Proto-Lith. **ūīr-ia-s* (Smoczyński 2019: 2116) and *Vaduva*, *Vāduva*, *Vadvà* – potamonyms ~ *vādė* ‘dry riverbed, which becomes a river after the heavy rains’ (Vanagas 1981: 357: *Vadà*; Smoczyński 2019: 1999). Cf. Lith. hydronyms with *-uvà*: *Kūrtuva*, *Kurtuvà* ~ *Kurt-upis*; *Latuvà* ~ *Lāt-ežeris*; *Reguvà* < *Raguvà* ~ *Rāg-upis* (Vanagas 1981: 175, 182, 275) etc.

4.4. The Teterev Basin

*[A]uslā

Ву́сла, -сел (plur.) – source (Kiev region). Comp. tract and ravine *Ву́сла* (ibid.) (SMU 2004: 235) = Balt. *[A]uslā, cf. Lith. *Uslajà* < *Usl-ėja, where the root *usl-* is a possible apophonetic variant of *ausl-* in Lith. *Aūslas* – name of the lake and Latv. *aūsleja* ‘fish of the carp family’ (Vanagas 1981: 355). It is about the result of rethinking the singular form of the Baltic name as plural in Slavonic use. The initial *B-* is Slavonic prothesis, which frequently appears before *y* [u].

*[A]ušē

Уша – the river (Radomyslsky county of Kyiev region; SNMKG 2005: 91), *Уша*, -i – source (Zhytomyr region; SMU 2004: 185) = *[A]ušē, cf. Lith. *Ušnà*, *Ušaņtė* – names of the rivers with the stem *ušn-* that demonstrates *n*-extension (*n*-determinative) of the root *uš-* ~ Lith. *áušti* ‘cool down, cool off’ (Vanagas 1981: 354).

*Ēn-āuā

Єнава, 1975 – gully, the left trib. of the Teterev (OA) = Balt. *Ēn-āuā “Cold spring”, cf. Latv. *Enava* (with *ē-*) (to *ġna* ‘shadow?’) (Endzelin 1934: 128). An attempt to link this name with Latv. *ġna* is probable in view of the principle of nomination in the group of typologically similar Lith. hydronyms: *Šėšuvà*, *Šėš-ùpė*, *Šėšėvėlė* etc. ~ *šėšėlis* ‘shadow’ with more archaic semantics *šėš-* ‘cold’ (Vanagas 1981: 329). Regarding the second part cf. *āuā ‘source, wellspring’ (vide supra).

*Gēruē

Жерева – the river, tributary of the Teterev (SNMKG 2005: 98) = *Gēruē (< *gēru-ijā) ~ Lith. *Gėrvė*, *Gėrv-upis* – the rivers ~ *gėrvė* ‘Grus grus, heron’ (Vanagas 1981: 114; Smoczyński 2006: 190).

*Krūmas

Крим (*Крымъ*) – the river, the left arm of the Dnieper (SHU 1979: 288) = Balt. *Krūmas ~ Lith. *krūmas* ‘bush, shrub’, ‘young forest with slim trees’, Latv. *krūms* ‘bush’, Old Pruss. *krūms (about the antiquity of the appellatives see: Derksen 2015: 260; Smoczyński 2019: 805). It is possible that the older name **Крымъ потокъ* is the semi-calque of a Baltic toponym of the same type as Lith. hydronym *Krūto upėlis* (Vanagas 1981: 168). See also: Торогов 1984: 207–208. As applied to the field of water naming **krūmas* could be used as the name of the fork, crossroad, or place, where the river is divided into arms. Regarding the typology of the water naming cf. names of the Lukavka River tributaries in the Don basin: *Куст*, *Большой Куст*, *Двойновый Куст* (Otin 2011: 146) ~ *куст* ‘bush’.

*Mūkā

Мыка – the river (Radomyslsky county in Kiev governorate; SNMKG 2005: 96) = Balt. *Mūkā (*Mūkē? < *mūk-ijā) ~ Lith. *Mūkė*, *mukùs* ‘boggy, swampy’, Latv. *muka* ‘viscous swamp’ (Vanagas 1970: 61; 1981: 221). The formal similarity of this name and Slavonic derivatives from **тъкнѣти*, **тыкати* ‘pull’, ‘tear’, ‘shift’, ‘draw’ is random because of the difficulty in using them in the field of water naming.

*Pečūl-

Пчуля – the lake on the territory of the former Kiev regiment: «озеромъ, прозываемымъ Пчулею» (Lazarevskij 1866: 326, 327) < **Пчуля?* = **Pečūl-* ~ Lith. *Pečūl-upis* < *Pečūlis* (Vanagas 1981: 252).

*Rad-utiā or *Rad-utis

Радута – helonym (Kyiev region; SMU 2004: 285) = **Rad-utiā* or **Rad-utis* (?), which on formal grounds can be included in the cluster of East Baltic hydronyms with etymologically unclear stem *rad-*, cf. Lith. *Radūtė*, *Radūtis*, *Radeikis*, Latv. *Rad-grāvis* etc., of which see: (Vanagas 1981: 270). Slavonic flexion *-a* contributed to grammatical adaptation of the Baltic name. It is not excluded the coincidence in one toponym of Baltic

lexeme and Slavonic derivative from the root **rad-/*ord-* ‘glad’, ‘rejoice’ (the toponyms with this one are spread in the Slavonic area).

**uel-ī-ual-*

Вули́вало – the river, the left trib. of the Dnieper (*Веливела, Веливала, Вуливело, Вуливала, Валивала*) (SHU 1979: 124) = **uel-ī-ual-* ‘Dead Vala’, i. e. the composite of **uel-* ~ Lith. *velė* ‘soul of a dead’, *Vel-upỹs* – the river & **ual-* ~ Lith. *Valĩ upėlis, Valà* – hydronyms. As regards the structure, the composite cf. Lith. *Nar-ý-balė* (Vanagas 1981: 223, 361, 370).

5. DISCUSSION

It is possible to single out the group of exclusive complete lexical parallels linking the Baltic hydronymic substrate of the Dnieper area and Lithuanian hydronymy. The following examples provide a general idea of this phenomenon.

5.1. Old Baltic and Lithuanian counterparts: **[A]uslā* : Lith. *Uslajā*; **Dargalis* : Lith. *Dárgelė*; **Degē* : Lith. *Degė*; **Dul-upē* : Lith. **Dul-upis, Dul-upỹs*; **Eisraūā* : Lith. *Ėisrava*; **Gērūē* : Lith. *Gėrvė*; **Gur-ap-* : Lith. *Gur-upelis*; **Ir-upē* : Lith. *Ir-upė*; **Kibir-* : Lith. *kibiras*; **Lataūā* : Lith. *Latavà*; **Palangā* : Lith. *Palangà*; **Pečiul-* : Lith. *Pečiulis*; **Rad-utiā* or **Rad-utis* : Lith. *Radūtė, Radūtis*; **Tarp-iā* : Lith. *Tárpija*; **Ušnā* : Lith. *Ušnà*; **uērd-en-* : Lith. *Verdėnė, Verdėnis*; **uers-akis* : Lith. *Vers-akà*; **uilk-utiā* or **uilk-utis* : Lith. *Vilkūtė, Vilkūtis*.

This group of lexemes, perhaps, belonged to Old Baltic dialects, conditionally determined as Proto-Lithuanian. This language was spoken by *Baltic ethnos-ancestor of the contemporary Lithuanians, or an ethnos very close to them in terms of language*. This finding is consistent with the hypothesis by Anatolij P. Nepokupny about preservation in the Dnieper hydronymy of the lexemes, which are attributed to “a relic of the Baltic dialect of the Eastern Lithuanian or, more broadly, Aukštaitian type” (Nepokupnyj 1981: 76). His assumption is confirmed in the recent study on the separate Lithuanian–East Slavonic parallels (Popova, Kopus, Morhun 2024).

5.2. Old Baltic and Latvian counterparts: **Abaūā* : Latv. *Abava*; **Aldin-* : Latv. *Àldiņi*; **Ēn-āūā* : Latv. *Enava*; **Mag-upē* : Latv. *Maģ-upe*; **Ranā?* : Latv. *Rāņa-apluoks*; **Up-[a]-leīā* : Latv. *upleja*.

5.3. Old Baltic and Lithuanian-Latvian counterparts: **Mānas* : Lith. *Món-a-balė*, Latv. *Māņ-upīte*; **Mūkā* : Lith. *Mūkė*, Latv. *muka*; **Ras-apē* : Lith. *Rās-upis*, Latv. *Rasupi*; **Žard-enā* : Lith. *Žardėnas*, Latv. *Zārdena*; **Krūmas* : Lith. *krūmas*, Latv. *krūms*.

The hydrographic terms, as part of reconstructed Baltic lexemes, have close etymological parallels in the Old Indo-European toponymy of the Balkans (in Thrace, Dacia) and Mediterranean, cf. **Al-arnā* : Thrac. **Αλααι-βουα* (= **Alaja*; Duridanov 1969: 14) & *Ἄρωνα, Καλ-αωνα*, and *Arnon, Arne* etc. – the river names (N Syria/Levant; Woudhuizen 2020: 53); **Alda-žig-* : Thrac. *Alda-*, Dac. *alda*; **Ald-in-* : Thrac. *Ἄλδανες* (Duridanov 1969: 15); **Pal-angā* : Thrac. *Palae*, Dac. *Παλα-* (Duridanov 1969: 53); **Ab-auā* : *Abana* – potamonym in Anatolia etc. (Woudhuizen 2020: 46–47: **h₂eb^(h)-/h₂ep-* ‘water’) etc. Such parallels are ancient common innovations of the Proto-Baltic dialects and a group of the Old Indo-European languages, the native speakers of which settled the Balkans. These lexical units had been formed in the period before the speakers of Proto-Baltic arrived in their Dnieper habitat.

6. CONCLUSION

6.1. The etymologies proposed in the research, with high probability, allow us to speak about the belonging of a whole series of Dnieper hydronyms to the vocabulary of the relic Baltic dialects spoken by the population of the Desna, Pripyat, Psel, and Terev rivers coast. A sufficient ground for this conclusion is a number of phonetic and morphological features, which as a whole are peculiar to the primordial Baltic vocabulary and repertoire of

morphemes. In these terms, the toponyms-composites with Baltic lexemes for the river, stream as the second part are very indicative, cf. **Dul-upē*, **Ir-upē*, **Mag-upē*, **Gur-ap-*, **Ras-apē*, **uar-apē*. The same goes for names with other hydrographic terms as the first or second components, cf. **Al-arnā*, **Šueta-balin-* or **Šueta-uālinē*, **uers-akis*, **ueiš-a-dau-* etc. Apart from purely structural features, these compounds differ from Slavonic hydronyms in the model of naming, cf. “Flowing *arna*”, “Light pond”, “Stream from the swamp/lake” or “Flow with maelstrom”, “Flowing *dava*”, etc.

As for the suffixal derivatives, then in cases of formal similarity between Baltic and Slavonic formants, Baltic genesis of the geographical name is determined due to the originality of the root morpheme exactly for the Baltic repertoire of roots, cf. **Ab-auā*, **Eisr-auā*, **Lat-auā*, **Šar-auā* or **Šer-āuā*, **Sēt-inas* or **Sēt-inā*, **Žard-enā*, **Kem-ūlis*.

6.2. Etymological analysis of the hydronymy in the mentioned areas gives grounds for the reconstruction of fifty relic Baltic lexemes of different structures. The details of their morphology are more or less clarified when separating Slavonic derivational extension as a means of their adaptation in a foreign language environment.

6.3. The adaptation of Baltic hydronymy in the old dialects of the Dnieper Slavs passed through two conditional stages. Judging by the results of the phonetic assimilation of the baltisms by Slavs, *the first* coincides with the age of some important processes, with the rebuilding of the phonetic structure of Slavonic word and also changes in consonantism and vocalism. *The second* refers to the time when all these processes were completed; therefore, Baltic toponymy was Slavized with minimal changes, with the exception of cases of the anlaut transformation (aphaeresis, prothesis) and folk-etymological rethinking of the structure.

6.4. Most of the reconstructed Baltic lexemes have structural-etymological equivalents only in the Lithuanian vocabulary, in the absence thereof in the Latvian and Old Prussian languages. However, there is every reason to suppose the introduction of new Old Prussian and Latvian findings may affect the initial conclusion of the specificity of lexical parallels mentioned above.

REFERENCES

- Ambrazas Saulius 2000: *Daiktavardžių darybos raida 2: Lietuvių kalbos vardažodiniai vediniai* [The Development of Noun Formation 2: Noun Derivatives of the Lithuanian Language], Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.
- Anikin Aleksandr Je. 2005: *Opyt slovaria leksičeskich baltizmov v russkom jazyke* [Experience of the Dictionary of Lexical Balticisms in the Russian language], Novosibirsk: Nauka.
- Blažienė Grasilda 2023: Prūsiškų tikrinių žodžių tyrimų lauko ypatumai: įvardijimo principai, lemti laiko ir vietos, kalbos ir istorijos [Peculiarities of the Research Field of Old Prussian Proper Names: Principles of Naming Determined by Time, Place, Language and History]. – *Baltistica* 58(1), 81–104.
- DDH 1993: *Dilova dokumentacija Hetmanščyny XVIII st.* [Business Documentation of the Hetmanate of the 18th Century], Kyiv: Naukova dumka.
- Derksen Rick 2015: *Etymological Dictionary of the Baltic Inherited Lexicon*, Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Duridanov Ivan 1969: *Thrakisch-Dakische Studien 1: Die Thrakisch- und Dakisch-Baltischen Sprachbeziehungen* [Thracian-Dacian Studies 1: The Thracian and Dacian-Baltic language relations], Sofia: Verlag der Bulgarischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Endzelin Janis 1934: Die lettländischen Gewässernamen [The Latvian Water Names]. – *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie* 11, 112–150.

- Endzelīns Jānis 1971: *Comparative Phonology and Morphology of the Baltic Languages*, transl. by W. R. Schmalstieg, B. Jēgers, Hague, Paris: Mouton & Co.
- ESSJ XXIII: *Etimologičeskij slovar slavianskich jazykov. Praslavianskij leksičeskij fond* [Etymological Dictionary of Slavic Languages. Proto-Slavic Lexical Fund] 23: **narodbnъjъ* – **navijakъ*, pod red. O. N. Trubačiova, Moskva: Nauka, 1996.
- Fraenkel Ernst 1962: *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* [Lithuanian etymological dictionary] 1: *A – privekiúoti*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- GS 1901: *Generalnoje sledstvijsje o majetnostiach Nežinskogo polka 1729–1730 g.* [The General Audit about Estates of Nezhin Regiment 1729–1730], Černigov: Tipografija Gub. Zemstva.
- 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.
- Gerullis Georg 1922: *Die altpreußischen Ortsnamen* [The Old Prussian Place Names], Berlin, Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter & Co.
- Iliadi Alexander I. 2025: *Varia Onomastica: Sarmato-Alanica (Danapria, Bohus)*. – *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 92, [1–28]. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.35321/all92-05>.
- Jakob Anthony M. 2024: *A History of East Baltic Through Language Contact*, Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Jaškin Ivan Ja. 2005: *Slownik belaruskich miastsovych geografičnych terminaw: Tapagrafija. Gidralogija* [A Dictionary of Belarusian Local Geographical Terms: Topography. Hydrology], Minsk: Belaruskaja navuka.
- Karulis Konstantīns 1992: *Latviešu etimoloģijas vārdnīca* [Latvian Etymology Dictionary] 1: *A–O*, Rīga: Avots.
- Kazlova Raisa M. 2000: *Belaruskaja i slavianskaja gidranimija. Praslavianski fond* [Belarusian and Slavonic Hydronymy. Proto-Slavonic Stratum], Gomel: GGU.
- Kiparsky Valentin 1939: *Die Kurenfrage* [The Question of the Curonians], Helsinki: Suomalaisen tiedeakatemia.
- Krahe Hans 1964: *Unsere Ältesten Flussnamen* [Our Oldest River Names], Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- KRU 1957: *Kataloh ričok Ukrainy* [Catalogue of Rivers of Ukraine], Kyiv: Akademija nauk URSR.
- Lazarevskij Alexandr M. 1866: *Obozrenije Rumiancevskoj opisi Malorossii 1: Polk Černigovskij* [Overview of Rumyančev's Description of Malorossiya 1: Chernigov Regiment], Černigov: Gubernskaja tipografija.
- Lazarevskij Alexandr M. 1888: *Opisanije staroj Malorossii: Materialy dlja istorii zaselenija, zemlevladienija i upravlenija 1: Polk Starodubskij* [Description of Old Novorossia: Materials for the History of Settlement, Land Ownership, and Administration 1: Starodub Regiment], Kiev: Tipografija K. N. Milevskogo.
- Lazarevskij Alexandr M. 1893: *Opisanije staroj Malorossii: Materialy dlja istorii zaselenija, zemlevladienija i upravlenija 2: Polk Nežinskij* [Description of Old Novorossia: Materials for the History of Settlement, Land Ownership, and Administration 2: Nežin Regiment], Kiev: Tipografija K. N. Milevskogo.

- 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.
- LKŽ_e: *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas* [Dictionary of the Lithuanian Language] (1–20, 1941–2002), el. variantas, redaktorių kolegija: G. Naktinienė (vyr. redaktorė), J. Paulauskas, R. Petrokienė, V. Vitkauskas, J. Zabarskaitė; programuotojai: E. Ožeraitis, V. Zinkevičius, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, atnaujinta versija, 2018. Internet Access: <https://ekalba.lt>.
- Mažiulis Vytautas 1988: *Prūsų kalbos etimologijos žodynas* [Prussian Etymology Dictionary] 1: A–H, Vilnius: Mokslas.
- MEV: *Latviešu valodas vārdnīca* [Latvian Language Dictionary] 1–4, rediģējis, papildinājis, turpinājis J. Endzelīns, Rīga: Izglītības ministrija, Kultūras fonds. Internet Access: https://mev.tezaurus.lv/_/anotacija.
- Miakotin Venedikt A. 1896: *Generalnoje sledstvije o majetnostiach Pereyaslavskogo polka (1729–1731 g.)* [The General Audit about Estates of Pereyaslav Regiment (1729–1730)], Charkov: Tipografija Gubernskogo Pravlenija.
- Mūlenbachs Kārļis 1925/1927: *Latviešu valodas vārdnīca* [Latvian Language dictionary] 2, rediģējis, papildinājis, turpinājis J. Endzelīns, Rīgā: Kultūras fonds.
- Mūlenbachs Kārļis 1929/1932: *Latviešu valodas vārdnīca* [Latvian Language Dictionary] 4, rediģējis, papildinājis, nobeidzis J. Endzelīns, Rīgā: Kultūras fonds.
- Napol'skich Vladimir 2016: Ermanarichs *arctoi gentes* (Jordanes *Getica*, 116): Versuch einer Interpretation. – *Ancient Civilizations from Scythia to Siberia* 22(1), 26–54.
- Nepokupnyj Anatolij P. 1981: Baltijsko-ukrajinski vzajimosviazky i paraleli [Baltic-Ukrainian Interrelations and Parallels]. – *Hidronimija Ukrajiny v jiji mižmouvnych i miždialektnykh zvjazkach*, Kyjiv: Naukova dumka, 65–84.
- 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.
- Otin Jevgenij S. 2011: *Gidronimija Dona 1: Verchnij i Srednij Don* [Hydronymy of the Don River 1: The Upper and Middle Don], Doneck: Jugo-Vostok.
- Popova Oleksandra V., Kopus Olga A., Morhun Oleksandra O. 2024: Lithuanian–Ukrainian Language Parallels: Etymological Relationship and Typological Similarity. – *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 91, 147–176. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.35321/all91-06>.
- SHU 1979: *Slovník hidronimiv Ukrajiny* [Dictionary of Hydronyms of Ukraine], Kyjiv: Naukova dumka.
- Smoczyński Wojciech 2006: *Laringalų teorija ir lietuvių kalba* [Laryngeal Theory and the Lithuanian Language], Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.
- Smoczyński Wojciech 2019: *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego* [Etymological Dictionary of the Lithuanian Language], współpraca redakcyjna M. Osłon, wydanie drugie, poprawione i znacznie rozszerzone, na prawach rękopisu. Internet Access: [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).
- SMU 2004: *Slovník mikrohidronimiv Ukrajiny* [Dictionary of Microhydronyms of Ukraine], Kyiv: Oberegy.

- SNMKG 2005: *Skazanija o naselionnych mestnostiach Kievskoj gubernii* [Tales about Inhabited Areas of the Kiev Province], L. I. Pohilevič, Bila Tserkva: Olexandr Pšonkivskyj.
- Stryžak Olexij S. 1963: *Nazvy ričok Poltavščyny* [Names of the Rivers of Poltavschyna], Kyjiv: AN URSSR.
- Šafonskij Afanasij 1851: *Černigovskogo namestničestva topografičeskoje opisanije* [The Topographical Description of Chernigov Vicegerency], Kiev: Univesiteckaja tipografija.
- 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.
- Toporov Vladimir N. 1975: *Prusskij jazyk: Slovar: A–D* [Prussian Language: Dictionary: A–D], Moskva: Nauka.
- Toporov Vladimir N. 1979: *Prusskij jazyk: Slovar: E–H* [Prussian Language: Dictionary: E–H], Moskva: Nauka.
- Toporov Vladimir N. 1980: *Prusskij jazyk: Slovar: I–K* [Prussian Language: Dictionary: I–K], Moskva: Nauka.
- Toporov Vladimir N. 1984: *Prusskij jazyk: Slovar: K–L* [Prussian Language: Dictionary: K–L], Moskva: Nauka.
- Toporov Vladimir N. 1990: *Prusskij jazyk: Slovar: L* [Prussian Language: Dictionary: L], Moskva: Nauka.
- Vanagas Aleksandras 1970: *Lietuvos TSR hidronimų daryba* [Formation of Hydronyms in the Lithuanian SSR], Vilnius: Mintis.
- Vanagas Aleksandras 1981: *Lietuvių hidronimų etimologinis žodynas* [Etymological Dictionary of Lithuanian Hydronyms], Vilnius: Mokslas.
- Vasilyev Valery L. 2021: Toponymic Baltisms near the Upper Volga Lakes. – *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 85, 141–159.
- Vitkūnas Manvydas, Zabiela Gintautas 2017: *Baltų piliakalniai: nežinomas paveldas* [Baltic Hillforts: An Unknown Heritage], Vilnius: Lietuvos archeologijos draugija.
- Woudhuizen Fred C. 2020: The Old Indo-European Layer in the Mediterranean as Represented by Hydronyms, Toponyms, and Ethnics. – *The Journal of Indo-European Studies* 48(1/2), 41–60.
- Zinkevičius Zigmās 1980: *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika 1: Įvadas. Istorinė fonetika. Daiktavardžių linksniavimas* [Historical grammar of the Lithuanian language 1: Introduction. Historical phonetics. Declension of nouns], Vilnius: Mokslas.
- Zinkevičius Zigmās 1987: *Lietuvių kalbos istorija 2: Iki pirmųjų raštų* [History of the Lithuanian Language 2: Until the First Writings], Vilnius: Mokslas.
- Železniak Iryna M. 1987: *Ros i etnolingvistyčni procesy Serednionaddnyprianskoho Pravoberežzia* [The River Ros' and Ethnolinguistic Processes of the Middle Dnieper Right-Bank Region], Kyjiv: Naukova dumka.