

# Early Latin Loanwords in Modern Ukrainian and the Question of Toponymic Replications

Olena Ponomareva  
Sapienza Università di Roma, Italia

**Abstract** An in-depth analysis of two distinct linguistic elements (lexical and toponymic) of Latin origin in the modern Ukrainian language adds some important elements to the study of the direct contacts of proto-Slavic populations and cultures with Roman civilisation in the early centuries of the first millennium. The paper examines ancient Latin loanwords in modern Ukrainian, in comparison with other Slavic languages and focuses on the question of Roman influences on the toponymy of Ukraine. Considering the difficulties linked to the temporal distance and the genetic diversity between late Latin and modern Ukrainian, these linguistic phenomena are correlated with historical, archaeological, numismatic data (as materially attested), in order to frame the linguistic question in the respective historical context, and at the same time to highlight the lexical connections and cultural continuity with the late Latin period.

**Keywords** Ukrainian language. Latin loanwords. Toponymic replication. Ethnolinguistic connections.

**Summary** 1 Latinisms in the Ukrainian Language. – 2 Old Lexical Latinisms in the Ukrainian Compared with Other Slavic Languages. – 3 The Imperfective Future In Ukrainian: Typological Analogies With The ‘Romance Model’. – 4 The Eastern Proto-Slavic Area: Specific Archaeological Cultures and the Earliest Evidence of Rudimentary Writing. – 5 The Historical-Cultural Significance of Roman Coins Found in the Chernyakhiv Culture Areas. – 6 Roman Toponymic Replications in Ukrainian Geographic Space. – 7 Conclusions.



## Peer review

Submitted 2022-08-23  
Accepted 2022-10-12  
Published 2022-12-15

## Open access

© 2022 Ponomareva | 4.0



**Citation** Ponomareva, O. (2022). “Early Latin Loanwords in Modern Ukrainian and the Question of Toponymic Replications”. *Balcania et Slavia*, 2(1), 91-108.

DOI 10.30687/BES/2785-3187/2022/01/005

## 1 Latinisms in the Ukrainian Language

Like other European languages, Ukrainian has acquired numerous borrowings from Latin, in most cases through the mediations of the Neo-Latin languages and Polish, another Slavic language. The most complete lexicographic sources of the contemporary Ukrainian language include about three thousand Latinisms that reflect different socio-cultural contexts, referring to various historical periods, as well as the multiple contacts and the most varied interactions with other cultural realities. Similarly to other languages, Latin elements in Ukrainian are characterised by the heterogeneity of historical and etymological sources caused by extra-linguistic factors.

Most of the lexical Latin loanwords were introduced into Ukrainian between the 15th and 18th centuries, during the period of a close interaction between Ukrainian linguistic reality and cultural, religious and socio-political contexts of the 1st *Rzeczpospolita* where Latin was the written language in active use, especially in the judicial and administrative spheres, in education system and in the Church as official liturgical language. It was also the language used by the cultural elite: in the multiethnic *Rzeczpospolita* Latin had become a kind of *lingua franca* demarcating cultural rather than national boundaries:

In the entire panorama of European national cultures, it is difficult to find an analogy to the role played by Latin in *Rzeczpospolita*, to its *sui generis* bilingualism. The upper strata of society in the Confederation were bilingual, which contributed to a unique symbiosis between the Slavic mother tongue and Latin language. (Axer 1995, 76-7)

At that time, Ukrainian adopted, through the mediation of the Polish language, the Latin words *auctōr* > pol. *autor* > ukr. автор; *administratiōne(m)* > pol. *administracja* > ukr. адміністрація; *commissio* > pol. *komisja* > ukr. комісія; *magnātus* > pol. *magnat* > ukr. магнат and many others. At the same time, given the high level of general education in Ukraine in that period (excluding the peasants), as well as the deep knowledge of the classical Greek and Latin heritage by Ukrainian scholars and writers, it can be assumed that many borrowings from Latin have been assimilated not through the mediation of Polish, but in a parallel way with the acquisition of the same words in the Polish language and in other European languages. In other cases, Ukrainian lexicographic sources certify some direct acquisitions from Latin like in *absurdus* > ukr. абсурд, *bursa* > ukr. бурса (in the meaning of 'theological seminary'); *vacātiō* > ukr. вакації; *humōre(m)* > ukr. гумор; *ratiōne(m)* > ukr. рація; *termīne(m)* > ukr. термін.

The most frequent sources of Latin loanwords in Ukrainian were Romance languages, mainly French. Through French mediation, Ukrainian has adopted the Latinisms as *arbīṭēr* > fr. *arbitre* > ukr. арбітр; *expēditio* > fr. *expédition* > ukr. експедиція; *mandātu(m)* > fr. *mandat* > ukr. мандат; *manifēstu(m)* > fr. *manifeste* > ukr. маніфест; *ministēr* > fr. *ministre* > ukr. міністр and others. In many cases, however, it is a matter of etymological plurality or, more precisely, of the plurality of historical sources for the same loan, which means that the words belonging to different languages are going back to the same etymology: *annexiōne(m)* > ted. *Annexion* > fr. *annexion* > ukr. анексія; *corruptiōne(m)* > ted. *Korruption* > fr. *corruption* > ukr. корупція; *doctrina(m)* > ted. *Doktrine* > fr. *doctrine* > ukr. доктрина; *emigratiōne(m)* > ted. *Emigration* > fr. *émigration* > ukr. еміграція; *institūtu(m)* > ted. *Institut* > fr. *institut* > ukr. інститут; *informatio* > ted. *Information* > fr. *information* > ukr. інформація.

The lexical Latinisms adopted in the subsequent period, more precisely between the 18th and 19th centuries, mainly concerned the terminology of the various branches of science: алібі 'alibi', ампула 'phial, vial', вакуум 'vacuum', гербарій 'herbarium', дегенеративний 'degenerative', еволюція 'evolution', модус 'mode' etc. In that period, many loans came through the mediation of the Russian language, and this is a rather curious linguistic phenomenon, considering the fact that in the previous period there had been reverse processes: Latin loans were adopted by the Russian language through the Ukrainian language (cf. Vinogradov 1982, 523).

## 2 Old Lexical Latinisms in the Ukrainian Compared with Other Slavic Languages

Of particular interest are the earliest Latin loans whose assimilation presumably dates back to the period of Proto-Slavic linguistic unity and the subsequent differentiation of the various Slavic languages; an assimilation that, in many cases, took place through the mediation of the Gothic language and/or other Germanic languages. This kind of loans is well preserved in most modern Slavic languages, including Ukrainian: contemporary etymological and lexicographic sources<sup>1</sup> record about twenty Latinisms of this type perfectly integrated and assimilated by Ukrainian language to appear indigenous lexical creations. The semantic fields vary from the names of cultivated

<sup>1</sup> *Etymologichnyj slovnyk ukrajinskoj movy* (EtSIUkrM) v 6 tomakh. Kyiv: NAN Ukrainy, Naukova dumka, 1982-2012; *Akademichnyj tlumachnyj slovnyk ukrajinskoj movy v 11 tomakh* (SUM-11). Kyiv: NAN Ukrainy, Naukova dumka, 1970-80; *Velykyj tlumachnyj slovnyk suchasnoji ukrajinskoj movy* (VTSSUM). Irpin: Perun, 2005; *Slovnyk ukrajinskoj movy v 20 tomakh*. Kyiv: NAN Ukrainy, Naukova dumka, 2010-21.

plants as редька 'horseradish', цибуля 'onion' or the names of dishes like оцет 'vinegar', гляр 'abomasum, maw', by extension 'curdled milk' - to the names of pre-Christian beliefs and some Christian rituals, for example русалка 'undine', 'water nymph', 'mermaid'; поганин 'pagan', 'heathen'; Коляда 'Christmas rite'; or even numerous replications of the toponym Рим 'Rome' and some cultural-specific realities of ancient Rome (this topic will be examined in the paragraph dedicated to Ukrainian toponymy of Latin origin). Despite different writing and pronunciation, the phonetic and semantic similarities of most of these words in various Slavic languages are evident:

- Цибуля, 'onion' in Ukrainian: from lat. *cepulla(m)*, diminutive of *cēpa* 'onion' (assimilated through Germanic mediation); цибуля in Belarusian; *cybula* (*cybla*) in Upper Sorbian; *cybula* in Lower Sorbian; *cebula* in Polish; *cibule* in Czech; *cibul'a* in Slovak; *čebula* in Slovene versus лук in Russian and Bulgarian, *luk* in Croat;
- Редька, 'horseradish' in Ukrainian: from lat. *rādix* 'root' (assimilation took place through Germanic mediation); рэдзька in Belarusian; редька in Russian; *rjedkej* in Upper Sorbian; *rjadkei* in Lower Sorbian; *rzodkiewka* in Polish.
- Гляр, 'abomasum', 'rennet', 'curdled milk' (especially obtained from the extraction of stomach enzymes from unweaned young ruminants) in Ukrainian: from lat. *coagulāre*, deriv. of *coāgulum* 'to clot', 'to curdle', 'to congeal' (the assimilation took place through the Romanian mediation of the noun *cheag* 'clot', 'lump'; 'rennet'). Among all Slavic languages, apart from Ukrainian, the word with the same meaning exists only in Polish (*klag*) and in Slovak (*kl'ag*). In Ukrainian the word гляр has produced numerous derivatives: over twenty meanings including nouns, verbs and participles (гляр'анка, гльоганка 'curdled milk'; гляр'анець 'sweet ricotta cheese'; гляр'ати, гляр'жити, гляр'жити 'to curdle', referred to 'milk'; гляр'аний 'curdled' etc.), most of them of ancient formation. The phonetic aspect is another peculiarity of this word: гляр contains two letters *r*, traditionally present in some Ukrainian lexemes like гав'а 'crow', гандж 'defect', 'fault', ґрунт 'soil', 'terreno', гудзик 'button', which is particularly useful in the transliteration of foreign anthroponyms like Гете Goethe, Гайдеґґер Heidegger, Гюґо Hugo. In 1933 after the invalidation of the *Orthography of Kharkiv*,<sup>2</sup> the letter *r* was abolished, consequently the sound disappeared

<sup>2</sup> It was the first unified orthography of Ukraine, a synthesis of the best solutions of the previous norms for spelling, elaborated by authoritative linguists representing the different linguistic traditions, Western-Ukrainian and Eastern-Ukrainian, which have been extensively discussed in the *All-Ukrainian Orthographic Conference* in Kharkiv in 1927. *The Orthography of Kharkiv* was abolished in 1933 after the advent of a 're-

not only in loanwords, but also in properly Ukrainian lexemes. Гляг was replaced with сижуг, which coincided with the Russian word and was thus encoded in the dictionaries, while in the numerous derivatives the phoneme /r/ was replaced with /r/.<sup>3</sup> After 1989 the word гляг was reintroduced into dictionaries.

- Оцет 'vinagr' in Ukrainian: from lat. *acētum*, similar to *acer* 'sour' (through Gothic mediation *akeit* 'vinagr'); вóцет in Belarusian; оцёт in Bulgarian; оцет in Macedonian; ócet in Polish and in Czech; òcot in Slovak; òcat in Croatian.

The vowel -o- instead of -a- indicates the phonetic and graphic adaptation of Latinisms in Slavic languages. We can observe the same phonetic change in the Ukrainian adjective поганий 'bad', 'ugly', 'unpleasant' plus numerous derivatives (about twenty), as well as in the noun поганин 'pagan', 'heathen', 'follower of Paganism'; the words are derived from the same source, from lat. *pāgānus* (*pāgus*) 'country dweller', 'villager' (presumably because villagers embraced Christianity later than city dwellers). In some South Slavic languages the derivatives formed from the same Latin root *pag-*, (*pog-*) exist predominantly in the form of the noun with the meaning 'bad person': поганець in Bulgarian (which also means 'rat'), поганац, поганик in Serbian. In most of the Slavic languages the meaning is 'pagan', 'heathen', 'follower of Paganism': *pogan* in Upper and Lower Sorbian; *poganin* in Polish; *pohan* in Czech e Slovak; *pogan* in Sloven. In Ukrainian from the adjective поганий also derive the noun гана 'reproach', 'disapproval', and the verb ганити 'to disapprove', 'to scold'.

Of particular interest are the borrowings in the semantic field of pre-Christian beliefs and Christian rituals. For example, русалка in the meaning 'undine', 'water nymph', 'mermaid' is common for most Slavic languages: русалка in Belarusian, Russian, Macedonian e Serbian; *rusalka* in Slovak, *rusálka* in Czech and Slovene; *rusalka* in Polish. In Slavic folklore, the rusalky "were conceptualized as unrest souls of improperly deceased young women, girls or infants" (Dynda 2017, 83). In its broadest sense, it means 'water nymph', but also 'wood nymph' and designates a vast and complex phenomenon of the penetration of elements of ancient pre-Christian rituals into Christian worship. It derives from the Old East Slavic word русалица, which was a typical *Totenfest* linked to the spring season which subsequently also entered into Western and South Slavic languages. According

---

newed' language policy aimed at the affirmation of Russian as the *lingua franca* of the Soviet Union.

<sup>3</sup> Although the graphemes are visually similar, they indicate two separate phonemes: /r/ indicates the voiced pharyngeal fricative consonant, while /r/ is the voiced velar occlusive consonant. The letter r was officially reintroduced into the alphabet in 1989, but its phonemic status has been restored only by the Spelling Reform in 2019.

to the most accredited etymological dictionaries, it is a direct Latinism which can be traced back to the Latin form *rosālia* or *rosaria*, 'rose festival' in ancient Rome, dedicated to the commemoration of the dead and linked to seasonality of blooming of roses "given that the roses, characteristic spring flowers, allude to the rebirth: their red color means life, blood, flesh, and earthiness" (Parodo 2016, 723).

The word *коляда* is another example of a direct Latinism in Ukrainian and in most Slavic languages. It derives from *kālendae* (*cālendae*), the first day of every month signifying the start of a new lunar phase. In Slavic language the semantic area of this word is connected to the winter solstice, and, subsequently, to the Christmas cycle and Christmas customs: *калядà* in Belarusian; *ко̀леда*, *ко̀леде* in Bulgarian and Macedonian; *ко̀леда* in Serbian; *коляда́* in Russian, also with the meaning of 'winter solstice'; *koléda* in Slovenian; *kole-da* in Czech and Slovak with the meaning of 'Christmas and Easter carols'; *kołęda* in Polish, 'Christmas song', but also with the meaning of 'visit of the priest to families on the occasion of Christmas holidays' (Brückner 1927, 245-6). In Ukrainian *коляда* represents a lexical unit with the larger number of meanings compared to other Slavic languages as it connotes:

- Christmas ritual;
- Christmas ritual song;
- a group singing Christmas carols, with derivatives - *колядник* (the feminine form *колядниця*) 'who goes about singing Christmas carols', *колядувати* 'to sing Christmas carols';
- a reward offered to groups performing Christmas ritual song;
- Christmas Eve;
- Christmas gift.

*Коляда* (with capital letter) also means a deity linked to the winter solstice signifying the start of a new year.<sup>4</sup>

An aspect of ethnological interest is the maintenance in the various Slavic cultures of the *Koliada* ritual, in which singing groups composed mainly of young people dressed as shepherds and other typical crib characters go from house to house singing Christmas carols. This tradition is particularly heartfelt and alive in Ukraine, and is typical not only of rural culture, as is usually the case in contemporary societies, but also identified with mainstream culture. The *Koliada* ritual is regenerated every year at Christmas through musical, theatrical and artistic performances on a high level. In this way centuries-old traditions are handed down from generation to generation.

The presence of these Latinisms with similar meanings in most Slavic languages speaks in favour of a rather remote period of ac-

<sup>4</sup> EtSIUkrM, 2: 526-7; SUM-11, 4: 237; VTSSUM, 557; SUM-20, 8: 255.

quisition, presumably in the times of Proto-Slavic linguistic unity. According to the sources of historical lexicology, these borrowings may date back to the period between the 2nd and 4th centuries AD, which corresponds to some initial phases of differentiation of the various dialects of the Proto-Slavic language in which the phonetic, lexical and morphosyntactic differences between these dialects that later formed the distinct Slavic languages began to strengthen. Many scholars of Old Slavic languages, among them the etymologist Franciszek Sławski and the medieval historian Lech Tyszkiewicz, argue that the period of the greatest differentiation of Slavic languages could correspond to the time of Germanic and, later, of Slavic migrations and thus dates back to the 5th-6th centuries AD (Tyszkiewicz 1990, 40-8, 198-203; Sławski 1975). Recently, this thesis of Slavic migrations has been put into question, at least, in its traditional version of relatively quick processes (Curta 2021). In any case, the presence of Latinisms with similar meanings in most Slavic languages demonstrates not only the existence of a vast area of contact on the borders of the Roman Empire but also the temporal continuity of Slavic languages with the Latin heritage.

### 3 The Imperfective Future In Ukrainian: Typological Analogies With The ‘Romance Model’

In addition to the lexical and semantic influences mentioned above, there is a grammatical category in Ukrainian that has similarities rather with Western Romance languages than with Slavic languages: the simple imperfective future where the endings that represent the shortened personal forms of the verb *мати*, *jmati* ‘to take’, ‘to grab’, ‘to have’ (as a result of ‘take’), are added to the infinitive of verbs:

(я) писати -му	(ми) писати -мемо
(ти) писати -меш	(ви) писати -мете
(він, вона, воно) писати -ме	(вони) писати -муть

Comparing the simple imperfective future in Ukrainian with the simple future in Western Romance languages, the replication of the same morphological pattern becomes evident:

French ( <i>avoir: ai, as, a, avons, avez, ont</i> )	
<i>j'écrit-ai</i>	<i>nous écrire-ons</i>
<i>tu écris-as</i>	<i>vous écrire-ez</i>
<i>il, elle écrit-a</i>	<i>ils, elles écrir-ont</i>

Spanish (*haver: he, has, ha, hemos, habéis, han*)

<i>escribir-é</i>	<i>escribir-emos</i>
<i>escribir-às</i>	<i>escribir-éis</i>
<i>escribir-à</i>	<i>escribir-àn</i>

Italian (*avere: ho, hai, ha, abbiamo, avete, hanno*)

<i>scrivere-ò</i>	<i>scrivere-emo</i>
<i>scrivere-ai</i>	<i>scrivere-ete</i>
<i>scrivere-à</i>	<i>scrivere-anno</i>

Catalan (*haver: he, has, ha, hem, heu, han*)

<i>escriur-é</i>	<i>escriur-em</i>
<i>escriur-às</i>	<i>escriur-eu</i>
<i>escriur-à</i>	<i>escriur-an</i>

Portuguese (*haver: hei, há, ha, hemos (havemos), heis (haveis) hão*)

<i>escrever-ei</i>	<i>escrever-emos</i>
<i>escrever-às</i>	<i>escrever-eis</i>
<i>escrever-à</i>	<i>escrever-ão</i>

As can be seen from these examples, the personal forms of the Ukrainian verb *писати*, 'to write', in comparison with the forms of the same verb in the simple future in French, Spanish, Catalan, Italian and Portuguese, follow the Romance pattern: the different verb conjugations have the same endings added to the infinitive. Similar grammatical forms – sufficiently documented by textual sources – existed in Vulgar Latin from the 2nd century AD onwards (Renzi, Andreose 2015, 154). It should be pointed out that the ancient form of the simple future with the verb 'to have' was present in Old Church Slavonic language, it is part of Indo-European heritage and it is also common among some of Non-Indo-European languages. Anyway, this verbal form no longer exists in most Slavic languages, nor in the Eastern Romance languages.

At the same time, in contemporary Ukrainian linguistics, there is still a contradiction between prescriptive and descriptive approaches to the interpretation of the future form of imperfective verbs and there is no unanimity among scholars on the question of synthetism of the synthetic future tense from the point of view of its diachronic typology (cf. Vykhovanets, Horodenska 2004, 254-7; Marchylo 1997, 22-5; Bevzenko 1997, 213-17; Danylenko 2010, 113-21). Nevertheless, the difficulties related to the temporal distance as well as the genetic diversity between Late Latin and Modern Ukrainian make our linguistic investigations rather complex, thus it becomes necessary to correlate these lexical and morphological phenomena with histor-



ical, archaeological and numismatic data (as materially attested), placing the linguistic question in its historical and cultural context.

#### **4 The Eastern Proto-Slavic Area: Specific Archaeological Cultures and the Earliest Evidence of Rudimentary Writing**

The eastern dialectal area of the Proto-Slavic ethnic and linguistic community between the 1st and the 2nd century AD comprised a large territory located between the upper course of the Dnister river and the middle course of the Dnipro river. It is often related to the Zarubyntsi culture identified in 1898 by Vikentiy Khvoyka, the Czech-Ukrainian archaeologist, and named after the site where it was found near the village Zarubyntsi located 140 km south of Kyiv. Subsequently the Zarubyntsi culture was attested by about 500 archaeological sites. Some years later, Khvojka discovered the vast sepulchral area belonging to the Chernyakhiv culture, named after the place where it was found near the village of Chernyakhiv in the vicinity of Kyiv. In the same period, the Polish-Czech archaeologist Karel Hadáček identified sepulchral monuments of the same type in the upper Western Buh river (now known as archaeological site of Neslukhiv in vicinity of Lviv). In 1903 similar sepulchral areas identifiable with the Chernyakhiv culture were discovered in the Sântana de Mureş region in Transylvania. Important archaeological evidence proves that in the period of Gothic invasions most of the local tribes were settled and remained to live in the same places even after the Goths were pushed further west by the Huns in the 4th and 5th centuries AD, and that in the same places the Chernyakhiv culture succeeded the Zarubyntsi culture. Archaeologists correlate the formation of the Chernyakhiv culture with the intensified contacts of the barbarian peoples settled in Eastern Europe with the Roman Empire, especially during the Scythian Wars of the 3rd century (between 238 and 271). The peak of the expansion of the Chernyakhiv culture coincided with the reign of Ermanaric, the king of the Ostrogoths who died in 370. Ermanaric succeeded in institutionalising the political dominance of the Goths over the rest of the barbarians in the region, ensuring a relative internal stability and advantageous trade with the Roman Empire, as well as with the Greek colonies along the northern Black Sea coast, then vassals of Rome such as Olvia (Olbia Pontica), Tyras, Chersonese (Eleunte), Panticapeo (Panticapea).

The Chernyakhiv culture represented a rather disparate ethnic conglomerate: its populations were descendants of the Scythians, Sarmatians, Thracians, with an important Slavic component (Pivtorak 2015, 225; Sedov 1979, 98-100). The economy was centred on agriculture using an innovative type of plough with an asymmetrical

ploughshare, equipped with a mobile front end on wheels that needed to be transported by oxen or horses. A favourable climate and fertile soil which gave the possibility of a rich harvest, especially of cereals, determined the settled nature of the populations: this is testified by the remains of unfortified settlements and necropolises which lasted on average 100-150 years. Trade with the Roman Empire included not only grain exports, but also importation of foodstuffs, in particular wine and oil, transported in amphorae, the finds of which are very frequent in the areas of the Chernyakhiv culture (Synytsia 2013, 688). The archaeological finds of amphorae in the area of forested steppes along the northern coast of the Black Sea correspond to the areas of the spread of the Chernyachiv culture, and they are practically absent outside this area (Kropotkin 1961, 44). The discovery of Roman silver coin hoards throughout the area of the Chernyachiv culture, as well as the entire archaeological context, demonstrates that Roman coins were mainly used for the accumulation of money rather than as a medium of exchange, at least until the 5th century AD.<sup>5</sup>

## 5 The Historical-Cultural Significance of Roman Coins Found in the Chernyakhiv Culture Areas

At the end of the 19th century Volodymyr Antonovych, the father of modern Ukrainian archaeology, described ancient coins found on the territory of Ukraine as “the earliest attested sources of its history” (Braychevsky 1963, 36). Although the question of the penetration of Roman coins into the areas of the Chernyakhiv culture still remains open, we can specify some basic theses widely accepted in the international scientific community: the Roman coins of the Late Antique period are contemporary with the discoveries of the Chernyakhiv culture and have a precise location in the Dnister and Dnipro rivers basins (cf. Myzgin 2012, 197-201); the boundaries of these numismatic finds coincide with the archaeological boundaries and, most likely, with the boundaries of political and economic structures existing in that period (cf. Magomedov 2001, 58-60).

According to a thesis supported by authoritative contemporary archaeologists, among them Mark Shchukin, Boris Magomedov, Kyrylo Myzgin, Arkadiusz Dymowski and others, the Roman silver *denarii* found in the areas of Chernyakhiv culture could be part of the wages paid to the Goths as the *foederati* of the Roman Empire after the stipulation of the *foedus* with Constantine I in 332 AD. There is even

---

<sup>5</sup> It is rather symptomatic that in later periods the coins minted in the medieval State of Kyiv Rus' in the 10th century were derived from the Roman *denarius* of the 2nd century AD.

a hypothesis that after the stipulation of the *foedus* Rome considered the Gothic kingdoms along the northern coast of the Black Sea as its own territories, which in any case fell within its political and military sphere of influence (Shchukin 2005, 201; Magomedov 2006, 41-56). The increased inflow of Roman coins coincided with the intensification of trade between the Goths and the Roman Empire at that time. Of particular interest is the supposition of contemporary Russian historian Vladimir Lavrov about the existence of a single Gothic Kingdom governed by a dyarchy represented by the military leader Ermanaric, the king of the Ostrogoths, and the descendant of an ancient aristocratic lineage Athanaric, the king of the Visigoths; the latter was mentioned in Roman documentary sources as *iudex*, a title with executive force equivalent to the nominal governor in imperial provinces. In this way, Athanaric's subjects could be considered as inhabitants of the Roman Empire who, by paying contributions, also received *ipso facto* the rights and privileges of Roman citizens (Shchukin 2005, 207).

The last important discovery of Roman Imperial coins in Ukraine dates back to 2005 (Levada, Alekseenko 2011, 373-95). Nevertheless, the most systematic and comprehensive study of Roman coins found on Ukrainian territory remains the monograph by Mykhailo Braychevsky *Rymska moneta na terytorii Ukrainy*. Braychevsky provides an accurate topographical description of the finds of Roman hoards on territories of contemporary Ukraine and repeatedly mentions Podolia, a historical-geographical region located in the west-central and south-western part of Ukraine and in north-eastern Moldova, on the right bank of the Dnister river in the Transcarpathia. These territories from the 2nd century AD onwards bordered Dacia, which became a Roman province in 106, along Trajan's Wall.<sup>6</sup>

Mykhailo Braychevsky provides a precise dating of these coins, most of them date from the period between the end of the 1st to the beginning of the 2nd century AD, which corresponds to the time of the Antonine dynasty, i.e. the greatest expansion of the Roman Empire characterised by the territorial shift of the Empire's borders following the conquest of Dacia. While a substantial decrease in the influx of coins, starting from the first half of the 3rd century, coincided with the most serious economic crisis of the Roman Empire, on the one hand, and with barbarian invasions and the Indo-European migrations, on the other. In the following periods, despite the decrease in the influx of new coins, the use and importance of the Roman *denarius* increased considerably; in particular, silver coins imitating Roman ones were independently minted, with an exact reproduction of the original *denarii*.

<sup>6</sup> Contrary to its name, Trajan's Wall was not built by the Romans during Trajan's reign, but probably by the Goths and Byzantines between the 3rd and 11th centuries.

At the end of his work, Mykhailo Braychevsky provides an important numismatic data: a catalogue of Roman coins - over 30,000 units - found in 1,100 inhabited centres in Ukraine. This catalogue is known in Ukrainian archaeology and historiography as the "Braychevsky's list".

## 6 Roman Toponymic Replications in Ukrainian Geographic Space

The linguist Kostyantyn Tyshchenko conducted an important toponymic and onomasiological research in order to study the toponymic material contained in the "Braychevsky's list". In this way, the scholar in his pioneering work conceptualised the question of Roman influences on the toponymy of today's Ukraine. Tyshchenko highlights three most frequent morphological units in place-names and compares them with toponyms in other European countries whose territories in Late Antiquity were part of the European *Barbaricum*: Poland, Slovakia, Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary, Germany and other countries of northern, central and eastern Europe. The most frequent morphological units are:

1. *Doman-* from the stem of the common Latin name *dominus*;
2. *Traian-* (*Trojan-*) from the stem of the anthroponym *Traianus*;
3. *Rom-* (*Rym-*) from the stem of the toponym Rome (Tyshchenko 2006, 250-8).

In the place-names analysed by Tyshchenko, the most numerous are replications of the Latin-derived stem *Doman-*: this replication concerns 96 localities in 13 countries in a vast geographical area extending from Germany to Russia and from the Baltic States to Turkey; it includes very different nations belonging to different language families of which six are Slavic nations. It is a very common place-name in Romania - with 26 locations, in Poland - with 41 locations, and, especially, in Ukraine where it is replicated in 54 toponyms:

1. Germany: Domäne (3), Domnitz, Domnitzsch - 22.
2. Czech Republic: Domanìn (3), Domanìec, Domanìc, Domànovice - 12.
3. Slovakia: Domanìnky, Domadice, Domandice, Domaniža, Domanovce - 12.
4. Hungary: Domahàza, Domaszék, Domoszlò, Domony - 7.
5. Romania: Doman, Domnești (5), Domnița (Mihail Kogàlniceanu), Dumesti (2), Doamna - 26.
6. Poland: Domanice (5), Domaniew (2), Domaniewice (3) Domankòw, Domanin (2), Domanków, Domanin (2), Domaniów (2), Domaniwice, Domanowo, Domanów - 41.

7. Ukraine: Доманове, Думниця, Думичі (2), Думи (3), Доманинка, Доманці, Думени, Думанів, Думинське, Доманівка (2), Домантівка, Домонтове, Думанці, Думенки, Домниця (2) - 53.
8. Belarus: Дамановічы (2), Даманава (3), Даманы, Домнікі, Домнікава.
9. Russia: Доманичи, Доманово, Деменка, Думаничи, Дмыничи, Думиничи, Деменино.
10. Other countries (15 replications) included Latvia: Domenikava; Lithuania: Domopole; Turkey: Domaniç.  
(Tyshchenko 2006, 248-51)

There are about 60 replicated place-names derived from the anthroponym *Traianus - Traian- (Trojan-)* in eleven different countries; they represent a more compact geographical area also including some Slavic countries of the Balkan-Danubian area. The vowel -o- in place of the Latin -a- indicates adaptation to the phonemic context of the Slavic languages, since place-names are of the same type for East, West and South Slavs; it is therefore an isophonic phenomenon denoting a common toponymic base and a probable (though not always certain) continuity from the time of Proto-Slavic linguistic unity. The largest number of replications deriving from the Latin stem *Traian- (Trojan-)* can be found in Ukraine; their correlation with the areas where Roman coins were found could attest to the direct contacts of local populations with the Roman Empire and not only during the 'reign of Trajan': in particular, the Russian Soviet historian Boris Rybakov believes that

the real emperor Trajan (98-117 AD) deified by the Senate after his death, like many Roman emperors, could also become a deity in the Slavic polytheistic religion among the south-western Slavic tribes that came into direct contact with the 'lands of Trajan', in other words with the Roman Empire. (Rybakov 1963, 14-15)

The 'centuries of Trajan', also mentioned in the epic poem *The Tale of Igor's Campaign* of the 12th century, indicate not only the period of this emperor's reign, but - and above all - the subsequent periods that coincided with the expansion of Slavic peoples into the areas of the middle course of the Dnipro river (the Chernyakhiv culture) under strong material and cultural influences from the 'land of Trajan'. More specifically, the 'centuries of Trajan' are the three centuries between the 2nd and 4th centuries AD,

when the Slavic ruling classes sold grain to the Romans using Roman measures, accumulated wealth in Roman denarii, adorned their wives with Roman jewels [...] In the collective imagination

of the Slavs, Emperor Trajan was the personification of the imperial rule of the Roman state rather than a real person. (Rybakov 1963, 15)

The spread of place-names derived from the anthroponym *Traianus* (*Traian-*, *Trojan-*) as a result of toponymic transmigration in the European geographical space is configured in this way:

1. Germany: Trainau, Traindorf, Treinfeid.
2. Czech Republic: Trojanovice.
3. Slovakia -
4. Hungary: Torjàn.
5. Romania: Traian (19), Traian Vuia, Troianul.
6. Poland: Trojany (2), Trojanów, Trojanowo (2), Trojanowice (2), Trojadyn.
7. Ukraine: Троян, Трояни (7), Троянів, Троянівка (3), Троянове, Троянка (4) - 16.
8. Belarus: Траянец, Траянаўка.
9. Bulgaria: Троян (2), Трояново (2), Троянска Планина, Троянски перевал.
10. Russia: Троян.
11. Other countries - Slovenia: Trojane; Moldova: Troian. (Tyshchenko 2006, 248-51)

The third of the most replicated toponyms is the very name of the Roman Empire and/or its capital Rome (Rzym, Řim, Рум, Рим, РЫМ in the phonetic and graphic adaptation in the Western and Eastern Slavic languages as well as the Baltic languages). Toponymic transmigration is determined by the notoriety and importance of the name, by its historical, political and institutional significance, which explains its reuse in various European countries: there are more than 50 toponyms replicated in ten European countries. The largest number of replications we found in Germany, Poland, Slovakia and Ukraine. The geographical configuration is very similar to the area of diffusion of the place-names of anthroponymic origin derived from *Traianus*:

1. Germany: Rom, Rommerode, Rómhild, Romsdorf, Rómsted, Rómersberg, Rómershag, Rómershagen, Rómershausen (2), Rómershofen.
2. Czech Republic: Řimov (2), Řimice, Rymice.
3. Slovakia: Rimavská Baňa, Rimavská Pila, Rimavská Seč, Rimavská Sobota, Rimavské Brezovo, Rimavské Janovce, Rimavské Zalužany.
4. Hungary: Rimóc, Romhány, Románd, Romonya.
5. Romania: Roma, Roman.
6. Poland: Rzym (2), Rzymy-Las, Rzymiany, Rzymisko, Rzymówka, Rzymkowice, Rzymanów (2), Rzymań, Rymer, Rymki.

7. Ukraine: Римачі, Рими, Римів (Велика Бурімка), Римиги, Ромейки, Ромашки, Романівка (7).
8. Belarus: Рум, Рымінка, Раманішчы.
9. Latvia: Rumšiškēs, Rimše, Rimšēnai, Romašiai. (Tyshchenko 2006, 248-51)

## 7 Conclusions

Research into two distinct linguistic phenomena, lexical and toponymic, in contemporary Ukrainian adds some relevant elements to the study of contacts (both direct and mediated by the Goths and other Germanic tribes) of the Proto-Slavic populations in the basin of the Dnipro and Dnister rivers and the northern shores of the Black Sea with Roman civilisation in the early centuries of the 1st millennium. Ancient Latinisms assimilated by Slavic languages are the most numerous in the Ukrainian vocabulary, followed by Polish and Slovak vocabularies. Historical and toponymic data reveal the existence of a stratum of oikonyms of Latin origin presumably assimilated in the Late Antique period. This is supported by numismatic data, i.e. the discovery of coin hoards of the Roman Empire dating from the end of the first century to the beginning of the second century AD in the vast areas between the basins of the Dnipro and Dnister rivers. The correlation between place-names of probable Latin origin and the locations of ancient Roman coin hoards on Ukrainian territory, highlighted by the analysis of linguist Kostyantyn Tyshchenko, is a particularly important aspect. The toponymic transmigration of such place-names over the vast area encompassing various countries of northern, central and eastern Europe can attest to linguistic continuity lasting at least since the Late Antique period between the 2nd and 4th centuries AD. The fact of greater conservation of this type of toponymy in the Ukrainian lexis with a high number of Latin replications seems rather significant.

A particularly interesting linguistic fact is the presence in the Ukrainian language of an exclusive grammatical category that has similarities rather with Western Romance languages than with Slavic languages: the simple imperfective future where the endings that represent the shortened personal forms of the verb *імати*, *ймати* 'to take', 'to have' (as a result of 'take') are added to the infinitive of verbs.

These data highlight some fundamental aspects attributable to a direct Latin inheritance of historical and cultural realities in the Ukrainian geographical and linguistic space whose past as an immediate Roman periphery in the early centuries of the first millennium still remains insufficiently studied. The new focus on a lexical and toponymic investigation into early Latin loanwords in contemporary Ukrainian can represent the starting point for further devel-

opment of such issues, especially in comparison to other Slavic and non-Slavic European languages.

## Bibliography

- Axer, J. (1995). “‘Latinitas’ jako składnik polskiej tożsamości kulturowej” (‘Latinitas’ as a Component of Polish Cultural Identity). Jerzy, A., *Tradycje antyczne w kulturze europejskiej – perspektywa polska*, Z. 1-2. Warszawa: OB-TA, 71-81.
- Bevzenko, S. (1997). *Formy vyjavu maibutnoi dii v ukrainskykh dialektakh in: Ukrainskyi dialektolohichnyi zbirnyk* (Ways of Expressing the Future Tense in Ukrainian In: Dialect Atlas of Ukraine), vol. 3. Kyiv: Vyd-vo Kyivskoho Universytetu im. B. Hrinchenka, 1997.
- Braychevsky, M. (1963). *Koly i iak vynyk Kyiv* (When and How Did Kyiv Come into Existence?). Kyiv: Vyd-vo AN URSR.
- Curta, F. (2021). *Slavs in the Making. History, Linguistics, and Archaeology in Eastern Europe (ca. 500-ca. 700)*. London: Routledge Editor.
- Danylenko, A. (2010). “Naskilky ukrajinskyi syntetychnyi majbutnii chas je syntetychnym?”. *Movoznavstvo*, 4-5, 113-21.
- Dynda, J. (2017). “Rusalki: Anthropology of Time, Death, and Sexuality”. *Slavic folklore*. Prague: Charles University, 83-100. *Studia Mythologica Slavica*.
- Kropotkin, V. (1961). *Klady rimskikh monet na territorii SRSR* (Roman Coin Hoards on the Territory of URSS). Moskva: Izdatelstvo AN SRSR. Svod Arheologicheskikh Istochnikov G4-04.
- Levada, M.; Alekseenko, N. (2011). “A Hoard Near Moshny Village”. *Peterburzhskii apokrif. Poslanie ot Marka*. Sankt-Peterburg; Kishinev: Izd-vo Vysshaya antropologicheskaya shkola, 373-95.
- Magomedov, B. (2001). *Cherniakhovskaia kultura. Problema etnosa* (The Chernyakhiv Culture. The Question of Ethnicity). Lublin: Wyd-wo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Magomedov, B. (2006). “Monety jak dzherelo vyvchennja istorii plemen Cherniakhivskoi kultury” (Coins as a Source for the Study of the Chernyakhiv Culture Tribes). *Arkheolohija*, 4, 46-52.
- Marchylo, L. (1997). *Z istorii skladnykh form maibutnoho chasu v ukrainskij movi in Systema i struktura skhidnoslovianskykh mov: mizhkafedralnyi zbirnyk naukovykh prats* (From the History of the Complex Future Forms in Ukrainian in the System and Structure of East Slavic Languages: Thematic Scientific Collection of Research Papers). Kyiv: Vyd-vo Natsionalnoho Universytetu im. M. Drahovanova.
- Myzgin, K. (2012). “Finds of Roman Coins of Asia Minor Provincial Mintage in the Territory of Chernyakhiv Culture”. Tsetskhladze, G.R. (ed.), *The Black Sea, Paphlagonia, Pontus and Phrygia in Antiquity. Aspects of Archaeology and Ancient History*. Oxford: BAR Publishing, 197-212. BAR International Series 2432
- Parodo, C. (2016). “Purpureos flores ad sanguinis imitationem in quo est sedes animae: i Rosalia e l’iconografia del mese di Maggio”. *Archeologia classica*, LXVII, n.s. II, 6, 721-50.
- Pivtorak, H. (2015). *Istoryko-linhvistychna slavistyka* (Historical and Linguistic Slavic Studies). Kyiv: Naukova dumka.



- Renzi, L.; Andreose, A. (2015). *Manuale di linguistica e filologia romanza*. Bologna: il Mulino.
- Rybakov, B. (1963). *Drevnaja Rus'. Skazania, byliny, letopisi* (Ancient Russia: legends, byliny, chronicles). Moskva: Izd-vo AN SSSR.
- Sedov, V. (1979). *Proiskhozhdenie i ranniia istoria slavian* (Origins and early History of the Slavs). Moskva: Nauka.
- Shchukin, M. (2005). *Gotskii put. Goty, Rim i Cherniakhovskaia kultura* (The Gothic way. The Goths, Rome and Chernyakhiv Culture). Sankt-Peterburg: Filologicheskii fakultet SPbGU.
- Sławski, F. (1975). "Słowianie. Nazwa" (Slavs. Name). *Słownik starożytności słowiańskich: Encyklopedyczny zarys kultury słowian od czasów najdawniejszych do schyłku wieku XII: Tom piąty*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 304-6.
- Syntsia, J. (2013). *Cherniakhivska Kultura in Entsyklopedia Ukrainy* (The Chernyakhiv Culture in Encyclopedia of Ukraine), vol. 10. NAN Ukrainy, Instytut istorii Ukrainy: Vyd-vo Naukova dumka.
- Tyshchenko, K. (2006). *Movni kontakty: svidky formuvannia ukrainsiv* (Language Contacts: Witnesses of the Formation of Ukrainians). Kyiv: Akvilon-Plus.
- Tyszkiewicz, L.A. (1990). *Słowianie w historiografii antycznej do połowy VI wieku* (Slavs in Ancient Historiography Until the Mid-6th Century). Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Vinogradov, V. (1982). *Ocherki po istorii russkogo literaturnogo jazyka* (Essays on the History of Russian Literary Language). Moskva: Vysshiaia shkola.
- Vykhovanets, I.; Horodenska, K. (2004). *Teoretychna morfolohia ukraïnskoi movy* (Theoretical Morphology of the Ukrainian Language). Kyiv: Pulsary.

