

ON SLAVIC LINGUISTIC INTERRELATIONS

UKRAINIAN INFLUENCE ON THE POLISH LANGUAGE IN THE 16TH AND 17TH CENTURIES

YURY ŠERECH

Dedicated to Professor D. Čiževsky on his sixtieth birthday anniversary.

[Stefan Hrabec, *Elementy kresowe w języku niektórych pisarzy polskich XVI-XVII w.*, Toruń, 1949, p. 159. Towarzystwo Naukowe w Toruniu, Prace Wydziału filologiczno-filozoficznego III, 2.]

Since the war Polish linguistics has been working actively on a detailed study of the language of Polish writers of the 16th century, endeavoring in this way to establish premises for a strictly scientific history of the Polish literary language and at the same time bring nearer the solution of intricate problems of Polish historical dialectology. In 1949 Stanisław Rospond's voluminous book (533 pages!), *Studia nad językiem polskim XVI wieku*, devoted to the language of four precursors of M. Rej — Jan Seklucjan, S. Murzynowski, J. Sandecki-Malecki and G. Orszak — was published. Hrabec' book, discussed here, is another result of investigations in this field.

Hrabec' book is smaller in size but more complicated because of the task which the author set himself. While Rospond gives a general account of the language of the writers whom he studied, collecting material for a history of literary language and historical dialectology, Hrabec poses one definite problem and considers the language of the authors examined by him only as material for the solution of this problem. This problem is Eastern influences on the Polish language of the 16th-17th centuries, primarily Ukrainian (Ukr.) influences, but also Byelorussian (BR), Russian (Rus.), Rumanian, and Turko-Tatar. The problem of studying Slavic linguistic mutual interactions is particularly difficult. Strictly speaking it can even be considered insoluble until we have more or less complete dictionaries for individual epochs, or, at

least, general historical dictionaries of the individual Slavic languages. For the 16th-17th centuries there are no such dictionaries for either the Byelorussian or the Russian language; for the Ukrainian language there is only the first volume of Tymčenko's dictionary (A-Ž in the Cyrillic alphabet). Polish must content itself with Linde, who does not satisfy modern requirements for historical dictionaries, although he does present examples of 16th-17th century writers. Under such conditions it is impossible to expect anyone to succeed in an attempt to show Slavic linguistic mutual interactions during that period and it is even difficult to blame a writer for not succeeding. Works of this type can be evaluated only in terms of their partial results, without expecting completeness and thoroughness of them.

To go on, it must be stated, however, that Hrabec' book suffers from certain shortcomings which could have been avoided even under the present-day state of the study of the history of Slavic languages. Hrabec' work is arranged as a consecutive account of "*kręsy* (areas of the Polish state with a predominantly non-Polish population) components" in the works of eight writers: Biernat from Lublin (c. 1480-c. 1529); Mikołaj Rej (1505-1569); Stanisław Orzechowski (1513-1566); Sebastian Fabian Klonowic (1545-1602); Mikołaj Sęp Szarzyński (c. 1550-1581); Szymon Szymonowic (1558-1629); Szymon Zimorowicz (1608-1629) and Bartłomiej Zimorowicz (1597-1677). A chapter is devoted to each writer. In each chapter the material is discussed in the following order (if, of course, the designated elements are present in the language of this writer): biographical facts which favored the appearance of "*kręsy* elements" in the writer's language; Slavic "*kręsy* components" with phonetic traits alien to the Polish language; Slavic "*kręsy* components" with derivative elements, foreign to Polish, particularly diminutives; translated loan words; lexical borrowings; borrowed inflections; borrowings from Church Slavic (Ch.S.), insofar as they were used in *kręsy*; Ukrainian and Byelorussian quotations; idioms; syntactical loan translations; names of persons and localities; orientalisms; and Rumanianisms. Following this there is a general evaluation of the "*kręsy* elements" in the language of the given writer, mainly from the point of view of whether they

perform a positive or negative stylistic function, whether they are used in a lofty or vulgar style, or are stylistically neutral.

This survey of "*kresy* components" in the language of individual authors is preceded by an introduction devoted mainly to a review of the literature upon the problem discussed and an exposition of the tasks facing the author, and the whole work ends with broad general conclusions. The author does not give statistics but, taken roughly, he examines up to 500 words which he considers were introduced into the Polish literary language in the 16th-17th centuries from *kresy* or were affected, to some degree at least, by these influences. The author suggests that "*kresy* elements" appeared first as special military or shepherds' terms, then expressions of an emotional character with a negative coloration began to spread and then the use of "*kresy* components" started for creating *couleur local* (137). Their negative function gradually was replaced by a sentimental and even positive one, not unconnected with the development of the baroque style in literature (138, 142). This influence becomes apparent in an increase in the number of "*kresy* components" in Rej's late works as compared with his earlier ones, more strongly in Klonowic's work and with full force in the genre of the peasant idyll with Ukrainian background, which was cultivated by poets of the "Red-Ruthenian" school — Szymonowic and both Zimorowicz.

From this brief exposition of the structure of Hrabec' book some of its inescapable defects are already apparent. The book abounds in repetitions; if any word is encountered in all of the writers, it is cited in each chapter. Hrabec presents no generalizations from which it would be clear whether this or that word of *kresy* origin is the innovation of a given author or was in general use in this and perhaps even in the preceding period. His book is more a list of materials for characterizing the language of eight writers than the characteristics of the Polish language of the 16th-17th centuries. True, it makes it possible to obtain information easily but the entire work still remains more on the level of a collection of raw materials than of synthesized research. The author records equally in a given author, for example, the word *duma* (pride) in general use in that period, and purely individual

borrowings of the type of *ptaszyna* (bird) and individual new formations in the *kresy* spirit of the type of *prachta* (See *infra*). Of course, the reader can draw conclusions concerning the degree to which one or another word was spread by the frequency with which Hrabec returns to it, but should not the author himself have done this work of synthesizing? The Polish language of the 16th-17th centuries as a common Polish language is actually absent from Hrabec's book — he deals exclusively with the language of individual writers.

To illustrate my thought, I shall take examples from "*kresy* elements" of P. Skarga. In *Synod Brzeski* he writes: ". . . z innemi duchownemi, *protopopami* y *popami*, *archimandryty* y *humienami*."¹ The italicized words were taken from the Church Slavonic language in its Ukrainian usage, but they are not innovations of Skarga. When speaking of these orders of the Orthodox clergy, every Pole used these and not other words. It is a completely different matter when in "O jedności" Skarga writes: ". . . nas zochidzenia Greków heretykami y *chulę* (iako Słowieńskim językiem mówia) . . . mowiącemi zową."² Here the Ch.S. *xula* (detraction) is obviously a personal innovation of Skarga, which he uses in affective speech. Hrabec very rarely draws such a distinction.

In Hrabec there are, however, more vital and dangerous defects in the very presentation of the subject. One of the most important is inaccuracy in the conception itself of "*kresy* elements." *Kresy* were a political concept in Poland during the 16th-17th centuries, corresponding more or less to what would now be called colonies. They were to a certain degree also a linguistic concept, insofar as the literary language was concerned — the *kresy* for a long time used the Ruthenian (Ruth.) literary language, the use of which was, by the way, guaranteed even by a Lithuanian statute. But the presence of a single literary language should not hide from researchers the fact that it was a common written language for various peoples — Ukrainians, Byelorussians and Lithuanians — but this did not exclude the existence of these languages as spoken

¹ *Pamiętniki polemiczkiej literatury w Zapadnoy Rusi*, 2, SPB, 1882, p. 953 (Russkaja istoričeskaja biblioteka, 7).

² *Ibid.*, 228.

languages. This circumstance would have played a lesser role if Hrabec had compared the facts of the language of the 16th-17th century Polish writers with the Ruthenian literary language of that time. But he never does so. He ignores this language completely and compares Polish linguistic data of the 16th-17th centuries solely with contemporary East Slavic languages, chiefly with Ukrainian. However, there never existed a single Slavic language of *kręsy* and in this sense Hrabec is comparing Polish material with something fictitious.

On the one hand, this absence of a real object for comparison leads Hrabec to a lumping together of Ukrainian, Byelorussian, and Russian facts, which is methodologically crude and lacking in historical perspective. On the other hand, it makes it possible for him to draw comparisons, which are not at all supported by the facts, and to attribute to *kręsy* and, in fact, to the Ukrainian language, words and forms which never existed in it nor anywhere else. In fact, when a Polish author uses a word which defies explanation by the facts of the Polish language, Hrabec simply states that the given word is taken from *kręsy* and leaves it at that without even trying to find a prototype of the given word. I shall illustrate this with examples.

Hrabec cites *izmiennik* from Klonowic, stating that this word is not listed in Ukrainian dictionaries; however, Linde cites it from six writers (71). Thus the word was spread rather widely in Polish. One could only assume that it entered from Ukrainian Church Slavic (since it was certainly not used in the spoken language) provided the phonetic substitution of *e* for the Ukr. *i*, since at that time in Church Slavic texts *ě* was undoubtedly pronounced as *i*. This is hardly likely, considering the strong affectiveness of the word. Thus it is more likely that it is not a "*kręsy* element" but a Russianism; yet it would be interesting to trace when and how it penetrated into the Polish language.

This is not the only Russianism among Hrabec' "*kręsy* elements." *Pytka* in B. Zimorowicz (121) is unquestionably another. Its Byelorussian and Ukrainian origin is refuted not only by the fact that this root acquired the meaning 'to torture' in Russian,³ but

³ Although in his *Lexis* (in the new edition of Ja. Rudnyčyj, 1946, p. 12) Lavrentij Zizaniĭ translates Church Slavic *istjazaju*—*pytaju*!

also by the use of the suffix *-k* (*a*) in the sense of a process.^{3a} This means that there is no basis for considering this word a “*kresy* element.”

The problem is more complex with the words *derewnia* (village) in Zimorowicz, 118; *dziegi* || *denhy* (in Klonowic and Zimorowicz, pp. 73 and 123); and *posuly* (in Rej, 34). All of these words are unknown in contemporary Ukrainian and Byelorussian but are common in Russian. In their phonetic aspect the first two, however, give evidence at least of Ukrainian media (hardness of the consonants before *e*, *h*; I shall not discuss here whether there existed hard consonants before *e* in medieval Muscovite speech). In modern Ukrainian dialects *derevnja* means “timber for building” and more rarely “wooden building”; it is not used at all in the literary language. The meaning “village” developed only in Russian. Sreznevskij *s.v.*⁴ gives all of the examples from Russian texts, beginning with 1359. The only previous example from the Kievan Rus’ period, “I вѣзгоша Стефанѣчь манастырѣ, i derevně, i Gerьmany” (Hyp.) enables *derevni* to be understood as “wooden buildings” as well. Tymčenko *s.v.*⁵ repeats this phrase but all of his subsequent examples indicate the modern Ukrainian meaning. If one turns to examples from Zimorowicz, they all also permit the interpretation “a wooden building.” It is characteristic that side by side with the phrase “*a naszego Symicha kochane derewnie?*” is the phrase “*Ogień wszystkie miasta, wsi, zamki poburzy*”⁶ where the word *wsi* is used in the meaning of “village.” Thus it is possible that in Zimorowicz *derewnie* is a Ukrainianism with the meaning “wooden buildings.” If the word really means “village,” as Hrabec maintains, then this is either a contamination of the Russian meaning and Ukrainian form (A Lvov poet would hardly have known the Russian pronunciation) or an independent development of the meaning of the word in some Ciscarpathian dialect, parallel to Russian.

^{3a} The type *przechadzka*, *ucieczka* is represented in Polish by rare examples. See Jan Łoś, *Gramatyka polska*, Lviv, 1925, p. 76.

⁴ I. Sreznevskij, *Materiały dla słownika drevne-russkogo jazyka*, SPB, 1893-1912.

⁵ *Istoryčnyj slovnyk ukrajinśkoho jazyka*, I, Pid red. Je. Tymčenka, Kharkov-Kiev, 1930-1932.

⁶ *Bartłomiej Zimorowica Sielanki*, Wydał Jan Łoś, BPP71, Kraków 1916, p. 141.

Den'ha — undoubtedly a Russianism and it meant not “money” in general but “Moscow money.” Tymčenko (694) quotes only one example from a deed of 1500 and his translation “small copper coin” is not accurate. Apparently the word got into Polish from Russian both directly and through Ukrainian, as is evidenced by its two forms, with *g* and with *h*, as cited above.

Posuły is completely unknown in modern Ukrainian. In Byelorussian the stem is represented by the rare word *pasulka*.⁷ It could have been assumed that the word entered Polish from Russian, if it had not been used in the *Krexiv Books of the Apostles*,⁸ where it corresponds to the Ch.S. *mazda*, Pol. *pieniędzy*. However, inasmuch as the word is rare in Ukrainian of that time, and much more frequent in Polish, one can suppose that it penetrated into the Ukrainian from Polish. Thus its path was from Russian to Polish (and Byelorussian) and from Polish into Ukrainian. Therefore, like *izmiennik* and *dzięgi* and *pyłka*, it is not at all a *kręsy* element for the Polish language. From the historico-semantic point of view it is easy to justify the borrowing of these four words by the nature of diplomatic relations between Moscow and Poland. The author's general *kręsy* approach has obscured all of these interesting historical details.

In other instances the Ukrainian or Byelorussian origin of a “*kręsy* component” should have been differentiated. For example, *bies* in Orzechowski leads us to a Byelorussian source (I do not mean to say by this that Orzechowski himself borrowed the word from Byelorussian!) The borrowing from Ukrainian would have sounded *bis* (as it is once in Zimorowicz — see p. 117) and in the event of a substitution we would expect **bias*. However, phonetic substitutions, quite normal in parallel usage of two related languages,⁹ are not typical of affective expressions, where

⁷ I. Nosovič, *Slovar' belorusskogo narečija*, SPB, 1870, p. 483.

⁸ I. Ohijenko, “Ukrajins'ka literaturna mova XVI-ho st., I, Ukrajins'kyj Krexivs'kyj apostoł,” I-II, Warsaw, 1930, p. 100.

⁹ Compare *kałika* cited by the author, p. 74 — a direct borrowing from Ukrainian (where it is from Turkish *qalyq* — cf. A. Zajęczkowski, *Studia orientalistyczne z dziejów słownictwa polskiego*, Wrocław 1953, p. 56), but in Cnapius and modern Polish already *kałeka*, with a secondary *e*, as usual corresponding to a Ukrainian *i* in an open syllable not before hard dentals. On the other hand, see hyper-substitutions in Ipatij Potij, who systematically replaces *e* in the endings of the perfect -em by -om: *ustupilom* (*Pamiętniki polemičeskoj literatury v Zapadnoj Rusi*, 3, SPB, 1903; *Russkaja istoričeskaja biblioteka*, 19, 1005), *vydělom* (*Akty, odnosjaščiesja k istorii Zapadnoj Rossii*, 4, SPB, 1851, p. 82).

unusualness of phonetic form is one of the factors which strengthen the emotional tone, as already mentioned above. It is interesting to note that the form with *e*, which has become common Polish, was used by Ipatij Potij in his Ruthenian works.¹⁰

Zubr (20), which later assumed the form *žubr*, evidently also leads to a Byelorussian source. With regard to nouns with the suffix *-ajl(o)* of the type *szukajło*, Hrabec disputes with Łoś, who sought its origins in Byelorussian, and suggests that this suffix can also be considered Ukrainian. There is no doubt that it is also used in contemporary Ukrainian, but it seems that it is more typical of Northern Ukrainian dialects.¹¹ As a rule, Northern Ukrainian dialects here go hand-in-hand with Southern Byelorussian. This would also be in line with the fact that Hrabec did not find this suffix in "Red-Ruthenian" poets, connected with South-Western Ukrainian dialects but in Klonowic, who lived where the Polish language is contiguous to North Ukrainian dialects, in Lublin. But the complex problems of the connections and crossing of dialects, which lie at the basis of the Ukrainian and Byelorussian literary languages, is completely beyond the range of Hrabec's interests. This is all the more to be regretted because these questions were interestingly elucidated in Pol. linguistics in the works of W. Kuraszkiewicz.

Hrabec's investigations of the words *Litwiniec*, *suwałka* and *wsrokoczywy* can serve as examples of his neglect of historical sources. *Litwiniec* was noted in Rej and explained as "Byelorussian-Great Russian" on the basis of BR. *lic'vin* and Rus. *litovec*. It is difficult to imagine that Rej would have used such a corrupt form of a Byelorussian and Russian word, to say nothing of the fact that in the Russian language *litovec* was a later formation and generally not used at that time. There is no word **lic'vinec* in contemporary Byelorussian which, like contemporary Ukrainian, knows only *lic'vin/lytvyn*. In Ukrainian interludes of the 18th century there is a regular hero, *Lytvyn*, in Dovhalevs'kyj for example, but I am not aware of instances of the form *lytvynec'*. Meanwhile, the problem can be solved simply by an elementary

¹⁰ *Pamiętniki polemiczkiej literatury*, 3, 1069.

¹¹ For BR. examples see E. Karskij, *Belorussky II*, 2, Warsaw, 1911, 23f.

morphological analysis of the word: in names of nationalities the suffix *-ec* is added to the stem, designating a geographical concept. But here it is added to a stem which designates a person. This happens when the suffix has a diminutive meaning, like *chłop—chłopiec*. Hrabec himself notes a pejorative nuance in the word's meaning but this is often connoted by diminutives.¹² Thus the author is avenged for attributing to Byelorussian a word without a Byelorussian prototype. In fact, to all appearances *Litwiniec* is not a *kresy element* but an individual innovation of Rej.¹³

The question of *suwałka* (Orzechowski 54) is less clear and in this case only an hypothesis is possible. The meaning of this word is "unorganized crowd of the military." Hrabec's connecting it with the BR. *súvalaka* (tow), Nosovič 621, is so fantastic that it can not be taken seriously. The words have nothing in common either phonetically (the author accepts the loss of the consonant after *l* without proofs) or in meaning. I could sooner suggest the Ukr. *valka* (string of tchoomakcarts, now generally, string of carts); this meaning of the word is rather old, since it is noted in South-Russian dialects.¹⁴ The prefix *su-* is frequent in Ukrainian in the sense of "concentration, that is movement toward a single center or a state of nearness"¹⁵ and was undoubtedly productive during this period. In this case the word might mean the "concentrated strings of carts," which corresponds precisely to its meaning in Orzechowski's phrase. Geographically it is also more natural to expect a Ukrainianism and not a Byelorussianism

¹² This, by the way, also relates to the words *pohaniec*, *bisurmaniec* (p. 141), which according to Hrabec should demonstrate "kresy" use of the suffix *-ec* in the sense of nationality. Hrabec refers to H. Ułaszyn, *Pochodzenie etniczne nazwy Ukrainiec*, Łódź 1947, but in Ułaszyn he could read that in these instances a stem designating a country or city is primary (type III in Ułaszyn; *pohaniec* from the adjective stem belongs to type I). As for the form *pohanyń*, it was attested as early as in Ukrainian-Moldavian writs, see V. Jarošenko, "Ukrajins'ka mova v moldavs'kyx hramotax XIV-XV vv., "Zbirnyk komisiji dlja doslidžennja istoriji ukrajins'koji movy, I, Kiev, 1931, p. 335. Cf. also Sreznjevskij, *op. cit.*, II, 1011.

¹³ I shall not go into a study of the single *litvinec* in a Russian deed of 1529. See B. Unbegaun. *La langue russe au XVI^e siècle*, I. Paris 1935, p. 270. Concerning the suffix *-ec* in Polish see also J. Ramberg, "Dzieje przyrostków *-ec* i *-ca* w nazwach osobowych," *Prace Filologiczne*, XI (1927).

¹⁴ V. Dal', *Tolkovyj slovar' živogo velikorusskogo jazyka*, II, 1880-1882. See I, 164.

¹⁵ Oleksa Synjavs'kyj, *Normy ukrajins'koji literaturnoji movy*, Lviv, 1941, p. 140f. Examples: *suvertok*, *sukrajok*, *suprjaha*, *suzirja*.

from Orzechowski, who was a resident of Peremyśl'. Brückner's idea (provided with a question-mark) on the matter of a connection with *suwanie*¹⁶ is, of course, implausible. Formations with *-alka* have connotations of instruments or localities but not that of collectivity.

As for the word *wsrokoczywy* (32f, Rej), it is encountered once; its meaning is unclear from the context ("Pospolicie lichy bywa wsrokoczywy"), and the idea of a corruption of the text suggests itself. Hrabec' comparison with Ukr. *rokoťaty* || *rokoťity*, Rus. *rokoť*, denoting a soft, melodious sound, has no basis and, as often happens to Hrabec, is built on a fortuitous phonetic proximity. One could rather connect it with the word *stroskaty* (Cf., *I fra-sunky ne malyje mene stroskajut*, "Slovo o zburenju pekla"¹⁷), the undistorted form of the word would then be */w/stroskoczywy*, or with *stropotnyj*/Cf. ". . . *mnoho stropotnyx slov*" — The writ of the Kievan Metropolitan Michael, 1590¹⁸): the final *-t* of the root and *č* of the suffix must then be assimilated but it would have to be assumed that *t* had dropped out and *p* replaced graphically by *k*: */w/stropo/t/czywy* > *wsrokoczywy*. Both of these conjectures are insufficiently convincing but they at least have this advantage that they come closer to the meaning and are based on words which were used in the 16th century! In either case *wsrokoczywy* is unclear for the time being and can not be used as material for ascertaining Ukrainian or Byelorussian influences on Polish.¹⁹

The inclusion among "*kresy* elements" of Rumanianisms and orientalisms assumes that all of them entered Polish through

¹⁶ A. Brückner, *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*, Kraków 1927, s.v.

¹⁷ *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva im. Ševčenko* 81, 1908, p. 16.

¹⁸ *Akty . . . k istorii Zap. Rossii* 4, 33.

¹⁹ I mention still another possibility, phonetically the simplest but with chronological difficulties. In modern Ukrainian *strokatyj* < *srokatyj* means "variegated": but Hrinčenko gives a marginal meaning "whimsical" from Kotljarevs'kyj. This meaning suits the text perfectly. Like the modern Polish form, the old Ukrainian does not have *t* after *s*. And in Linde (S. Linde, *Słownik języka polskiego*, Lwów 1854-1860), V, 419 we find the meaning "*unruhig im Kopfe*," with an example, however, also from the end of the 18th century (Trębiecki, 1780): "*Jeśli będzie miał w głowie trochę mniej srokatę*. . ." If one had succeeded in discovering this meaning earlier, the mystery of the word *wsrokoczywy* could have been solved.

Ukrainian media. There is no doubt that most orientalisms and Rumanianisms penetrated into the Polish language through Ukrainian, but to generalize this to such a degree is just as untrue as Šelud'ko's generalization was that all German elements entered Ukrainian via Polish. Rumanian elements could have penetrated into Polish directly through the Rumanian shepherds who reached Moravia, as is known. *Maczuga* (stick) (43f, from the Rumanian *maciuca*), frequent in Rej, quoted from three more writers by Linde, overgrown with many word formations and having developed a number of figurative meanings but yet unknown to me either in Ukrainian or in Byelorussian probably is of that nature.

This is particularly clear in respect to such Turko-Tatar loan-words as *korbacz* || *karbacz* and *wojłok*. *Woj/d/łok* (43, Rej) is unknown both in Ukrainian and in Byelorussian. Giving the etymology of the word, Vasmer²⁰ shows that the word was used only in Russian and Polish. If even in Pol. this is a loan-word from Rus. then in order to connect it with "*kresy*" it would be necessary to find examples of this word in Old-Byelorussian.

Korbacz (74, Klonowic) 'leather lash' according to Brückner, Sł. Et. 256, came into Polish from Turkish via the Hungarian *korbacs*. Hrabec criticizes Brückner and assumes Ukrainian as the medium — without any proofs. Brückner nevertheless was undoubtedly right and this is proven by the geography of the word. The word is quite widely known in Polish and from here it came into Western Ukrainian and Western Byelorussian (Dal' II, 92 gives it with the mark *zap.* but no *już.*!). The word is unknown in the Central and Eastern Ukraine and in Central Byelorussia. It is obvious that the word entered Ukrainian and Byelorussian from the west as an element of landlord-peasant relations. If it had spread from Tatar to the West then its geography would have been completely different.

In regard to *szarańcza*, Brückner *s.v.* and Kowalski²¹ assumed that the word spread in Polish via Ukrainian and Hrabec agrees with them. However, the question is not completely clear. According to Kowalski 52, the word was verified for the first time in

²⁰ M. Vasmer, *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg, 1950 . . . , I, 215.

²¹ T. Kowalski, *Szarańcza, język polski* 1947, 2.

Polish in 1549; but in Mączyński's dictionary, 1564, this word has not only supplanted the old *kobytki*, but has already acquired a great deal of figurative meanings and this means that it probably had been used in the Polish language for a long time. The word apparently had a strong emotional coloration in the language, since Małecki, in the translation of the Gospel of 1551, revised it as *kobytki*.²² For Ukrainian Kowalski assumes the borrowing as early as the 11th-12th centuries (for the word is attested in Codex Cumanicus) but the word has not been verified for this period. Modern Ukrainian knows *sarana*, which obviously cannot go back to the Turk. *sarynča*, *sarynža* or *saryža*. Lavrentij Zizaniij still has no knowledge of this word in his Lexis of 1596 and translates Ch.S. *pruzi* as *konyky* (17). It is true that Krexiv Books of the Apostles 114 knows *saranča* as corresponding to the Ch.S. *prusi*, Pol. *szarańcza*, but one must not forget that this translation rests on the Polish text! The word *saranča* is attested also in *Synonima slavenorosskaja*,²³ where it can also be a Polonism, however. Thus it is possible that Pol. *szarańcza* and Ukr. *sarana* can be traced back to different Turko-Tatar sources and were borrowed independently. In this case the dialectal Ukr. *saranča* would itself be a borrowing from Polish. It is possible, too, that the Ukr. *sarana* is a later borrowing. Meanwhile it is better to leave this matter unresolved.

If Hrabec had not only treated modern Ukrainian data but also materials of the 16th-17th centuries, this would, in some instances, have reinforced his arguments. In others it would have compelled him to reject them no less absolutely. The words *blaho*, *blahy* (33 in Rej, 52 in Orzechowski) can be taken as an example of the first. The word was in wide use in the Pol. language of the 16th century — cf. in Górnicki "Wedle mego blahego zdania."²⁴ The use of the word in the same meaning "insignificant, cad" in Ukr. can be illustrated by an example from Ipatij Potij: "zaledve nakhonec do jakoho prystanyšča i to blahohe pryblukaetsja."²⁵ But

²² Rospond, *op. cit.*, 251.

²³ P. Žytec'kyj, *Narys literaturnoji istoriji ukrajins'koji movy v XVII vici*, L'viv, 1941, p. 183.

²⁴ Lukasz Górnicki, *Dworzanin polski*, Warszawa, s.a. (Biblioteka polska), p. 28.

²⁵ *Pamjatniki polemičeskoj literatury*, 3, 1051.

the word continued to be used in lofty styles with a Church Slavic coloring in the sense of "kind, good," cf. in Ivan Vyšens'kyj: "Skudno bo jest' blahoe, i malo spasaemyx."²⁶ Of course, it is precisely this semantic contrast — which existed in Old Czech, as well — that imparted a special pungency to the use of the word and furthered its dissemination. The dropping of the positive meaning weakened the emotional aspect of the word and became the basis for its being gradually eliminated. The word has only a negative meaning in modern Ukrainian, Byelorussian and Polish but does not belong to the number of those which are frequently used and is fairly neutral.²⁷

An example of the second could be Hrabec' deliberations regarding the word *popudny* (112, Zimorowicz): "Teraz wszystko pokryły popioły popudne." Citing Brückner's nearly true explanation as "brzydkie," Hrabec prefers to turn to a completely fantastic explanation with the aid of modern Rus. *popudnyj*, saying that *popioły popudne* could mean "heavy ashes." To say nothing of the absurdity of the image, how can a word with the distributive meaning of "by the pood" take the meaning "heavy"? To this must be added that at this time pood was used generally as a measure in Russia but not in the Ukraine. Yet it is not difficult to explain the word *popudnyj* with the aid of the Polish and Ukrainian language of the 16th-17th centuries. This word was completely normal in 16th-17th century Ukrainian, only with the suffix *-lyv*. Here are several examples: "I rozhněvalsja popudlyvost'ju velykoju Hospod' na Izrailja" — *Otpis* of the Ostroh cleric, 1598;²⁸ "Terplyvost', často obražánaja, v popudlyvost' zvykla sja preměnjaty" — *Apokrysys* 1597-99;²⁹ "S. popudlyvosty vsě spa porvaly, kyi pobraly" — *Ljament* of Ostroh.³⁰ The *Synonima slavenorosskaja* translates *popudlyvyj* by the Ch.S. *žělnyj*.³¹ Finally, in Krexiv Books of the Apostles, 97, *popudlyvost'* corresponds to the Ch.S.

²⁶ P. Golubev. *Kievskij mitropolit Petr Mogila*, I. Kiev 1883. Appendix, p. 112.

²⁷ It is curious that Tymčenko's *Ist. slounyk* does not take note of *blah* in the negative meaning.

²⁸ *Pamjatniki pol. lit.*, 3, 388.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 2, 1800.

³⁰ *ZNTŠ*, 51, 1903, 20.

³¹ *Žytec'kyj, op. cit.*, p. 175.

jarost', Pol. *popędliwość*. And here is the real key to the problem. In the 16th-17th centuries Ukr. *popudlyvost'* was a Polonism but it was absolutely no "*kresy* element" in Pol. Although *pudyty* is a common Slavic word, and has been verified in East Slavic territory no later than the 14th century,³² but restrictedly, and it is doubtful whether it was used in Ukrainian territory.³³ It spread in Ukrainian and Byelorussian only in the 16th-17th centuries and evidently under Polish influence. It is easy to document its use in Polish texts of that time. Here are some examples from many possibilities: "Ujęły ich gniew i popędliwość onę ubłagały" (Górnicki 218); "Umysłu swego za popędliwością odmienić nie chcieli" (*Ibid.* 219); in Małecky — see Rospond 282. The word is also used in this sense in modern Polish.

Zimorowicz's innovation consisted only in replacing the suffix *-liv-* by *-n-*, possibly according to the requirement of the verse and possibly, also, in order to give the adjective more animation, to bring it closer to a participle. In Zimorowicz the word *popudne* means "those who arouse fury," which very well suits a text which speaks of the annihilation of the population as the result of an enemy raid. Of "*kresy*" nature, that is, Ukrainian, may only be the use of the *u* in the root instead of a nasal vowel, if the word is not simply taken from Old Czech *popudný*.

In general, Hrabec's book shows some knowledge of Polish literature but a complete ignorance of Ukrainian literature. In his bibliography Hrabec lists the dictionaries of Hrinčenko, Hrycak and Kysilevs'kyj, Kuzela and Rudnyc'kyj (*Želexivs'kyj* is not even used!) and the grammars of Simovyč, S. Smal-Stoc'kyj and Gartner, and Zahrods'kyj — all concerned with modern language and all the grammars in addition obsolete or (Zahrods'kyj) generally without any scientific orientation. Of literature on the history of the Ukrainian language only *Žytec'kyj* is named, but only named, since even the *Synonima slavenorosskaja*, printed, as is known, in the appendix to *Žytec'kyj*'s book, is not used. Tym-

³² Sreznevskij, *Materialy II*, 1198, 1723.

³³ Only with the prefix *ros-* the word is attested also in the Ukraine from the 11th century by a great number of examples, but in the wholly concrete sense "to disperse." Incidentally, I note a completely fantastic statement by J. Holub — F. Kopečný, *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého*, Praha, 1592 *s.v.* *puditi* that the word is known only in Polish and Czech!

čenko's historical dictionary of the Ukrainian language is not used at all, nor are the important glossaries in the appendices to Ohijenko's study of the Krexiv Books of the Apostles, Yarošenko's on the language of Ukrainian-Moldavian deeds, Lavrentij Zizaniy's Lexis, to say nothing of Pamva Berynda's Lexicon, etc. The author is unacquainted with articles by I. Zilyns'kyj, "Vzajemovidnosyny *miž* ukrajins'koju ta pol's'koju movoju," ZNTŠ 155, 1937, I. Šarovol's'kyj's "Rumuns'ki zapożyčennja v ukrajins'kij movi," *Zbirnyk Zaxodoznaustva*, I, Kiev 1929, D. Šelud'ko's "Rumänische Elemente im Ukrainischen," *Balkan Archiv*, 2, 1926, etc. The author undertook to study one of the most difficult subjects in the history of Slavic languages without equipping himself sufficiently. It is not surprising that this is also apparent in the results of his researches which are often erroneous and sometimes even fantastic. I shall dwell on certain of them from this point of view — in addition to what has already been analyzed.

Duszyca (31, Rej) — from Ukr. *dušycja*. But *dušycja* does not exist in Ukrainian, neither in modern Ukrainian nor in old Ukrainian. The diminutive of *duša* is verified only in the form *duška* (Tymčenko, *s.v.*) True, the suffix *-yc/ja/* is used in Ukrainian in a diminutive sense, cf. "Štož za požytok z toe dočasnoe slavycy," Ivan Vyšens'kyj, "Oblyčeniye dyavola myroderžca,"³⁴ cf. also in Polish in Zimorowicz, 129, *ziemica*, but Hrabec does not consider this form a Ukrainianism. But this does not mean that this suffix can be added to any word. However, one has only to glance through Gebauer³⁵ to be convinced of the pervasion of this form in old Czech. Thus *duszyca* of Rej is a Czechism and not a Ukrainianism.

Filoret (125, Zimorowicz) from Ukr. **Filoret*. The author places an asterisk above this Ukrainian form, while actually there is no such Ukrainian form. Why should this name generally be considered a Ukrainianism? Because of the use of *o* after *l*? But in

³⁴ *Kievskaja starina*, 1889, 8 (Vol. XXV). In *Arxiv Jugo-zapadnoj Rossii* I, 7, p. 22 (Kiev 1887) the text reads: "Čto ž za požytok toj dočasnoj slavy," but in this publication peculiarities of the language are not rendered, and the spelling is that of modern Russian. Cf. also "tščuju slavicu" in another text by Vyšens'kyj in *Akty, odnosjaščiesja k istorii Južnoj i Zapadnoj Rossii*, II. SPB 1865, p. 233.

³⁵ Jan Gebauer, *Slovník staročeský*, I-II. Praha, 1901-13. S.v.

names of such a type, Ukrainian authors of the 16th century use *a(ja)*, for example often *Filjaret*, which Ipatij Potij sometimes turns into *Filjapsevd* in the form of a pun, sometimes into *Filjaplet*,³⁶ but never into **Filolet*. This, of course has nothing to do with Ukrainian, the *o* appeared here under the influence of such words, used in Polish, as *filozof*, etc.

Hrabec deduces *kuš* (119, Zimorowicz) from the Ukr. *ktivš*. Actually, in Zimorowicz *u* corresponds to modern Ukr. *i* from *o*, as the examples *hultaj* (118), *probuh* (123), *Samujlo* (126)³⁷ indicate, which together with well-known material from Gavatovyč's interludes (*buhme, vud, pyruch*, etc.) indicates that in Lvov even in the 17th century one could hear Ukrainian dialects which have *u < o* in newly-closed syllables. Thus *ktivš* must then have been pronounced **kuvš*. What particularly confirms the idea of Hrabec is the conformity of the Ukrainian and Polish text of the *Otpys* of Ipatij Potij to the Ostroh cleric, which was not known by Hrabec. The Ukrainian phrase "vryxle natečet s kov^bšom na brahu" has its correspondence in Polish text "wrychle nabieży s kuszem na brahu."³⁸

Despite all this it would be wiser not to eliminate also the other explanation of the Pol. form *kuš* as derived from *kuša / kuchwa*, from which come the modern Ukr. *kuxol'* and Pol. *kufel*. This Germanism³⁹ was widely spread throughout all Ukrainian and from there entered into South Russian dialects (See Dal' II, 232). The alternation of *x: š* is quite normal in Ukrainian as it is also in Polish. Cf. *kuška* still in modern Ukrainian — a kind of wooden cup into which a whetstone is put by mowers; in Ekaterinoslav province it is a bucket in which the whetstone lies in water during the mowing (Hrinčenko, *s.v.*) This explanation is supported by the retention of *v* in the modern Ukr. *ktivš*, as well as in the form *kovš*, quoted in *Synonima slavenorosskaja* (with the translation

³⁶ *Pamjatniki pol. lit.* 3, 1115, 757.

³⁷ But Hrabec is mistaken here in adding *od kul*, where *u* has a different origin. Cf. A. Krymskij, *Ukrainskaja grammatika*, Moscow, 1907, p. 156.

³⁸ *Pamjatniki pol. lit.*, 3, 1115.

³⁹ D. Šelud'ko, "Nimec'ki elementy v ukrajins'kij movi," *Zbirnyk komisiji . . .*, I, Kiev, 1931, 35.

počerpalō).⁴⁰ With the dropping of *v* the word would then coincide with *kiś—kośa* which was in wide usage at that time. (Cf. in Ipatij Potij: "*A ja-m . . . na kośu zostal*").⁴¹ For these reasons one could make certain of the correctness of comparing *kuš* with *kivś* only if one could find either Polish spellings with *w* (**kuwsz*) or other examples of *uv* being changed into *u* at that time. The spelling *putora*, *putrzeci*, *pukopi* in deeds of the Cracow Archive of 1588, which Z. Stieber mentions (*Rozwój fonologiczny języka polskiego*, Warsaw 1952, p. 77) are of a somewhat different type, since *u* here is from *ł* and, mainly, the dropping of *u* occurs there at the boundary of parts of a compound. For the time being both of the explanations are equally possible. It would be interesting to compare Rus. *kuvśyn* with this — in Lavrentij Zizanij 13 it is quoted and translated *zban*. But in this case *kuksin* from Domostroj would have to be considered a word of different origin.⁴²

According to Hrabec *lachawica* (37, Rej) is a loan word from Ruthenian. I am unfamiliar with this form either in Ukrainian or Byelorussian. In these languages it could hardly have been the designation of a person — cf. Ukrainian words of such type as *blyskavycja* (lightning), *trjasavycja* (fever), *dysavycja* (asthma), etc.⁴³

Pecała (52, Orzechowski) Hrabec interprets as a Ukrainianism — from Ukr. *pečal'* (grief) with Little Polish *mazurzenie* resulting in the substitution of *č* by *c*. It remains unexplained why the final *-l'* became hard and why the word was converted into *-a*-stems. The difficulties regarding the spread and meaning of the word are not less. In modern Ukr. the word *pečal'* is rare, relating to poetic language. Its synonyms *sum*, *smutoł*, *žurba* are normally used. Apparently in Ukrainian it is a loan word from Russian or Church Slavic. The material quoted in Sreznevskij also indicates either Church Slavic or Russian texts, but not Ukrainian. Lavrentij Zizanij cites the word as Church Slavic and gives the translation

⁴⁰ Žytec'kyj, *op. cit.*, 156.

⁴¹ *Akty . . . Zapadnoj Rossii*, IV, 85.

⁴² Vasmer, *Russ. Etym. Wörterbuch*, 679.

⁴³ Synjavs'kyj, *Normy*. . ., 122. This meaning is standard for Polish, too, cf. Łoś, 72f.

outysk, *outrapienja* (16). If we turn to the 16th-17th century texts, we find this stem but only in the meaning of "care"; cf. *peča*, *pečalovatysja*, *pečalovanie* (concerning the church) in Krexiv 87. *Synonima slavenorosskaja* translates *pečalovanie*-*popečenie*, *opasenie*; *pečalovytyj*-*popečitel'nyj*. This stem also has the same meaning in the Polish of that time, for example: "Pilnie strzegła swych rzeczy: Jam też swe miała na pieczy" (Rej):⁴⁴ "Natura ni o czym większej pieczy niema, jako iżby każda rzecz w istności swej zachowała" (Górnicki 205) — cf. Rospond 129, 242f, also with the *mazurzenie-piecolowanie* 321. The author took the meaning "grief" from the modern Russian language but, as we see, it is difficult to apply it to a work which appeared in 1564. But what is most important is that the abstract meaning "grief" fits Orzechowski's text very poorly. He speaks of the robber crucified together with Christ: "Ten święty łotr urodził w księstwie, to jest w niewoli djabelskiej, z której pragnął wybawionym być do swobody bożej, której nigdzie nie widział, jedno w królestwie Panu Chrystusowi poddanem, które królestwo ma kapłana olejem świętym pomazanego, i króla cierzniem, to jest z drogich kamieni koroną, pecały pełną w królestwie swem koronowanego."⁴⁵ It is quite difficult to imagine a crown full of grief!

Thus, Orzechowski's *pecała* probably has no relation to Ukr. *pečał*, and thereby does not come into "*kresy* elements." The word's origin is unclear and here one can only conjecture. Hrabec used the 1919 edition by Łoś. This edition, like the first edition, is not accessible to me. But in the 1858 edition it was printed not *pecały*, but *pęcały*. If this is not a misprint then it would be tempting to compare this word with the root *pęk-*, allowing that in this case *c* is in place of *č*, just as in *pęcał*.⁴⁶

Pomarlica (85, Szymonowic, 112, Zimorowicz) (cattle plague). I know the word neither in Ukrainian nor in Byelorussian, neither in the modern nor in the old language. However, the word was evidently in circulation in the vicinity of Lvov, since two authors

⁴⁴ *Mikołaja Reja Kupiec*, Kraków, 1924 (BPP77), p. 53.

⁴⁵ S. Orzechowski, *Quicunx, to jest: wzór korony polskiej na cynku wystawiony*, Kraków, 1858, p. 69.

⁴⁶ Cf. Brückner, *Sł. Et.* 403.

use it more than once. But why is it necessary to trace it to a hypothetical Ukr. *pomerlycja*? One can with no less justification consider it as having originated in Polish; this is corroborated by the fact that Szymonowicz used it as the title of one of his *sielanki* and ordinarily we do not find Ukrainian words in his titles. It is possible that the word was known to Linde from spoken usage: at the very time when he quotes the word *pomarlica* only with one example from Szymonowicz, he himself uses this word in his explanation of the word *pomorek*.

Prachta (55, Orzechowski) in the expression *ni prachty* (nothing at all, not a drop). Hrabec traces the root of the word to the Ch.S. *prax*^b, well-known in the usage, e.g. of Ipatij Potij, where it corresponds to Pol. *proch*; the word is explained in *Synonima slavenorosskaja* by *porox*.⁴⁷ However, this root can also be Czech and the very formation, with the suffix -t(a), possibly an innovation by Orzechowski, must be connected in all probability not with the Ukrainian language, which has no **poroxta* (Ukr. *porošyna*), but with Cz. *drobty*.⁴⁸ Cf. the Pol. expression *ni krzty*, and in Zimorowicz 16 *szczypta*, not noted by Hrabec.

(w) *przejmy* (88, Szymonowicz) Hrabec traces to a "hypothetical Ukr." *v perejmy*. This expression is not hypothetical at all in Ukrainian, it exists even now in the adverb *navperejmy* (to intercept). Nevertheless, one can not be sure of the Ukrainian nature of the Polish expression. It is closely connected with *przejmować* and belongs to a quite ordinary type of adverbs. There is too much data in Linde to suspect it of a "*kresy*" character. Incidentally, I shall note that the meaning of the expression is not "*na przemian; z przerwami*," but as above. The meaning of the word is the same in Byelorussian, (Nosovič 403).

Przewodnia (69, Klonowicz) (carrying across the border). There is no basis at all for comparing it with Ukr. *perevodnja* (degenerated species). In addition to its literal meaning "to transfer," *perevodyty* in the 16th century Ukrainian can mean action in general (to proceed), cf. Krex. 86. In relation to processes the suffix -n(ja) indicates "hasty, disorderly and not too effective, al-

⁴⁷ *Pamiętniki pol. lit.*, 3, 1075; Zytec'kyj, *op. cit.*, p. 175.

⁴⁸ Gebauer, *Slovník*, I, 338, s.v. *drobtek, drobtek*.

though intensive processes."⁴⁹ All of this scarcely fits the meaning suggested by Hrabec. The most common meaning of the suffix in Polish is local. It seems that this meaning fits perfectly both examples which Hrabec quotes from Klonowic: "Łowi żrzóbki, trzymając u Nestrz przewodnią" and "Tym. . . , co kradną i z złodziejmi trzymają przewodnią." The meaning of the word would be "passage near the border" or "place for hiding near the border." If this is so, it is difficult to say where this word originated with this meaning — in Ukrainian or in Polish, inasmuch as the history of Ukr. *argot* has not been studied at all.

s/z/udamno (35, Rej) "*zgrabnie, elegancko*" is difficult to consider a Ukrainianism, since no Ukrainian parallel has been offered either by Brückner, Klich or Hrabec, who all seem to refer to Ukrainian origin only to avoid the obscurity of the word in Polish. Connection with Russ. *ssudit'* "to lend" which Brückner 525 suggests with a question mark, is not warranted either semantically, phonetically, historically, or geographically.

walaski (18, Biernat) (Rumanian). Hrabec' explanation that it is a contamination of the Balkan *vlax* and Ukr. *volox* has little probability, if only because it does not explain the first *a*. Vasmer's explanation 166 (and Brückner's) that it is from the German *Walach*, which is allegedly from the "Russian" *volox* is also unlikely, — a new German borrowing would not have reached Astrakhan, as pointed out by Dal' (I, 163). In addition, it developed a secondary meaning "castrated ram, ox," with the South Russian verb *valóšit'* (a beast) and subst. *valóšen'e* was derived from it. It was Chaloupecký who pointed out that the first *a* in *valax* is due to the changes that South Slavic *vlax* obtained when passing through Hungarian media.^{49a} It is easy to imagine the confusion of the meanings "Rumanian," "shepherd," "castrator of sheep," under conditions of the Carpathian sheep raising economy, but the spread of this meaning to the Lower Volga and Kaluga (while lacking in Byelorussia²) can not be accounted for by its Carpathian origin.

⁴⁹ Jury Šerech, *Narys sučasnoji ukrajins'koji literaturnoji movy*, Munich, 1951, p. 211. Rarely used in Polish in the sense of a process (*kłótnia*), cf. Łoś, 33.

^{49a} V. Chaloupecký, *Valaši na Slovensku*, Prague, 1947, p. 16f. But cf. P. Skok, *Dolazak slovena na Mediteran*, Split, 1934, p. 89.

When we turn to 16th-17th century Ukrainian, we shall see that Italy was designated by the Polonism *Vloxy*⁵⁰ and Rumania — *Voloxy*. The latter designation was also adopted from Ukrainian into the Russian language of that time.⁵¹ Krex. 19 gives *Vloxove* (Italy) and it knows *valax* only in the meaning “castrated male” (“evnux što sja rozumeeť rězanec’ to jest valax” —13); in the epistle of Constantine of Ostroh, 1593, we read: “Potreba i do Moskovskoho, i do Volox poslaty,” — this relates to orthodox countries.⁵² *Synonima slavenorosskaja* 139 explains *valax*—*kaženyk*, *evnux*, *skopec*; *valašenyj*—*trebnyj*. Thus, still at that time, *volox* (Rumanian) and *valax* (castrated male) are clearly differentiated. The other meaning “castrated ram” has not been verified later than 1529.⁵³ Pol. *walach* has the same meaning in the 16th century, e.g., in Rej, *Kupiec* 110, in Orszak, see Rospond 297.

From this brief survey it is clear that in the 16th century *volox* and *valax* were different words, and if they were fused, then this was later. The adjective *walaski*, used by Biernat with the noun *cap* (ram) is probably connected more with the meaning “castrated” than “Rumanian.” If one can speak of *volox* in Polish as a Ukrainianism, one can not say this of *valax*. It is in all probability a Slavic formation from the root *val-* (*valit’*), as Dal’ suggested, *ibid.*, although this was considered hitherto as a folk etymology; later on in Carpathian area this word phonetically coincided with the South Slavic *vľax* which was transformed into *valax* in Hungarian.^{53a}

wiaduk || *wiaduch* (27f Rej, Orzechowski). Hrabec considers *wiaduk* as the primary form with the Ukrainian suffix *-uk*, while the form *wiaduch* is, in his opinion, a hyper-correct one, which originated from the Little Polish change of final *-x* > *-k*. However, the forms **wiaduk* — *veduk* are unknown either in modern or old Ukrainian and Byelorussian. What is more they are quite improbable, since the suffix *-uk* is not used in Ukrainian with verbal

⁵⁰ E.g., Ipatij Potij — *Pamjatniki pol. lit.*, 3, 1071.

⁵¹ E.g., Antyryzys, *Pamjatniki pol. lit.*, 3, 823; as to Russian see Unbegaun 171.

⁵² *Akty* . . . *Zap. Ros.*, 4, 66.

⁵³ Šelud’ko, 24.

^{53a} Cf., R. Jakobson in *Word*, 7, 2 (1951), p. 190.

stems.⁵⁴ On the other hand, the suffix *-ux* is possible, although rare, in Ukrainian with these stems (*spljux*, *zmerzljux*). However, the prototype of *wiaduk* || *wiaduch* was probably not a Ukrainian word of this type (I do not know such examples from 16th century texts), but the Czech *padouch* (swindler, cheat)⁵⁵ which figured in Rej, *Kupiec*, 215, in the form *paduch*: "Spatnieć nas ten paduch straszny." Thus *wiaduk* in Rej is rather a Czechism than a Ukrainianism. However, Hrabec, 28, is evidently correct when he finds a Ukrainian suffix in *ziemiańczuk* in Rej, although I do not know such a formation from Ukrainian texts.

wielmi (52, 69, 96, Orzechowski, Klonowic, Zimorowicz). Hrabec does not consider it a Ukrainianism in Polish but, referring to Brückner's opinion concerning its going out of use in the 16th century, suggests that its usage in 16th-17th century texts was supported by a Ukrainian influence. This is completely possible. But if this is so, then it is all the more interesting to turn our attention to another aspect of the question, which Hrabec has not taken note of. The crux of the matter is that *vel'my* is actually very frequently in Ukrainian of the 16th-17th century, but it is used not in the Ukrainian form but in the Polish. For Ukrainian we would expect the theoretical form **vil'my* with the normal development *i < e* in a newly closed syllable. And such a form has indeed been stated several times with the "new *ě*" in 14th century Ukrainian texts. We read *věl'mi* in the Pandects of Antiochus, 1307, and in deeds of 1349 and 1352.⁵⁶ If the form *vel'my*, known from numerous texts of Kievan Rus', appears anew in subsequent texts, then in essence it does not continue the old form directly but is a Polonism. This word is very typical of the extraordinary complexity of those mutual interactions which existed between Polish and Ukrainian.

Hrabec evolves *wierzę* (33, Rej) (indeed, in truth) from the old

⁵⁴ Synjavs'kyj, 128.

⁵⁵ Brückner, *Sł. etym.*, 390. The suffix *-uch* is frequent in Old Polish, also in such words as *wiaduch*, *paduch*; cf. Łoś, 94, where other examples are cited, as well.

⁵⁶ I cite the example from Pandects of Antiochus from A. Kočubinskij's review of *Očerky literaturnoj istorii malorusskogo narečija* by P. Žytec'kyj in *Otčet o 32 prisuždenii nagrad grafa Uvarova*, SPB 1892, p. 52. The deeds are quoted from Sreznevskij, *Materialy*, I, 240 and Tymčenko, *Ist. slovnyk*, 484. It is possible that this is the same example. Unfortunately, the edition of 14th-15th century deeds of V. Rosov is unavailable now to me and therefore I can not collate the text.

acc. /*na mą/ wiare*, which the Ukrainians, having lost the soft *r*, took as the first person singular; in conformity with this they introduced a change into the Pol. form — *wierzę*. Actually it is hardly necessary to accept Ukrainian instrumentality in this case. We find the form *wierzę* in Górnicki,⁵⁷ for example, not related biographically at all to the Ukraine. In addition, one can dispute whether, at that time, *r* had become hard in Ukrainian south-western dialects (its early hardening in north Ukrainian dialects is without question). Meanwhile it is easy to explain the appearance of the form *wierzę* from Polish itself. As is well known, fluctuation in *ě* reflexes after labials was observed for a long time in Polish and 'a||'e appeared simultaneously, see Rej, *Kupiec, powieasz* 44, 60 and *powiadaj*. Under these conditions the form *wierę* was normally used together with *wiare*. When the form *wiara-wiare* triumphed in the paradigm of the noun, it appeared necessary to give the form *wierę* a new meaning structurally; it was understood as the first person singular of a verb and, consequently, reshaped as *wierzę*. In Górnicki, there are the forms *wiare* (33) and *wierę* (34). The Czech influence could have been a contributing factor.

zbroja (weapon), 16 Biernat and others, is one of those words which etymologists like to get rid of by ascribing them to any other language but their own, since it is difficult to explain these words with the history of a single language. Bulaxovs'kyj traced Rus. *sbruja* from Polish; Hrabec assumes, on the contrary, that Pol. *zbroja* was borrowed from "Ruthenian" (Ukrainian? Byelorussian?). One can also mention that C'vjatkov⁵⁸ tried to trace Ukr. and BR. *zbroja* phonetically from Pol. *broń* as the result of *ń* changing to *j* before *n* in the adjective **zbrońny* > *zbrojny* from which, they say a new subst *zbroja* was derived. It is impossible to agree with this view since, by the 16th century, *zbroja* was a very widely used and the changing *ń* > *j* occurred later; it is also not understandable why this process did not embrace all adjectives.

⁵⁷ Górnicki, 118, 211, 319, etc.

⁵⁸ L. C'vjatkov, "Nekatoryja rysy inšaslavjanskaj fonetyki w belaruskim leksyčnym matarjale," Instytut belaruskaj kul'tury, *Zapiski Adzdelu humanitarnyx navuk*, 2, Minsk 1928, p. 77.

tives with "double" *n*- for the first *n* was soft everywhere after the following *б* was dropped.

Il'inskij solved the problem, however, by providing quite convincingly that *zbroja* is related to *briti* just as *boj* is to *biti*. *briti* had as its original meaning "to cut, to strike."⁵⁹ Thus *zbroja* was neither a borrowing from Ukrainian to Polish nor vice versa, and the explanation is required only by *u* in Rus. *sbruja*, which actually can lead to a Polish or Ukrainian source. However the problem of *sbruja* does not belong to our subject.

The suggested concept of the origin of *zbroja* in Polish and Ukrainian is verified by the use of the word and its synonyms in both languages in the 16th-17th centuries. Ukrainian texts in this period know the synonyms *zbroja*, *oružie*, *bron'*. The word *oružie* has the most abstract character. Ipatij Potij writes: "Samy sebe oružyem svoym poražaete."⁶⁰ In "Slovo o zburenju pekla" *Ljucyper* speaks to his servants, ordering them to distribute the *g o n f a l o n s*: "V rukax svoyx oružye mocno deržete."⁶¹ Lavrentij Zizanij gives *oružye* as a Church Slavic word and translates it *bron'*, *zbroja*. *Zbroja* can appear in the same abstract meaning, e.g., "Oboločymsja v zbroju svētlosty,"⁶² as well as in a completely concrete sense, e.g.: "Kozak, ne majučy ně zbroy, ně šyšaka, Styhaet tatar" (Verses on the burial of Sahajdačnyj).⁶³ Finally *bron'* is more rarely used, being felt, very likely, as a Polonism. The word is used only once in *Krex*. ("Vzjavšy bron' pravry," 12) but the compiler of *Synonima slavenorosskaja* considered it a Church Slavicism and gave it as a Church Slavic translation of the word *zbroja*.⁶⁴ The adjective is used mainly as *zbrojnyj*.⁶⁵

⁵⁹ G. Il'inskij, "Slavjanskije ètimologii," *IORJaS* 23, 1918, p. 163. Compare in Rej: "Jerzy mieczem, koniem broi" (*Kupiec* 218). F. Sławski, *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*, Kraków 1952 *s.v.* cites another similar example of Rej's use of *broić* in the same sense.

⁶⁰ *Pamjatniki pol. lit.*, 3, 1091.

⁶¹ *ZNTŠ* 81, 1908, 29.

⁶² Ohijenko, *Krexiv.*, p. 42.

⁶³ Xv. Titov, *Materijaly dlja istoriji knyžnoji spravy na Ukrajinі v 16-18 vv.*, Kiev 1924, p. 39. True, *oružie* is used in the same sense in the further part of this work: "Mnoho tam pobytix i rannyx Zostalo oružiem Turčynov pohanyx." (See *Istoričeskie pesni malorusskogo naroda*, V. Antonovič i M. Dragomanov, II, 1, Kiev 1875, p. 132.)

⁶⁴ Žyteč'kyj, *op. cit.*, p. 152.

⁶⁵ E.g. *Pamjatniki pol. lit.* 3, 187f; *ZNTŠ* 81, p. 21.

In Polish, on the contrary, the difference between *zbroja* and *broń* was apparently not stylistic but semantic. *Broń* meant "weapon," *zbroja* "armament, armor" (from which, by the way, it is easier to trace Rus. *zbruja*). Cf. in Górnicki: "We zbroi . . . barzo z nią (the beard) źle" (105); "Wesoła a świetna barwa tak na zbroi, jako pod tarczą przystoi" (106); "W.M. dał się czyścić tłustem namazać, a wespół ze zbroją" (34), but ". . . umiał dobrze z każdą bronią, tak pieszo, jako i na koniu" (38). Cf. also in Rej: "Bo w swem wojsku dziwy broi, Biegając w zupełnej zbroi" (*Kupiec* 35). Cf. also material in Rospond 308, 354. In regard to *oręż*, it is less typical of the language of the epoch (but: "Oręża na rajtary dobywajcie" — Orzechowski, Quicunx 5).

Ukrainian examples point to the fact that Ukr. *zbroja* had the feeling of its own word, while *oružye* and *bron'* were somewhat foreign; in Polish both *zbroja* and *broń* were completely Polish. Thus the theory of the Ukrainian origin of Pol. *zbroja* crumbles.

I shall mention only two more problems. Adverbs in *-o* (*-no*?) Hrabec considers (*piłno, bujno* etc.) Ukrainianisms in Polish (83, 104). However, the matter is not so simple. On the one hand, there were Polish forms with *-o* and on the other, forms with *-e*, *-ě* were used very often in Ukrainian. Unfortunately the author did not avail himself of J. Šemlej's useful work, "Pryslivnyky na *-o*, *-e* v ukrajins'kij movi," *Ridna mova*, 1934, 2-5.

It is also too risky to consider as Ukrainian the diminutives with the suffix *-uchn-* (65, 94, 106). They were widespread among writers, who had no connection biographically with "*kresy*," cf. *częściuchno, niziuchny* in Górnicki 27, 30.

Having attributed to the Polish language of the 16th-17th centuries many "Ukrainianisms" which actually were not Ukrainianisms, Hrabec, on the other hand, far from exhausts the real Ukrainianisms or that which could be a Ukrainianism in the language of the writers he has studied. I shall cite several words from Rej's *Kupiec*. I do not contend absolutely that they are Ukrainianisms but in any case they would be worthy of analysis:

chobot (221) — Ukr. *xobot*. However, it might also be a Czechism — cf. Gebauer I, 541.

chocia (32) — Ukr. dialectal *xotja*, literary *xoč*. If one even assumes that the root is Polish, taking as a basis episodic words with *choc-* || *chocz-* stem from 14th century texts, it is easier to explain the final vowel from Ukrainian or Czech (by a hyper-correct substitution). But the meaning of the Cz. *chotě* || *chotie* (willing) does not fit the Polish word, whereas the meaning of the Ukrainian word does.

chuć (19, strictly Seklucjan's text, but Rej himself also uses the word, cf. also in Orzechowski, Quicunx 3, Zimorowicz 20) — identified on phonetic grounds by Sławski, Sł. Et. 88 as either a Czechism or Ukrainianism. The extraordinary frequency of the word's use in Ukrainian 16th-17th century texts,⁶⁶ exceeding by far the frequency of its use in Polish and Czech texts, speaks more in favor of the second. Later on the word went out of use in Ukrainian, probably for reasons of a euphemistic order, but it was retained in Byelorussian (Nosovič 685).

czerwony (217) — Ukr. *červonyj*. See my statement in *Word* 8, 4, 1952, p. 340f.

gorze (53) — Ukr. *hore*, in the expression *na swe gorze*. Usually known as an interjection in Old Polish, while in Ukrainian and Old Czech it is used both as a substantive and an interjection. This already suggests the possibility of a certain influence, especially here in the substantive usage. But cf. Gebauer I, 462.

lada (59) — against the background of the Ukr. *leda*, Cz. *leda* can best be explained as a manifestation of hyper-correctness. Connection with BR. *ljada* (by virtue of *aķan'e*, when used in compounds) is hardly likely.

łuczyć (139), cf. *łuczny* in Zimorowicz 128, Ukr. *vlučyty* "to hit the mark."

nieborak (54) — Ukr. *neborak*. Brückner Sł. Et., 34, assumed that in Pol. *r* was deliberately (euphemistically) substituted for *ż* in *niebożak* (same in Old Czech). It coincides strangely with the Serb. *nebore*, where *r* < *ž* has a number of parallels in other words. The suffix *-ak* with an augmentative nuance is more widespread, it seems, in Ukrainian than in Polish: *parubčak*, *holjak*, *pys'-*

⁶⁶ See, e.g., *Akty* . . . *Zap. Ros.* 4, pp. 64, 65, 71; *Pamjatniki pol. lit.*, 2, 471; *Ibid.*, 3, 1029, 1103, etc.

mak. . . It would be tempting to attribute the word to Ukrainian-Balkan connections in the Carpathians, but the matter requires study, of course. Serbian and Czech also have other suffixes: *nebožac*, *nebožatko*.

nielza (31, 47 etc.) Cf. in *Apokrysys* in Old Ukr.: "Nelza . . . terplyve znosyty."⁶⁷ It is retained in modern Byelorussian. In Polish, it is a peculiarity of Rej's language, according to Brückner (*Sł. Et.*, 293) but certain others also have it (e.g., Górnicki, 12). In Czech, however, it is typical.

pieszki (224) — Ukr. *pišky*. Also in Czech.

pogotowie (98) — Ukr. *pohotiv*, is used also in Byelorussian, everywhere with the meaning "all the more." Also in Czech.

potwora, fem. (304) while in Polish, masc. — Ukr. *potwora*. For BR. *patwora* Nosovič gives the inaccurate translation "stubborn person." In Czech it is also feminine.

przystaw (323) — cf. *prystav* in *Synonima slavenorosskaja* translated into ChS. (!) *pristavnyk*, *pestun*.⁶⁸

put(em) (234) — can be a Ukrainianism as well as a Czechism. Brückner contends the latter in his commentary on *Kupiec*, 323.

serce (313) — see my article in *Word*, 8, 4, p. 340.

smucić (316) — see my article in *Word*, 8, 4, p. 331ff.

szybalec (142) — cf. *šybala* in *Synonima slavenorosskaja*⁶⁹ with the peculiar translation *prezor* "pride, scorn"?

wesoły (*weseli*, nom. pl. 229) — see my article in *Word*, 8, 4, p. 340.

This list could be increased, but it would grow even more if other books by Rej and his contemporaries and successors were studied. Here are some examples at random from Zimorowicz: *sołowi*j (3), *drobiazg* (11), *szaraj* (20), *opończa* (125), *sadowina* (13), *huczny* (25) etc. Of course, many of those named here entered the Polish language before Rej, but Hrabec also includes in his investigation e.g. *bojarzyn*, known to have been borrowed long before the 16th century. This indicates that what have been defined by Hrabec as Ukrainianisms in the language of the 16th-

⁶⁷ *Pam. pol. lit.*, 2, 1510.

⁶⁸ Żytec'kyj, 179, Brückner, *Sł. etym.*, 514, quotes parallels from non-Slavic languages.

⁶⁹ Żytec'kyj, *op. cit.*, 196.

17th century writers, whom he studied, are not only often classified incorrectly, but they do not at all cover all of the material.

We have now to take a look at Hrabec's evaluation of the role of Ukrainianisms. As I pointed out at the beginning, Hrabec suggests that in the 16th century the chief function of "*kręsy* elements" was to lower the style. Here he is correct in many instances, but sometimes he groundlessly ascribes this negative shading to "*kręsy* elements" with a purely nominative function. Thus Hrabec is correct when he analyzes the doublets *sorom* || *srom* or *Węgrzy* || *Wuhrzy* in Orzechowski 50, 51). It would be worth pointing out that the lack of differentiation between Byelorussian and Ukrainian, which Hrabec notes in the direct speech of peasants in Rej (37) and partly Klonowic (72), indicates a general scornful attitude toward "*kręsy*" language as such. However, the seeking for indications of a low style in *bukłak* in Rej is unconvincing. True, the word is used in Rej with a degrading epithet, but by itself it had a purely nominative function, as is evident from examples quoted *s.v.* *boćlag* (39).

On the other hand, Hrabec finds positive shade of estimation in some "*kręsy* elements" of this period, but he fails to explain this. He refers, primarily, to these words — *duma*, *bojarzyn*, *bohатыr*, *krynica*.

In Polish, as is known, the meaning of *duma* evolved from "idea" to "pride, arrogance." Hrabec establishes the second meaning, beginning with Szymonowic (1593-1614),⁷⁰ but it probably had originated somewhat earlier. It can be established at least as early as Górnicki 36: "/Anaksarch/ z Demokrytowej, preceptora swego, dumy powiedział być niezliczoną liczbę światów." In Ukrainian the meaning "arrogance" appears later and remains secondary, without ever supplanting the meaning "idea" and, finally, disappears completely. Thus, if *duma* was actually borrowed from Eastern Slavic into Polish, as Hrabec suggests (I leave this question without investigation), then the new meaning developed in Polish, was borrowed in Ukrainian from Polish but was not retained there. It is easy to ascertain this from material collected by Tym-

⁷⁰ Incidentally, this chronology would have excluded the possibility that the change in the meaning occurred through the expression *dumni bojary*, as Hrabec suggests.

ženko, Ist. slovn., 839f. To this I add that Lavrentij Zizaniј does not know *duma*, but only *pyxa* (9). Yet even when *duma* (arrogance) was used, *pyxa* was predominant.⁷¹ For this reason there is no basis whatever for tracing *dumny* (proud) in Szymonowic to Ukrainian (86). But turning to the emotional nature of the word: the very development of its meaning in Polish indicates that if, at first, it had positive nature, it lost it later. But this important feature generally escapes Hrabec's attention: words borrowed from Ukrainian in Polish in the previous period, — before the 16th century — have a positive coloration. New loan words either bear a negative estimation, or have a playfully familiar character, or are limited to a nominative function.

Both *bojarzyn*, and *bohater* were borrowed earlier and this is decisive. Hrabec' considerations concerning the fact that a connection was felt between *bohater* and *bóg*, if it ever existed, are unconvincing. Generally, in relating borrowed words to one or another stylistic plane, social appraisal of the environment from which they came has much greater importance than the procedure of etymologizing. This also pertains to *krynica*. If it is a borrowing from Ukrainian (which I doubt because Ukrainian forms with *-ry- < -rb-* are of more recent origin in West Ukr. dialects, and one can assume the borrowing only if one assumes for Old Ukr. two parallel forms *krinicia* and *krōnicja*), it is also from an older period, and this is important, but not a comparison with the Gr. κρήνη which only a few scholars could have known.

Hrabec could not have comprehended changes in the emotional estimation of Ukrainian borrowings, since he studied them without any connection with historical processes. Rus' could command Poland's respect before the 14th century, but in the 16th, when it depended upon Poland politically and lagged far behind her culturally, it could not. Ukrainianisms appeared in the Polish language of that time, since the Ukraine was part of Poland and a great number of Ukrainians joined the ranks of the Polish *szlachta*, bringing their own habits of speech. But with this hierarchy of social and national values which was established at that time, borrowings from Ukrainian could be either neutral (nominative

⁷¹ Cf., *Pam. pol. lit.*, 3, 1017; Ohijenko, *Krexiv.*, 88; *Żytec'kyj*, 180.

function, names of objects of everyday life, different from Polish) or negative in various shades and gradations. And although Hrabec does not take note of this, his material clearly indicates a difference in the evaluation of borrowings of the previous period and borrowings of the period which he studied.

From this standpoint it is necessary to review also Hrabec's opinion that, beginning with the 17th century, Ukrainianisms again obtain a positive function. This opinion confuses the historico-literary point of view with the linguistic. Hrabec takes a definite genre of Baroque literature, the pastoral-peasant idyll of the poets of the "Red Ruthenian" school, which was part of what was wittily called *höfische Dorfpoesie*. Baroque poetics actually permitted in this genre a certain number of expressions of low character, socially and stylistically, but thoroughly sifted and neutralized by means of a general lofty style and numerous mythological images and names like those in the pastorales "Aminta" by Tasso (1572) or "Pastor fido" by Guarini (1590). As a result there was supposed to appear a certain pathos, typical of this rather conventional genre, which Zimorowicz himself called "*padwany Ruskie*" (5).⁷²

But there is absolutely no basis for transferring this transformation within a genre to the general function of the linguistic means as they were used in the literary and spoken language as a whole. It remained low, base. This was precisely the reason for the interest in using them in a definite literary genre: the cult of contrasts in baroque found its expression in such "lofty" uses of "low" means. But if these means had really become lofty, then the genre itself would have lost its charm and even the right to exist. And, indeed, if Hrabec had taken the works of 17th century Polish writers who did not write in the genre of the idyll or not only in this genre (e.g. W. Potocki) he would have found that, as a rule, their Ukrainianisms were devoid of lofty coloration and positive shading.

⁷² Ukrainianisms and even the use of Ukrainian texts in the erotic and sentimental lyrics that K. Badecki calls (not always well-grounded) bourgeois poetry have the same characteristics. Cf. "Ruthenian" songs in his *Polska liryka mieszczańska*. Pieśni-Tańce-Padwany. Lviv, 1936 (the list on p. 480f), and in *Z badań nad literaturą mieszczańsko-ludową XVII wieku*, Wrocław 1951, p. 46.

In order to support his thesis that the role of Ukrainianisms, at the end of the 16th and beginning of the 17th century, has been reappraised, Hrabec tries to use the opinions of contemporaries about Ruthenian and Church Slavic. Let us look at these statements. Hrabec refers to Kromer and Górnicki, who both, allegedly, maintained that the "Ruthenian language" was the oldest Slavic language. Because of this, according to Hrabec 138, "Ruthenian lost its character as a culturally lower language, as it was considered originally." The tradition, among Ukrainians, of using old Church Slavic books and some features of their language, which resembled Czech, favored this.

Alas, these assertions are based partly on accidental quotations and, partly, have no basis at all. True, there were voices in 16th century Polish literature which suggested that Ruthenian words be incorporated into the Polish standard language. But this was only a reflection in philology of the idea of a supranational (*universitas polska*, Orzechowski 43) Polish kingdom and even such a radical publicist as Szymon Budny recommended the use of Great Polish, Cracow, Mazur, Podlachie, Sandomierz and also Ruthenian words.⁷³ The very listing of Ruthenian words side by side with Polish dialecticisms indicates that the evaluation of the first was not high. The epithet which Orzechowski used in relation to himself, *hruby Rusin* (Quicunx, 38), was not, of course, original but repeated a common, current expression. As is usual in such cases, declarations about Slavic brotherhood, in Kromer or M. Bielski, for example, in the field of practical linguistic policy signified nothing more, at best, than permitting foreign Slavic words in Polish for notions not yet designated by Polish words. In fact it went no further than such curiosities as examples of a Cyrillic writing and several Ch.S. prayers with Latin letters in *Dzieje tatarskie, kozackie i tureckie* by M. Paszkowski (1615) or the words *kniha*, *hlawa* quoted by Orzechowski in his *Policja*. . .⁷⁴

Views on linguistic policy, set forth by Górnicki, also do not leave this circle of ideas. Górnicki proceeds from a necessary concern for Polish and protests against excessive foreign borrowings,

⁷³ I. Pervol'f, *Slavjane, ix vzaimnye otnošenija i svjazi*, II, Warsaw 1888, p. 153.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 149, 151.

although he makes no objections to the use of Czech or Latin words, if there is no corresponding Polish word or if the foreign word is generally accepted. The author's alter ego, Kryski, asserts that Polish, like other Slavic languages, is comparatively young and they all evolved from the Slavic tongue. The idea that "naród i język ruski miałyby być najstarszy" (52) is put forth only as the opinion of "certain people," but this idea is rejected immediately since, first, it can not be verified because of the remoteness in time and second, there is no need to discuss it. Putting aside this opinion *ad acta*, Kryski-Górnicki insists that, be that as it may, the first Slavic language must have been *grubyj* "crude." On the contrary, Bulgarian was noted for its richness, because translations were made into it from Greek and Latin: "Tu już ten język dobrze obfitszy, niż nasz, być musi, a to stąd, iż dawniej w nim pismo, niż w naszym" (53). But by now Czech was "polerowańszy" and richer, for the Czechs lived near cultured peoples and had Latin letters. For this reason Czech is the main source of borrowings, but it is possible to prefer individual words "*ruskie, abo charwackie, abo serbskie*," if they are more comprehensible, and one can use "i pruskie, kaszubskie słowa, z których się więc śmiejemy" (54). Thus the Ruthenian language here is only slightly higher in the hierarchy of appraisals than the openly despised Kashubian, but in the interests of Polish "Panslavism" neither the one nor the other, however, can be renounced. This characteristic is topped off by a famous phrase "ruski (language) zasię (is) surowy" (55). Kryski-Górnicki wishes to approach problems of linguistic policy calmly and purely rationally, in the spirit of the Renaissance. However, behind this is concealed the common opinion which regards the language of Rus' in a haughty manner — that same common opinion which forced Orzechowski to call himself *hruby Rusin*. And although in Orzechowski "Ruthenians" are treated as the Pole's equals (Quicunx, 74) they are equal thanks to Poland. Only this turns "niewolą w swobodę, hańbę w cześć, głupotę w mądrość, a hrubość . . . w ćwiczoną naturę polską" (Quicunx 73). These words, spoken of Lithuania (with her Rus' culture!) must be applied also to the entire Ukraine before her annexation by Poland. It is obvious that such a formulation of the question eliminates a high evaluation of the language

although, of course, it does not presuppose straightforward persecutions of the language.

Górnicki *Dworzanin polski* was published in 1566. P. Skarga's famous treatise bears the date of 1577, disclaiming not only a popular Ukrainian language but also Church Slavic, thus going further in this direction than Górnicki: "K temu wielce cię oszukali Grekowie, narodzie Ruski, iż ci, wiarę ś. podając, językać swego Greckiego nie podali. Aleć na tym Słowieńskim przestać kazali, abyś nigdy do prawego rozumienia y nauki nie przyszedł. . . Z Słowiańskiego języka nigdy żaden uczonym być nie może . . . Stąd nieumiejętność y błędy bez końca powstają, gdy ślepi ślepe wodzą."⁷⁵

These ideas were so influential and widespread that when adherents of Church Slavic took up the cudgels for it, they searched for arguments in appeals to Latin. Thus, Meletij Smotryč'kyj, referring to Strykowski in the chapter "On the Prosody of Verse" in his Church Slavic grammar (1619), says: "Ovidia onaho slavnaho latinskaho poetu v sarmatskix narod zatočenyi byvša i jazyku ix soveršenstvę navykša, slavjanskym dialektom za čystoe cho krasnoe i ljubopriemnoe stixy ily věršy pysavša."⁷⁶

The increasingly disdainful attitude toward Ruthenian parallels to the "elevation" of the Polish literary language, purifying it of archaisms, dialecticisms, etc., the other aspect of the same process. Thus, when in 1564 Marcin Siennik published *Lekarstwa doświadczone*, which had been written in 1501-1506, he edited the language of the book accordingly.⁷⁷ This process was cut short by the new wave of Latinization in the 17th century, but this does not enter into our subject.

If Hrabec had analyzed these and similar statements against the historical background of Polish-Cossack struggle, he would not have come to his conclusion concerning the revaluation of the role of Ukrainianisms at the beginning of the 17th century. Even in Zimorowicz, who very actively used Ukrainianisms, there ap-

⁷⁵ *Pam. pol. lit.*, 2, 485f.

⁷⁶ Quoted from O. Bilec'kyj. *Xrestomatija davn'oji ukrajin's'koji literatury (Doba feodalizmu)*. Kiev 1949, p. 143.

⁷⁷ A. Brückner, *Dzieje języka polskiego*, II, Kraków 1913, 95.

peared, under the influence of the wars led by Khmelnytsky against the Poles, such unflattering epithets concerning the Cossacks as "*zbójcy domowi*" (113), "*nasi własni najmici, smrodliwi gnoj-kowie*" (115), "*nam dojadły ukraińskie muchy*" (117). But even earlier, before such sharp conflicts had arisen, Zimorowicz spoke with scorn about those who remain "*prostym Hrycem*" (6). Of course, this attitude can not be carried over directly to appraisal of the Cossacks' language, but one can not assume that it was completely cut off in the appraisals. But Hrabec, on the whole, does not go into a historico-linguistic evaluation of data. When he leaves the historico-literary position, he turns to the biographical. However, a very large number of Ukrainianisms in Rej, Klonowic, and others are explained not by their biographical data but by the general system of the Polish language of the period. In the foregoing exposition I have deliberately used examples from Górnicki — he was not from *kresy*, but in the main the same Ukrainianisms can be found in him as in Rej and, partly, in Orzechowski. The problem of Ukrainian elements and Ukrainian linguistic influences was the problem of all Poland and not only of her *kresy* and this is the second reason why the use of the term *kresy* fails in the theme elaborated by Hrabec. If Hrabec had really wished to indicate the connection between the writers' use of Ukrainianisms and their biographies, he should, first of all, have eliminated the common Ukrainianisms, used by all of them, and then spoken about original ones introduced precisely by given writers.

* * *

In my review I have dwelt almost exclusively on the shortcomings in Hrabec's work. It was necessary to do this since he has come forward as a pioneer in the difficult field of the study of linguistic interrelations among Slavs and it is necessary that his successors should not repeat his mistakes. However, Hrabec's work is also somewhat useful. First, because of the very formulation of the problem; second, because of the collection of a great deal of material which, however, is lacking strict critical examination. Hrabec rightly corrected certain errors which Brückner had put into scientific circulation, for example, about the existence of

a primordial Pol. *h*, and the lack of Ukrainianisms in Rej. He collected material of value to the history of many Polish words. Important for the history of the Ukrainian language is his treatment of the poets of the "Red-Ruthenian" school. They have significance as one of the sources not written in the traditional alphabet and orthography. Their works confirm the fact that at that time in the environs of Lvov *o* in the new closed syllables was pronounced like *u* and not as *i*;⁷⁸ that unaccented *e*, *y* were merged, that *a* after soft consonants had already changed into *e*, etc. I shall end this review of Hrabec's book with a brief analysis of one peculiarity, which is related to Ukrainian, in the language of the poets of this school which he cites but disregards.

Both Zimorowicz have the adjective *rosiejski* (96, 113) although there is only *rosijs'kyj* in Ukrainian now. Where does the *e* before *j* come from in this case? It is impossible to see the influence of the Russian pronunciation on the Zimorowicz of Lvov. Closer analysis shows, however, analogous spellings also in Ukrainian texts of the period, e.g.: *oleksandrejskyj* side by side with *oleksandrějskaja* (Krex., 507); *Florentejskom* (Ipatij Potij, *Pamjatniki polemičeskoj literatury*, 3, 991, cf. also 1035); *Aleksan^ъdrejskyj*, *An^ъtyoxejskyj*, *Neokəsarejskoho* (Ibid., 1079, 1089) — though — *Floren^ъcyja* (1111). The form *Florentskyj* is also used,⁷⁹ but not *florentijskyj*. Apparently this was an artificial pronunciation among the Ukrainian intelligentsia, which appeared partly under the influence of Ch.S. forms like *galilejskyi*, but mainly under the influence of spellings with *ě*, it subsequently being replaced by *e*. Thus, here one can see an artificial pronunciation arising under the influence of orthography — a phenomenon which is found not only in our time but also in the 16th century.⁸⁰

⁷⁸ But this does not mean that it was so everywhere and that there was not yet a pronunciation *i*. In a literary work one could deliberately select a more archaic, but at the same time more characteristic or more traditional, rendering of peasant speech.

⁷⁹ *Akty* . . . *Zap. Ros.*, 4, 84.

⁸⁰ I am indebted to D. Čiževsky, R. Jakobson and W. Weintraub for the interesting discussions of some points of this article in manuscript.