Polish-Latin Influences in Pre-Petrine East Slavonic: Some Observations

H. LEEMING

THE present article has two objects: to make a contribution to the general discussion of Polish influences in East Slavonic, and to present the results of personal research into the vocabulary of pre-Petrine Russian sources, with a note on the role of Ukrainian and Byelorussian as intermediaries in the transmission of Latin words via Polish to Russian.

I

The importance of the Polish channel for West-European and particularly Latin influences on the vocabulary of the East Slavonic languages during the 16th and 17th centuries is generally accepted. However, some Russian scholars show an understandable tendency to deny or minimise such influences. Some fail to recognise them; others seek to exclude 'international words' from the category of loanword.

As an example of the former type we may take V. Z. Zavitnevich, who published ninety years ago an account of one of the masterpieces of East Slavonic religious polemic, the *Palinode* of Zakhary Kopystensky.[1] Zavitnevich states that, while Church Slavonic appears in quotations from the scriptures, the dialectal bases for the language of the text are Byelorussian and Polish; the former with an admixture of Ukrainian elements, the latter liberally garnished with Latin words. This seems a fair-minded analysis. Yet, in a curious footnote, motivated one can only imagine by the desire to play down the role of Polish, the author tells us that an enormous number (масса) of Latin words in Kopystensky's text are left completely unchanged.

In view of its relevance to the topic Zavitnevich's footnote is given below.[2] It will be seen that among seventeen examples offered of un-

H. Leeming is Reader in Comparative Slavonic Philology at the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University of London. [This paper is to be presented to the VIIth International Congress of Slavists, Warsaw, August 1973.]

[1] V. Z. Zavitnevich, *Palinodiya Zakharii Kopystenskogo i yeyo mesto v istorii zapadno-russkoy polemiki XVI i XVII vv.*, Warsaw, 1883.

[2] 'Масса встречающихся здесь латинских слов в большинстве случаев оставлены без всякого изменения. Для образчика приведем несколько таких слов: вотум, квестионис, кардо, конфузе, капция, инноватор, профанатор, экскоммуникация, ексистимация, скрибент, скализация, павимент, митигация, сугилляция [?], полерация, цертовать, кенотомия, ексагерация', p. 322.

altered Latin words are included eight which have substituted a new suffix and inflection -ация for Latin -*atio*. If analysed, this substitution shows three changes: -*t*- has been assibilated to -*c*-; the nominative singular ending is now -*a*, as against Lat. -*o*; the borrowed word, which belonged to the Latin consonantal *n*-stem declension, has been adapted to the Slavonic soft *a*-stem. Zavitnevich, however, saw no change at all, otherwise he would have chosen some other examples to make his point. Павимент from Lat. *pavimentum* is presented as unchanged, and indeed the change is minimal, consisting only in the loss of the Latin inflection. This in itself, however, reflects a process of morphological adaptation which is not carried through in the case of вотум. The verb цертовать from Pol. *certować* retains unchanged only the root of Lat. *certare*. This example suggests that Zavitnevich was not concerned with the complete morphological analysis of his material, and that it would be rather unkind to attribute to him any wish to mislead.

At the present time similar tendencies may be seen in a recent dissertation by Yu. V. Tsimbalyuk, which is in many respects an excellent piece of work.[3] In this thorough analysis of structural types of Latin words in Ukrainian there may be observed a reluctance to give due weight to Polish influence. The Latin derivatives in the Ukrainian vocabulary are discussed as if they were directly borrowed, and morphological changes are interpreted as internal facts of Ukrainian grammar, although it would be difficult to find amongst the material many examples of words which do not agree in phonology and morphology with their counterparts in Polish.

According to Tsimbalyuk substitution of Ukr. -ація for Lat. -*atio* is primarily due to the fact that the ending of the Latin suffix, -*o*, was not characteristic of the Ukrainian language.[4] Polish mediation is mentioned only as a secondary cause. Furthermore, we are told, words with the Latin suffix -*entia* were adopted without change, for example аудієнція, секвенція.[5] In fact we here see a substitution of -*c*- for Latin -*t*-, the model for which was supplied by Polish, where the suffix is attested in the 16th century, e.g. *audijencyja*.[6]

Other writers are more tendentious and rather too eager to trim the embarrassingly profuse growth of Polonisms which characterises many 16th- and 17th-century East Slavonic texts. Sometimes they even deny the obvious facts of phonology. M. L. Khudash, in his dissertation on the vocabulary of Ukrainian official documents of the

---

[3] Yu. V. Tsymbalyuk, *Strukturnyye tipy latinskikh zaimstvovaniy v ukrainskom yazyke*, avtoreferat, L'viv, 1971.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 15.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 16.

[6] *Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku*, Wrocław–Warsaw–Cracow, 1966–, I, p. 229.

late 16th and early 17th centuries,[7] includes among Common Sla-
vonic elements of the Ukrainian lexicon хлопець, although this is a
clear case of metathesis of the Polish type, cf. Pol. *chłopiec* from C.S.
*chołp-, as against the East Slavonic treatment of medial liquid diph-
thongs, which would give холопець.[8] One would also query the
statement that мова 'speech' and замок 'castle' are inherited by
Ukrainian from Common Slavonic. The former is identical with
Pol. *mowa*, having -o- in place of the expected East Slavonic -ol- from
a Common Slavonic syllabic l. The latter, while showing the regular
East Slavonic development of **zamъkъ*, has semantic and prosodic
features, the immediate model for which is Pol. *zamek* 'castle'.

Such imprecision does not incline one to sympathise with his com-
plaint that certain scholars in the recent past have exaggerated
foreign and particularly Polish–Latin influences on the Old Ukrain-
ian or 'West-Russian' language, thereby denying the independent
development of these languages.[9] Statistics adduced by Khudash are
not wholly convincing. Out of 18,000 words in the sources he finds
3,000 of foreign origin. This is a much more significant proportion
than Khudash would have us believe, since borrowed words will not
be repeated as frequently as such components of the native vocabu-
lary as conjunctions, pronouns, modal words, and so on.

While Khudash admits the presence of many Polonisms in the
terminology of politics and human relations, in particular words
connected with behaviour and social attitudes, such as шидерство,
завдячне, легче поважити, he takes care to point out that 'all these
words and phrases were not characteristic of Ukrainian: they were
arbitrarily introduced into the language of Ukrainian official docu-
ments and even literary composition by literate people, especially the
writers of polemical works—but even in this sector of the vocabulary
the Ukrainian base remained'.[10]

A similar tendency to deny or play down Polish influences is seen
in the work of T. K. Molodid on the language of Kopystensky's
Palinode.[11] A clear Polonism, огень is interpreted as characteristic of
South-West Ukrainian dialects.[12] Surely the presence of such a form
in the dialects is due to Polish influence, just as Macedonian оган
must be ascribed to the influence of Serbo-Croat, even though this
may be based on the usage of some Macedonian dialects.

Admitting the presence of many words of Polish origin in the

---

[7] M. L. Khudash, *Leksika ukrainskikh delovykh dokumentov kontsa XVI–nachala XVII vv., (na
materialakh l'vovskogo stavropigial'nogo bratstva)*, avtoreferat, Kiev, 1961.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 5.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 14.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 9.
[11] T. K. Molodid, *Yazyk 'Palinodii' Z. Kopystenskogo*, avtoreferat, Kiev, 1963.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 5.

vocabulary of the 17th-century Ukrainian *prosta mova*, Molodid emphasises the phonological adaptation to Ukrainian of a great proportion of such words. He reaches the conclusion that the majority of the Polonisms in Kopystensky's *Palinode* are not met in Modern Ukrainian, since they never constituted a part of the common language of the Ukrainian people and were the consequence of the assimilatory policy of the Polish gentry.[13]

In answer to the points raised by these scholars the following observations may be made. Such concepts as 'arbitrary' or 'unnecessary' borrowing, based as they often are on personal judgment, if not outright prejudice, belong rather to the language of the stylist or the prescriptive grammarian and are out of place in historical lexicology. There is one objective criterion of loanword status, and that is adaptation of a foreign word to the phonology and morphology of the receiving language.

The term 'internationalism' may express a valid and useful concept in lexicology. Words which have won widespread or universal currency, especially in languages which are not genetically related, deserve a special label and classification. None the less, the application of this term in Russian to words of ultimate Latin or Greek origin calls for a word of comment.

V. V. Akulenko makes a fair assessment of the historical origins of such words in the Ukrainian language.[14] He sees the earliest stratum as Church Slavonic transmissions from Greek, and occasionally from Latin. The next stratum, which brings us up to the late 17th century, is composed of Polish transmissions from Latin, some of which had also passed through German and Czech; many of the words in this stratum were further transmitted by Ukrainian to Russian. Since the end of the 17th and the beginning of the 18th century the Russian language is the main source of 'internationalisms' in Ukrainian.

Akulenko's analysis is fair-minded and gives due weight to the importance of the earlier stages. However, there is a tendency in some quarters to use the term 'internationalism' as an adequate description of words based on Greek or Latin roots with no reference to the genesis, pedigree or model for such neologisms. This is of course partly due to the phonological inertia which characterises many scientific loanwords introduced by pedants and scholars. Yet a word which remains identical with its Latin original may have a version of an Italian work of geography, Giovanni Botero's *Relazioni*

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 14. For a definitive answer to such arguments, see W. Witkowski, 'Uwagi o ukraińskim języku literackim' in *Z polskich studiów slawistycznych*, Seria 3, Warsaw, 1968, p. 359.
[14] V. V. Akulenko, 'Pro istorychni dzherela leksychnykh internatsionalizmiv v ukrayins'kiy movi', in *Pytannya istorychnoho rozvytku ukrayins'koyi movy*, Kharkov, 1952, p. 109.

more immediate source. In the 17th-century Russian manuscript *universali*, we find a rare example of a Latin masculine noun retaining in Russian the nominative singular inflection -*us* as part of its new stem: полюсу антарктицкому 'to the Antarctic pole'.[15] The Russian word owed its form to an immediate source, that is to say a Polish version which retained unchanged in translation from Italian *polus antarcticus*, one of a number of scientific terms which appeared in Latin guise in Botero's original Italian text.[16]

No one would suggest that in the Yakut language the scientific terms конус 'cone', полюс 'pole', радиус 'radius' and кыраадыс 'degree'[17] are borrowed direct from Lat. *conus*, *polus*, *radius* and *gradus*, although only the last of these shows any change. As words of universal currency they belong to the category of 'internationalisms' in Yakut. They are borrowed, however, from Russian конус, полюс, радиус, градус and any treatment of them which omitted to state that fact would be incomplete. So it is also with many of the so-called интернационализмы of the Russian language, and this term must not be used to stifle discussion of immediate source, channel of transmission or morphological model.

II

The topic of Polish–Latin influences in pre-Petrine East Slavonic cannot be fully investigated until there are adequate historical dictionaries for Polish, Russian, Ukrainian and Byelorussian. In the absence of such dictionaries the individual must do his own lexicographical spade-work, using and adding to what has already been achieved by others. The ground covered will depend above all on access to unpublished manuscripts and books not available in Western libraries. Thanks to the kindness and willing assistance of the Manuscript departments of the Lenin Library, Moscow, the Jagiellonian Library, the Chapter Library and the Czartoryski Library, Cracow, I was able to consult many sources otherwise not available.

The sources from which the material was drawn were classified under six headings and an attempt was made to discover in which of these a given word first appeared: ambassadorial report, interrogation of prisoners of war, correspondence, library catalogue, translation, and finally, original writings of Russians. In the following sum-

---

[15] MS Rum. 2423 of the Lenin Library, Moscow, f. 268, recto.

[16] *Relatiae powszechne abo nowine pospolite Iana Botera*, Cracow, 1609, part I, p. 268. For bibliographical details of the Italian original see H. Leeming, 'Italian words in pre-Petrine sources' in *Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientale, Sezione Slava*, IX, Naples, 1966, p. 199.

[17] P. P. Barashkov, L. N. Kharitonov, *Kratkiy terminologicheskiy slovar' yakutskogo yazyka*, Yakutsk, 1955, pp. 121, 201, 218, 62.

mary account examples are given in a standardised spelling. Full
documentation will be given when the work is eventually published.

Much of the material found in ambassadorial reports[18] refers to
foreign dignitaries and the life and procedures of foreign courts.
Thus in the account of M. G. Saltykov-Morozov's embassy to Cra-
cow we find the titles бискуп 'bishop', канцлер 'chancellor', под-
канцлер 'vice-chancellor', секретарь 'secretary', каштелян 'cas-
tellan', with the derivative каштелянович, сенатор 'senator', мо-
нарх 'monarch'; коруна 'the Polish realm', with derived adjective
корунный. His report of the musical entertainment at a banquet is
the context for музыка 'music' and органы 'musical instruments,
pipes, organ'. Names of wines served are of Romance, ultimately
Latin origin: алкан 'alicante', малмазия 'malmsey', мушкатель
'muscatel'.

A minor but interesting context is the interrogation of prisoners of
war captured by the Muscovite forces.[19] Questions put to the prison-
ers concerned political developments and military dispositions in
Poland and the territories under Polish control. They also touched
on the religious practices of the captives.

A word which figures in the questions asked by the tribunals and
the prisoners' replies is the Western religious term 'sacrament'—
сакрамент. Prisoners were asked to declare their religion and the
number of times they allowed the Catholic clergy to minister the
sacrament to them. Most of the words appearing in this context are
of a military or administrative connotation, although унеят 'uniate',
another religious term associated with disloyalty to Muscovy,
appears in 1661. Military terms found here include foreign ranks:
драгун 'dragoon' (1635); генерал 'general', желдак 'soldier', with
adjective желдатский (1655); волентар 'volunteer', панцырник
'cuirassier' (1660); рементарь 'regimentary, deputy hetman'
(1661). Terms associated with the conduct of military operations are
стация 'provisions levied from the local population' (1648); армис-
тиция 'cease-fire', реймент 'command, control' (1660). Among
the documents collected in *AMG* one finds рота 'company' first used
in 1614 of Polish units, and later, in 1632, of a Russian formation. It
will be interesting to see if this chronology is upheld by other
sources. The names of new items of military equipment sometimes
appear first in this context. For example, гранат 'grenade' (1656) and
пинард 'petard' (1614) are both first used in despatches describing
captured stores. The earliest date found for the former in a Russian
context was 1662.

[18] In N. I. Novikov, *Drevnyaya rossiyskaya vivliofika*, Moscow, 1788–91.
[19] In *Akty moskovskogo gosudarstva, izdannyye pod redaktsiyeyu N. A. Popova*, St Petersburg,
1890–1901, hereafter called *AMG*, and *Russkaya istoricheskaya biblioteka*, St Petersburg,
1872–1914, hereafter called *RIB*, II, cols. 598–668.

There can be no doubt that many words were introduced into the Russian vocabulary in this way. However, the materials available are inadequate to form a true judgment of the importance of this channel of transmission. A factor to be borne in mind here is the possibility that not only Poles, but also Ukrainians and Byelorussians were among the prisoners interrogated.

Translations and transcriptions of official correspondence were regarded as a separate type of source, or context of transmission. An example of an early occurrence in such a context is the loanword прелат 'prelate' in the translation of a papal letter to the king of Poland, recorded in the 2nd Sophian Chronicle under the year 1438.[20] Occasionally loanwords are used by the clerks who filed the correspondence, for example маестат 'majesty' (1600), in the address of a letter to the king of Poland; календарь (1614), of the reformed Gregorian calendar used by the Poles to date their letters; легат 'legate', the writer of a letter to the False Dmitry. Other words appearing in letters of various kinds include: капелян 'chaplain' (1653), уния 'Uniate Church' (1652), костельный 'belonging to the church' (1656, in a petition from the Bernardine monks of Kovno to the tsar). However, in view of the lack of thematic cohesion it was difficult to decide whether anything was gained by the isolation of 'correspondence' as an independent context of transmission.

Library catalogues among the sources were few in number. The most interesting was the catalogue of the Moscow *Pechatny dvor*, or Printing House, ascribed by some scholars to the poet and pedagogue, Silvestr Medvedev.[21] The latest dated work in this catalogue is of the year 1666, and this is the probable year of its compilation. Here were noted, either in book titles or commentary the following words: диалог 'dialogue', лямент 'lament'; аллегорический and аллегоричный 'allegorical', аттестация 'attestation', комментария 'commentary'; диалект 'dialect', лексикон 'lexicon'; дедикован 'dedicated', типография 'printing-press'.

The richest sources surveyed were translations from Latin or Polish: the Cosmography of Kholmogory, 1670,[22] Szymon Starowolski's account of the Turkish Court, 1678,[23] Mikołaj Krzysztof Radziwiłł-Sierotka's record of his pilgrimage to the Holy Land[24] and a collection of humorous stories or Facetiae, translated from

---

[20] *Polnoye sobraniye russkikh letopisey*, St Petersburg, 1846–, VI, p. 167.

[21] 'Oglavleniye knig, kto ikh slozhil' in *Chteniya v imperatorskom obshchestve istorii i drevnostey rossiyskikh*, Moscow, 1846, bk. III.

[22] *Kniga glagolemaya kozmografiya*, Obshchestvo lyubiteley drevney pis'mennosti, nos. XXI, LVII, LXVIII, St Petersburg, 1878–81.

[23] 'Dvor tsesarya turetskogo, sochineniye Ksenza Simona Starovol'skogo' in *Pamyatniki drevney pis'mennosti i isskusstva*, hereafter called *PDP*, St Petersburg, XLII, 1883.

[24] *Pokhozhdeniye v zemlyu svyatuyu Knyazya Radivila Sirotki*, ed. P. A. Gil'tebrandt, St Petersburg, 1879.

Polish in the 17th century.[25] Manuscript translations consulted in the Lenin Library, Moscow, were of Cesare Baronius' *Annales Ecclesiasticae*, 1678,[26] of Giovanni Botero's *Relazioni universali*, 1681,[27] and various others. All these are translations of Polish versions, with the exception of the Cosmography, most of which is translated from the Latin of Gerard Mercator.

The Cosmography is particularly rich in scientific terminology. Most of the words from the vocabulary of religion, administration and military affairs are found elsewhere at an earlier date. But numerous innovations in the vocabulary of geography, cartography, botany, zoology, art and education are here met for the first time.

The following list gives some idea of the richness of this source: гемисфериум 'hemisphere', екватор 'equator', эквинокциал 'equinoctial line', кград 'degree', кубит 'cubit', леука 'league', полюс 'pole', тропик 'tropic'; беты 'beet', гебан 'ebony', мацис 'mace', нишпули 'medlars', пастернак 'parsnip', петрушка 'parsley', помаранчи 'oranges', терпентин 'turpentine', шпанят 'spinach'; бажант 'pheasant', делфин 'dolphin', тигр 'tiger'; пирамидский 'pyramidal', театр 'theatre'; академия 'academy', семинариум 'seminary'.

The adaptation of Botero's work is, if anything, even richer, particularly in scientific terms: карта 'map', торридский 'torrid', архипелаго 'archipelago'; каннибалы 'cannibals', пигмей 'pygmy'; ганиж 'aniseed', ляка 'lac', рожа бурнатная 'burnet rose'; армадило 'armadillo', бестия 'beast', геена 'hyena', грифалкон 'gerfalcon', онза 'ounce'; мумия 'mummy'; подагра 'gout'; галун 'alum', видриол 'vitriol', калцедан 'chalcedony', тиркус 'turquoise', перла 'pearl', перловая матица 'mother-of-pearl'; лабиринт 'labyrinth', обелишк 'obelisk', свинга 'sphinx'.

The translation of Piotr Skarga's Polish condensed version of Baronius' *Annales*[28] is primarily a source of terms associated with church and state, although words from other semantic categories are also met. Many of the religious terms had occurred in earlier texts, for example, каноник 'canon', кардинал 'cardinal', опат 'abbot', папеж 'pope'. Not so far found in earlier texts are: картуз 'Carthusian', кистерценский 'Cistercian', клунаценский 'Cluniac'; вигилия 'vigil', паллиуш 'pallium'; интердикт 'interdict', мозарабский 'Mozarabic'; мосхеа 'mosque', Romance transmission of an Arabic word; костел поганский 'heathen temple', modelled on Pol. *kościół pogański*. Most of the words from the vocabulary of govern-

---

[25] 'Fatsetsii ili zharty pol'skiye' in *PDP*, I, 1878–9, pp. 85–152.
[26] MS Rum. 16 of the Lenin Library, Moscow.
[27] See footnote 15.
[28] P. Skarga, *Roczne dzieje kościelne*, Cracow, 1609.

ment had already been introduced: канцлер 'chancellor', комисар 'commissioner', секретарь 'secretary', сенатор 'senator', тиран 'tyrant', корона 'crown' and титул 'title'. First noted in this source were консул 'consul in ancient Rome'; коронация 'coronation', короновать 'to crown'. Occasional terms from various semantic categories include комета 'comet', дактил 'date' (the fruit), рожинки 'raisins', компаз 'compass', гисторик 'historian', литера 'letter of the alphabet', библиотека 'library', библиотек 'librarian', таблица 'tablet', фигура 'figure'.

The translation of Starowolski's account of the Turkish court repeats numerous loanwords noted in other sources: библия 'bible', евнух 'eunuch', кавалер 'cavalier', кварта 'quart', фунт 'pound', миллион 'million', португал 'portague', фляшка 'flask', алхимия 'alchemy', конфект 'confection', пергамин 'parchment', материя 'material'. Words noted only in this source include маринар 'mariner', аптекарчик 'apothecary's assistant', паперня 'paper-mill'.

Radziwiłł's journal translated into Russian from the Polish of A. Wargocki's version is prolific in loanwords of all semantic classes. About 130 items were noted but of these only about ten were confined to this source, including квардиан 'Father Guardian' (a monastic rank), цминтар 'cemetery', бандит 'bandit', галеон 'galleon', лава 'lava', етезие 'etesian winds'.

Loanwords noted only in the translated *Facetiae* included фрашка 'joke', фацеция 'jest', окуляры 'spectacles', колнер 'collar', виридарь 'viridarium, cloister garth'. Words met elsewhere which also figure in these humorous stories are плебан 'vicar', барвер 'barber', каплун 'capon', подагра 'gout', вирш 'verse', поет 'poet'.

From the examples given it will be seen that, even when the translation was made from a Latin rather than a Polish version, the Polish language influenced the forms of the adapted words, many of which were already current not only in West Slavonic, but also in Ukrainian and Byelorussian.

A source which proved difficult to classify was Mikołaj Dylecki's *Idea gramatykii musikiyskoy*.[29] This was studied in a manuscript dedicated to Grigory Dmitriyevich Stroganov. The title page gives the date of the manuscript as 7187, that is 1679 AD, and describes the work as 'originally compiled in Vilnius but later translated into the Slavonic dialect by the author in the capital city of Moscow'. This places us in a quandary. Should one regard the work as a translation of a Polish version which, incidentally, has not come down to us, or as an independent creation resulting from the collaboration of the

[29] For bibliographical details see A. I. Sobolevsky, 'Perevodnaya literatura moskovskoy Rusi XIV–XVII vekov' in *Sbornik otdeleniya russkogo yazyka i slovesnosti*, LXXIV, no. 1, St Petersburg, 1903, pp. 123–4.

two men whose signatures appear at the end as 'Василе[й] Реза-нецъ Писецъ' and 'Mikolay Dilecki Творе[ц]'. On the whole, al-though Vasily, the scribe, may have assisted Dilecki with the finer points of Church Slavonic style, we should perhaps treat the source as a translation, rather than an original Muscovite work, noting however that this work was written and used for the practical pur-pose of training musicians, so that the context is one of active usage.

Dilecki's work introduces a complete vocabulary of 17th-century musical terms, and a number of literary terms are met in the dedica-tion to his patron. Most of this material constitutes a permanent contribution to the Russian vocabulary of music: инструмент 'musical instrument', корнет 'cornet', лира 'lyre', органиста 'organ-ist', пузан 'trombone', диспозиция 'disposition', инвенция 'inven-tion', каденция 'cadence', конкорданция 'concordance', контра-пункт 'counterpoint', концерт 'concert', транспозиция 'transposi-tion', фантазия 'fantasia', фуга 'fugue', алт 'alto', бас 'bass', дис-кант 'descant', тенор 'tenor', ноты 'music in notation', лига 'tie', линия 'line', павза 'pause', партитура 'score', пропорция 'propor-tion', такт 'beat', клявиш 'key', бемоль 'flat', диезис 'sharp', дуральный 'natural', кварта 'fourth', квинта 'fifth', октава 'octave', секста 'sixth', секунда 'second', септима 'seventh', терция 'third', мордент 'mordent', трель 'trill'.

The following original sources were surveyed: official documents and correspondence collected in *Akty moskovskogo gosudarstva*,[30] *Akty istoricheskiye*[31] and other compilations; the accounts of Russian pil-grims to the Holy Land;[32] various chronicles of Moscow, Pskov and Novgorod; the writings of Ivan Grozny,[33] Andrey Kurbsky,[34] Grigory Kotoshikhin,[35] Archpriest Avvakum[36] and others.

The correspondence of Grozny is notable for the use of foreign titles, sometimes with a derisory or ironical overtone, as for example администратор 'self-styled administrator of Livonia', in a letter to Jan Chodkiewicz; выцерент 'vice-regent' appears in a similar con-text. One or two of Grozny's terms of abuse are Latin derivatives of probable Polish transmission: лотр 'rogue', with adjectives лотров-ский or лоторский, фалшер 'forger', with adjective фалшерный.

Since some of Kurbsky's letters touch on literary and educational questions we find numerous loanwords in these categories: бакаляр

---

[30] See footnote 19.
[31] *Akty istoricheskiye*, Arkheograficheskaya komissiya, St Petersburg, 1841–72.
[32] In *Pravoslavnyy palestinskiy sbornik*, St Petersburg, 1881–1911.
[33] *Poslaniya Ivana Groznogo*, ed. D. S. Likhachev and Ya. S. Lur'ye, Moscow–Leningrad, 1951.
[34] In *RIB*, XXXI.
[35] G. Kotoshikhin, *O Rossii v tsarstvovaniye Alekseya Mikhaylovicha*, St Petersburg, 1859.
[36] *Zhitiye Protopopa Avvakuma im samim napisannoye i drugiye yego sochineniya*, ed. N. K. Gudzy, Moscow, 1934.

'tutor', екзордия 'exordium', елокуция 'elocution', орация 'ora-
tion', with the adjective ораторский 'oratorical', пронунцияция
'pronunciation', силогизм 'syllogism', софизматы 'sophisms', пре-
фация 'preface', сенс 'sense'. Loanwords of all semantic categories
were located in Kurbsky's *Istoriya o velikom knyaze moskovskom*:
бискуп 'bishop of the Western church', опат 'abbot', секта 'sect',
кляштор, 'monastery', регула 'monastic rule', церемония 'cere-
mony', коронация 'coronation', интерегнум 'interregnum', кава-
лер 'cavalier', сенат 'senate', декрет 'decree', привилий 'privilege',
жолнер 'soldier', ротмистр 'captain', кортуна 'type of cannon',
марципан 'marzipan', карты 'playing cards', доктор 'doctor,
teacher', порт 'port', кроника 'chronicle', фабула 'fable', трагедия
'tragedy', кухня 'kitchen', маньяк 'maniac', паразит 'parasite'.

The following loanwords were noted in Kotoshikhin's account of
Russia: предика 'sermon', кастелянус 'castellan', генерал-губерна-
тор 'governor-general', конфедератство 'conspiracy', потентат
'potentate', референдариус 'referendary', фактор 'factor', процесия
'procession', бандолер 'bandolier', драгун 'dragoon', натура
'nature', аптека 'apothecary's store', инбир 'ginger'.

Since Avvakum's intention is to avoid tricks of literary style and
write simple Russian, he is a witness to the complete assimilation of
such words as пистоль 'pistol' and башня 'tower'. On the other hand
we find loanwords sometimes used by him in a context of religious
controversy or disapproval of Western influences on society. Thus, in
the tradition of the chronicles, he uses the specific terms костел and
крыж with reference to the Western church and crucifix. From each
of these he coins a new term—костельник to denote a supporter of
Western influences in the Orthodox church, and крыжок a contemp-
tuous diminutive form, for a small crucifix carried in the pocket.
Attacking the ostentation and self-indulgence of the higher clergy he
mentions with disapproval кореты 'carriages', романея 'Romanée
wine', пиво с кордомоном 'beer with cardomum'.

III

The accompanying table analyses the material by meaning and
context of appearance. Against the semantic categories indicated in
the left-hand column are entered the relevant figures for original
writings (O), translations (T), correspondence (C), ambassadorial
reports (A), interrogation of prisoners (I), and library catalogues
(L). Under 'derived forms' are included words whose root has
already been counted as a loanword; 'secondary' refers to loanwords
which reappear with a secondary meaning.

The overall total is 502 loanwords, with 151 derived forms, giving

SEMANTIC CATEGORY	TYPE OF SOURCE						TOTAL
	O	T	C	A	I	L	
Religion							
loanwords	23	26	6	2	1	4	62
derived forms	8	8	1	—	1	1	19
secondary	4	2	1	—	—	—	7
State							
loanwords	31	13	6	12	7	1	70
derived forms	8	4	2	7	5	—	26
secondary	12	9	2	5	2	—	30
Military							
loanwords	36	3	2	2	10	—	53
derived forms	12	—	1	2	2	—	17
secondary	10	1	—	3	2	—	16
Commerce							
loanwords	52	12	—	4	—	—	68
derived forms	20	5	—	2	—	—	27
secondary	3	—	—	—	—	—	3
Education							
loanwords	4	5	—	1	—	—	10
derived forms	2	—	—	—	—	—	2
secondary	—	1	—	—	—	—	1
Science							
loanwords	14	62	—	—	1	2	79
derived forms	6	13	—	—	—	—	19
secondary	3	2	—	—	—	—	5
Music							
loanwords	7	61	—	—	—	—	68
derived forms	2	23	—	—	—	—	25
secondary	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
Art							
loanwords	14	14	—	2	—	1	31
derived forms	5	—	—	—	—	—	5
secondary	3	3	—	1	—	—	7
Literature							
loanwords	21	13	—	1	—	9	44
derived forms	5	—	—	—	—	—	5
secondary	—	1	—	—	—	—	1
Compliment/invective							
loanwords	14	2	—	1	—	—	17
derived forms	6	—	—	—	—	—	6
secondary	1	—	—	—	—	—	1

653 in all. Of these 72 appear in more than one semantic category, for example персона, which is first met in the sense of 'a royal personage', in later texts bears the meanings: 'person, a grammatical term', 'a portrait' and 'a statue'.

Earlier chronologies in Ukrainian or Byelorussian were established for about one third of the material. Examples from 14th-century Ruthenian legal documents are the following: бискуп, жак, каплан; костел, келих, коморник, персона, подкоморий, грош (all 1347), костельный, школа, 'synagogue', артикул, привилий, фальшивый, фунт (all 1388). 15th-century Ukrainian and Byelorussian sources have the following words which appear later in Russian:

каноник, плебан, прелат, корона, маестат, канцлер, кухмистр, подканцлерий, мистр, фалшер, галган 'galingale', розынка 'raisin', фига, цытвар 'zedoary, a spice', каляштор, кухня, пергамен, стация. The following examples are from the 16th century: депутат, каштелян, комисар, комисарский, секретарь, декрет, статут, календарь, коронный, титул; пушкарь, рота, ротмистр; корынт, материя, органиста, шарлат, грамматика, планета, порт, бестия, перла, таблица, фигура, дата, папер, типография, фундамент.

The material affords a number of examples of the Polish mode in the pronunciation of Greek and Latin derivatives, which provided the prosodic and phonetic norms for the 'internationalisms' of Modern Russian. Polish–Latin *e* replaced *i* of the Church Slavonic tradition when this was derived from Byzantine Greek η or οι: планета for планита from Greek πλανήτης. Suffixal stress in Greek derivatives in -ия gave way to root stress, as in астроно́мия for астроми́я;[37] this change was wholly beneficial, resulting in variety of stressed vowel in a most numerous category of learned words. Polish–Latin also provided a new model for nouns derived from Greek adjectives in -ική, музика, реторика and грамматика replacing the earlier мусикия, риторикия, граматикия. Here again, shift of stress from the suffix to the root syllable brought about vocalic variety in a less numerous but still important class of pedagogical terms.

The nominal suffix -ия for Lat. -*io* in abstract nouns was well represented in the material. The following were found: диспутация, елокуция, комисия, конвокация, конклюзия, конфедерация, коронация, орация, пронунциация, пропорция, процесия, пургация, религия, стация, транспозиция, уния.

Of particular interest is the adjectival suffix -альный. A number of these adjectives show the Russian suffix -ный attached to borrowed noun stems: мигдальный, коральный, сандальный, derivatives of мигдал, корал, сандал from Lat. *amygdalus* 'almond', *corallum* 'coral', *sandalum* 'sandal-wood'.

In most cases we see a combination of two adjectival morphemes, Latin -*al*- and Slavonic -'*n*-, the function of the latter being the morphological and syntactic adaptation of an established Latin adjective. Here генеральный and трибунальный were noted in the administrative vocabulary, but the type was particularly frequent in musical terminology: дуральный, каденциальный, пропорциональный, триумфальный, финальный, формальный, фундаментальный, хоральный. Adjectives denoting intervals attach this suffix to Latin ordinal stems: секундальный, терциальный, квартальный, квин-

---

[37] See L. A. Bulakhovsky, *Istoricheskiy kommentariy k russkomu literaturnomu yazyku*, Kiev, 1958, pp. 281–2.

тальный, секстальный, септимальный, октавальный. Dilecki also uses alternative forms in which the Latin stems are translated by their Russian equivalents: второльный, трояльный, четверальный, пятальный, шестальный, семальный, осмальный. These forms may be analysed in two ways, either as half-calques in which the root is translated while the borrowed adjectival suffix remains, or as neologisms employing a new adjectival suffix. An example of the spread of this suffix in the early eighteenth century is синодальный used by Feofan Prokopovich. A. G. Preobrazhensky comments that this is a strange formation. M. Vasmer[38] derives it from Latin *synodalis* or Polish *synodalny*. It is rather strange that this derivation did not occur to Preobrazhensky,[39] who was more concerned with the Polish derivation of R. синод suggested by N. Smirnov, which he rejected in favour of direct borrowing from Greek.

[38] M. Fasmer [Vasmer], *Etimologicheskiy slovar' russkogo yazyka*, Moscow, 1964–, III, p. 625.
[39] A. G. Preobrazhensky, *Etimologicheskiy slovar' russkogo yazyka*, Moscow, 1910–4, II, p. 288.