

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34069/AI/2022.56.08.3>

How to Cite:

Nechytailo, I., Kovaliuk, O., & Gorodyska, O. (2022). Eastern Romance borrowings in Ukrainian dialects (Indo-European retrospective). *Amazonia Investiga*, 11(56), 28-37. <https://doi.org/10.34069/AI/2022.56.08.3>

## Eastern Romance borrowings in Ukrainian dialects (Indo-European retrospective)

### Східнороманські запозичення в українських діалектах (індоєвропейська ретроспектива)

Received: August 20, 2022

Accepted: September 22, 2022

Written by:

**Iryna Nechytailo**<sup>7</sup><https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8595-5874>**Olha Kovaliuk**<sup>8</sup><https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4251-3432>**Olga Gorodyska**<sup>9</sup><https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2125-0618>

#### Abstract

The article deals with the original Eastern Romance vocabulary recorded in the dialects of the Ukrainian language and its proto-forms, as well as examines the formation of the semantics of Eastern Romance borrowings from the Proto-Indo-European period to the present. To achieve the goal, the author compiles a corpus of original Romance words presented in Ukrainian dialects, determines their Indo-European, Italic and Latin proto-forms, corrects those of them indicated in the etymological literature, and establishes regularities of semantic transformations of various thematic groups on the axis of Proto-Indo-European language – Proto-Italic – Latin – ancient and modern Eastern Romance languages and dialects – Ukrainian dialects. The study proves that the Proto-Indo-European origins of Eastern Romance dialectisms, which had the meanings “action” and “state”, as a result of natural changes in the semantic structure, acquired the meanings of objects of practical human activity and became the basis for naming the animal and plant world of the Carpathian region, tools and the results of the work of the ancient population of the West of Ukraine.

**Key words:** Eastern Romance borrowings, Ukrainian dialects, etymology, Proto-Indo-European stems, regularities of semantic development.

#### Анотація

У статті розглядається питома східнороманська лексика, зафіксована в діалектах української мови, та її давні праформи, досліджено формування семантики східних романізмів від праіндоєвропейської пори до сьогодення. Для досягнення поставленої мети складено корпус питомої романської лексики, представленої в українських діалектах, визначено їх індоєвропейські, італійські та латинські праформи, скориговано ті з них, що вказано в етимологічній літературі, встановлено закономірності семантичних перетворень романізмів різних тематичних груп на осі праіндоєвропейська мова – праіталійська мова – латинська мова – давні та сучасні східнороманські мови та діалекти – українські діалекти. Доведено, що праіндоєвропейські витоки східних романізмів, які мали значення “дія” та “стан”, в результаті закономірних змін семантичної структури набули значень об’єктів практичної діяльності людини і стали базою для найменування тваринного й рослинного світу Карпатського регіону, знарядь та результатів праці давнього населення Заходу України.

**Ключові слова:** східнороманські запозичення, українські діалекти, етимологія, праіндоєвропейські основи, закономірності семантичного розвитку.

<sup>7</sup> DSc in Linguistics, Professor, Professor of the Department of Slavic Studies of Kyiv National Linguistic University, Ukraine.

<sup>8</sup> PhD in Philology, Associate Professor of the Department of Philological and Natural Sciences of the Institute of International Cooperation and Education of the National Aviation University, Ukraine.

<sup>9</sup> Lecturer at Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University, Ukraine.



## Introduction

In the last few decades, Ukrainian etymological science has paid considerable attention to dialectological issues, successfully combining the conceptual apparatus of dialectology and the reconstruction of proto-lingual states. Due to this, numerous cases of lexical borrowings of the languages bordering on peripheral dialects of Ukraine fell into its circle of interests. Studies of ways and means of assimilation of Eastern Romance words by Ukrainian dialects stand out against this background. Scientific findings in this field have become diagnostically valuable in determining migration flows and contacts of Proto-Slavs and ancient Slavs, for the reconstruction of the Slavic proto-lingual area.

Specialists in Slavic studies and Eastern Romance studies conducted large-scale studies of the influence of the Romanian, Moldavian, and Aromanian languages on the formation of the vocabulary of Western and South-Western Ukrainian dialects. The analysis of borrowings was carried out in the general language context (Popescu, 2007; Nechytailo, 2011; Holovach, 2012, Cozmei, 2014; Burduja, 2020) or on the material of certain sayings (Verkhratsky, 1902; Lysenko, 1974; Karpenko, & Lukyaniuk, 1971–1979; Pradid, 2006; Huzar, & Zakrevska, 1997; Miroshnychenko, 2005; Huyvanyuk, 2005; Mohyla, & Kondratenko, 2022), as well as focused on separate thematic groups of borrowings (Lobiuc, 1971; Vişovan, 2001; Kozhukhar, 2014; Kovaliuk, 2017).

Etymologists consider the main practical tasks in the field of Romance loanwords in the Ukrainian language to be an in-depth search for the origins of Romanisms, their etymological analysis, a comprehensive study of ways of adapting loanwords in all possible aspects, establishing the regularities of their semantic transformations on the axis of *Proto-Indo-European language – Proto-Italic language – Latin – modern Eastern Romance languages and dialects – Ukrainian dialects*.

## The subject of the paper

The object of the research is the original Eastern Romance vocabulary recorded in the dialects of the Ukrainian language and its proto-forms.

## The aim of the article

The purpose of the article is to study the formation of the semantics of Eastern Romanisms from Proto-Indo-European times to

the present. To achieve the goal, the author plans to compile a corpus of specific Romance vocabulary presented in Ukrainian dialects, to determine their Indo-European, Italian and Latin proto-forms, if necessary correcting those of them that are presented in the etymological literature, as well as to establish the types of semantic transformations of Romanisms on the axis of *Proto-Indo-European language – Proto-Italic language – Latin language – ancient and modern Eastern Romance languages and dialects – Ukrainian dialects*.

## Research background

The multifaceted problem of the interaction of Ukrainian and Eastern Romance languages, lexical borrowings, their chronology and protolingual sources, as well as semantic and formal transformations of protostems remain relevant even in our time. Until the beginning of the 21st century, Ukrainian dialectological romance philology accumulated a significant amount of specific material in the context of etymological research, which increasingly requires deepening of etymological research.

Researchers of Eastern Romance loanwords did not always manage to cross the “Latin border” of reconstruction. In his works on this issue, E. Vrabie in particular based on the etymological dictionaries of the Ukrainian language, made a convincing attempt to subject the Romanian and Moldavian elements inherent in the Ukrainian language to a deeper interpretation (Vrabie, 1991; Rudnyc'kyj, 1962–1982). Here, as well as in (Vrabie, 1967), a large dialect layer of words is reconstructed in compliance with the diachronic depth of the basic vocabulary and fixed mainly in Latin as the source language.

A considerable number of Romanian and Moldavian loanwords are collected in the Etymological Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language: here the ways of their penetration into Ukrainian dialects are explained, the intermediary languages are indicated, and the Latin source of each of the registered words is highlighted (Melnychuk, 1982–2012; Lukinova, 2013).

The etymology of both entire lexical-semantic microsystems and individual dialectisms attracts the attention of researchers. While studying the oronyms of the Ukrainian Carpathians, Yu. O. Karpenko was able to distinguish in this lexical array both the Proto-Slavic layer and the

Romance contribution to the onymy of the western region (Karpenko, 1999). Versions about the Romanian borrowing of the dialectal words *къча, жбир, грун, грехит, глижа, клечец*, etc. he refutes it by appealing not only to Proto-Slavic and Latin, but also to Proto-Indo-European stems.

The level of etymological research of N. I. Pashkova is deepening more often. The extensive dialectological, lexicographic, and etymological material of the comparative-historical study of the dialect element *кошапа*, the involvement of Indo-European proto-forms allowed her to shed light on the origins of this Carpathianism (Pashkova, 2020).

Etymological dictionaries of the Romanian language significantly enrich our understanding of the history of the emergence of Romanisms. The Etymological Dictionary of the Romanian Language (Ciorănescu, 2001), contains serious substantiations of Latin words as the source of most of the Eastern Romance lexicon and a large list of Slavisms. The more ancient origins of Romanianisms in the Ukrainian language can be revealed by turning to the Etymological Dictionary of the Romanian Language by M. Vinereanu (Vinereanu, 2008), because the author recognizes Indo-European antiquity as the oldest level of origin of words.

To specify the successive semantic changes of Indo-European proto-forms, it is worth referring to M. de Vaan's Etymological Dictionary of the Latin Language: by comparing Romance lexemes, the researcher recreates the Proto-Italic etymon as a significant stage of development from the Proto-Indo-European base to modern languages (Vaan, 2008). This explanatory impulse is a strong point of the proposed reconstruction.

At the time, the need for deepening reconstructions of the Romanian-Moldavian stratum, etymologizing it to the Indo-European and even Proto-Indo-European level is felt more and more.

### Methodology

The analysis of the lexical microsystem of Eastern Romance dialectisms was carried out using a complex methodology, which ensured the identification of diachronic and synchronic characteristics essential for their retrospective study. The diachronic approach involved the analysis of the semantic history of proto-lingual stems and made it possible to trace the

regularities of their evolution. The main method of research is *comparative-historical*, with the help of which the meaning dynamics of protostems are traced and the regularities of the semantic formation of Romanisms are established on the axis of *Proto-Indo-European language – Proto-Italic language – Latin language – modern Eastern Romance languages and dialects – Ukrainian dialects*. Collection of factual material from dictionaries was conducted by the continuous sampling method.

*The method of semantic parallels* contributed to revealing the regularity of semantic transformations of Indo-European proto-stems in the formation of dialectisms of Eastern Romance origin.

### Results and Discussion

The diachronic study of Romanisms in the composition of Ukrainian dialects aims to reconstruct their morphological and semantic state not only in the Latin, but also in the Proto-Italic and Proto-Indo-European periods. At this point, the research is faced with the problem of the peculiarities of the semantics of proto-stems. Proto-forms are presented as nouns or as verb stems in etymological dictionaries. Those the proto-stems with process-event semantics can be considered earlier, because in the human mind, the system of verbal meanings qualifies as a decisive factor in the formation of the linguistic picture of the world. Through action, a person enters an active relationship with reality, because action is a coordination centre that regulates the relationship between a person and the world (Kubryakova, 1992), so the verb shows the greatest semantic-derivative ability.

The next stage of the existence of the proto-form is the formation of verb nouns, the meanings of which are motivated by the specifics of the semantics of the verb.

Tracing the directions of the semantic derivation of Romanisms from the Indo-European proto-language to our time will be carried out according to thematic groups.

Let us consider the Eastern Romance borrowings, which reflect the eternal occupation of Ukrainians in the Western and south-western regions – animal husbandry. These are primarily **zoonyms**.

The Western Ukrainian dialectal *барза* “black sheep with white breast” or “white goat”, borrowed from the Romanian language (*barză*

“black stork with white wings and white breast”), shows extreme antiquity and is characterized by a certain opacity of etymology. A. Ciorănescu considers it to be derived from Latin *\*gardea, ardea* “black heron” with primary \*b-, M. Vinereanu prefers Albanian origin (*barth* “white”). It is possible that its Italic root is *\*boþjo-*, derived from Proto-Indo-European *\*bherāgos / bherāgā* with the semantics “shine, light, white color” and, more deeply, *\*bherēg-* “white, to shine” (Melnychuk, 1982, I, p. 142; Trubachev, 1974, I, p. 202; Ciorănescu, 2001, p. 704; Vinereanu, 2008, p. 118; Pokorny, 1959, 2, p. 166; Vaan, 2008, p. 67–68). The proto-lingual meaning “action”, “state” here changed to “colour” and created the zoonym in the Romanian language based on the colour of the animal. There was a transition of the content on the basis of Ukrainian dialect: ornithonym – zoonym.

The names of sheeps by the color recorded in the Carpathians *omiua*, as well as *вотіша, вотішер* are explained as the result of borrowing from the Moldavian or Romanian languages: *oacheș(ă)* and dialect variants *uótișă, oat'eșă, oakishî* “sheep with black near the eyes” are derived from Romanian *oachiu* “eye” and earlier from Latin *oculus*. We find their origins in the Proto-Italic *\*ok(e)lo-*, Proto-Indo-European root *\*okw-* “to see”. The basis of the nomination of sheep of this breed is a bright sign – black colour around the eyes (Melnychuk, 2003, 4, p. 233, Pokorny, I, p. 4; Vinereanu, p. 591; Vaan, p. 425).

The Hutsul dialectism *буча* “black goat with a white face”, *буче* “the name of a sheep”, as well as *бучка* “a black sheep with a white face”, *бучко* “the name of a ram” underwent significant semantic changes, because in the Romanian language, where it came from, *bucă* means “cheek”, as in Latin *bucca* “swollen, filled cheek”, a continuation of Proto-Italic *\*bukka-*. The Indo-European proto-root of this name can be considered *\*b<sup>h</sup>ew-* “to swell” (Melnychuk, 1982, I, p. 313; Pokorny, 2, p. 114; Vinereanu, p. 160; Vaan, p. 76). The verb meaning of the original proto-form was transformed into the name of a body part. It is noted that the zoonym is based on a distinctive feature of the animal’s appearance.

The nickname of the cow *Мургуза*, a modified loanword from the Moldavian language (Moldavian *мургуце* or Romanian *murgúță* “also”), is a diminutive form of *мурзэ (murgă)* “roan” from the Latin *merus* “pure, unmixed; clear, clean”, derived from the Proto-Italic base *\*mero-*. Its original Proto-Indo-European form is

considered to be *\*mau-ro-* “weak, dark” – from *mer-, merk-, mer(e)k-, mer(e)gh-* “to twinkle, to shine” (Melnychuk, 1989, 3, p. 391–392; Pokorny, 2, p. 223; Vinereanu, p. 557; Vaan, p. 376). Here we also trace the development of semantics in the direction: *action – sign by action – zoonym*.

According to the same principle, the Hutsul dialectism *корнута* “horned sheep” and Bukovinian *корнуца* “sheep with straight horns”, and *курнута* “sheep with small horns”, which come from the Romanian *cornúță* “horned” and, further, from the Latin *cornūta* “also”, related to the noun *cornū* “horn”. The name was also based on an external feature – the presence of horns, with specification in Ukrainian dialects. Latin *cornūta, cornū* reflect Proto-Italic *\*komu-, \*komo-* “horn” and Indo-European proto-form *\*k<sup>er</sup>-, \*k<sup>er</sup>a- : \*k<sup>r</sup>ā-, \*k<sup>er</sup>ei-, \*k<sup>er</sup>eu-* “horn” (from *\*(s)ker-4, (s)kerā-, (s)krē-* “to cut off”) (Melnychuk, 1989, 3, p. 32; Pokorny, 1, p. 403; Vaan, p. 136–137).

The dialectism *курма* “squat-tailed shepherd” is also borrowed from the Romanian language, but in Romanian *Curtu* is the name of a tailless dog, from Latin *curtus* “short”, from Proto-Italic *\*kortos* and, further, from Proto-Indo-European *\*(s)kr<sup>1</sup> tós* “short” from *\*(s)ker-* “to cut” (Melnychuk, 1989, 3, p. 158; Vaan, p. 157–158).

Fertility, as one of the most important abilities of domestic animals, can also be the basis for the name. The noun *умуця* “barren sheep” from Romanian *știră* “barren” (about animals), less often “barren” (about women), which may have been inherited from the Latin language (*sterilis* “barren”), is especially revealing here. Its hypothetical Proto-Italic form *\*ster-eli-, \*ster-f-*, Proto-Indo-European – *\*ster-* “hard, frozen” (Melnychuk, 2012, 6, p. 477, Pokorny, 2, p. 627; Vinereanu, p. 813; Vaan, p. 586). The original name underwent a semantic narrowing in Ukrainian.

The issue of the origin of the south-western dialectism *куцилей* “little dog”, borrowed from Moldavian language (*кэцел* “puppy; baby carnivore” from Latin *catellus* “puppy, dog” and from *catulus* “small animal (mainly kitten, puppy)”), is limited only by Proto-Italic *\*kat-elo* “also” with the assumption of motivation *\*katlo-* “sacrificial animal” (Melnychuk, 3, p. 166; Vaan, 2008, p. 98). For them, A. Walde also proposed a common verb-noun Proto-Indo-European root *\*kat-* “to give birth to young”, “baby animal” (Walde, 1906, 1, p. 183). Thus, the deverbative Latin name retained its meaning

in the Romanian and Moldavian languages and underwent semantic modification in Ukrainian.

The verbal method of formation is also demonstrated by the names of groups of animals. For example, Boyki dialect word *турма* “flock, pack; band, crowd, herd” is a formation with a generalization of the meaning from the Romanian *turmă* “flock”, which comes from the Latin *turma* “squadron; crowd”. Roots are set for it: Pre-Latin *\*torba*, then Proto-Italic *\*trf-ā* and, ultimately, Proto-Indo-European *\*(s)trbh-* “confusion (disorderly movement, commotion)” and the verb proto-stem *\*tuer-*, *\*tur-* “to move quickly, spin” (Melnychuk, 2006, 5, p. 682; Pokorny, 1, p. 749; Vinereanu, p. 853; Vaan, p. 634).

A limited number of zoonyms have a noun origin. Let us turn to the zoonyms of the Eastern Romance source for the designation of cubs. For example, the name *laituk* “young goat” in Western dialects was derived from the modified Moldavian *vetui* “goat (one-year-old)” or Romanian *vătuî*, *vătuie* “young buck; one-year-old goat until lambing”. Its source is defined as Latin *vitulus* “calf; young animal”, derived from Proto-Italic *\*wet-elo-* “year-old calf”, Indo-European proto-form *\*uēt-* “year”. (Melnychuk, 1982, 1, p. 366; 3, p. 185; Pokorny, 1, p. 251; Vaan, p. 687).

Age is defined here as the basis for naming in the Pre-Italic period. In the Romanian and Moldavian languages, we observe a shift of meaning to another kind of animal.

Let us turn to dialect ornithonyms, such as, for example, Western Ukrainian *nikip* “field lark, *Alauda arvensis* L.” and Boyki *нікєр* “wagtail”, also derived from the Romanian dialect *pichere* “guinea fowl, *Numida meleagris*”. These names are formed from the Romanian onomatopoeic *píchiri* (Melnychuk, 2003, 4, p. 402), motivated by the onomatopoeia of *pik*. It can be assumed that they are reflexes of onomatopoeia: Proto-Italic *\*piko-*, *\*peikā-* and Proto-Indo-European *(s)pīko-* (Vinereanu, p. 633–634; Vaan, p. 464; Pokorny, 2, p. 81).

Another name of the skylark, noted in the West of Ukraine, *туртулії*, as well as *тутулії* “crested lark, *Galerida cristata* L.”, is derived from the Romanian ornithonym *turtureá* “turtledove, *Streptopelia turtur* L.”, *tuturél* “also (male)”. They are inherited from the Latin language: *turturilla* (*turturella*) are derived from *turtur* “turtledove” with an onomatopoeic stem (Melnychuk, 2006, 5, p. 684). According to the

specification of M. de Vaan, this form goes back to Proto-Italic *\*torzdo-*. Proto-Indo-European *\*(s)treig-*, *st Reid(h)-*, defined by Yu. Pokorny as “to hiss” (Vaan, p. 634–635; Pokorny, 2, p. 651), or *\*ret(e)r-* “to croak”, *\*tu*, *\*tutu* “to imitate birds or some dull sounds” (Vinereanu, p. 855).

**Phytonyms** are found among East Romance dialect borrowings, for example, *куреки* “head cabbage, *Brassica oleracea* L.”. The name comes from Moldavian (*курець* “cabbage”) or Romanian (*curéchi* “also”) languages. They go back to the Latin names *coliculus* (*cauliculus*) “stem, shoot, sprout” – diminutives of *caulis* “stem (mainly cabbage), cob”. At the Proto-Italic level, they correspond to *\*kauli-* “stem”, at Proto-Indo-European – *\*(s)keh<sub>2</sub>u-l-i* “plant root, trunk”, motivated by *\*(s)ker-4*, *(s)kerā-*, *(s)krē-* “to cut off” (Melnychuk, 3, p. 153; Vaan, p. 100; Pokorny, 1, p. 422, 2, p. 573). Etymologically related to them is the phytonym *курнум* “thorny weed” (from Moldavian *курнуц* “needweed, *Xanthium* L.”, Romanian *cornút* “field hornwort, *Cerastium arvense* L.”, because they come from the same Proto-Indo-European root (Melnychuk, 3, p. 156; Pokorny, 1, p. 403). In the development of the semantics of the Indo-European proto-form, we trace the stages: *action – root, trunk of a plant – plant – cabbage – (Ukrainian) a type of cabbage*.

The agricultural work of the ancestors of South-Western Ukrainians is reflected in the name *люга* “heap of reed sheaves” borrowed from the Moldavian language. Moldavian *лугэ*, as well as Romanian *glúgă*, “hood; shock” comes from the Latin *cuculla* “hood” and, according to etymologists, is a loan word from the Illyrian or Gaulish language. It is considered a reduplication of the Proto-Indo-European stem *(s)keu<sub>2</sub>ə* : *(s)kū-* “to cover, roll up, bend”, which on the Romance base was transformed into a name due to the similarity of the form (*to cover – covering – headdress – cone-shaped pile*) (Melnychuk, 1, p. 531; Pokorny, 2, p. 546; Vinereanu, p. 398–399).

Most of the Romanian and Moldavian borrowings relate to *animal husbandry and its products*. A direct borrowing from Romanian is *шкaм* “first-class wool”. Romanian *scámă* “wool or cotton thread, fibre, carp” continues Latin *squama* “scale”, motivated by Proto-Indo-European *\*(s)kewH-* “to cover” (Melnychuk, 4, p. 426; Vaan, p. 583–584; Pokorny, 2, p. 546). Therefore, the development of this Romanianism can be represented by a scheme: *surface action – coating (scale) – wool, fiber – first-class wool*. A similar way of formation is demonstrated by the

name of the lamb's wool of the autumn shearing *myuupa* (from Romanian *tușiră, tușină* “wool from shorn sheep”), which continues Folk-Latin *\*tonsionare* and Latin *tondere* “to cut”, Proto-Italic *\*tond-eje* and Proto-Indo-European *\*tond-eie* “to cut” (Melnychuk, 2006, 5, p. 689; Vaan, p. 622).

Let us try to trace the development of the Hutsul word *лял* “part of the stomach of a ruminant animal, used for fermenting milk”, as well as its variants *ляк, ллі, ляга, ляги, лел, кляк* “also”, borrowed from the Romanian language, where *chiag*, Aromanian, Megleno-Romanian *chiag* are derived from Latin *coāgulum* “leaven, enzyme, sourdough”. In turn, *coāgulum* comes from *cogo* “connect, thicken, condense” < *co-āgo*, where *āgo* “bring, lead” continues Proto-Italic *\*ag- e/o-* “to do, to act” and Proto-Indo-European *\*ag-* “to lead” (Melnychuk, 1982, 1, p. 531; Vaan, p. 30–31; Pokorny, 1, p. 35).

We will also find out the semantic dynamics of proto-forms for **instrumental names**. For example, the south-western lexeme *рашка* “part of a spinning wheel, a frame with teeth in which the spool is turned and through which the spun thread is wound onto the spool”, is related to Romanian *rășchiá* “to wind on a reel”, *rășchitór* “reel” and Folk Latin *\*rasclare* “to scrape”. We consider its proto-form to be Proto-Indo-European *\*rēd-2: rōd-: rəd-* “to scratch” (Melnychuk, 2006, 5, p. 35; Pokorny, 2, p. 369). The instrumental name is motivated by the verbal designation of the action that the device should perform when spinning.

The south-western dialectism *фурка* “a pitchfork with three horns” (from the Romanian *furcă* “a pitchfork”, derived from the Latin *furca* “a two-pronged pitchfork, a pitchfork” does not have a reliable etymology until now. M. de Vaan suggests that the proto-form *\*ghorka* > *\*fo/urca* entered Latin from one of the substratum dialects. Then, according to J. Pokorny, the Proto-Indo-European form *\*ghrebh-1, \*gherbh-* “to grab, to seize”, *\*g'hei-* “to catch, to take” became the origin of this Romanian name (Melnychuk, 2012, 6, p. 140; Vaan, p. 251–252; Pokorny, 1, p. 652; Vinereanu, p. 371). Romanianism acquired a concrete meaning in the Ukrainian dialect.

Among the dialectisms there are the names of **household items**, it is worth referring to the Bukovinian *дзестра, дзестри* “dowry”, *зестра, зестре, зестри, зястра* “also”, borrowed from Romanian (*zestre* “dowry”) or Moldavian (*зестре* “also; property”) languages.

They are united by the Latin *dextrae* “gift; solemn promise”, which comes from *dextra* “right hand”. The specified lexemes reflect the Proto-Italic *\*dextero-*; *\*deks(i)wo-*, Proto-Indo-European *\*deks-tero-* “right; to the right”, *\*deks-(i)uo-* “that which is right” and finally *\*dek-* “to take” (Melnychuk, 1985, 2, p. 58; Vaan, p. 168; Pokorny, 1, p. 782).

Let us trace the origin of the **names of clothes** inherent in the dialects that bordered on the Eastern Romance languages. Regarding the Hutsul name *немек* (as well as *немак, немок*) “a type of half-captan”, there is an opinion that they are borrowed from the Romanian or Moldavian languages, where *pétec* “patch, piece, rag” is derived from the Middle Latin *pettadium* “a piece of cloth”, which in Latin means “piece of parchment or cloth”. Although there are no deeper studies of *pettadium*, we assume its origin from Proto-Italic *\*pet-e/o-*, which continues Proto-Indo-European *\*pt-(e)i-* “to fly” (by analogy with the formation of Ukrainian *латка* from Proto-Slavic *\*lata* “patch”, *\*latati* “to fly, to scatter, to dangle” (Melnychuk, 2003, 4, p. 361; Trubachev, 1987, 14, p. 47–48; Vaan, p. 463–464; Pokorny, 1, p. 19).

**Landscape names** are essential for farming.

The landscape name *арушця* “steep mountain, sunny side of the mountain” is defined as borrowing from Eastern Romance languages: Moldavian *арушцэ* “heat”, Romanian *ârșița* “also; pasture on a hill, in a forest on the sunny side” come from the Folk-Latin *\*apcicia* “burning” (Latin *ardeo* “burning”, *apci* “I burned”). Its origins can be seen in Proto-Italic *\*ās-ē* “to be dry”, Proto-Indo-European *\*h<sub>2</sub>eh-* “also”, *ai-dh-*, *i-dh-*, *i-n-dh-* “to burn” (Melnychuk, 1982, 1, p. 91; Vaan, p. 53; Pokorny, 2, p. 5). The modern meaning has gone through the stages of formation from the name of an action, a state, a sign, and a place with this sign.

The etymology of the dialectal *грунь* “hill”, *грунь* “top, mountain ridge”, *грунь* “also” and (old) *грунь* (XIV–XV centuries) as a loanwords from the Romanian language (*grúiu* “hill, top of a hill”) needs clarification. In our opinion, *grúiu* continues Latin *grumus* “heap of earth, hill”, Proto-Italic *\*gromo-* “heap”, which became the deverbative of Proto-Indo-European *\*ger-* “to wrap” (Melnychuk, 1982, 1, p. 606; Vaan, p. 273; Pokorny, 1, p. 593).

A group of Romanic borrowings (the names of water bodies) attracts attention. Ukrainian

dialectal *balma* “liquid swamp, swamp” comes from Romanian *băltă* or Moldavian *bălmă*. These names are sometimes compared with Latin *blatea* “dirt” and are considered to be a Thracian-Illyrian borrowing derived from the Indo-European proto-form *\*bhol(ə)to-m / \*bhol(ə)ta*, derived from the colour-signifying *\*bhā-l-* “bright, white” (Melnychuk, 1982, 1, p. 128; Trubachev, 1975, 2, p. 179–182; Vinereanu, p. 113). Yu. Pokorny attributed this proto-form to the Indo-European root *\*bhā-l-, \*bhō-, \*bhə-* “to shine” (Pokorny, 2, p. 122).

The word *лак* “lake with swampy shores” also found its way into Ukrainian dialects from the Moldavian (*лак*) or Romanian (*lac*) languages, the origins of which can be seen in Latin (*lacus* “lake, pond; bath, tub, pit”) and, more deeply, in Poto-Italic (*\*laku-*) and Proto-Indo-European (*lok-u* “lake”). For *lacus*, *\*laku-* Yu. Pokorny advocates the Indo-European proto-form *\*laku-* with the procedural meaning “accumulation of water in a pit, pool, lake” (Melnychuk, 1989, 3, p. 186; Vaan 336; Pokorny, 2, p. 380; Vinereanu, p. 475).

The dialectal *чара*, in addition to meaning “crowd”, is defined as “foreign party”. It came from the Romanian language: *țară* “country, region”, “commoners, peasants”) and comes from the Latin *terra* “earth”. The study of the deeper origins of this name allows us to name its Proto-Italic form *\*tersa-* “land”, *\*terso-* “land, region” and Proto-Indo-European *ter-s-* “to dry, to wither” (hence, “dry area, dry land”) (Melnychuk, 2012, 6, p. 228; Vaan, p. 616–617; Pokorny, 1, p. 737; Vinereanu, p. 856).

**Socionyms and professionalisms** make up an important group of names that identify a person’s role in society. For example, *флут, флутур*, which in Western dialects mean “swindler, scoundrel”, represent a semantically modified borrowing from Romanian language: *fluture* “butterfly” comes from Latin *flūtulus*, possibly related to *flūto* “to flow, float”. Its origins can be seen in the Proto-Italic root *\*flow-e/o-* and Proto-Indo-European *\*bhleuH-(e/o-), \*bhleu-* “to flow; to blow” (Melnychuk, 2012, 6, p. 112; Vaan, p. 228; Vinereanu, p. 362; Pokorny, 2, p. 213).

We agree that the dialectal *журат* “judge” comes from Romanian, where *jurát* means “one who has sworn; implacable; juror” and is related to *jurá* “to swear”. Experts see its origins in Latin *jūro* “I swear”, as well as in Proto-Italic

*\*jowos, \*jowes-* “oath, law”, Proto-Indo-European *\*h<sub>2</sub>oi-u-* “life force, eternity” or *\*j<sub>1</sub>eu os-* “norm, right” (from *\*j<sub>1</sub>eu-* “to join”) (Vaan, p. 316–317; Pokorny, 1, p. 203; Vinereanu, p. 472). The ancient ritual of swearing consisted in touching the object with which one swore (Melnychuk, 1985, 2, p. 210).

## Conclusions

As a result of the study of Eastern Romance loanwords in the dialects of Western Ukraine, Ukrainian dialectology and etymology faced the task of establishing the Indo-European origins of Romanian and Moldavian words learned in the Ukrainian language.

In the south-western dialectal area of Ukraine (Hutsul, Bukovyna, Boyki, Lemki dialects), these borrowings (285 units) are differentiated by thematic groups: names of animals, birds, plants, products and work tools, household items, landscape names and definitions of human social roles.

Each group in diachrony shows specific semantic and word-forming features. Thus, the names of animals were formed from Proto-Indo-European names of actions or states, which were transformed into the names of the performer of the specified action or the bearer of a certain characteristic. In the Latin period, definitions were formed, which in Romanian and Moldavian languages ended as a noun – the name of an animal based on a special external feature. On the Ukrainian basis, such Romanisms undergo a narrowing of meaning.

Proto-lingual onomatopoeia cause the formation of bird names, which in Ukrainian dialects undergo a shift in meanings. The origin of phytonyms is based on Proto-Indo-European names of forms of plants (stem, root, horn, pile, etc.), which were also mostly formed in Latin and are de-verbatives in Indo-European retrospective.

The basis of the formation of the vocabulary of animal husbandry products, as well as the names of tools and household items, are the actions performed during their production (*cutting, thickening, scraping, catching, taking, covering*, etc.). Landscape names developed on the base of the verbal meanings of the original Indo-European proto-stems and went through a long path of transformation: “action” (“state”) – “sign (form)” – “name of the area”.

Thus, Romance borrowings in Ukrainian dialects developed from Indo-European proto-stems with the semantics of action, and finally acquired substantive meanings in the Proto-Italic and Latin eras. Romanian and Moldavian lexemes inherited Latin meanings with certain modifications, and in dialects of the Ukrainian language their adaptation took place in the direction of semantic concretization.

Knowledge of the regularities of the semantic development of loanwords on the axis *Proto-Indo-European language – Proto-Italic language – Latin language – Eastern Romance languages – Ukrainian dialectisms* can help in the reconstruction of Romanisms in other Slavic languages, as well as in reproducing the picture of Romance-Slavic language contacts in the Carpathian region.

### Bibliographic references

- Burduja, V. N. (2020). The influence of the Romanian language on the lexicon of the Ukrainian language [Influența limbii române asupra lexicului limbii ucrainene]. IASI [Iași]. [in Romanian] URL: [http://mail.lit.uaic.ro/scoala\\_doctorala/DOCUMENTE/CV%20drd%2020/Rezumatul%20N%20Burduja.pdf](http://mail.lit.uaic.ro/scoala_doctorala/DOCUMENTE/CV%20drd%2020/Rezumatul%20N%20Burduja.pdf).
- Ciorănescu, A. (2001). The etymological dictionary of the Romanian language [Dicționarul etimologic al limbii române]. Saeculum I. O. Publishing House, Bucharest [Editura Saeculum I. O., București]. [in Romanian]
- Cozmei, A. (2014). Romanian-Ukrainian linguistic interference (doctoral thesis) [Interferențe lingvistice româno-ucrainene, (teză de doctorat)], Suceava, “Stephen the Great” University from Suceava [Suceava, Universitatea “Ștefan cel Mare” din Suceava]. [In Romanian]. URL: [http://exlibris.usv.ro:8991/F/EYJNP62HMSJPUMDNTV9XFJVQKSCRK2FB4FDV71QJF1RV8UTC3V-57196?func=find-acc&acc\\_sequence=000733457](http://exlibris.usv.ro:8991/F/EYJNP62HMSJPUMDNTV9XFJVQKSCRK2FB4FDV71QJF1RV8UTC3V-57196?func=find-acc&acc_sequence=000733457)
- Holovach, N. M. (2012). Lexical Romanisms in the Ukrainian language at the dialectal and literary normative levels (doctoral thesis) [Leksychni rumunizmy v ukrainskii movi na dialektnomu ta literaturnonormatyvnomu rivniakh, (dysertatsiia)]. Yuri Fedkovich Chernivtsi National University, Chernivtsi [Chernivetskyi natsionalnyi universytet imeni Yurii Fedkovycha]. [In Ukrainian].
- Huyvanyuk, N. V. (2005). Dictionary of Bukovinian idioms [Slovyk bukovynskykh hovirok]. Chernivtsi: Ruta Publishing House [Vydavnytstvo Ruta]. [In Ukrainian]
- Huzar, G., & Zakrevska, Ya. (1997). Hutsul idioms: A short dictionary [Hutsulski hovirky: korotkyi slovnyk]. Lviv: Institute of Ukrainian Studies of the National Academy of Sciences. [In Ukrainian]
- Karpenko, Yu. O. (1999). Proto-Slavic oronymy of the Ukrainian Carpathians. Notes on onomastics [Praslov'ianska oronimiia Ukrainskykh Karpat. Zapysky z onomastyky]. Odesa: Astroprint. Vol. 7, p. 17–23. [In Ukrainian]. URL: <http://dSPACE.onu.edu.ua:8080/bitstream/123456789/18200/1/17-26.pdf>
- Karpenko, Yu. O., & Lukyaniuk, K. M. (1971–1979). Materials for the dictionary of Bukovinian sayings [Materialy do slovnyka bukovynskykh hovirok]. Chernivtsi: Chernivets State University [In Ukrainian]. URL: <http://194.44.152.155/elib/local/sk352306.pdf>
- Kovaliuk, O. (2017) Borrowed token denoting the emotional state of nervous excitement in the old Ukrainian language of XIV–XVI centuries [Modern Science]. Prague: Forests [Nemoros]. Num. 5, p. 151–159.
- Kozhukhar, E. S. (2014). Eastern Romance borrowings in the names of food and drinks in the Ukrainian dialects of the Republic of Moldova [Vostochnoromanskije zaimstvovaniya v nazvaniyah pishchi i napitkov v ukrainskikh govorah Respubliki Moldova]. Slavic Readings [Slavyanskije chteniya], Num. 3(9). [In Russian]
- Kubryakova, E. S. (1992). Verbs of action through their cognitive characteristics [Glagoly dejstviya cherez ih kognitivnye harakteristiki]. Logical analysis of language. Models of action [Logicheskij analiz yazyka. Modeli dejstviya]. Moscow: Science [Nauka], p. 84–90. [In Russian]
- Legchilina, E. (2020). Designing of social and labor relations in the context of transformation: principles, organizational and institutional aspects. Revista Cientifica Del Amazonas, 3(5), 43-53. <https://doi.org/10.34069/RC/2020.5.04>
- Lobiuc, I. (1971). Romanian loans in zoonimia huță [Împrumuturi românești în zoonimia huțulă]. Yearbook of Linguistics and Literary History XXII, Academy Publishing House [Anuar de Lingvistică și Istorie Literară XXII, Editura Academiei], Iasi [Iași]. [In Romanian]
- Lukinova, T. B. (2013). Ukrainian vocabulary: semantic changes in borrowed words [Ukrainska leksyka: semantychni zminy v

- zapozychenykh slovakh]. Linguistics [Movoznavstvo], p. 18–38. [In Ukrainian]
- Lysenko, Ya. S. (1974). Dictionary of Polissya dialects [Slovnyk poliskykh hovoriv]. Kyiv: Nauk. [In Ukrainian]. URL: [http://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/cgi-bin/ua/elib.exe?Z21ID=&I21DBN=UKRLIB&P21DBN=UKRLIB&S21STN=1&S21REF=10&S21FMT=online\\_book&C21COM=S&S21CNR=20&S21P01=0&S21P02=0&S21P03=FF=&S21STR=ukr0001576](http://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/cgi-bin/ua/elib.exe?Z21ID=&I21DBN=UKRLIB&P21DBN=UKRLIB&S21STN=1&S21REF=10&S21FMT=online_book&C21COM=S&S21CNR=20&S21P01=0&S21P02=0&S21P03=FF=&S21STR=ukr0001576)
- Melnychuk, O. S. (Ed.). (1982–2012). Etymological dictionary of the Ukrainian language [Etymolohichni slovnyk ukrainskoi movy]. Vol. 1 (1982), A–D [A–Г]. Vol. 2 (1985), D–Koptsi [Д–Компц]. Vol. 3 (1989), Kora–M [Kopa–М]. Vol. 4 (2003), N–P [H–П]. Vol. 5 (2006), R–T [P–Т]. Vol. 6 (2012), Y–Z [Y–Я]. Kyiv: Scientific opinion [Naukova dumka]. [In Ukrainian]. URL: [http://litopys.org.ua/djvu/etymolog\\_slovnyk.htm](http://litopys.org.ua/djvu/etymolog_slovnyk.htm)
- Miroshnychenko, O. (2005). Eastern Romance loanwords in Ukrainian South Bessarabian dialects [Skhidnoromanski zapozychennia v ukrainskykh pivdenobessarabskykh hovirkakh]. Lviv: Dialectological studies [Dialektolohichni studii] 5, p. 279–284. [In Ukrainian]. URL: <http://www.inst-ukr.lviv.ua/uk/publications/materials/documents/?newsid=184>
- Mohyla, O., & Kondratenko, L. (2022). Romanian lexical elements in the Carpathian dialects of the Ukrainian language [Rumunski leksychni elementy v karpatskykh hovirkakh ukrainskoi movy]. World dimensions of educational trends [Svitovi vymiry osvityk tendentsii]. Kyiv: NAU, p. 15–22. [In Ukrainian]. URL: [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1UT\\_oamfmSwyXwdilPixYmew3RNQGi4ip/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1UT_oamfmSwyXwdilPixYmew3RNQGi4ip/view?usp=sharing)
- Nechytailo, I. M. (2011). Paleo-Slavia and the semantics of dialectisms [Paleoslavia i semantyka dialektyzmiv]. Scientific journal of the NPU named after M. P. Drahomanov. Modern trends in language development [Naukovyi chasopys NPU imeni M. P. Drahomanova. Suchasni tendentsii rozvytku mov], Vol. 6, p. 163–167. [In Ukrainian]
- Pashkova, N. (2020). Genesis of the Carpathism Koshara. Slavia Orientalis, vol. LXIX, No 4, p. 899. URL: <https://journals.pan.pl/dlibra/results?action=AdvancedSearchAction&type=-3&val1=Source:%22Slavia+Orientalis%5C%3B+2020%5C%3B+vol.+LXIX%5C%3B+No+4%5C%3B+899%5C-912%22>
- Pokorny, J. (1959). Indo-European Etymological Dictionary [Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch], Bern – Munich, 2 Bde. [In German].
- Popescu, I. (2007). Romanian elements in the Ukrainian language [Rumunski element v ukrainskii movi]. Chernivtsi: Ruta Publishing House [Vydavnytstvo Ruta]. [In Ukrainian]. URL: <https://bit.ly/3eRB8eh>
- Pradid, Yu. F. (2006). From observations on dialect phraseology (based on the material of Boyki's sayings) [Iz sposterezhen nad dialektnoi frazeolohiieiu (na materiali boikivskykh hovirok)]. In the field of linguistics and law [U tsaryni linhvistyky i prava.]. Simferopol, p. 21–24. [In Ukrainian]. URL: <https://search.rsl.ru/ru/record/01002940903>
- Rudnyck'kyj, J. B. (1962–1982). An Etymological Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language: Vol. I (A–Г), (1962–1972). Winnipeg Vol. II (Д–Б), (1982). Ottawa: Ukrainain Mohylo-Mazepian Academy of Sciences. URL: [https://archive.org/details/rudnycky\\_slovnyk\\_tom1.cropped.ocr](https://archive.org/details/rudnycky_slovnyk_tom1.cropped.ocr), [https://archive.org/details/rudnycky\\_slovnyk\\_tom2.cropped.ocr](https://archive.org/details/rudnycky_slovnyk_tom2.cropped.ocr)
- Trubachev, O. N. (Ed.). (1974–1987). Etymological Dictionary of Slavic Languages: Proto-Slavic Lexical Fund [Etimologicheskij slovar' slavyanskikh yazykov: Praslavyanskij leksicheskij fond]. Moscow: Science [Nauka]. Vol. 1 (A—\*besǫdъlivъ) (1974); vol. 2 (\*bez—\*bratъ) (1975); vol. 14 (\*labati—\*lǫtǫplъ) (1987). [In Russian]. URL: <https://etymolog.ruslang.ru/index.php?act=essja>
- Vaan, M., de (2008). Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages. Boston: Leiden.
- Verkhratsky, I. (1902). About the speech of the Galician Lemkos [Pro hovir halytskykh lemktiv]. Lviv: National Academy of Sciences. [In Ukrainian]. URL: [http://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/cgi-bin/ua/elib.exe?Z21ID=&I21DBN=UKRLIB&P21DBN=UKRLIB&S21STN=1&S21REF=10&S21FMT=online\\_book&C21COM=S&S21CNR=20&S21P01=0&S21P02=0&S21P03=FF=&S21STR=00004689](http://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/cgi-bin/ua/elib.exe?Z21ID=&I21DBN=UKRLIB&P21DBN=UKRLIB&S21STN=1&S21REF=10&S21FMT=online_book&C21COM=S&S21CNR=20&S21P01=0&S21P02=0&S21P03=FF=&S21STR=00004689)
- Vinereanu, M. (2008). Etymological dictionary of the Romanian language based on Indo-European studies. [Dicționar etimologic al limbii române pe baza cercetărilor de indoeuropeanistica]. Bucharest [București]. [In Romanian].



- Vişovan, Ş. (2001). Romanian-Ukrainian interference in the toponymy of Maramureş. [Interferențe româno-ucrainene în toponimia Maramureşului]. Umbria Publishing House, Baia Mare. [Editura Umbria, Baia Mare]. [In Romanian].
- Vrabie, E. (1991). New and revised romanian etymologies. University Park, Pa, Vol. 31 (3-4), p. 153-162. URL: [https://idiscover.lib.cam.ac.uk/permalink/f/1kas1sp/TN\\_cdi\\_proquest\\_miscellaneous\\_85554322](https://idiscover.lib.cam.ac.uk/permalink/f/1kas1sp/TN_cdi_proquest_miscellaneous_85554322)
- Vrabie, E. (1967). The influence of the Romanian language on the Ukrainian language [Influenza limbii romane asupra limbii ucrainene]. Romanoslavica, XIV, Bucharest [Romanoslavica, XIV, Bucureşti], p. 183-184. [In Romanian].
- Walde, A. (1906). Latin Etymological Dictionary [Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch]. 1st edition [1 Auflage]. Heidelberg: Winter. [In German].