

# Anthroponymy in The Pomianyky of Horodyšče of 1484

Part I

IRAIDA IRENE TARNAWECKY

## Chapter I

### INTRODUCTION

#### Delineation of the Problem

**I**N COMPARISON WITH THE DEVELOPMENT of the study of anthroponymy in Western Europe the study of this subject in Slavic countries has been relatively modest. This restraint is especially evident in the sphere of given names. However, it does not attest a lack of interest in names among Slavs. On the contrary, personal nomenclature has always attracted the attention of Slavic philologists, but their interest has been directed chiefly towards semantics or the etymology of names. The pioneer work in this field appeared as early as the beginning of the seventeenth century when P. Berynda compiled the first systematic Eastern Slavic dictionary and included a considerable number of personal names with an explanation of their origin. The dictionary was written in the literary Ukrainian language of the seventeenth century and published in 1627.<sup>1</sup>

Scholarly studies of Slavic personal names began in the second half of the nineteenth century with the monumental work of F. Miklosich in 1860.<sup>2</sup> He was the first person to devote his attention primarily to the systematic study of Slavic personal and place-names and thus laid the foundation for Slavic onomastics. The work of Miklosich stimulated other scholars to further research. The

<sup>1</sup> P. Berynda, *Leksikon Slovenoroskyj i imen tolkovanije*. (Slavic-Rus Lexicon and Explanation of Names), Kiev, 1627.

<sup>2</sup> F. Miklosich, *Die Bildung der Slavischen Personen- und Ortsnamen*, Vienna, 1860, reprinted in "Sammlung Slavischer Lehr- und Handbücher," ed. A. Leskin et al., Heidelberg, 1927.

earliest of his followers, M. Moroškin,<sup>3</sup> published in 1867 a collection of Slavic names of which many were native Russian. Another significant contribution was made by N. M. Tupikov.<sup>4</sup> He approached the problem quite differently and examined the history of names as well as their social and geographical distribution, while leaving the philological aspect aside.

The most significant studies of Eastern Slavic personal given names in the twentieth century have been made by V. Simovyč,<sup>5</sup> I. Ohijenko,<sup>6</sup> J. B. Rudnyčyj,<sup>7</sup> L. Velyhorškyj<sup>8</sup> and L. Humetska.<sup>9</sup> A number of dictionaries of given personal names have been compiled and published. In addition to the aforementioned comprehensive works, numerous articles dealing with this subject have been published in various linguistic periodicals.

<sup>3</sup> M. Moroškin, *Slavjanskij imenoslov ili sobranije slavjanskich ličnych imen v alfavitnom porjadke* (Slavic Name Register or Collection of Slavic Personal Names in Alphabetical Order), St. Petersburg, 1867.

<sup>4</sup> N. M. Tupikov, "Zametki k istoriji drevne-russkich ličnych sobstvennych imen" (Remarks on the History of Ancient Russian Personal Names), St. Petersburg, 1892, reprinted with some changes in the Introduction to his Dictionary, *Slovať drevne-russkich ličnych sobstvennych imen* (Dictionary of Ancient Russian Personal Names), St. Petersburg, 1903.

<sup>5</sup> V. Simovyč, "Typy imen" (Types of Names), published in *Naukovyj Zbirnyk Vys. Pedahoh. Inst. im M. Drahomanova v Prazi* (Scholarly Collection of Works of the High Pedagogical Institute of M. Drahomanov in Prague), Prague, 1929.

<sup>6</sup> I. Ohijenko, "Naši osobovi jmennja" (Our Personal Names), a series of articles published in the linguistic periodical *Ridna Mova* (Native Language), Warsaw, 1933–1939.

<sup>7</sup> J. B. Rudnyčyj, "Pro ukrajinski osobovi jmennja" (On Ukrainian Personal Names), *Na Čuzuni*, Augsburg, 1947, and *Rid i znamenno*, No. 2, Frankfurt, 1957, pp. 27–30.

"Ridkisi jmennja slovjanskoho pochodžennja v ukrajinskomu nazovnyctvi" (Some Rare Names in Ukrainian Onomastics), *Rid i znamenno*, No. 3, Frankfurt, 1947, pp. 36–37; reprinted in *Postup*, Winnipeg, 1963.

<sup>8</sup> L. Velyhorškyj, *Imena hovorai'* (Names Speak), Ukrainian Toiler, Toronto, 1951.

<sup>9</sup> L. Humetska, "Slovotvorča budova čolovičyeh osobovyeh nazv v ukrajinskij movi XIV–XV st." (Word-Formation of Masculine Personal Names in the Ukrainian Language of the XIV–XV Centuries), published in *Movoznavstvo* (Philology) X, 1952.

"Žinoči osobovi nazvy v ukrajinskij aktovij movi XIV–XV st." (Feminine Personal Names in the Ukrainian Legal Language of the XIV–XV Centuries), published in *Naukovi Zapysky Instytutu Suspilnych Nauk* (Scholarly Writings of the Institute of Social Studies), Akademia Nauk Ukr. S.S.R., Vol. III, Kiev, 1954.

Although a considerable number of studies have been made during the past century in the field of Eastern Slavic anthroponymy, they have been concerned primarily with those Eastern Slavic personal names which originated in the language itself, the so-called native names. As a result, Eastern Slavic Christian names have, to some degree, been overlooked. In fact, no general treatise on these names covering the whole of Eastern Slavic territory has even been attempted. Nor has sufficient study been devoted to the process of the Slavicization of Christian names (predominantly of Greek origin) in the different geographical spheres of the Eastern Slavic languages. Moreover, the adoption of Christian names into the Eastern Slavic name system and their development in various periods has attracted even less scholarly attention, although such a study would undoubtedly be of importance to a history of language as well as of interest to historians in general. In the field of Slavic Christian names the research to date is contained in a small number of essays published in various periodicals. The articles on this subject are usually either monographic or deal with various detailed aspects of the name formation.

The most important contributions to the study of Eastern Slavic Christian names have resulted not from specifically onomastic research but from investigations made with a different purpose in view. A. L. Sobolevskij,<sup>10</sup> for example, while studying the adoption of foreign loan words in the Russian language, traced many dialectical forms of personal names back to their originals. From a different aspect, M. Vasmer<sup>11</sup> has explained the general procedure of integration of Greek loan words in the Russian language, including a selection of Christian names. Recent and valuable contributions to Eastern Slavic onomastics, insofar as it is concerned with Christian names, were made by A. Baecklund<sup>12</sup> who, investigating the personal names in the *Gramoty Velikago Novgoroda*, selected the basic Novgorodian variants of the so-called "Kalendarnyje imena" and

---

<sup>10</sup> A. L. Sobolevskij, *Lekcii po istorii russkago jazyka* (Lectures on the History of the Russian Language), 4th ed., Moscow, 1907.

<sup>11</sup> M. Vasmer, "Dissimilationsvermeidung im Russischen", *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen*, LI, Berlin, 1923.

<sup>12</sup> A. Baecklund, *Personal Names in Medieval Velikij Novgorod, I. Common Names*, Stockholm, 1959.

illuminated the problem of their Russification and their social function during the republican period of Velikij Novgorod. The present study is, however, limited to a specific region and period of the twelfth to the fifteenth century.

Evidently, according to the foregoing survey, the field of Eastern Slavic anthroponymy has not been sufficiently explored. Among the material deserving special attention belong the personal names of the *Pomianyk of Horodyšče*.

That work is not only the unique Cyrillic manuscript in Canada but also is an authentic source; its importance to Eastern Slavic personal names need hardly be stressed. It is a document of public character<sup>13</sup> containing approximately 20,000 entries and mentioning most of the popular Christian names of the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. These names were recorded either by professional monastic scribes or by other people conversant with the art of writing, who then passed the names on to the monastery. Thus the names recorded were based on the spoken forms which were often colored by the local dialect and employed the orthographic practices of the particular scribe reporting the names. The majority of names belong to the people who populated Southern Volhynia. A considerable number of entries, however, contain names of members of leading families and Church dignitaries from various parts of Eastern Slavic territories and also from Lithuania, Poland and Moldavia.

Since the *Pomianyk* embraces such extensive material, the present study should prove to be of some value and interest in the field of onomastics.

#### Scope and Object of the Study

The main object of the study is to analyze the forms and variants of both masculine and feminine given names occurring in the oldest part of the *Pomianyk*.

An attempt is also made here to explain the process by which the names of foreign, primarily Greek, origin were Slavized. This process followed three principal lines:

<sup>13</sup> "Public character" here implies a register of the names of persons deceased in the community.

(1) Phonetic modification, by which foreign names were brought into accord with the Eastern Slavic sound system in general and with the Volhynian dialect in particular.

(2) Morphological modifications of the foreign names on the pattern of native personal names and appellatives, and the partial fitting of those names to the Eastern Slavic declension system.

(3) The formation of derivatives.

By recording the occurrences of each name, the study also endeavours, to establish data regarding the frequency of names during the period covered by the oldest section of the *Pomianyky*.

Moreover, with the support of comparative material from ancillary sources, the investigation attempts a clarification of the effect of Christianity on Eastern Slavic personal names.

Finally, there is included within the scope of this work the *A-tergo Dictionary* of given names listed in the *Pomianyky*, which is also the first *A-tergo Onomasticon* in the Slavic language.

In order that the reader might see a more complete picture of the material contained in the *Pomianyky*, a description of some paleographical aspects of the manuscript itself, as well as an examination of the genre of literature which it represents, is necessary. This, however, will be published in another journal.

### Sources

*Pomianyky of Horodyšče*.<sup>14</sup> The *Pomianyky*, which is preserved in a manuscript, dated 1484–1737, is one of the first known literary documents produced by Ukrainian monasteries. The manuscript

<sup>14</sup> At present Horodyšče is a village in Volhynia. It is located on the small island between the two branches of the river Buh. Horodyšče, as its name suggests, is the remnant of an old fortification which probably belonged to a prince.

*Volhynia* – the Principality of Kievan Rus' State.

In the 13th century – Kingdom of Galicia-Volhyn'.

From 14th to 15th century – Ukrainian-Lithuanian cultural centre (The first Ukrainian Bible was printed in Ostrog in 1580).

In the period from 17th to 18th century – Province of Polish Kingdom.

From 19th to 20th century – Province of Russia.

Presently Volhynia is the Western Province of the Ukrainian S.S.R.

For more extensive information about Volhynia see the work by J. B. Rudnykyj, *Nazvy "Halycyna" i "Volyni."* (The Names "Galicia" and "Volynia"), Winnipeg, 1952.

was discovered in 1902 by Olexander Kolessa, professor at Charles University in Prague. It was among the contents of a chest found by Kolessa in a wooden church which was, in his opinion, the sole remnant of a once famous monastery.

In his article, "The South-Volhynian Horodyšče and Horodyšče manuscripts of the period from the twelfth to the sixteenth centuries,"<sup>15</sup> Kolessa has this to say of the *Pomianyk*: "As an official of the Vienna Central Commission for the Preservation of Ancient Monuments, I examined in 1902 the Basilian Fathers' libraries for the purpose of making studies in paleography. The notes on the Apostle of Chrystynopil and the Gospel of Bučač indicated that the manuscripts were from the monastery of Horodyšče and made me visit Horodyšče and also the Basilian Fathers' monastery of Chrystynopil."<sup>16</sup> Visiting Horodyšče, Kolessa found on the site of the monastery an old wooden church. He continues: "From this church comes the *Pomianyk* of the fifteenth century which I discovered in the atrium of the Horodyšče church in an old primitive oak chest among the candle-ends and other useless church articles. This *Pomianyk*, of which I hope to give a full description, contains information about the history of the old monastery of Horodyšče."<sup>17</sup> Unfortunately, this hope was never realized. This was presumably why the *Pomianyk* has not been the subject of description or research before now. However, Kolessa has left us a brief description of other Horodyšče manuscripts.

For many years the *Pomianyk* remained in Kolessa's private library. In 1951, J. B. Rudnyčyj purchased the book from the Kolessa family for the Slavic book collection in the University of Manitoba, intending that it should be used as source material for advanced studies in the Slavic field. The purchase of this unique volume was made possible through a grant from the Ukrainian Studies Fund in Winnipeg.

Naturally, the acquisition of such a valuable book by the University of Manitoba, and especially its display during the opening of the new Library on September 26, 1958, evoked considerable

<sup>15</sup> O. Kolessa, "Pivdenno-Volhynske Horodyšče i Horodyški rukopysni pamiatky XII–XVI st.," published in *Naukovyj Zbirnyk Ukrajin'skoho Universytetu v Prazi* (Scholarly Collections of the Ukrainian University in Prague), Prague, 1923.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 5.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 6.

public interest. Under this impetus various articles pertaining to the book have recently appeared. Local newspapers, both ethnic and English, have expressed curiosity and surprise at the revelation that the writing of this book began eight years before Columbus's discovery of America. At present the manuscript of the *Pomianyk of Horodyšče* forms part of the rare book section of the Elizabeth Dafoe Library at the University of Manitoba.

## Chapter II

### DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF PERSONAL NAMES IN *THE POMIANYK OF HORODYŠČE*

#### A Note on the Formation of Indo-European and Eastern Slavic Personal Names

Language designates and is therefore concerned with the giving of names. We may assume that even at a primitive stage of language development, the first articulated sounds which had any significance were used as names. In one form or another, naming has sometimes been considered to be the earliest of all intellectual accomplishments. The first man was also the first giver of names: "... and Adam gave names."<sup>18</sup> In the Biblical narrative this is man's first recorded activity which may be regarded as his first intellectual activity. Because names are universal E. Pulgram writes: "Since the giving and bearing of names have found such universal acceptance in all forms of society and in all stages of culture, this fact of universality ought to be indicative of a common need perhaps even of a common urge, which all human beings share."<sup>19</sup>

The possession of a name has been highly esteemed throughout the ages: "A nameless creature is a transitory phantom, only the name makes the being known, by the name it is distinguished from

---

<sup>18</sup> *Genesis 2:20; 2:19*. "And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air; and brought them unto Adam to see what he would call them: and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, and this the name thereof."

<sup>19</sup> Pulgram, Ernst, *Theory of Names*, published by The American Name Society, 1954, p. 5.

others.”<sup>20</sup> The ancient ritual of name giving was a symbol of solemn welcome of the newly born into the family. The name received entitled the child to the full rights of society. “For all parents fit names to their children as soon as these are born, so that there is no one so poor or so gentle that he is nameless.”<sup>21</sup> The word, “nameless,” signified an unknown and almost unwelcome condition (and still does).<sup>22</sup> Therefore the selection of a name was made very carefully, since, as Bach states, the name was considered as a part of one’s appearance: “The name gives the audible picture of a human being, an animal, or an object and there is an inseparable link between the name and the object.”<sup>23</sup>

A similar approach to names also existed among later generations. In *Dichtung und Wahrheit* Goethe writes: “. . . because the name of a person is not an overcoat, but is a perfectly fitting dress, as the skin that has grown over the person which he is not allowed to scrape.”<sup>24</sup> The same tendency is noted in modern times. Smith, discussing the importance of the study of names, considers a man’s name as the most prominent feature to others and as his most intimate friend. He says: “A man’s name is one of the most permanent of possessions; it remains when everything else is lost; it is owned by those who possess nothing else. A name is the only efficient means of describing a man to his contemporaries and to posterity. When one dies it is the only part that lives on in the world.”<sup>25</sup>

The given name has always been considered by some to have an influence upon the character or personality of a person. The realization of the fate expressed in the name often affected the formation of personality in either a positive or negative way. The obligation towards a given name in old times and in later periods was factual. In 1652 Jenkin wrote: “Our baptismal names ought to be such as may prove remembrances of duty . . . This is good to impose such

<sup>20</sup> Günter, H., “*Von der Sprache der Götter und Geister*,” Halle, 1921, (Quoted by A. Bach in *Deutsche Namenkunde*, Vol. I, Part II, p. 224, Heidelberg, 1953).

<sup>21</sup> *Odyssey*, Book VIII – Shaw translation (Quoted in *Names*, Vol. I, 1952, p. 241).

<sup>22</sup> For instance, a writer speaks of “a nameless sorrow.”

<sup>23</sup> Adolf Bach, *Deutsche Namenkunde*, Heidelberg, 1953, Vol. I, Part II, p. 227.

<sup>24</sup> Quoted by A. Bach in *Deutsche Namenkunde*, Vol. I, Part I, p. 237.

<sup>25</sup> E. C. Smith, *The Story of our Names*, New York, 1950, p. 61.



names as expresse our baptismal promisse. A good name is as a thread tyed about the finger, to make us mindful of the errand we came into the world to do for our Master."<sup>26</sup> Or as Goethe mentions: "... thus it happened that I was named 'Joseph' at baptism and by this my way of life has been determined to a certain extent."<sup>27</sup>

A name not only influences its bearer but it also creates an idea about him with others. This fact led poets and writers to the invention of meaningful names in literature in order to provide a complete picture of characters by means of a name. These so-called "Redende Namen" probably originated in folklore but are still popular today.

In their original invention and purpose personal names had a definite and appropriate significance. Sources for these names were the same among all people but their popularity differed according to the mentality of the various ethnic groups. The names usually varied according to what people aimed at in life. It is apparent that primitive society, because of its close association with nature, used the latter as the main source for names. Thus the characteristics of nature were transferred into human society. Then, too, names not only were derived from the names of gods, spirits and supernatural beings, but were also supplied by the imagination and then transposed into reality. Although sources for naming were endless, a certain rule as to their significance could be established. All ancient names, with few exceptions, denote praise or fame and signify good omen for the future of a child. Through the naming procedure it was hoped the best of everything would be achieved for the child concerned. Hence, names mirror truthfully the feeling, the ideals and the highest aspirations of various groups of people.

The technique used in the formation of personal names was essentially the same everywhere. Among all people the same motives were taken into consideration, but were expressed differently. "Not only name-bearing, but also name-building was a universal human practice, with the same elementary rules everywhere, just as human language is basically the same physical and nervous

---

<sup>26</sup> Quoted by D. T. Starnes, *Names*, 10.56 (1960).

<sup>27</sup> W. Goethe, "Wilhelm Meisters Wanderjahre," (Quoted by A. Bach in *Deutsche Namenkunde*, Vol. I, Part II, p. 228).

performance of human speech production and comprehension, regardless of the multitude and variety of languages.”<sup>28</sup>

Being aware of the unexplainable force and strength of a name and believing firmly in its magic, ancient society often applied specific methods in the giving of names. It practiced a transfer of the names of dead relatives, a repetition of components, a variation of components or a linking of components according to alliteration (“Stabreim”). Furthermore, a body of euphemistic and taboo names was also cultivated among Indo-European peoples.

*Indo-European Anthroponymy.* As previously mentioned, onomastic sources for the anthroponymy are endless. Any word can perform this function. Albeit the choice is determined by historical, cultural and ethnical factors, potentially any noun can become a name, and not only a noun but also a verbal form, an adverb, a whole sentence, a particle, even a letter. However, it is evident that nouns and adjectives used as substantives form the vast majority of Indo-European names.

Traditionally Indo-European anthroponymy is classified into dithematic and monothematic names. Ancient names were chiefly dithematic.<sup>29</sup> They were formed of two components for which the nouns of concrete or abstract meaning were used. But other parts of speech were used as well. Basically, there are two main compositional types of dithematic names: (1) determinative composition, where the basic part is determined closely by the first component; (2) copulative composition in which two components are independent of each other. In the later stage of language development, when one part or both parts of the compound name lost their appellative meaning, copulative technique often resulted in meaningless names.

Dithematic names fall into two classes – full names and short names. Short names are considered a secondary development from full names: the former came into being in Indo-European times and were usually formed through the contraction of full names in order to make the latter more convenient for everyday use. According to their structure, short names are also classified as monothematic and dithematic.

<sup>28</sup> Pulgram, Ernst, *Theory of Names*, p. 20.

<sup>29</sup> F. Solmsen, *Indogermanische Eigennamen als Spiegel der Kulturgeschichte*, Heidelberg, 1922, pp. 111–118.

In the structure of short names are suffixes which change the nature of names of special interest. In spite of their great variety, two main groups of suffixes are differentiated. One group comprises suffixes attaching to a name a distinct character – so-called individualistic suffixes – while the other group consists of diminutive suffixes by means of which names predominantly of endearment character are formed.<sup>30</sup>

Although some of them originated in prehistoric times, monothematic names were less popular among ancient Indo-Europeans. Such names are made up of several types of names of which “lall-names” and “by-names” (nicknames) should be especially mentioned. In composition “lall-names” are very similar to the words of baby-language – hence their derivation – and represent the most ancient type of names.

“By-names,” on the other hand, are of later origin. In most instances they denote the physical peculiarities or characteristics of a person. Because they tended to be the liveliest and the most distinctive part of the appellation, in the course of time, “by-names” became real names.

As a rule, members of the Indo-European society bore one name. Such a practice was retained in individual Indo-European languages for a long period. When the Dark Ages were drawing to a close and societies proceeded once more from tribal to national organizations, the need for additional names, besides the individual names, for the more certain identification of individuals became urgent. An increase in the complexities of the administration and social organization of an ethnic group tends to produce an increase in the complexity and rigidity of the onomastic system. Hence, in the later Middle Ages there arose the necessity of creating new names. First, a by-name was attached to a person and disappeared with that person’s death. Later on, by-names became hereditary. This development obliterated the significance of personal by-names, but produced the modern family names.

In general, the old Indo-European names are distinguished by a creative instinct. They had an embracing content, profound meaning, logical combination of components and a definitely poetic spirit.

---

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 130.

These old native names, with their characteristics, were alive until the time of Christianization. With the spread of Christianity the old name system was modified. Changes occurred in the form of names, in the lexicon and also in the act of name creation. The old traditional names began to lose their meaning and subsequently a good many of them became meaningless. Christian names, predominantly of Greek and Hebrew provenance, replaced them.

The term, *Christian name*, is probably a corruption of the now almost obsolete "christened name." The name given to early converts to Christianity at the baptismal ceremony to symbolize their new life came to be designated as the "christened" or "baptismal" name. Today the term *Christian name* is so common that frequently forenames given to Jews or other non-Christians are also designated as "Christian names." Dictionaries define this term simply but often incorrectly as a given or first name, thereby illustrating the practice of using the terms *Christian name*, *given name* and *first name* interchangeably.

*Slavic Anthroponymy.* Slavic anthroponymy is analogous to that of other Indo-European languages. In the past, Slavic personal names have expressed a wish of everything best for the child possessing the name. In the course of time, however, their meaning has changed or a name may have been lost altogether. Even at the beginning of the historical period of Slavic languages the original meaning of a considerable number of Slavic personal names was probably not fully understood. Consequently, many of them gradually lost popularity and were much more easily and quickly supplanted by the new Christian names than were the native personal names of other Indo-European peoples.

Native Slavic personal names may be classified into (1) dithe-matic and (2) monothematic names.

Monothematic names were far more popular among the Slavs than with other Indo-European peoples. Many of these names were originally by-names which characterized their bearers most vividly. However, judging from their popularity in Medieval Ruś most of them lost their primary and original meaning and became genuine names.<sup>31</sup>

<sup>31</sup> Tupikov, *Slovař*, pp. 121-122 and 130-131.

From the morphological point of view, there are several types of monothematic names. They may present themselves as nouns, adjectives or verbal derivatives; e.g. Golub, Krasnyj, and Ždan.

Dithematic Slavic personal names, which today belong to the category of compound nouns, are derived from Indo-European languages. Word-construction by means of combining two components did not gain real popularity among the ancient Slavs. A majority of compound words in Slavic literature represent calques from Greek which remained in the language of books. But the existence of compound anthroponyms as well as names of pagan gods, toponyms and a considerable number of appellatives testifies that this technique of word-formation was natural for the Slavic language also. Although limited, the procedure was continued during the historical development of the language.

Slavic dithematic personal names are of aristocratic and solemn-sounding character. They show variety in their structure depending on the parts of speech by which the components are expressed and in what relationship they stand to each other. It should be noted that in the period of origin of Slavic dithematic anthroponyms the words did not have such grammatical differentiation as was found in the historical period of the language. Thus, today the determination of the parts of speech in compounds is very difficult. It is assumed that the same root of a component in the course of the development of the language could appear in different forms. It could designate an object, express a quality, or express an action.<sup>32</sup> In this connection a special consideration should be given to nouns, adjectives and numerals among which the formal difference is insignificant.<sup>33</sup>

Slavic compound names, similar to other Indo-European personal names, constitute two basic structural groups of the compound words, namely, (1) copulative and (2) determinative.

(1) *The copulative structural type.* The copulative composition has been known to Indo-European languages from the very beginning of their literary efforts. For this reason the origin of this type has been ascribed to the remote prehistoric period. The ancient

<sup>32</sup> M. Zelezňak, "Typy serboxorvatskýx antroponymičnyx kompozytiv XII-XV v." (Types of Serbo-Croatian Anthroponymic Compounds), *Filolohičnyj Zbirnyk*, Ukr. Academy of Sciences, Kiev, 1963, p. 198.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 199.

Slavic written monuments demonstrate the existence of only an insignificant number of the copulative anthroponymic forms. Probably this method of word-formation was already very weak in the Proto-Slavic period. In a later stage of development of the language the semantic value of the copulative anthroponyms was changed or became incomprehensible due to folk etymology. As a result, the copulative technique in Slavic languages became obsolete very early and the anthroponyms themselves archaic or meaningless.

Names with copulative structure consisted mainly of two nouns or their themes, such as Vitrobraterъ, Bratosynъ, and Volkolysъ. According to Miklosich, in the structure *nomen + nomen* the first component contains the main semantic meaning whereas the second component determines the form of the compound.<sup>34</sup> The main feature of this composition is the possibility of the insertion of a conjunction (i 'and'). For example, Volkolysъ consists of Volkъ i Lysъ 'a wolf and a fox.' E. Dickenmann, however, regards the copulative composition as a more complicated semantic combination. In his opinion, Volkolysъ should be interpreted not as 'wolf and fox' together but as 'a wolf' which is at the same time 'a fox,' that is the hybridization of the two.<sup>35</sup>

(2) *The determinative compositional structure.*

- (i) Anthroponyms of the type adjective + adjective, such as Jaroslavъ, Dobromirъ, Miroslavъ, Seroslavъ.

The compounds formed of two adjectives or their themes originally were adjectives which presenting primarily a combination of semantic related compounds. Very early, however, they evidently became substantives because of their easy combination with adjectives and other parts of speech in accordance with the rules pertaining to nouns. In this way these anthroponyms still preserve a very ancient wordformative model which has been modified in the modern Slavic languages. Compounds of the type adjective + adjective occupy an important place in the Slavic personal nomenclature. Usually two adjectives of different meaning were linked but

<sup>34</sup> F. Miklosich, *Vergleichende Grammatik der Slavischen Sprachen*, Wien, 1875, p. 378.

<sup>35</sup> E. Dickenmann, *Untersuchung über die Nominalkomposition im Russischen*, Bd. I, Leipzig, 1934, p. 76. (Quoted by M. Zeleznjak, *op.cit.*, p. 200.)

occasionally the components had a tautological meaning, e.g. Dragomilъ.

The compounds under discussion do not always correspond with the determinative composition. Some of the compounds are close to the copulative compositional type.

(ii) Anthroponyms of the type adjective + noun or attribute + substantive, for example,

Svjatopolkъ, Drahovitъ, Miroslavъ.

These compounds are adjectival in their semantic formation but preserve a substantival meaning in form. Anthroponyms of this structure belong to the so-called secondary possessive type.<sup>36</sup> In such compounds the sense and the grammatical meaning are connected with the first element.

The combinations of the adjectival and substantival themes presented a vital and productive phenomenon in the Slavic languages in the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries. On the basis of results obtained, the type attribute + substantive must at this stage be considered of later origin than the type nomen + nomen and older than the type verbum + nomen.

(iii) Anthroponyms of the type numeral + adjective, for instance, Osmomyslъ 'eight minded.'

Names containing a numeral as their first element are very rare in Slavic languages. This compositional type is regarded as a slaviced calque from another language family or as a Slavic formation modeled on another language group. However, there are monothematic anthroponymic forms formed from numerals, such as Pervuša, Četvertunja, etc.

Leskien states that the compounds of the type numeral + adjective should be regarded as adjectives; hence, the anthroponym Osmomyslъ was originally an adjective.<sup>37</sup>

A different view is held by Rudnyčkyj. He established that the name of Osmomyslъ was originally a compound form of the type noun

<sup>36</sup> V. Jagič, "Die slavischen Composita in ihrem sprachgeschichtlichen Auftreten," *Archiv für slavische Philologie*, XX, 1898, p. 523. (Quoted by M. Zeleznjak, op. cit., p. 203.)

<sup>37</sup> A. Leskien, *Grammatik der albulgarischen (altkirchenslavischen) Sprache*, Heidelberg, 1909, p. 100. (Quoted by Zeleznjak, op. cit. p. 206).

+ verbal theme. Its later character (numeral + adjective) was motivated in the Slavic anthroponymic system by the loss of the meaning due to folk etymology.<sup>38</sup>

(iv) Anthroponyms having verbal forms as their components.

(a) The structural type verbal form + noun, such as

Mstibogъ, Molibogъ, Deržikraj.

(b) Verbal form + adjective, for instance,

Borislavъ, Mstislavъ.

This structure was known to Indo-European protoglossa; however, the common model made its own way in the process of the development of the individual languages. In the Slavic languages numerous anthroponymic forms of the above structure manifest strong vitality.

There is a divergency of opinion among scholars concerning the nature of the verbal elements used as the first part of compounds. Milewski states that the verbal part is a theme of the infinite + aorist. J. Otrębski divides the verbal element into two groups: (1) the forms of the aorist, e.g. Deržikraj and (2) the forms of the imperative, e.g. Dažъbogъ. Similar views were expressed by other scholars. J. Loś, on the other hand, denies the view of majority and postulates the nominal origin of the discussed components.<sup>39</sup>

Nevertheless, in the historical period of the development of the Slavic languages, the first verbal components very early assumed an imperative form regardless of their origin.

(c) The structural type noun + verbal theme, for example,

Vojiborъ, Bogdanъ, Snovidъ.

Though the compounds of this type have their second part expressed by a verbal form, they appear in the Slavic languages as nouns. The model of this technique in word-formation was inherited by the Slavs from the Indo-European protoglossa through the medium of Proto-Slavic. But individual anthroponymic forms are the product of Proto-Slavic and of individual Slavic languages; e.g. the name Svjatogorъ which has provoked curiosity among some

<sup>38</sup> J. B. Rudnyčyj, "Čomu Jaroslav Hałyčyj Osmomyslom?" (On the Name "Osmomysl" in Slovo), *Zyttja i Znannja*, Vol. 10, L'viv, 1937, pp. 278–279.

<sup>39</sup> J. Otrębski, *O najdawniejszych polskich imionach osobowych*, Wilno, 1935, pp. 4–5. (Quoted by Zeleznjak, op.cit. p. 209.)



Slavic scholars. Several theories have appeared concerning the origin and interpretation of this name.

Vasmer derives his theory from the Greek name of Saint George.<sup>40</sup>

Miller deduces the name Svjatogorъ from "Svjatyje Gory" 'the Holy Mountains.'

Hruševskij contradicts the above theory by rejecting the existence of mountains under such a name but, unfortunately, does not offer any other theory regarding the origin of the name Svjatogorъ.

Rudnyčkyj treats the name Svjatogorъ as a compound of the structural type adjectival theme + verbal theme, where \**sveto* 'strong,' 'mighty' is the adjectival root and \**gor* ~ *gorjъ* ~ *goreti* 'to burn' is the verbal root. Thus the name Svjatogorъ would mean 'one burning,' 'overflowing with power.' Rudnyčkyj support his explanation by other Slavic anthroponyms similar in structure, such as Dobrovitъ, Dragoljubъ.<sup>41</sup>

As to their grammatical texture, V. Jagič says that when the second verbal element takes a form of a name, it tends to become a participle. On the other hand, J. Loś expresses the view that in the modern language the verbal element changes into a suffix.<sup>42</sup>

To this day the semantic aspects of the verbal element in the Slavic languages are still quite clear.

The types of Slavic anthroponyms which have been considered here reflect types and models of word-formation which are characteristic of all Slavic languages. The majority among them illustrate very ancient formations peculiar to Slavic and Indo-European anthroponymy. The structural characteristic typical of those compound words dealt with, is the manner in which component parts are linked together within the compounds in question.

#### The Slavicization of Christian Names

From the historical point of view the anthroponymy of the *Pomianyk* could be divided into two categories, pre-Christian names and Christian names.

<sup>40</sup> M. Vasmer, *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg, 1952-58, Vol. II, p. 297.

<sup>41</sup> J. B. Rudnyčkyj, "Svjatogor - the Name of the Hero of Bylina," *Names*, 10.229-32 (1962).

<sup>42</sup> N. Zeleznjak, *op.cit.* p. 212.

The group of pre-Christian names mainly consists of native Slavic names. Besides these, some names of Scandinavian provenance are also included in this group, e.g. Glěbъ, Igorъ. They came into Ruś with the Varagians and were slavized together with their bearers long before the coming of Christianity. The native names constitute a rather inconsiderable part of the material of the *Pomianyk*, and their number is insignificant. Some of these anthroponyms, however, may be regarded as Slavic translations of the Greek names, e.g. Věra, Lubovъ, or as Christian names which became acceptable to the Church after the canonization of their bearers. As a result, a few native names entered the Church calendar in spite of the fact that the corresponding saints were originally canonized under Greek names, e.g. St. Borisъ as Romanъ, St. Glěbъ as Davidъ, St. Volodimirъ as Vasilij and St. Olga as Elena.<sup>43</sup>

In the material under study no examples of the names Olga and Volodimirъ can be found. Nor do the names Borisъ and Glěbъ, although their bearers are considered to be first Slavic saints,<sup>44</sup> attain any appreciable degree of frequency in the same material.

The bulk of names under consideration consists of Christian names which were introduced into Eastern Europe through the medium of the Greek Orthodox Church. The Church played a vital part in the naming of people, and the most effective means by which it exercised its influence was baptism. According to the Canons<sup>45</sup> and Church tradition, only the names of saints and martyrs were given at the time of baptism. These names constitute the so-called *Svjatci*.<sup>46</sup> Originally these were the names taken from the Holy Scriptures and from the names of the first Christian saints and martyrs. But by the time Eastern Slavs were Christianized,<sup>47</sup> the

<sup>43</sup> I. Vlasovskýj, *Narys istoriji Ukrajinškoji Pravoslavnoji Cerkvy* (An Outline of the History of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church), New York, 1955, p. 29.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.* p. 55.

<sup>45</sup> A. V. Kartašev, *Očerki po Istorii Russkoj Cerkvi Vol. I* (An Outline of the History of the Russian Orthodox Church), Paris, 1959, pp. 52–124.

<sup>46</sup> J. Rudyč, "V spravi ukrajinskoho imenoslova" printed in *Ukrajinskij Pravoslavnyj Cerkovnyj Kalendar*, (Ukrainian Name Register), Stuttgart, 1950, pp. 41–53.

*Svjatci* is a register of the names of saints and martyrs from which names are chosen at the baptism. Kievan metropolitan P. Mohyla compiled and edited the first *Svjatci* for Eastern Slavs in 1646 where he included names of Slavic saints and martyrs.

<sup>47</sup> Official conversion of the Kievan Ruś to Christianity took place in 988.

majority of the Greek names had entered *Svjatci*. In the process of Christianizing Ruś, the Church insisted on the change from the pagan to the Christian nomenclature. Individuals who insisted on keeping their pagan names, had to bear two names, a Christian one for the Church and another one for the world. Such cases, however, occurred only among the Ruś nobility and the princely families. For example, “v kreščenii Iosifō, a mirŭsky Ostromirō.”<sup>48</sup> As a result, previously mentioned Slavic native names were later accepted by the Church.

The Christian names of Greek, Hebrew and Latin origin were taken over in the Old Church Slavic version into which their Hellenic or hellenized form had been transferred to the first Slavic Christians. This onomastic introduction proceeded along several lines, the most effective of which was through the medium of the literary Old Church Slavic language in which the oldest ecclesiastical texts were written. The other process was the direct linguistic contact of the Southern Slavs with the Byzantine Greek in the very earliest stage of their Christianization. These Slavs had adapted some of the Greek names in the vernacular forms which had been brought to the Eastern Slavs with the first flow of Bulgarian culture.<sup>49</sup> However, the majority of Christian names were introduced into Ruś from Bulgaria in Church Slavic form only. Then, too, we must note the influence of the Western Slavs. In Volhynia there is evidence indicating the effects of the early missionary work of St. Methodius and his Moravian and Panonian disciples.<sup>50</sup>

As a consequence of this multifarious method, some names spread among Eastern Slavs in two forms, that is, in written Old Church Slavic and in the vernacular originating with the direct linguistic contact between Slavs and Greeks. In Ruś these already-slavicized Christian anthroponyms became exposed to the influence of spoken languages and underwent further changes. As a final result many of the names of Greek provenance assumed among the Eastern Slavs a double form, one being Old Church Slavic and the other vernacular, e.g. Feodorō ~ Fedorō, and Georgii ~ Jurii.

The names under study entered the oldest Old Church Slavic texts as literary loan-words from Greek. Their forms were kept close

<sup>48</sup> N. M. Tupikov, *Slovař*, p. 5.

<sup>49</sup> A. V. Kartašev, *Očerki po Istoriji*, pp. 52–83.

<sup>50</sup> I. Vlasovskýj, *Narys istoriji*, p. 20.

to the Greek equivalents and simply transliterated in the Slavic alphabet, thereby preserving, with few exceptions, the phonetic value of the Greek letters in the pronunciation of that time, that is Koine, e.g. *e* > *i* or *b* > *v*; Mixael > Mixailъ.

In rendering of the Greek spirants *f* and *th* the earliest Old Church Slavic texts were inconsistent from the beginning. In Old Church Slavic, which was based on the North Bulgarian dialect, there actually existed the *f*-sound; therefore in the majority of cases the Greek *f* was presented by *f*, e.g. Iosēf > Iosifъ.

The situation is different picture with regard to the voiceless spirant *th*. This sound was completely unfamiliar to the Slavs and has remained so to the present time. Consequently in Old Church Slavic manuscripts there were three ways of rendering the Greek *th*: (1) by the letter *th* pronounced *f* in the East and *t* in the West; (2) by the corresponding stop *t*; (3) by another spirant, *f*; thus Matthaïos > Matfei ~ Mattei ~ Matthei.<sup>51</sup> The Old Church Slavic texts often reflect a synthesis of Eastern and Western influences. Hence in early texts we meet both forms Matei and Matthei, or Marta and Martha. It seems, however, that in Glagolitic texts *t* persists while in the Cyrillic *th* dominates.<sup>52</sup> The traditional ecclesiastical form which entered *Svjatci* is Matthei. In the *Dictionary* by Berynda we find Matthei also. On the other hand, in the Hrinčenko's *Dictionary* we come upon forms which emerged under Western influences, that is, Matij, Marta.<sup>53</sup> In the text under study there appears as the earliest variant the form Matthei (gsg. and accsg. Mattheię). In Part C of the manuscript, however, the forms Matthei, Mathei and Matfei are written in interchangeable letters. This scribal practice suggests that at that period in Volhynia both spirants had an *f*-sound. Moreover, in Part C there quite often occurs the form Matvei. This one presents a popular Volhynian variant, known also to other Ukrainian dialects. In contrast to Russian, in

<sup>51</sup> A. Baecklund, *Personal Names in Medieval Velikij Novgorod*, Stockholm, 1959, p. 59.

<sup>52</sup> P. Diels, *Altkirchenslavische Grammatik*, I. Teil, Heidelberg, 1932, pp. 45-56.

In Codex Assemanianus *t* and *th* are interchangeable. In Codex Zogr. the *t* is predominant and in Codex Mar. the rendering of Greek *th* by *t* is the rule. On the other hand, in Sava book the *th* is prevailing and in Codex Supr. *th* is used more or less consistently.

<sup>53</sup> P. Berynda, op.cit. p. 222. B. Hrinčenko, op.cit. p. 556.

the Ukrainian language *f* in some positions became vocalised; thus Matfei > Matvei. Besides the given examples of rendering Greek *th* and *f* in Eastern Slavic there is to be noted the substitution of *x* for *th* and *f* as, for instance, Theodosii > Xodosii, or Fionna > Xvenna. Examples of such forms, which are not numerous, emerged in the later process of Slavicization due to the influence of the spoken dialects.

Other phonological modifications shown in the *Pomianyk* which should perhaps be noted in connection with vernacular influences are as follows:

the change of the initial *a* > *o* due to the accent,

Aleksandros > Aleksandṛo > Oleksandṛo or Agripina > Ogripina;

the preiotation of initial *e*,

Elene > Jelena, Eudokiia > Jevdokiia;

and the change of this initial preioted *e* > *o*,

Jelena > Olena, Jevdokiia > Ovdotiia;

the appearance of *v* before initial vowels,

Ovdotiia > Vovdotiia;

the narrowing of unstressed vowels,

Kosmas > Kosma > Kusma;

the loss of initial unstressed *a*,

Anastasiia > Nastasiia, Agathiia > Gafiia;

the loss of unstressed initial *e*,

Ekaterina > Katerina;

loss of initial *i*,

Ilarion > Larioṇo,

Isidoros > Isidoṛo > Sidoṛo.

In regard to the forms of names, some of them were adopted in the Slavic morphological system practically unaltered. These were mainly the hellenised Hebrew and other non-Greek names ending in a consonant. In Slavic only *o* was appended to the end-consonant and so these names were fitted into the masculine declension of the *o*-stems. The sign of *o* had no phonological significance: adding *o* to the end-consonants became rather a mechanical process which reflected the tendency of the early phenomenon in Slavic called "the opening of syllables."

Dabid > Daviḍo, Gabriel > Gavriiḷo, Iosef > Iosif̣o.

The majority of names, however, were accepted only after partial morphological modifications.<sup>54</sup>

<sup>54</sup> P. Diels, op. cit. pp. 180–187.

The morphological alteration of imported names was concerned mainly with the modification of the termination of the names. Thus Greek *-os* and *-es* were dropped and only *ъ* was added to the stem of a name. In this way such names were brought into line with the Slavic masculine declension of *o*-stems:

Aleksandros > Aleksandrъ, Petros > Petrъ,  
Ioannes > Ioannъ.

The Greek ending *-as* was represented by *-a*, e.g.

Nikitas > Nikita, Thomas > Thoma.

These names were inflected on the pattern of the feminine declension of *-a* stems. The final *-ios* was rendered by *-ii*,

Grigorios > Grigorii, Athanasios > Athanasii,  
Makkarios > Makarii.

When *-ios* was preceded by unstressed *-e-*, the group *-e-ios* was substituted by *-ei* or *-ii*, thus,

Basileios > Vasilei > Vasilii.

The end group *-a-ios* was also rendered by *ei* (*ěi*)

Bartholomaios > Vartholomei.

The anthroponyms which received in Slavic the endings *-ii* or *-ei* (*-ěi*) were treated according to the masculine declension of *io*-stems. An examination of the source material discloses numerous instances of the forms, such as

Vasiliię gsg. and accsg. from Vasilii;  
Ignatiię gsg. and accsg. from Ignatii.

These forms reflect only the graphic problems of that period which were involved in the presentation of the *ja*-sound and have no connection with the declension of *a-*, *ja*-stems.

In Part C of the text there occasionally occurred some names in the nominative case, such as

Thekla, Maria, Mixailo or Pavlo.

The forms *Pavlo* and *Mixailo* provide interesting examples of masculine anthroponyms ending in *-o*, which are not so frequent in Slavic onomastics. Masculine names ending in *-o*, although rare, occurred in many Slavic languages but their development and expansion were not the same everywhere. In some languages these

forms were kept alive only as hypocoristic. In others they were preserved in surnames. In Ukrainian, however, they led to the development of the individual type of masculine nouns ending in *-o*. There is a divergency of views among scholars on the explanation of this development. According to Smal-Stockyj, neuter nouns ending in *-o* originated masculine nouns of this type.<sup>55</sup> In the opinion of Kulbakin, the suffix *-ko* influenced the formation of masculine nouns ending in *-o*. Šaxmatov derives the masculine nominative form ending in *-o* from the vocative form of names of the *a*-stems. Krymskyj states that this type of masculine nouns sprang from the "love amongst people for such forms."<sup>56</sup>

The most convincing explanation is made by V. Simovyč. He motivates the emergence of masculine nouns ending in *-o* by historical factors. Simovyč holds that such a development was caused by the disappearance of *ь* and *ъ* in the final position, and provided the basis for the existence in the language of neuter nouns in *o*-stems. When *ь* or *ъ* was dropped, the reduction of syllables took place and at the end of a name there emerged a group of consonants usually difficult to pronounce and enunciate. In order to simplify the pronunciation one of the most popular methods was the adding of *-o* to the end-consonant, thus

Павѣѡ > Павѣл > Pavlo or

Маркѡ > Марк > Marko.

This method led to the invention of several categories of names ending in *-o* and finally produced an individual type of masculine nouns ending in *-o*.<sup>57</sup>

The feminine anthroponyms in Slavic received the endings *-a* and *ia*. They were adopted in feminine declensions of *a*- and *ia*-stems respectively and were treated accordingly.

<sup>55</sup> Smal-Stockyj and T. Gartner, *Grammatik der Ruthenischen (Ukrainischen) Sprache*, Wien, 1913, p. 215.

<sup>56</sup> S. M. Kulbakin, *Ukrainskij jazyk, kratkij očerk istoričeskoj fonetiki i morfologii*, Xarkov, 1919, p. 59.

O. Šaxmatov and A. Krymskyj, *Narys z istoriji ukrajinskoji movy ta xrestomatija pysmenskoji staro-ukraiščyny XI-XVIII vikiv*, Kiev, 1924, p. 102.

<sup>57</sup> V. Simovyč, "Ukrajinski imennyky čolovičoho rodu na "o" v istoričnomu rozvytku j osvitlenni," *Praci Ukrajinskooho Vysokoho Pedagogičnoho Instytutu im. M. Drahomanova*, Praha, 1929, pp. 305-369.

The Hellenic or hellenized feminine names which had no endings were first adopted unaltered. Then later they were modified on the pattern of prevalent feminine names: for instance,

Clk. Elizabeth > OCS Elizavetꙗ > Elizaveta.

The modification of endings in order to fit the anthroponyms into the Slavic declension system had already taken place in the Old Church Slavic texts. This is regarded as the first stage in an intentional and systematic change, carried out by the early scribes.

The other method of Slavicization was the shortening or contraction of names, e.g.

Domna > Doma, Theofanꙗ > Thofanꙗ, Gavriilꙗ > Gavrilꙗ;  
Ignatii > Ignatꙗ, Kondratii > Kondratꙗ.

Furthermore, the suffixation and formation of derivatives constitute an important method of Slavicization of foreign names. In our material the name suffixes are all native Slavic. They were usually appended to the stems of foreign names, and thus produced names of diminutive or augmentative nature according to the pattern of native names, as Ždanꙗ > Ždan-ko. But more often the addition of suffixes to the themes of derivatives formed typical Volhynian variants: for instance,

Aleksii > Oleś-ko; Zinovii > Zeńko; Ioannꙗ > Ivanꙗ >  
Iva-š-ko; Anna > Annu-ška; Anna > Annyciia;  
Ekaterina > Kas-ia > Kaś-ka; Eugeniia > Gas-ia;  
Dariia > Dar-ka.

As is evident from the material investigated, the emotional character of suffixes appears to have weakened or disappeared in the course of time. In the *Pomianyky* names with diminutive or augmentative suffixes are used as full names. Such forms as Jurko or Kaśka are difficult to treat as hypocoristic. They present vernacular but complete onomastic forms.

We must not conclude, however, that all names came directly and exclusively via Byzantium. There is a small number of Latin names which presumably introduced into Volhynia through the Western Slavs. These names, too, became slavicized by undergoing slight changes similar to Greek names and first of all modification of termination, e.g.

L. Adrianus > OCS Adrianꙗ,  
L. Patricius > OCS Patrikii.



Phonology and Morphology in *The Pomianyk of Horodyšče*

The orthography of the *Pomianyk* is far from being regular or uniform. Moreover, the same name frequently appears in various orthographical forms in one and the same entry. The most striking inconsistency is found in the rendering of the iotized vowels, the pronunciation current at the time being reflected only occasionally. In general, the tendency towards Old Church Slavic orthography can be noted. But since the system of writing does not correspond with actual pronunciation, many signs are used mechanically. South Slavic influences are most evident in the use of accent signs. In addition, there is a good deal of confusion as to the use of ѣ and ѓ. Iotization is also absent in some instances where in Eastern Slavic it should take place. In the text, however, forms do appear which mirror the phonetic reality of the time; they supply enough examples to document several phonological features. In this connection the phenomenon known as *ikanya* deserves particular attention.

*Ikanya*, or the interchange of *i* with *e* and *o* in certain closed syllables, is one of the most important peculiarities of Ukrainian phonology and is linked with the history of ѣ (jer) and ѓ (jor). It was caused by the disappearance of ѣ and ѓ in the weak position. When this change occurred the original Proto-Slavic *e* and *o* in an immediately preceding newly-closed syllable changed in Ukrainian to *i*, after having passed through the intermediate stage of *u*, *ou*, *y*, etc. In our text the intermediate stage of *ikanya* is exemplified by such forms as Markuovъ (196) (poss. adj.),<sup>58</sup> Vasyliuvъ (73) (poss. adj.), and Maksymuvъ (196) (poss. adj.). Here the original *o* changed into *u* (*y*) thus Markovъ > Markuvъ, corresponding to the Modern Ukrainian *i* as in Markiv. This development is one of the most peculiar features of the present-day Volhynian dialect.

Another historical Ukrainian phenomenon is the change of unaccented vowels. Unaccented initial *a* became *o*, then disappeared and formed the typical Volhynian variants of names: thus,

Agrethiny (27) > Ogregfyny (13) ~ Ogrifyny (21) >  
Grifyny (28) > Gorfyny (8) > Grefy (32).

The variants Ogregfyny (13) ~ Ogrifyny (21) or Artemia (22) ~ Artimia (18) suggest a confusion of *e* with *i*. Identification of *o* with

<sup>58</sup> Numbers in brackets indicate the folios of the *Pomianyk*.

*u* (*y*) is also found in the *Pomianyk*, e.g. *Ovdotii* (20) ~ *Udotii* (43), and *Matrony* (14) ~ *Motruny* (49). Such a development in the Western Ukrainian dialects is usually due to the accent.

The iotization of the vowel *e* took place in the Proto-Slavic period; thus *Elena* was pronounced *Jelena*, and *Evdokia* ~ *Evdotia* was pronounced *Jevdokia* ~ *Jevdotia*, respectively. Some forms of the anthroponyms under study exemplify the further stage of this development and illustrate the phonological rule that every Proto-Slavic ioted initial *e* was changed to *o*; for example, *Ėvdotii* (59) > *Ovdotii* (20).

Further, prothetic consonants appear before the initial vowels. The forms *Vovdotii* (8) and *Voksimii* (37) attest the prothetic *v* and the form *Hanna* (258) serves as an example of the prothetic *h*.

From time to time we come upon forms which show the identification of *ы* (jery) with *i* – for example, *Alkilyny* (29), *Lukyrii* (12)<sup>59</sup> – as well as the weakening of the final *i*, as in *Ili* (18), *Anastasi* (42).

The loss of initial *i* as in *Sidoria* (15), *Lariōna* (17), could either be attributed to the Slavicization of these names, or on the other hand, as Vasmer points out, to the loss of the initial *i* which took place in Greek due to modification in *sandhi* position.<sup>60</sup>

Although in general the former semivowels *ь* (jer) and *ѣ* (jor) in the *Pomianyk* are vocalized in their strong position, quite often there occur such spellings of names as *Sѣozonta* (34), *Vѣovdotii* (27), and *Sѣfii* (33) instead of *Sozonta*, *Vovdotii*, and *Sofii*. This phenomenon has no historical motivation and can only be explained as a scribal habit apart from which, *ь* and *ѣ* are used as mere graphic signs without any phonological significance.

Bulgarian influence is found in the frequent appearance of the final *ь* instead of etymological *ѣ*; for instance, *Petrovь* (69), and *Romanovь* (63).

The form *Selevestra* (17, 24) attests to the development of pleophony. Simplification of Indo-European “liquid diphthongs” (vowel and *l* or *r*) led to pleophony in Eastern Slavic. For example, in Eastern Slavic the groups *ol/or*, *el/er* developed into *olo/oro* and *ele/ere* respectively, thus *Selvestra* > *Selevestra*.

<sup>59</sup> See Transliteration Table II.

<sup>60</sup> A. Baeklund, op. cit., p. 63.

'Hypercorrect' forms such as Esifa (8), Ieva (18), and Eltuxia (35), and side by side with them, such forms of vernacular character as Ancypora (16), Valfłomeę (19), and Vєvdotoi (31) suggest that some scribes were not very familiar with hagiography.

The rendering of iotized vowels in the text under study displays a most striking inconsistency.

Iotized *a*, pronounced *ja*, is rendered by the combination of *ѧ* (*i + a*), or more frequently, by a nasal sign *ѧ* (*e*). Thus, Tatiany is written ТѧТИѧНЫ (45) and ТѧТЬѧНЫ (8).

The vowel *e* had already been iotized in Proto-Slavic and was always pronounced as *je*. For this reason only a few instances of iotization of *e* are found in the *Pomianyk* in such 'hypercorrect' forms as Iesifa (19) pronounced Jesifa.

The iotization of the vowel *i* is most often indicated by the ken-dema sign (") placed above *ї* or *й*; thus, Evthimii pronounced Jevtimiji and written as ЄВѢИИЙ (42), or Anastasii written as ѠНАСТАІІ" (42) and pronounced Anastasiji.

Iotized *u* usually is rendered by the sign *Ю*, e.g. Юрѧѧ (11), Iurię, pronounced Jurija, or occasionally by the nasal sign *ѧ* (*o*) as in Жрїѧ (11), Orię, also pronounced Jurija.

Many forms, however, show absence of iotization: for example, Тѧтьѧny (28), Akima (15), Ustiany (21), and Ulity (22), although they were pronounced Tatijany, Jakima, Justiany, and Julity.

Like the iotized vowels, ordinary vowels also exhibit inconsistency.

The vowel *i* is presented

- by the sign *ї* as in Васїїѧ (35), Vasilija;
- by the sign *и* as in Симона (10), Simona;
- by the sign *ѣ* as in Сѣмона (27) Simona;
- by the sign *ѧ* as in Лѡѧкирѧѧ (18), Lukiręi; and

in all cases it was pronounced as *i*. The most commonly used sign is *и*; the sign *ѧ* is used rarely.

The vowel *o* is rendered

- by the sign *o* as in Івоны (14), Ivony;
- by the sign *ѡ* as in ѡмелѧна (11), Omeliana;
- by the sign *ѡ* as in Сѡфїїѧ (33), Sofii; and

is usually written *o* in the middle of a word while *ѡ* is written at the beginning of a word or in the middle of a word to indicate *ō* (long *o*).

The vowel *u* is expressed

by the combination of *oy* as in Ульєny pronounced Uljany;  
by the sign *ŝ* as in Ганнŝ (258), Hannu; and  
by the nasal *ж* (*o*) as in Зовжца (2), Zovžšča, pronounced  
Zovušča.

The *oy* predominates in initial and medial positions of a word while the sign *ŝ* renders final *u* (*y*). The occurrence of *ж* (*o*) in the place of *u* (*y*) is very rare.

The Greek letter *ξ* is rendered in the *Pomianyk* by the sign of *ž* as in Ялєžєл (11), Alekseež; by the combination of *k* and *c* (*kc*) as in Ялєксеа (15), Aleksea; and by the combination of *ž* and *k* as in Ялєкžандра (11), Alekksandra.

The letter *з* is expressed by *з* as in Захарїи (9), Zaharii, and by *ѕ* (*dz*) as in Синовїи (10), Zinovii, pronounced Zinovii or Dzinovii. The forms with *ѕ* (*dz*) may be regarded as a reflection either of Northern Volhynian pronunciation or of South Slavic influence.

The Greek diphthongs *eu* and *au* are rendered in our text by the combination of *ev*; thus,

Gk. Eudóksia > OCS Evdoksia (17).

In the *Pomianyk* we frequently meet a substitution of *x* for *th*, as in Ходора (63), Ximy (88) and the substitution of *v* for *th*, as in Matvež (237), as well as the usual identification of *th* with *f*, as in Matfeia (234).

Basically, the morphological features of the anthroponyms under study are Greek and represent a simple transliteration of the Greek morphological system. However, some Slavic innovations are evident:

- (1) in the endings of the principal forms and derivatives;
- (2) in the suffixation; and
- (3) in the abbreviations and contractions and other processes.

As previously noted, the names of Greek provenance were brought into the Eastern Slavic declensional system by means of the modification of Greek endings (Gk. Basilios > OCS Vasilii).

Names in the *Pomianyk* are in most cases recorded in the gsg. However, accsg. and gsg. forms and those of possessive adjective also appear occasionally. All those cases indicate that the names were treated in accordance with the rules of the Slavic declensional system. For instance, Anny (gsg., 8), Annu (accsg., 258), Ка(ѕ)ка

(nsg., 29), Kasiu (accsg., 196), Romanovъ (poss. adj., 63), Vasiliuvъ (poss. adj., 73), Lubovъ (accsg., 222), and Lubve (gsg., 254). The form *Lubve* exemplifies the archaic appellative form of the gsg. of the *ü*-stem declension.<sup>61</sup>

The names in the *Pomianyk* provide only a limited variety of Slavic suffixes which were usually appended to the stems of Greek names so as to form Slavic derivatives.

In the masculine names the suffix *-ko* appears most frequently. This suffix was added: (1) to the contracted or shortened variant of a name,

Seń-ko (74) < Ksentii < Avksentii,  
Erem-ko (256) < Ierema < Ieremia;

(2) to another diminutive

Fed'-ko (247) < Fedъ < Fedor < Theodorъ,  
Zeń-ko (246) < Zenio < Zinovii,  
Dać-ko (219) < Todosъ < Theodosii.

Under the influence of appellatives ending in *-a-š*, *-ja-š*, there arose in the native Slavic nomenclature such forms as *Bogdaš* < *Bogdan*.<sup>62</sup> Christian anthroponymy was also formed on this pattern, e.g. *Ivaś* < *Ivan* < *Ioannъ*, *Oleś* < *Oleksii* ~ *Aleksii*. But whenever a vowel preceded *-š* in such formations, the suffix *-ko* was frequently added after *-š*. Similar formations are documented in the *Pomianyk* by the derivatives *Ivaško* (258) and *Oleško* (257).

Instances where a final *o* is added to a full form are very rare in the material studied. The forms which do appear (*Mixailo*, *Pavlo*) are discussed above in the section on Slavicization.

In the *Pomianyk* only two types of feminine suffixes are found, namely, *-ka* and *-sia*. That these suffixes still seem to preserve their original emotional tone suggested by the nature of the derivatives which they form: *-ka* produced augmentative formations while *-sia* carried a tone of endearment.

Like masculine suffixes, feminine suffixes are added either to a short form of a name, for example, *Zeń-ka* (74) < *Zinovia*; or to the diminutive variants as in *Daś-ka* (254) < *Theodosia*, and *Kaś-ka* (29) < *Ekaterina*.

<sup>61</sup> N. luby, G. lubъve, D. lubъvi, A. lubъvъ, V. luby, I. lubъvъjъ, L. lubъvi.

<sup>62</sup> A. Baecklund, op.cit., p. 67.

The diminutive suffix *-sia* in our material is always appended to another diminutive form, viz., *Ka-sia* (247) < *Katia* < *Ekaterina*, *Ga-sia* (272) < *Genia* < *Eugenia*, and *Ma-sia* (247) < *Mania* < *Maria*.

Abbreviation and contraction occur more frequently in the *Pomianyky* than does suffixation; for example, *Semena* (41) < *Se-meona*, *Uroni* (26) < *Feuronii*, and *Prosimii* (36) < *Evfrosimii*.

Some 'hypercorrect' forms should also be mentioned. These are formations in which the Old Church Slavic suffix *-ii* is incorrectly added to a number of names with the purpose of giving them Old Church Slavic character, e.g. *Danilię* (23) < *Danila*, *Kirilię* (73) < *Kirila*.

Western Slavic influence on the anthroponyms studied is revealed in the names *Veťslava* (31) and *Stanislava* (89). Moreover, the style and structure of a majority of entries denotes Polish effects; for example, "upys panei" or "Upys pana Oleksandrova podskarbiego."<sup>63</sup> Yet, marginalia in the *Pomianyky* bear witness to profound Polish influence.<sup>64</sup>

<sup>63</sup> The *Pomianyky*, pp. 12-13.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, Part B and Part C.