

NON-RUSSIAN ELEMENTS IN THE
DICTIONARIOLUM RUSSICO-ANGLICUM
OF 1618-1619

A Thesis
Presented to
The Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
The University of Manitoba

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by
Hermann Rempel
March 1970



ABSTRACT

The purpose of this thesis is to investigate the non-Russian elements in the "Dictionariolum Russico-Anglicum of 1618-1619".

The "Dictionariolum" is valuable for the following reasons:

a) The date and place of its entries (1618-1619, Northern Russia) as well as its author (Richard James), are well known, and b) its material falls into a period of Russian linguistic history that has not been satisfactorily documented and investigated.

The non-Russian elements are divided into two categories: foreign words, including loan translations, and Russian words with non-Russian phonological and morphological characteristics. For foreign words, a brief description is given according to the following plan: a) an English translation, b) the date of first attestation in Russian, c) the form of the word in the original language, and d) the form in the mediating language or languages. The foreign words are divided, according to the degree of certainty of their etymologies, into the following three groups: a) words with certain etymologies, b) words with etymologies that are not clear in all details, and c) words with obscure etymologies. The non-Russian words were found to be of Turko-Tataric, Finno-Ugrian, West Slavic, Germanic, Ukrainian, and Greek provenance. Besides the non-Russian words that constitute about one-fifth of the vocabulary in the "Dictionariolum" a relatively large number of originally Russian words showed various influences of the Finno-Ugric substratum.

A semantic classification of the vocabulary was undertaken on the basis of "Der deutsch Wortschatz nach Sachgruppen" by F. Dornseiff. This classification showed that the different semantic groups are very unevenly represented in the "Dictionariolum". Most numerous are the entries related to the material world, whereas those referring to abstract concepts are relatively few. The number of attested foreign words for each semantic group is shown in a table, divided into three historical periods, along with an indication of the donor languages.

Since the publication of the "Dictionariolum" as an appendix to "Russko-Anglijskij Slovar6 - Dnevnik Ričarda Džemsa" by B. A. Larin, articles on various aspects of the material have been published; however, none of them are of the scope or extent presented in this thesis.

TABLE I

ALPHABETICAL ORDER USED IN THIS THESIS

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| A a | B b | C c | Č č | D d | E e | Ě ě | Ě ě | F f | G g | H h |
| I i | J j | K k | L l | M m | N n | O o | P p | Q q | R r | S s |
| Š š | T t | U u | V v | W w | X x | Z z | Ž ž | Ǿ | Y y | ǿ |

TABLE II

TRANSLITERATION SYSTEM OF RUSSIAN ALPHABET

The following transliteration system will be used in this thesis for transliterating the Cyrillic alphabet.

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|-----|-------------|-----|------|
| А а | - a | І і | - i (Ukr.) | У у | - u |
| Б б | - b | Ї ї | - ji (Ukr.) | Ф ф | - f |
| В в | - v | Й й | - j | Х х | - x |
| Г г | - g (Ukr.) | К к | - k | Ц ц | - c |
| Г г | - h (Ukr.) | Л л | - l | Ч ч | - č |
| | g (Ru.) | М м | - m | Ш ш | - š |
| Д д | - d | Н н | - n | Щ щ | - šč |
| Е е | - e | О о | - o | Ъ ъ | - 6 |
| Ё ё | - ě | П п | - p | Ы ы | - y |
| Є є | - je (Ukr.) | Р р | - r | Ь ь | - ǿ |
| Ж ж | - ž | С с | - s | Э э | - ě |
| З з | - z | Т т | - t | Ю ю | - ju |
| И и | - y (Ukr.) | | | Я я | - ja |
| | i (Ru.) | | | | |

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

1. Languages and Dialects

| | | | |
|------------|----------------------|----------|----------------------|
| Ar. | - Arabic | MIran. | - Middle Iranian |
| Avest. | - Avestan | MPers. | - Middle Persian |
| Bu. | - Bulgarian | MLat. | - Middle Latin |
| Car. | - Carelian | ModHG. | - Modern High German |
| CS | - Church Slavic | ModPers. | - Modern Persian |
| Cz. | - Czech | Mordv. | - Mordvinian |
| ES | - East Slavic | Norw. | - Norwegian |
| Eston. | - Estonian | OCS | - Old Church Slavic |
| Fin. | - Finnish | OCz. | - Old Czech |
| Finno-Ugr. | - Finno-Ugric | OFr. | - Old French |
| Fr. | - French | OHG. | - Old High German |
| G. | - German | OIn. | - Old Indian |
| Germ. | - Germanic | ONorse | - Old Norse |
| Gk. | - Greek | OSw. | - Old Swedish |
| Goth. | - Gothic | OTk. | - Old Turkic |
| HG. | - High German | Pers. | - Persian |
| Hung. | - Hungarian | PGerm. | - Proto-Germanic |
| Ir. | - Iranian | Po. | - Polish |
| It. | - Italian | PS. | - Proto-Slavic |
| Lat. | - Latin | Rm. | - Rumanian |
| Latv. | - Latvian | Ru. | - Russian |
| Lith. | - Lithuanian | Sp. | - Spanish |
| LowG. | - Low German | Swed. | - Swedish |
| MDu. | - Middle Dutch | Tk. | - Turkic |
| MG. | - Middle German | Tk.-Tt. | - Turko-Tataric |
| MGk. | - Middle Greek | Ukr. | - Ukrainian |
| MHG | - Middle High German | | |

2. Other Abbreviations

cf. - compare

- Comm. - Commentary, pp. 201-266 in "Russko-anglijskij slovar6-dnevnik Ricarda Džemsa (1618-1619)" by B. A. Larin. vi
- Dict. - Dictionary, pp. 59-200, same source as under "Comm."
- f/e - folk etymological
- ms.-fs. - manuscript-facsimile, pp. 349-421, same source as under "Comm."
- P/N - personal name
- RJ - Richard James
- ts the same (meaning)
- * - reconstructed

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | page |
|---|------|
| Abstract..... | ii |
| Table I: Alphabetical Order Used in this Thesis..... | iv |
| Table II: Transliteration System of Russian Alphabet..... | iv |
| List of Abbreviations..... | v |
| Table of Contents..... | vii |
| CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| Richard James: A Brief Account of his Life and Stay in Russia..... | 1 |
| History of the "Dictionariolum Russico-Anglicum"..... | 2 |
| Critical Survey of the Pertaining Research of the "Dictionariolum" to date..... | 3 |
| Method of Procedure..... | 5 |
| Problems of Transliteration..... | 5 |
| A Note on the Formal Aspects of Larin's Presentation of the "Dictionariolum"..... | 8 |
| CHAPTER II: ANALYSIS OF INADEQUATE TRANSLATIONS BY R. JAMES IN THE "DICTIONARIOLUM"..... | 10 |
| CHAPTER III: ETYMOLOGICAL ANALYSIS..... | 21 |
| Group A Words whose Etymology is Certain..... | 21 |
| Group B Words with Etymologies that are not Clear in all Details..... | 80 |
| Group C Words of Obscure Etymology..... | 90 |

CHAPTER IV: NON-RUSSIAN PHONETIC AND MORPHOLOGICAL

| | |
|--|-----|
| FEATURES OF RUSSIAN WORDS..... | 98 |
| Substitution of "U" for Russian "v"..... | 98 |
| Spirantal "g"..... | 100 |
| Influence of the Ecclesiastic Language..... | 101 |
| a) Substitution of "e" for "*e ^v "..... | 101 |
| b) Preservation of "sc ^v "..... | 101 |
| Voiced and Unvoiced Consonants..... | 102 |
| a) Substitution of "d" for Ru. "t"..... | 102 |
| b) Substitution of "g" for Ru. "k"..... | 102 |
| c) Substitution of "s ^v " for Ru. "z ^v "..... | 103 |
| d) Confusion of "s" and "z"..... | 103 |
| Simplification of "sc ^v " and "c ^v " to "s ^v "..... | 105 |
| a) Simplification of Ru. "sc ^v " to "s ^v "..... | 105 |
| b) Substitution of "s ^v " for Ru. "c ^v "..... | 106 |
| Confusion of "c" and "c ^v "..... | 106 |
| a) Substitution of "c ^v " for Ru. "c"..... | 106 |
| b) Substitution of "c" for "c ^v "..... | 106 |
| Initial Vowels before Consonant Clusters..... | 106 |
| Words with Final "-ga"..... | 107 |
| Nominative as Objective Case..... | 111 |
| CHAPTER V: SEMANTIC CLASSIFICATION AND ANALYSIS..... | 112 |
| 1. Time..... | 113 |
| 2. Space. Position. Form..... | 115 |
| 3. Size. Amount. Number..... | 121 |
| 4. Nature of being. Relation. Happening..... | 125 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 5. Visibility. Light. Colour. Sound. Temperature. Weight. Aggregate conditions. Smell. Taste..... | 128 |
| 6. Inorganic world. Materials..... | 135 |
| 7. Plants. Animals. Physiology of Man..... | 137 |
| 8. Change of Place..... | 144 |
| 9. Volition and action..... | 148 |
| 10. Sensory impressions..... | 150 |
| 11. Feelings. Passion. Character traits..... | 151 |
| 12. Reasoning..... | 153 |
| 13. Signs. Communication. Language..... | 155 |
| 14. Letters..... | 156 |
| 15. Art..... | 157 |
| 16. Society and community..... | 157 |
| 17. Artifacts..... | 163 |
| 18. Economy..... | 166 |
| 19. Morality. Ethics. Law..... | 168 |
| 20. Religion. The supernatural..... | 169 |
| Summary and Conclusions..... | 170 |
| CHAPTER VI: SUMMARY OF RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS..... | 174 |
| INDEX OF WORDS WITH NON-RUSSIAN ELEMENTS..... | 179 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY..... | 199 |
| APPENDIX I: Printing Errors in the Dictionary..... | 205 |
| Russian Part..... | 206 |
| English Part..... | 219 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| APPENDIX II: Errors in the Index..... | 223 |
| Words Found in the Dictionary but not in the Index..... | 224 |
| Printing Errors in the Index..... | 226 |
| APPENDIX III: Corrections of the Lists | |
| of Accented Words..... | 231 |
| Words whose Forms do not Agree with | |
| the manuscript-facsimile..... | 232 |
| Words that should be Added..... | 237 |
| Words whose Accent is not Clearly Marked..... | 240 |
| Words that Should be Deleted..... | 240 |
| APPENDIX IV: Samples of the Manuscript-Facsimile..... | 244 |

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

RICHARD JAMES: A BRIEF ACCOUNT

OF HIS LIFE AND STAY IN RUSSIA

Richard James, the author of the "Dictionariolum Russico-Anglicum", was born at Newport on the Isle of Wight in 1592. After graduation from the Corpus Christi College at Oxford in 1614, he took holy orders and set out on a series of journeys to Wales, Scotland, Shetland, Greenland, and eventually to Russia. To the lastnamed country he went as chaplain to Sir Dudley Digges' embassy in 1618¹. Since his account of his stay in Russia has been lost, very little is known about his life in Russia. It is not even quite certain what places in Russia he visited. However, most of his two-year stay in Russia he spent at Xolmogory². Here he met mostly ordinary townspeople, farmers, fishermen, and hunters, from whom he recorded the words and phrases in the "Dictionariolum". Having acquired some knowledge of Russian before coming to Russia, he made his entries without an interpreter³. In his later life R. James enjoyed a great reputation as a scholar and poet. He died in December 1638 in Westminster, England.

1. Leslie Stephen and Sidney Lee (ed.), The Dictionary of National Biography (Oxford University Press, 1921-1922), X, 655.

2. Larin, 32

3. Larin, 313

HISTORY OF THE "DICTIONARIOLUM RUSSICO-ANGLICUM"

Richard James' manuscript of the "Dictionariolum Russico-Anglicum" has been kept at the Bodleian Library at Oxford, England, since 1676. Before that it was in the possession of Thomas Greaves who had taken over James' papers at the time of his friend's death in 1638.

In the 1850's the "Dictionariolum" aroused some interest among Russian scholars chiefly because of its second part, eight pages stitched to the main manuscript, containing six Russian songs⁴. Only toward the end of the century did Russian scholars show interest in the study of the "Dictionariolum" itself. In 1897 P.K.Simoni, a member of the Russian "Imperial Academy of Sciences", asked Professor W.R.Morfill of Oxford, England to have a handwritten copy prepared and sent to him. This copy was received by Simoni not later than February 1898⁵. That it aroused considerable interest among members of the Imperial Academy of Sciences can be seen from a letter written by A.A.Saxmatov.

"We had many discussions about R. James' dictionary or rather collection of Russian words that has arrived from England. It is very interesting. We will probably publish it in its entirety." ⁶

The reasons why it was published only in 1959, sixty-one years later, are not always clear. The main difficulty seems to have

4. According to Larin, 311, they were published in 1907.

5. Larin, 329, letter no. 7.

6. Larin, 331, letter no. 10.

been that the copy of the "Dictionariolum" was inadequate. According to B.A. Larin, who checked it in the 1930's, it had "hundreds of errors."⁷ The publication of the "Dictionariolum" was given up in 1904 "until a reliable handwritten or photographic copy is available."⁸ Thirty years later, shortly before his death, P.K. Simoni handed over, to B.A. Larin, all preserved materials connected with the ill-fated publication of the "Dictionariolum". In 1935, Prof. Bojanus and Prof. L. Armstrong, both of London, sent him a complete photographic copy of the "Dictionariolum". However, only fourteen years later, in 1959, was it finally published, together with an analysis and commentary under the title "Russko-Anglijskij Slovar6-Dnevnik Ričarda Džemsa (1618-1619)".

CRITICAL SURVEY OF THE PERTAINING RESEARCH
OF THE "DICTIONARIOLUM" TO DATE

By far the most important work on the "Dictionariolum" so far undertaken is that by B.A. Larin in "Russko-Anglijskij Slovar6-Dnevnik Ričarda Džemsa (1618-1619)". In it Larin laid the foundation for the understanding of R. James' entries with respect to its semasiological and phonological aspects. In his commentaries and in his phonological analysis he has collected pertinent material from various sources that facilitate further studies. The shortcomings concern his system of transliteration and numerous technical errors in some parts of his work. These

7. Larin, 317.

8. Larin, 333, letter no. 15.

two aspects will be dealt with in the next two sections of this chapter. With respect to non-Russian elements, his study of the phonological effects of foreign languages on the dialect of Xolmogory is broad in scope. However, his lists of words are frequently incomplete. His references to foreign words in the first part of his book as well as in his commentaries are very brief and sometimes require revision.

After the publication of Larin's work three articles dealing with foreign words in the "Dictionariolum" have appeared. The most important one is "Cards and Card-Playing in Muscovite Russia" by B.O. Unbegaun, in which he deals extensively with all of the relatively numerous non-Russian terms related to cards and card-playing. The ultimate source as well as the route of penetration into Russian is traced. The second article is "Ukrainian Borrowing in Seventeenth-Century Northern Russia", also by B.O. Unbegaun. It shows that some of the terms regarded by Larin as Ukrainianisms are either of Russian or unknown provenance. In the third article, "Russian in 16th-Century English Sources", H. Leeming compares different forms of a word with respect to meaning and phonology. One of the sources considered is the "Dictionariolum". However, Leeming does not make a distinction between genuine Russian words and loanwords. An extensive study of all the non-Russian elements in the "Dictionariolum" has apparently not been undertaken and the present study is the first of its kind with respect to scope, object and method of investigation.

METHOD OF PROCEDURE

All foreign words and calques found in the manuscript-facsimile were translaterated and their etymologies investigated. Chapter III contains a brief description of each of these words according to the following plan: a) English translation, b) date of first attestation in Russian, c) forms of the word in the original and mediating languages. The entries are shown in three groups according to the degree of certainty of the etymologies. The semantic classification of all words in the "Dictionariolum" was undertaken on the basis of "Der deutsche Wortschatz nach Sachgruppen" by F. Dornseiff. The inclusion of the Russian vocabulary in the semantic classification makes it possible to determine, qualitatively as well as quantitatively, the nature of the entire vocabulary and then to assess the importance of the foreign words and calques. Some of the results are tabulated in chapters V and VI.

PROBLEMS OF TRANSLITERATION

In this study transliteration was carried out in such a way as to make the transliterated form as close as practicable to that actually recorded by R. James. Transliteration was deemed necessary because James made use of a number of different symbols for the same sound. Thus "ch" stands for "x" in goroch (4:40), "č" in chado (62:1), and "k" in palcha (6:38); "e" stands for "i" in prebuīt (61:28), "y" in rīze (25:26), and it is mute

in colepak. From these examples which can be extended to great length it is obvious that transliteration is necessary. The method used was basically the same as that elaborated in Larin, 9-30, with the exception of two points involving a larger number of words. They are Larin's introduction of sibilants and substitution of "o" for James' "U".

Larin indicates in the "Dictionary" a number of transliterated words with s", z" where s and \check{s} , z and \check{z} fuse. While the existence of these sounds is not doubted, the introduction of s" and z" was not always clear. Thus Larin transliterates "shamga" as "semga" ($\sim \check{s}$ "emga) (14:26, Dict., 84), "baesh" as "bes"⁹ (6:12, Dict., 66), and "pérUska" as "perus"ko" (41:27, Dict., 143). From these examples it appears that Larin is either not certain how to read the words involving s $\sim\check{s}$ or s" is introduced when James' form deviates from the one in modern Russian. A similar situation exists for z, \check{z} and z". Because of this uncertainty the sibilants are not indicated in the transliterated forms used in this study.

The other case where Larin's transliterated form deviates from that in the manuscript-facsimile concerns his substitution of "o" for James' "U". The reason given in Larin, 39 is that in certain cases English corresponded to Russian "u". However, this is not certain since Larin himself states⁹ that James' speech was probably dialectically tainted and an analysis of the English commentaries in the "Dictionariolum" has apparently not been undertaken. Larin usually transliterates "u" for James' "o" only if

9. See Larin, 14.

standard Russian has a "u". For instance, "robaska" is transliterated as "rubas"ka" (7:14, Dict., 69), "collits" as "kulic" (60:18, Dict., 178), while the "o" in "noga" remains unchanged. Larin is not so sure when it comes to unusual forms containing "U" if standard Russian has an "o". "BrUsaj" he transliterates as "brusaj" (17:5, Dict., 90), "drUbin" as "drubina" (drobina?) (26:7, Dict., 107), "bUba" as "boba" (buba) (4:41, Dict., 6), and "mUrska" as "morska" (31:7, Dict., 119). To avoid difficulties of such a nature "U" will be transliterated as "u" and "o" as "o".

Another reason for giving a new transliteration which is as close as possible to James' form is that a number of inconsistencies occur in Larin's transliteration. Thus he transliterates "dareunah" as "djareunja" (5:5, Dict., 64), but "darevanne" as "derevjanno" (13:16, Dict., 82); "xosna" as "kozna" (45:12, Dict., 151), but "xozaine" as "xozain" (15:26, Dict., 87); "snait" as "znait" (znait⁶?) (61:22, Dict., 180), but "snege" as "sneg" (5:27, Dict., 65). The number of inconsistencies is so large that a mere list of changes would appear unsatisfactory.

Larin's aim in transliterating James' Russian words in the dictionary was to reproduce the word in such a way as it "might have been pronounced in Xolmogory and Arxangel'sk in the first quarter of the 17th century" ("rekonstruktija slova...v tom vide, kak ono moglo byt⁶ proizneseno...¹⁰). Larin took into consider-

10. Larin, 56

ation the difference between the English and Russian sound system as well as the study of the manuscript as a whole with all repetitions of the same word in different forms as well as analogous, similar spellings of different words. In addition to James' manuscript Larin, in transliteration, made use of publications on the speech of Xolmogory as well as first-hand information gathered by him on journeys to the Xolmogory and Arxangel6sk areas in 1946. The third basis for transliteration was the written sources of the 15th - 17th centuries.¹¹

The approach in this thesis is different from Larin's in so far as it makes use only of James' manuscript and thus, hopefully, comes closer to what James actually recorded, not what he might have heard. This approach produces some results, that are important for answering some pertinent questions of this thesis. For instance, James' "ingbire" Larin reconstructed as "inbir" (12:52, Dict., 81), but in this study it is "ingbir". The latter form shows its derivation from MHG "ingwer" more clearly than Larin's.

A NOTE ON THE FORMAL ASPECTS OF LARIN'S PRESENTATION OF THE "DICTIONARIOLUM"

Whereas Larin's analysis of the "Dictionariolum" was found to be thorough and broad in scope, it has certain inadequacies. Three parts of his work contain errors, mostly of a technical nature.

11. Larin, 56-7.

These are the printed reproduction of the manuscript (Larin, 59-200), the index of words (Larin, 268-303), and the lists of accented words (Larin, 340-348). In the Russian part of the "Dictionary" most of the errors involve a confusion of "i" and "i" and a misplacement of the stress signs, in the English part various substitutions of letters. The corrections for both the Russian and English parts are shown in Appendix I. In the index there are two kinds of errors: confusion of word numbers and omission of words that are found in the manuscript and also in its printed reproduction. Appendix II shows both types of errors. The errors found in the lists of stressed words are listed in Appendix III.