

БЪЛГАРСКА АКАДЕМИЯ НА НАУКИТЕ  
ИНСТИТУТ ЗА БЪЛГАРСКИ ЕЗИК  
„ПРОФ. ЛЮБОМИР АНДРЕЙЧИН“

БАЛКАНСКО ЕЗИКОЗНАНИЕ  
LINGUISTIQUE BALKANIQUE

XLV, 3

A LA MEMOIRE  
DU PROF. DR. GEORGI T. RIKOV

*Marek STACHOWSKI (Kraków)*

### NOTES ON GERMAN LOAN WORDS IN AN AREAL CARPATHIAN CONTEXT

In an article published recently (Stachowski 2005) I tried to define the notion of Carpathian word (or lexical Carpathianism) and to propose a geographical-linguistic classification of words typical of the Carpathian languages. Without repeating the arguments and the train of thought presented in that study, I would like to summarize here the most substantial points before going on to further considerations.

There are six languages<sup>1</sup> in the Carpathians: Polish (= Pol.), Czech (= Cz.), Slovak (= Slov.), Ukrainian (= Ukr.), Hungarian (= Hung.) and Romanian (= Rom.); hereinafter no practical distinction is made between Romanian and Moldovian (= Mold.). These languages can be divided into five functional groups<sup>2</sup>:

- I. Pol., Cz., Slov.
- II. Pol., Ukr.
- III. Hung., Ukr.
- IV. Hung., Rom. (+ Mold.)
- V. Ukr., Rom. (+ Mold.)

A word may be called a lexical Carpathianism if it is attested in no less than three Carpathian languages belonging to at least two different functional groups. In addition, no more than two of the three languages may be Slavic, and the word in question must not be equally well known outside the Carpathians (which could be the case for instance with international words like 'telephone' or 'communism')<sup>3</sup>. The words analysed in this study make grouping in the following geographical-linguistic zones possible:

**Northern Carpathianisms** are those attested in groups I, II and III but not in groups IV and V.

**Southern Carpathianisms** are those attested in groups III, IV and V but not in groups I and II.

**Contour Carpathianisms** are those attested in Pol./Cz./Slov.<sup>4</sup> + Ukr. + Rom. but not in Hung.

**Eastern Carpathianisms**<sup>5</sup> are those attested in Slov. + Ukr. + Hung. + Rom. and not found in Pol. and Cz.

**Western Carpathianisms**<sup>6</sup> are those attested in Pol./Cz./Slov. + Hung. + Rom. and not found in Ukr.

**Separated Carpathianisms** are those attested in Pol./Cz./Slov. + Rom. and not found in Hung. and Ukr., so that there exist no „connecting links“ between the North and the South of the region.

**Universal Carpathianisms** are those attested in at least four languages, Pol./Cz. + Ukr. + Hung. + Rom. (cf. the Eastern and the Western zone).

Siatkowski (1997) seems to constitute an especially valuable collection of words for the purpose of testing to what extent the classification summarized above can be successfully applied to another lexical stock, i.e. to German loan words. Naturally enough, Siatkowski could not follow my guidelines since his study appeared eight years earlier than mine. Therefore I had to exclude a relatively large number of words presented by him. For instance, a word like *putyra* ~ *pućyra* ~ *putin(k)a*, etc. 'vessel for milk or whey' is attested in Polish, Czech, Slovak and Ukrainian (Siatkowski 1997: 77), i.e. in Slavic languages only, which means that it is a Slavicism, rather than a Carpathianism.<sup>7</sup>

Reflexes of German *Grundbirne* 'potato' can be cited from Hungarian and Romanian only, but two languages of attestation are – according to my definition – not enough to call a word a Carpathianism. Siatkowski (1997: 85) does in actual fact adduce also Ukr. *krúmpľi* id. in this context; I, however, feel compelled to exclude this word, since it does not presumably go back to German *Grundbirne*, but, instead, to its diminutive *Grundbirnli* or *Grundbirnle*.

A similar case is Rom. *bajstrúcă* and Ukr. *bajstrjúk* 'bastard, illegitimate child', going back to Pol. *bastard* id. < German *Bastard* id. < Latin *bastardus* id. (Siatkowski 1997: 88 sq.) Two things are to be emphasized here: (1) The word *bajstrúcă* is not attested throughout Romania, but only in Moldova. Therefore, it should rather be treated as a regional loan from Ukrainian, i.e. Mold. *bajstrúcă* and Ukr. *bajstrjúk* are better regarded as *one* word; (2) The Ukrainian suffix *-uk* does not occur in the Polish etymon since it was added only after the word was borrowed into Ukrainian, which means that Pol. *bastard* is better excluded from this group. To sum up, I see no possibility of accepting *bajstrjúk* ~ *bajstrúcă* as a Carpathian word.

A similar example is Carpathian *šextār* ~ *žojtār* 'vessel used for milking' < Old High German *sehtāri* 'Hohlmaß; Melkeimer' (Kluge 663), attested in Slovak, Ukrainian, and Hungarian spoken in Ukraine. Since this word seems to have never reached Hungarian proper, i.e. as spoken in Hungary, it is practically known only in Slovakia and Ukraine, and has therefore to be treated as a German loan into Slavic (with a regional reflex in Hungarian dialects of Ukraine), which is not enough to be accepted as Carpathianism.

\*\*\*

The following German words can readily be classified as Carpathianisms:

- lada* 'coffin' < German dial. *Lade* 'chest, container; coffin' – attested in Slovak, Ukrainian and Romanian (Siatkowski 1997: 85), consequently: a **Contour Carpathianism**. The Hungarian word *láda* 'Behälter eines Fahrzeuges; Kiste, Truhe' (EWU s. v.) is etymologically the same word; however, its meaning, being different from the Slovak, Ukrainian and Romanian one<sup>8</sup>, it points to a discrete borrowing process, presumably via other channels. For that reason, it should be divorced from the other Carpathian attestations. This highlights a factor of paramount importance here since the inclusion of the Hungarian variant would change the lexical status of this word from **Contour** to **Eastern Carpathianism**.
- lajbl(i)* 'waistcoat' < Bavarian *Leib(e)l* ~ Southern German *Leibli* ~ *Leible* id. – attested in Czech, Slovak, Hungarian and Romanian (Siatkowski 1997: 78), consequently: a **Western Carpathianism**. Pol. *lajbik* ~ *lejbik* and Ukr. *lájbyk* ~ *lějbyk* id. (ibidem) do not belong here since the Slavic suffix *-ik* ~ *-yk* attached to the German loan makes them a separate lexical item.
- lojtra* ~ *létra* 'ladder' < German *Leiter* id. – attested in Slovak, Ukrainian and Hungarian (Siatkowski 1997: 94 sq.), consequently: a **Northern Carpathianism**. Precise determination of the German source dialects and borrowing channels requires further study.
- olovrant* ~ *lóránt* 'afternoon snack' < German dial. *Halberabend* id. – attested in Slovak, Ukrainian and Hungarian (Siatkowski 1997: 94), consequently: a **Northern Carpathianism**.
- put(i)na* ~ *putña* 'wooden vessel/container' < ? Old German *butin(n)a* id. (< Latin *butina* 'vessel, bottle, barrel' < Greek βυτίνη ~ πυτίνη 'Korbflasche' [EWU s.v. *puttony*]) – attested in Czech, Slovak, Ukrainian, Romanian and Hungarian (Siatkowski 1997: 77), consequently: a **Universal Carpathianism**. The principal language responsible for the dispersion of the word throughout the Carpathians was probably Romanian (cf. EWU s.v. *putina*). In this case, however, we should first investigate whether the German mediation between Romanian (< Latin) and the other Carpathian attestations is actually necessary. The Hungarian word *puttony* 'vat; great basket; container for bread or flour' (i.e. [put:ón], not [puto:ón] = \* <putóny>, as misprinted in Siatkowski 1997: 77), too, goes back via Early High German *putten* to Latin *butina* < Greek βυτίνη ~ πυτίνη (EWU s.v.); nevertheless, the apparently different borrowing channel and meaning compel us to divorce *puttony* from the *put(i)na* word family.

*šurc* ~ *šorc* 'apron' < German dial. *Schurz* ~ *Schorz* id. – attested in Polish, Czech, Slovak, Ukrainian, Hungarian and Romanian (Siatkowski 1997: 78), consequently: a **Universal Carpathianism**.

*šyndel* ~ *šingel* 'shingle (piece of wood, used to cover a roof)' < German *Schindel* id. – attested in Czech, Slovak, Ukrainian and Hungarian (Siatkowski 1997: 80), consequently: a **Northern Carpathianism**. Words like Rom. dial. *šind(r)ilă* ~ *šindră* id. (ibidem) are better treated separately because of their -ă, which possibly points to another channel of borrowing.

\*\*\*

Even this brief analysis of the few German loan words in the Carpathian languages brings some additional problems to the fore. Solutions to these – which will sometimes probably be more or less arbitrary, i.e. relying on a convention, rather than on precise arguments and inferences – will, in the future, possibly affect the areal interpretation of the Carpathian lexical zones proposed in Stachowski (2005) and summarized above if our understanding of the notion of "Carpathian linguistic area" has by then gained in precision and clarity. Let us now formulate some of the most important problems:

(1) Should all words reflecting a common root be treated together (as Siatkowski 1997 suggests), even if they display different suffixes (as is the case with *bajstrúkă*, *krúmpŕi*, *lajbik* and *šind(r)ilă* above)?

(2) Should words with more or less divergent meanings be treated separately, even if they display no substantial morphological differences? Cf. here *lada*, *put(i)na* ~ *puttony* and *szállás*.

(3) Should words of language A, used solely in a dialect of A spoken in an area of language B (e.g. Romanian or Slovak words in Ukraine, Hungarian words in Ukraine or Romania), be considered as representatives of A or B? Cf. here *bajstrucă* and *šextăr* ~ *žojtăr*.

(4) To what extent should German and Romani be treated as Carpathian languages? I have not included them here because lexical parallels among the Carpathian languages are generally closely connected with shepherd culture, which is typical neither of the German nor of the Gypsy population. Nevertheless, the problem deserves to be discussed at greater length.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Concerning the inventory of languages see also problem (4) at the end of this article. However this may be, in view of the Slavic languages in the Northern Carpathians, the linguistic area should rather be labeled Carpathian (Helimski 2003: 159), not a „Danube Sprachbund“, as it has been called at times in some earlier works. Incidentally, a

totally chaotic use of the term „Donausprachbund“ is presented by V. Skalička who writes among other things as follows: „Die Aufgabe meines Artikels ist zu zeigen, wie das bunte sprachliche Bild des Donaubeckens zu beurteilen ist. [...] Man hat [...] vom «balkanischen Sprachbund», der Rumänisch, Bulgarisch, Makedonisch, Albanisch und vielleicht Neugriechisch umfaßt, und vom mitteleuropäischen Sprachbund mit dem Ungarischen, Slovakischen, Tschechischen, vielleicht auch Serbokroatischen und Deutschen gesprochen.“ (Skalička 1968: 3). I cannot actually see what league is meant here if the author has, in the title of his article, promised to discuss the „Donausprachbund“. The notion of „Donausprachbund“ is not defined and the languages belonging to it are not enumerated anywhere else in the study either.

<sup>2</sup> I call them „functional“ because they do not exist as real linguistic units but, instead, perform a function in establishing geographical-linguistic zones in the Carpathians (see below).

<sup>3</sup> As can be seen, the setting up of criteria for distinguishing Carpathianisms, i.e. for deciding when a given word represents an areal feature, goes to the very heart of the notion „linguistic area/league/union“ itself. For an overview of criteria and arguments see e.g. Campbell [www]. An additional problem is whether „evident parallels in the domains of vocabulary and semantics (but hardly beyond these domains)“ actually are „sufficient for postulating a Sprachbund“ (Helimski 2003: 159).

<sup>4</sup> A forward slash means 'or'; a plus sign means 'and at the same time in'.

<sup>5</sup> Called „Central-Eastern“ in Stachowski (2005: 185).

<sup>6</sup> Called „Central-Western“ in Stachowski (2005: 185).

<sup>7</sup> Most of the examples presented by Siatkowski are just loan words into Slavic, not Carpathian, e.g. German *Faß* 'barrel' with its reflexes in Polish (> Ukrainian), Czech and Slovak (Siatkowski 1997: 83; its Lusatian and Byelorussian reflexes having no relevance for Carpathian linguistics at all); Old High German *suochan* (= Modern German *suchen*) 'to look for', attested in the Carpathians solely in Pol. *szukać* and Ukr. *šykaty* id. (Siatkowski 1997: 93), and so forth. The problem of differentiating between Slavic and Carpathian seems to represent a great intellectual challenge to Slavists.

<sup>8</sup> Similarly, I am inclined to separate the Romanian reflex of Hung. *szállás* 'accommodation; lodgings' from all the other Carpathian reflexes of this word since it means 'coffin; grave, tomb', contrary to the other languages of the region with their meaning 'shanty, primitive hut' (Balogh–Bańcerowski–Posgay 2000: 29 sq.). Even the other Romanian meaning, i.e. 'annexe, extension to a farm building' (ibidem) does not appear to be a sufficiently plausible link between 'lodgings; hut' and 'coffin' to enable us to explain 'coffin' as a straightforward next step in the semantic evolution of the word.

## REFERENCES

- Balogh, L., J. Bańcerowski, I. Posgay. 2000. Węgierskie elementy leksykalne w językach regionu karpacciego w świetle danych Karpacciego Atlasu Dialektologicznego. – *Prace Filologiczne*, 45, 27–34.
- Campbell, L. [www]. Areal linguistics: a closer scrutiny. – Accessible at: <[www.linguistics.utah.edu/Faculty/campbell/Areal\\_Linguistics\\_short.doc](http://www.linguistics.utah.edu/Faculty/campbell/Areal_Linguistics_short.doc)>.

- EWU = L. Benkő (ed.) Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Ungarischen. Budapest, 1993–1994.
- Helimski, E. 2003. Areal groupings (Sprachbünde) within and across the borders of the Uralic language family: A survey. – *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények*, 100, 156–167.
- Kluge = Fr. Kluge. Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache. 22. Auflage. Berlin – New York, 1989.
- Siatkowski, J. 1997. Językowe wpływy niemieckie w Karpatach. – In: B. Falińska (ed.), *Witold Doroszewski – mistrz i nauczyciel*, Łomża, 75–99.
- Skalička, V. 1968. Zum Problem des Donausprachbundes. – *Ural-Altäische Jahrbücher*, 40, 3–9.
- Stachowski, M. 2005. Karpatyzm leksykalny. – *Zeszyty Naukowe UJ. Prace Językoznawcze*, 122, 179–188.

**Author's address:**

*ul. Barska 1/4  
PL 30 – 307 Kraków  
Polska*