

DOI: 10.7596/taksad.v9i1.2494

Citation: Grytsenko, S., Medynska, N., & Dudko, I. (2020). Turkism as a Marker of the Ukrainian Linguoculture in the 16th-17th Centuries. *Journal of History Culture and Art Research*, 9(1), 447-457. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.7596/taksad.v9i1.2494>

Turkism as a Marker of the Ukrainian Linguoculture in the 16th-17th Centuries

Svitlana Grytsenko¹, Natalia Medynska², Iryna Dudko³

Abstract

The cultural development cannot help displaying the language development as a whole, though it has its brightest reflection in vocabulary. There are no “pure languages” that would have evolved for over the millennia without any influence of the linguistic environment and neighbors. Ukraine's entry to the European cultural and educational sphere in the 16th-17th centuries contributed to spread and use on its territories such languages as: Ukrainian, Church Slavonic, Greek, Latin, Hebrew, Yiddish, Armenian, Turkish, Kipchat-Tatar, Polish, German, Hungarian, Moldovan, Italian, French, etc. Written sources of the Ukrainian language of the 16th-17th centuries demonstrate the results of linguistic symbiosis – borrowings from different languages, among that Turkism is quantifiable. Borrowings from the Turkic languages are presented in almost all thematic groups of vocabulary, except for the judiciary, the mental activity (mental state) of a person, their language activity, influence, and will. The majority of Turkism is represented in the military sphere, which was caused by the long wars of Ukraine with the Turkic-speaking states, and also in the field of marking imported Eastern goods, in particular the names of fabrics, clothing, dishes, spices, seasoning, etc. Most of these lexemes function in modern Ukrainian language. Ukrainian linguists have done the first steps in the context of studying Ukrainian-Turkic interaction and outlined the main periods of Turkic-speaking influence, ways of the Turkism introduction into the Ukrainian language. However, there are also some gaps in the study of this problem, such as research on the influence of Turkic languages at different chronological levels of the Ukrainian language development and their role in forming the Ukrainian linguistic world. This paper will help closing these gaps.

Keywords: Dominant culture, Linguistic picture of the world, Dynamics of language, Verbalization, Vocabulary, Language contacts, Borrowings, Turkism.

¹ Dr. habil. in Philology, Associate Professor, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Institute of Philology, Department of General Linguistics, Classical Philology and Neohellenistic Studies, Kyiv, Ukraine, 01601. E-mail: ap730518@gmail.com

² Dr. habil. in Philology, Professor, Academician Stepan Demianchuk International University of Economics and Humanities, Department of the Ukrainian language and literature, Rivne, Ukraine, 33010. E-mail: medynsky.natalia@gmail.com

³ Ph.D. in Philology, Associate Professor, National Pedagogical Dragomanov University, Andrii Malysenko Faculty of Ukrainian Philology and Literary Creativity, Department of the Ukrainian Language, Kyiv, Ukraine, 01601. E-mail: irynadudko777@ukr.net

Introduction

Language as a way of the world verbalization is constantly changing. Social factors, significant historical events, the activities of prominent and influential personalities stimulate and direct linguistic dynamics. The markers of dynamics of extra-linguistic reality, changes of material and production spheres, cultural dominant of society are changes of the lexicon (Grytsenko, 2019). "The development of culture cannot help affecting the development of the language as a whole, but, first and foremost, it is clearly reflected on its vocabulary" (Kremlin, 1992: 83). It is demonstrated by Ukrainian memos of the 16th-17th centuries, the filling of which with borrowed lexemes increased significantly in comparison with the previous period. F.P Sorokoletov rightly noted that the history of the vocabulary of a particular thematic group reproduces the state of craft and production development (Sorokoletov, 1970: 23).

It should be noted that the economic revival of Ukraine, which began in the middle of the 14th century (and strengthened in the 15th-17th centuries), was stimulated by the development of agriculture, cattle breeding, crafts, which led to increased trade and intensive economic exchange between the city and the countryside and with other countries. It is known that "Ukrainian merchants maintained constant contacts with counterparties in Constantinople (Istanbul since 1453), Suceava, Kafi, Sudak" (Kotlyar, 1990: 7), Gdansk, Zamost, Lublin, Warsaw, Torun, Pinsk, Minsk, Slutsk, and in other cities. The scope of the Levantine trade and the significance of Kyiv in this process are indicated in the Latin-language work of Mykhaylo Lytvyn (1550) "De moribus Tartarorum, Litvanorum et Moscorum ...": "Kyiv is filled with foreign goods, because there is no known shorter and more reliable route than this ancient and well-known in all its congestions road leading from the Black Sea port, that is, from the city of Kafi, through the Tauri gate to the Tawan crossing in Borysphyn, and from here through the steppes to Kyiv; precious stones, silk and gold weave, frankincense, incense, saffron, pepper are taken north from Asia, Persia, India, Arabia, Syria to Moscow, Pskov, Novgorod, Sweden and Denmark" (Trade, 1990: 77). All this contributed to the dynamics of transactional processes, the development of the money market, the unification of the metrological system of Ukraine and the improvement and development of the transport sector (partly and under the influence of military confrontation). During the same period occurs the activation of Ukrainian international relations with Poland, the Ottoman Empire, the Moldavian, Transylvanian, Volos principalities, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, Austria, the Venetian Republic, the Swedish Kingdom, the Brandenburg, the Crimean Khanate, which contributed the spread of interethnic contacts and the spread of borrowed vocabulary in the Ukrainian language, in particular Turkism (word or its particular meaning, expression, derived from Turkic language or through their mediation from the other languages (mostly from Arabic or Persian) or formed according to their patterns).

The *object* of the study is Turkic borrowing, as evidenced in Ukrainian-language memos of the 16th and 17th centuries, as an integral component of the linguistic picture of the Ukrainian world. The *subject* of the study is the development of the Ukrainian language lexicon of the 16th-17th centuries as a result of linguistic and cultural interethnic changes. The purpose of the work is to outline the changes in the Ukrainian language lexicon of the 16th-17th centuries caused by Turkic-speaking influence and, consequently, changes of the segments of the linguistic-cultural picture of the world of Ukrainians of the studied period.

Methodology and background

According to Yu. Shevelyov, the Turkic influence among all non-Slavic languages, with which the Ukrainian language contacted, was the greatest, since the Ukrainian-Turkic language contacts

date back to the days of the early Eastern Slavic era, when the steppes of the Northern Black Sea were controlled by Turkic-speaking nomadic tribal associations of Huns (4th-5th centuries), Avars-Aubrey (6th century), Bulgars (6th-7th centuries) and Khazars (7th-10th centuries), displaced by Pechenigs (9th-11th centuries), which then gave way to the Kypchak-Kuman-Polovtsians (11th-13th centuries), and the last conceded to the Crimean Tatars and Nogai of the Golden Horde. With the development of the Cossacks and the Chumaks, according to O.M. Garkavets, the Turkic influence on the vocabulary of the Ukrainian language is increasing, and local linguistic relations are developing – with the Crimean Tatar and Nogai languages in the south of Ukraine; with Armenian-Kypchak – in Kamianets-Podilskyi, Lviv, Lutsk, Stanislavov (now Ivano-Frankivsk), Mogilev-Podilskyi and other cities, where there were the colonies of Kypchak language-speaking Armenians; Karaite – in Lutsk, Stanislavov and Halych; with Urumqi – in Nadazovye after the relocation of the Urumi from Crimea in 1778-1779; with Gagauz – in Bessarabia. In the case of local language communication, reciprocal influence is not limited to borrowing of non-duplicate vocabulary, and often covers all lexical areas (Garkavets, 2007: 774–775).

In the context of the study of Ukrainian-Turkic relations, in particular language contacts, there is a valuable work of O. Makarushka “Dictionary of Ukrainian Expressions Translated from Turkic Languages” (1895), which chronologically outlines and characterizes three periods of Ukrainian-Turkic contact: 1) the period of Slavic unity, “when the Slavs were adjacent to the Turkish tribes”; 2) the period from the second half of the 7th century, “that is, from the conquest of the Slavic inhabitants of the right bank of the Danube by the Turkish Bulgarians”; 3) the period “from the permanent settlement of the Turks in Europe” (Makarushka, 1895: 3). Note that D.G. Grinchyshyn also identifies three (“traditional”) periods of influence of Turkic languages on the Ukrainian language, stating that by the 15th century they were similar to influences on the Russian language (the first period – 1st century AD before the formation of Kyiv Rus; the second period – time before the Mongol-Tatar invasion (10th-12th c.); the third period of the Mongol-Tatar invasion (12th-15th c.)). But from the 16th century Turkic influences on the Ukrainian language increased, they were conditioned by the current political situation, which gives grounds to outline another period in the history of Turkic-Ukrainian relations – the 16th-18th centuries as a period of close contact between the Ukrainian population and the population of the Crimean Khanate and Ottoman Turkey (Grinchishin, 1995: 90; Baskakov, 1986: 5–6).

Ukrainian-Turkic language contact at different linguistic levels and periods has attracted the attention of many linguists, leading to the emergence of a number of diverse studies. In particular, the influence of the Turkic languages on the Slavic ones is highlighted in the researches of M.A. Baskakov, A.Yu. Krymsky, O.M. Garkavets, A.D. Cholakova. The functioning of the vocabulary of Turkic origin in the modern Ukrainian language is presented in the works of R.V. Boldyrev, who conducted a historical and etymological study of Turkic lexical elements of the Ukrainian language. I.G. Dobrodomov analyzed the Bulgarian-Chuvash borrowings in the Ukrainian language, R.A. Yunalaeva disclosed the specifics of the functioning of Turkic borrowings (thematic group “clothing names”) in modern Eastern Slavic languages, E.S. Otin researched the etymology of Turkic lexemes *comrades* and *food*, N.F. Klimenko described common Turkism in modern Ukrainian and Modern Greek. A number of works are devoted to the functioning of lexemes of Turkic origin in modern Ukrainian dialects, in particular L.T. Masenko studied the Turkic origin of hydronymy of the South Bug basin. The Turkic elements in the North Black Sea toponymy were studied by V.V. Loboda, the Turkic elements in the surnames of southeastern Ukraine were researched by V.D. Poznańska, the Turkic lexical elements in the dialects of the Right Bank Polissia were studied by I.A. Fedorovska, Turkism in the dialects of the Romanian language in Ukraine were researched by A.A. Biletsky.

Ukrainian historical linguistics also has some experience in the field of studying the functioning of Turkic borrowings in the ancient Ukrainian period, their representation in various genre memos, further formal and semantic adaptation to the recipient language. In particular, M.S. Rogal (1965: 173–191) thoroughly described Turkic lexical borrowings in Ukrainian chronicles at the end of the 17th – beginning 18th centuries. Turkism in the vocabulary of fisheries and sheep breeding, Turkic military vocabulary, also the Turkic anthroponyms in Ukrainian chronicles of the 10th-13th centuries (“The Chronicle of Lviv” and “The Chronical of Ostroh”) were investigated in various aspects by G.I. Khalimonenko (1972; 1993; 1996). Lexical-semantic and etymological analysis of Turkic borrowings, recorded in different genre memos of the 14th-17th centuries, was conducted by D.G. Grinchishin (1982; 1995). Thematic classification of Turkism, attested in the northern Ukrainian memos of the 16th-17th centuries, was filed by V.M Titarenko (2007).

The *methodological basis* of the proposed study is a theoretical basis on language as a coherent system of elements; historical development of language; ratio of static and dynamics of language; lexical-semantic language system and types of its segmentation. Such *methods* of research as descriptive, linguocultural, systematic, and classification were used.

Results and Discussion

Written memos of the corresponding period are the basic source for studying the Ukrainian language of the 16th-17th centuries. F. de Sossyur's remarks about ensuring the unity of language in time by means of writing have not lost their relevance, although “... writing hides language from our eyes ...” (Sossyur, 1998: 39, 44). The memos of the Ukrainian language of the 16th-17th centuries confirmed the entry into the Ukrainian lexicon of a large number of names that may not have been previously spread because their existence in the Ukrainian language is not confirmed by memos. Note that while not absolutizing the value of memos as a source for establishing a true lexicon history, we still cannot diminish the fixation role.

Ideographic stratification of Turkism in the Ukrainian lexicon in the 16th-17th centuries

Ukraine's economic progress, close cultural and political ties with other countries, and intensification of trade with both the East and the West in the researched period contributed to the development of trade nomenclature and economic vocabulary. Debt and credit relations were closely linked to accounting operations, the nomination of which was supplemented during the researched period with Turkic *барышъ* 'profit from trade' (1585). During the same period, a variety of names of monetary taxes and duties was observed, due to Turkism and derivatives from the Turkic bases: *контарне* 'duty on the sale of salt' (1558), *ясак / есачъчизна* 'the tax, the tribute', *есачниство* 'duty to pay the tax' (1552).

The development of international trade led to the development of metrology and a proper system of names. The lexical-semantic group of the unit of measure and weight was enriched by the borrowing of Turkic origin of *аршинъ / воршин* (1503) for the designation of 'measures of length of 15-16 tops, elbow; linear length 0.71 m'.

The development of the economics of the state, the craft sector, and trade, the course of military events were impossible without an extensive transport network. The favorable geographical location of Ukraine in Europe led to the development of both land and river-sea transport. The Cossacks, who were also called “water Cossacks”, approved and developed Ukrainian shipping in the Azov-Black Sea and the Mediterranean basins at the end of the 16th century, and with the Hetmaning of B. Khmelnytsky the Cossack fleet numbered up to 300 vessels. Among the large number of borrowed names, related to water and land transport, for the first time appeared the

certified in writing Turkic lexeme *чайка* 'a kind of a ship used by the Cossacks during marching'. Note that when comparing a seagull with European or Asian counterparts, it was half the size of a Venetian galley. At the same time, the Cossack boat was faster and more maneuverable than the Turkish rowing galleys. The seagull was a Black Sea-Azov vessel, but the Cossacks also used it in river conditions. In Ukrainian documents, the Cossack ship *чайка* was first mentioned in 1672. The memos of the studied period record the Kipchak *байдак* with several meanings: 'river boat, kayak' (1558), 'a ship much larger than an ordinary boat' (middle of the 17th century) and 'ferry' (17th century). In addition to kayaks and seagulls, the Cossacks' fleet had small two paddle flat-bottomed riverboats or single-mast riverboats that were named with Turkish / Crimean-Tatar *каюки* (17th century). In Turkic sources appears the lexeme *комязга* – 'a small vessel for transporting goods resembling a barge' (1571); sometimes this lexeme referred to 'a boat carved from one tree'. Frequent fixation in the memos the derivative *комязный* (1585) and its phonetic variants indicate a significant spread of reality and its name. From Turkish was borrowed the lexeme *сала* 'a small raft of sheaves used by Cossacks while crossing the river, they put weapons and clothing on it and then tied it to a horse's tail' (Dictionary, 1996, vol. 4: 97). The important testimony is provided by the Turkish traveller Evliya Chelebi and the historian Gaji Senai. Describing the transportation of died Tatars from beyond the Dnipro to the Crimea, E. Chelebi uses the word *сал* calling the handbarrow hung between two horses (Chelebi, 1961: 38), and G. Senai explains the term *сал* by Arabic *мазмил* 'handbarrow', but it becomes clear from the context that it refers to the platform on which the Tatars piled trophies and then carried or rode them (Senai, 1971: 169). Common in the memos was the Turkic lexeme *чардак* (late 17th- early 18th c.), which indicated the 'overlap-deck in the bow on which the observer was located'. Later, the deck was called *чардак* (see: works by I. Nechuy-Levitsky, Lesya Ukrainka).

A separate group is the names related to water transport, including details of boats, activities, and processes, features, among which there are such Turkism as: *бурундук* 'a rope from the stern to the embankment bollard pole'; *чал* 'rope', *чалка* 'a place for rafts mooring' and *чалити* 'moor the raft'.

The thematic group of vocabulary such as soldiery underwent significant changes in the study period, its development was due to more beyond language factors than linguistic ones, in particular, the dependent status of Ukrainians on their native land in the 16th-17th centuries, which caused the conditions for “powerful Cossack rebels, which showed contemporaries the influence and state-building capabilities of the Ukrainian Cossacks” (History, 2001, vol. 2: 482). The dramatic changes had taken place in military construction, the combination of traditional for Cossacks methods of war and its new forms typical not only for the European but also for the Asian regions, enabled B. Khmelnytsky to enrich the treasury of world martial arts in the middle of the 16th century. The level of armament of the army and military formations was the most significant indicator of the state’s development in the study period. The Ukrainian army of the National Liberation War of the middle of the 17th century, which was most famous for its “fiery army”, did not stand aside from this process. In the 16th-17th centuries, Ukraine used weapons of both local and foreign production, in particular Polish, Turkish, Iranian, Russian, French, Dutch, so it is natural to saturate the lexical-semantic group of the name of the weapon and its elements by borrowings, which were adopted in the recipient language during the study period. Among the names of the weapon, its constituents and the accompanying elements Turkism (<ар.) *кинджал*, *ганджар* 'cold weapon, dagger' is certified in many languages of Eurasia; Turkism *кончерь* 'a kind of a dagger which had a long narrow blade' (1567); Turkic *келеп* 'old hand-held weapon, a long-handle hammer' (1597); Turkism *балта* 'an ax, mounted on a long handle, dialect' bolt' (1627); Turkism *кобур* (*кубур*, *кобура*) 'a leather case for a pistol' (1596). D.I. Yavornitsky noted that “each Cossack had four pistols, two of which he carried under his belt and

two in holsters made from leather and sewn inside to the trousers” (Yavornytsky, 1990, vol. 1: 216); Tatar *ковчань* 'a quiver, an arrow case' (1589); Turkic *сагайдак (сайдак)* 'a wooden arrow case' (1616). In military affairs was also used non-proprietary weapons, which in written sources are represented by borrowings from the Turkic languages: *канчук* 'a kind of whip, whip' (1638); *карбач* 'id.' (1597); *басаликь* 'tin-tipped whip' (late 16th – early 17th centuries); *нагайка* 'a wicker whip' (1596); *аркан* 'a long rope with a noose at the end, a lasso' (Khalimonenko, 1993: 94), which, according to Samylo Wielichko, was used by the Cossacks as an aid in transporting, for example, enemy corpses (17th century), as well as for taming horses and other animals.

The written sources of the Ukrainian language testify to the existence of a clear military organization in Ukraine in the 15th century and, consequently, a system of appropriate terminology. Rank military terminology, both specific and borrowed, is preserved in ancient Ukrainian memos of different genres. Among the borrowings in the lexical-semantic group, there are the military ranks: Turkism *джура* 'armourer; servant in the army, assistant to the chieftain' (1571); *осавул / осавула (ясаул, ясавул, асавул, асаул, есаул, осаул, осаула, савул, савула, асауль, ясауль)* 'Cossack officer, adjutant of chieftain' (1590), the duties of this officer and at the same time the officer's rank in the Cossack troops were described by D.I. Yavornytsky and B.D. Grinchenko: “The military Osavula monitored the order and the static behaviour of the Cossacks both in peacetime in Sich and during the wartime in the camp; also he monitored the execution of the court order, took care of food in case of war, defended the interests of the troops at the boundary. He was sent forward the troops for reconnaissance about the enemy, observed the progress of the battle and assisted one unit of the army or the other at the most difficult moments ... Memoirists and historians called him the “ancient archon of Athenian”, right hand and right eye of the chieftain and compared his rank with that of the Minister of Police, Adjutant General under Field Marshal” (Yavornytsky, 1990, vol. 1: 179). In addition, the Osavula also performed purely civilian or semi-civilian functions: 'an elected official holding one of the administrative and military posts', 'a city magistrate's guardian', 'a person performing police duties at a magistrate', 'the landlord's estate clerk' (Dictionary, 1996, vol. 3: 65). The same lexical-semantic group includes the Turkism: *сердюкь* 'a soldier of a hired Cossack infantry who had guard duty' (1669); *сайдакерь* 'a soldier armed with a bow and arrow' (17th century).

The lexical-semantic group of military units and armies of the troops underwent minor changes, it was supplemented with Turkism *чамбул* 'squad of cavalry (Tatars)' (17th century).

During the period under study, the lexical-semantic group of the military regalia, attributes and symbols, was supplemented with Turkism. In particular, an indispensable attribute of the Zaporizh army was *барабан* (ancient Turkism), which was used as a means of communication in the performance of combat missions, as well as for celebrations, including the Cossack Council, etc. (1666). In the Ukrainian language the form *тарабан* 'a drum' is also certified, “it is available in both Polish and Romanian. The area of using *тарабан* is delineated within the borders of Poland, Romania, and Ukraine, that is, the lands whose peoples interacted closely with the Kipchaks” (Khalimonenko, 1993: 74). 'An ancient percussion instrument, a leather covered copper-pot', which was denoted by the Turkish lexeme *тулумбас*. It was an indispensable reality of the Cossacks' military life, they convened a council, reported an attack and even issued orders during the battle. The Cossacks took the instrument on a march. The largest instruments were kept only in Sich, they were beaten by 8 Cossacks at the same time. There is an evidence that the clatter of tumblers and drums was a terror to the enemy troops. According to Samyilol Velichko, the Crimean Tatars and Turks also used *tulumbas* (Khalimonenko, 1993: 85-86), three word forms are used to denote them: *тулумбаси, телембаси, тулубаси* (17th c.). Other musical instrument that did not belong to the regulated attributes of the Cossack Order, but played a huge role in the activity of Zaporizh Sich was

кобза. "Like most terms related to the formation and functioning of the Cossack Order, the name of this musical instrument was borrowed from the Turkic Cossacks by the Ukrainian Cossacks, and therefore when determining the etymon, one should focus on the languages of Kipach, thus not necessarily in the period of the Golden Horde or the Crimean Khanate, the borrowing could have happened in pre-Mongol times. The source of borrowing could be the dialect of Black Chlobucks or the Polovitsian language" (Khalimonenko, 1993: 83-84). Occasionally, in the written sources of the period under study, a Turkish lexeme, *буздиган*, was used to designate 'a symbol of power in Cossacks, a mace in the form of a ball on a tree' (1637). Note that the name *буздиган* is rare in memos, but *булава* and *пернач* are common.

Written sources of the 16th-17th centuries witnessed the changes taken place in the lexical-semantic group of the organization of the army and its daily life, which was conditioned by new models of functioning of the Ukrainian army and the sharing experience with other peoples. The organization of any military formation involved the recruitment of soldiers, military training, ensuring a proper standard of living and ended with dismissal, resignation. This group expanded its borders by Turkish borrowing *кошъ* (a military camp, a cart), "the headquarters of the Zaporizh army, which consisted of people who were not sedentary and who were always ready to move from place to place". Erich Lasota testified that sometimes the Cossacks called *кошем* "a hovel woven from the branches, covered above with horse skins for protection against rain" (Yavornitsky, 1990, vol. 2: 81). In written sources, this word is recorded from the beginning of the 17th century.

The thematic group of clothing and footwear vocabulary underwent significant changes during the study period, which was caused by the intensification of trade, close cultural ties of Ukrainians with other peoples, political instability, which led to military confrontation and, consequently, to the migration of people of different ethnicities in Ukraine. The revitalization of social life inevitably affected the living standards of Ukrainians, in particular their preferences for the appearance which played not only aesthetic function, but also status, it testified about the owner's economic potential and place in the social hierarchy.

Written sources of the study period testified to new borrowings from the Turkish language for the designation of varieties of shoes and their elements, in particular: *бачмакги* 'boots of good quality' (1595); *папуць* 'a shoe' (1646); *мешти* 'Turkish or Tatar shoes, light boots' (1720).

The names for the designation of the outer garment were enriched in the study period by the Turks: *байбаракъ* 'shroud covered with cloth or other material' (1698), *кобенякъ / копенякъ* 'long, spacious outer hinged garment with sewn linen that can be worn over the shroud; a variety of a cloak' (1598), *опанча (опонча, японча, епанча)* 'a summer cloak variety' (1501); *бурка* 'a long woolen coat' (1605), *чамара* 'a long-sleeved men's and women's fur coat' (1625); *ермакъ (> гермачокъ)* 'long men's clothing made of sheep cloth, kobyak' (1501); *чуга (чугай)* 'a fur coat', 'a short, knee-less, collar-less garment with only a neckline, leather or red cloth' (1597); *делия* 'a kind of outerwear often made of expensive fabrics, often lined with fur' (1558); *делюра* 'long outer garment' (1609); *каптанъ* 'men's long-sleeved outerwear', 'light outer-flared outerwear' (1627); *кунътушь* 'men's and women's outer hinged garments made of expensive fabric (brocade, damask, coloured cloth) with slit sleeves that could be folded over the shoulders behind the back worn over the county' (1649); *долман* 'a short hussar cloak' (1617); *газука* 'outerwear mostly sewn with fur' (1565) > *газучка* (1590).

The lexical-semantic group of the headgear name was replenished with borrowings from Turkic languages, including the following lexemes: *шликъ* 'a round, fur-covered cap; a sharp-topped hat; a round, fur-trimmed hat' (1596); *колпакъ* 'a kind of headgear, a high hat, a sleeping cap, a cap'

(1546); *серпанокъ* 'a cover on the head of a married woman of transparent cloth' (1650); *камка* 'women's headgear' (1554).

The lexical-semantic group of the name of the materials for the clothing manufacture, in which predominate Turkic borrowings, was also changed, in particular: *кенъдакъ* 'cotton cloth' (1568); *бейберекъ* 'silk embossed fabric' (1717); *мухояръ* 'cotton cloth woven with silk or wool' (1717) > *мухаеровый* f 'of woolen hairy material' (1627); *алтабасъ* 'slice, anc. altabass' (1554) > *алтабасовый*, *алтембасовый* 'made of altabass' (1558); *атласъ* '(silk or semi-silk fabric with a polis) satin' (1579) > *атласовый* 'made of satin' (1555); *багазия* 'cotton cloth, sieve' (1583); *безъ* 'kind of cotton cloth' (1568); *камка* 'ancient Iranian silk cloth with coloured patterns, often woven with gold or silver; a headdress, see above' (1578).

Among the names of the jewelry and the decoration of the garment there is the Turkish borrowing *канакъ* 'precious women's ornament with or without medallion' (1633).

In the 16th-17th centuries, the thematic group of vocabulary of household items also underwent some changes. The close relations with the Eastern peoples caused the appearance of Turkish textiles on the territory of Ukraine, which is reflected in the memos in which the lexemes are certified: *коверь* 'a carpet, a blanket' (*коверець* / *коберець*) (1555) > *коверцовый* (1572) *килимъ* 'id.' (1627).

Among the names of the utensils, the Ukrainian memos retained the Turkish borrowing *тазь* / *таць* 'a big shallow plate' (1655). Except glass and ceramic dishes, people traditionally used 'leather utensils for liquids, jars'. To denote this type of tableware there is Turkish *боклага* (1565), Turkic *куманъ* (1638).

Turkism is also attested by the names for the designation of devices for carrying things, loose materials, including *торба* 'a sack, a big bag' (1656), *калита* 'a sack for money' (1583).

The thematic group of vocabulary of food, beverage, cooking, and consumption, while keeping close contact with the previous stages of language development, is supplemented during the study period with new nominative units that reproduce the development of realism (Nimchuk, 1992: 33), among which borrowings are distinguished. In particular, among the names of delicacies and sweets, there is marked by the memos of the outlined time Turkism *изюм* for the designation of 'dried grapes' (16th c.). Among the names of cereals and dishes cooked with them there is a borrowing from the Turkish language: *оркишь* 'a variety of rye' (1642), *соломаха* (16th century); among the names of the varieties of meat and meat dishes there is a derivative of Turkism *кабан* – *кабанина* 'boar meat' (16th century); among the names of fish dishes, there is a borrowing from the Turkic languages *карась* (1622) and the derivative *карасикъ* 'karasik' (1571), *щербъ* 'fish soup' (1710).

The thematic group of the plant world vocabulary underwent slight changes during the period, in particular new names for the designation of solitaire culture – tobacco. As. Dzendzelivsky indicates tobacco appeared in Ukraine in the second part of the 14th century, in particular in Eastern part of Zakarpattia – Semigorod, where it was imported by the Turks in 1576 (Dzendzelivsky, 1960: 139). It should be noted that the Ukrainians distinguished two types of tobacco: real tobacco (*Nicotiana tabacum*), which was smoked, and mahorka (*Nicotiana rustica*), which was chewed and sniffed. The first type was nominated by lexemes *доганъ*, *долганъ*, *долган* (16th century), *доганъ*, *довган* (late 17th century), *тютюнь* (17th century), *тутюнь* (1667); the second was *табака* (16th century), *табакъ* (middle of the 17th century), *кабака* (late 16th – early 17th century),

кабакъ (1744). Note that according to etymologists' claim, lexeme *тютюнь* (and its phonetic variants) are borrowed from the Turkish language.

It is evidenced by the memos that among the names of vegetable plants there is a Turkism *гарбузь*. Old Ukrainian sources fix this lexeme as an anthroponym since the end of the 16th century (1596). Note that this anthroponym is even preserved in one memo in different phonetic variants: "ми(н)ко ва(р)бузь", "Аньдри(и) Га(р)бузь". The appellative name is fixed at the beginning of the 18th century. ("Матвий взялъ у него (Каленика) корову за стравлене гарбуза свинею" in 1719).

A small number of Turkism is attested among the nominees for the designation of representatives of fauna, including *кабанъ*, which was used as an anthroponym (1649), although earlier the memos testify to the derivative *кабанина* (1622); *бабакъ* (late 17th century), *саранча / шаранча* (1618 / 1627).

In Ukrainian written memos of the 16th-17th centuries, new Turkism for the designation of geographical concepts are also attested, in particular: *байракъ / байрачокъ* (1600), *майданъ* (1703), *сага* (1667). Nomenclature of musical instruments also experienced expansion in the period under review. Among the foreign names are predominantly Turkic, in particular Crimean-Tatar or Turkish *барабан / тарабан*, Turkish *тулумбас* 'an ancient percussion musical instrument in the form of a copper pot covered with leather', *кобза* 'a musical instrument', *сурма* 'a kind of Cossack wood pipe made from Karagach – solid wood' (> *сурмити* 'play the trumpet'). It should be noted that the term *сурна* was borrowed from the Turkic languages as early as the 13th century. ("...ударыша въ бубны и въ трубы и въ сурны"), and in the act of 1496 the form of the *сурба* ("... кажеш дей им сурбы рядити собе, коли у лови ездеш"), which testifies to a phonetic change м-into б-.

A special place in the ideographic structure of the Ukrainian language is occupied by the thematic group of the colour vocabulary, as it is between the names of objects and features (Ufimtseva, 1986: 199). O.V. Koval-Kostyns'ka, O.M. Divak, A.P. Kritenko, A.G. Kirichenko, V.J. Gorobets, N.B. Bakhilina, M.A. Surovtseva, M.I. Chikalo dedicated their works to various studies of this group of vocabulary. In particular, O.V. Koval-Kostyns'ka subdivides the colour spectrum into a core, which includes white, black, red, yellow, green, blue, and the periphery (other shades); O.M. Divak divides this LSG into primary, or abstract, words ("which at the present stage of development do not cause certain associative relations with other concepts and objects of the objective world") and secondary or specific ("formed by the coloristic similarity with objects and phenomena of the surrounding reality"). V.I. Horobets distinguishes non-motivated colour names, motivated by the type of colour, colour names with colour intensity, words that express intermediate colours and shades in relation to the main ones, words that do not indicate a specific colour, but only in the way of colour or the degree of colour intensity. N.B. Bakhilina uses the historical principle, analyzes the vocabulary for the designation of colours by the time of its appearance in written memos, in particular in the Kievan Rus memos (11th-14th centuries) and memos of the 17th century. In his research, M.I. Chikalo describes the names of achromatic and chromatic colours recorded in old Ukrainian written memos. Turkism is represented in the lexical-semantic group of brown, in particular *карый (карий, карій)* to indicate shades of 'black, dark', 'dark rot', 'dark brown'. This lexeme is recorded in written memos since the 16th century. Most cases of the use of the word *карый* refer to horses, and rarely for beavers. Written sources certify the composition *синокарый* to indicate 'dark brown, brownish-black' ("бобровъ ... на реце Ивници ше(ст)деся(т) чорныхъ а два(д)цать синокары(х)" (1584)). The memos of the 18th century record the frequent use of this adjective for the nomination of eye colour.

According to the presented material, the Turkic-speaking influence is recorded in different thematic groups of vocabulary, except for the judiciary, mental activity (mental state) of a person, their speech activity, influence and will. It was the most powerful in the military sphere (caused by the long wars of Ukraine with the Turkic-speaking states) and in the field of labeling of imported Eastern goods: fabric names, names of outerwear, names of dishes, spices, condiments, etc. Many of these lexemes are still functioning in the Ukrainian language, having become valuable attainment of the national culture.

Conclusion

The analysis of the achievements of Ukrainian linguistics in the field of the study of Oriental vocabulary allows to state both significant achievements and big gaps. In particular, Ukrainian linguists defined the basic periods of Turkic-speaking influence, ways of its penetration into the Ukrainian language and described the vocabulary of Turkic origin in modern Ukrainian literary language and in some dialects.

Studying the development of vocabulary in time-distant periods always leaves open the question of the role of oral communication, particularly in the borrowing process, it is not fully understood. It is difficult to answer unambiguously the question whether the analyzed element of language was adopted from other languages orally or as a result of scribes using foreign language samples to structure the texts of the respective genres. The role of the scribe, his idiotic, and often linguistic and ethnic identity cannot be totally defined, since neither written memos nor other sources provide such information. All this is beyond the reach of the actual observance of the modern historian of language, so one has to confine to assumptions about the nature of interlingual interaction.

The suggested language material, which correlates with borrowings from other languages and specific vocabulary, attests to the relevance of A.A. Beletsky's words that "it is necessary to study the connections of concepts at different stages of society development and different means of expression of concepts" (Beletsky, 2012: 140), because "... it is difficult to imagine how one can speak of a language without touching on its historical development. All that would then be left to the unhistorical consideration of language would remind us of the general reflections on the individual use of language, the relation of the individual to the linguistic norm" (Paul, 2008: 192).

References

- Baskakov, N. A. (1986). On Turkic lexical borrowings in the Russian language: (on the pages of the "Etymological Dictionary of the Russian Language" by M. Fasmer, vols. 3–4). *Sovetskaja tjurkologija*, 1, 11–19.
- Beletsky, A. A. (2012). Tasks of further comparative historical study of languages. *Selected works*. Kyiv, 121–150.
- Chelebi, E. (1961). Book of Travels: (extracts from the works of a Turkish traveller of the 17th century): translation and commentary. Moscow: IVL. Issue 1: The lands of Moldova and Ukraine.
- Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language*: in 4 volumes (1996). Kyiv: Science opinion. Vols. 3–4.
- Dzendzelivsky, Y. O. (1960). *The names of crops in the dialects of Zakarpattya*. *Studia slavica Hungarica*. T. 6, 113–143.

- Garkavets, O. M. (2007). Ukrainian-Turkic language contacts *Ukrainian language: encyclopedia*. Kyiv, 774–775.
- Grinchishin, D. G. (1982). Turkic lexical borrowings in memos of the Ukrainian language of the 14th and 17th centuries. *Vocabulary of the Ukrainian language in its relations with neighboring Slavic and non-Slavic languages: Abstracts*. Uzhgorod, 7–9.
- Grinchishin, D. G. (1995). Vocabulary of Turkic origin in the memos of the Ukrainian language of the 16th- the first half of the 17th century. *Ukrainian historical and dialect vocabulary*, 2, 89–104.
- Grytsenko, S. (2019). Dynamics as an Immanent Language Sing. *LOGOS*, 99, 189–199. (<https://doi.org/10.24101/logos.2019.43>)
- History of Ukrainian culture*: in 5 vol. (2001). Kyiv: Scientific Opinion.
- Khalimonenko, G. I. (1972). Turkism in early Ukrainian chronicles. *Historical-typological and synchronous-typological research*. Moscow: Science, 146–151.
- Khalimonenko, G. I. (1993). Turkic military vocabulary in the speech of Ukrainian Cossacks. Kyiv (manuscript).
- Khalimonenko, G. I. (1996). Turkism in the vocational-production vocabulary of the Ukrainian language: (animal husbandry vocabulary). Kyiv (manuscript).
- Kotlyar, M. F. (1990). Preface. *Trade in Ukraine, the 14th – mid-17th century: Volyn and Naddniproshchyna*, 3–8.
- Kremlin, O. I. (1992). On the peculiarities of the functioning of linguistic units with a national-cultural component in the artistic text. *Linguistic research*, 2, 83–86.
- Makarushka, O. (1895). A Dictionary of Ukrainian Expressions Translated from Turkic Languages. *Notes of Shevchenko Scientific Society*, 5(1), 1–14.
- Nimchuk, V. V. (1992). *Ancient Russian heritage in the vocabulary of the Ukrainian language*. Kyiv: Science opinion.
- Paul, G. (2008). Principles of language history. *Readings on General Linguistics*. Kyiv: Education of Ukraine, 184–208.
- Rogal, M. S. (1965). Turkic lexical borrowings in Ukrainian chronicles of the late 17th – early 18th centuries. *From the History of Ukrainian and Other Slavic Languages*, 171–192.
- Saussur, F. de. (1998). *General Linguistics Course*. Kyiv: Fundamentals.
- Senai, H. M. (1971). *Historia chana Islam Gereja*. Warszawa: Państwowe wydawn.
- Sorokoletov, F. P. (1970). *History of military vocabulary in the Russian language of the 11th-17th centuries*. Leningrad: Science.
- Titarenko, V. M. (2007). *Vocabulary of foreign origin in the northern Ukrainian memos of the 16th – 17th centuries*. Zhytomyr (manuscript).
- Trade in Ukraine, 14th – mid-17th century: Volyn and Dnieper*. (1990). Kyiv: Scientific Opinion.
- Ufimtseva, A. A. (1986). *The lexical meaning. The principle of the semiological description of vocabulary*. Moscow: Science.
- Yavornitsky, D. (1990–1992). *History of Zaporizh Cossacks: in 3 volumes*. Lviv: The world.