

To Prof. Maria Malec anniversary

A SYSTEMIC APPROACH TO THE ANALYSIS OF SLAVIC (UKRAINIAN AND POLISH) OIKONYMY FROM A DIACHRONIC PERSPECTIVE

Key words: place names, onomastic space, historical Western Ukrainian oikonyms, comparative oikonymic studies, oikonymic systems

The systemic approach to the analysis of Slavic onomastic vocabulary, toponyms and their subtype — oikonyms, in particular, is topical at present and in the foreseeable future. Scholarly work that neglects such an approach could lead to biased or false conclusions about the etymology of this type of onyms, as well as erroneous theoretical and pragmatic interpretations of “lexico-semantic classifications of toponymic vocabulary, aspects of its classification and structuring” (Frolov, 2002, p. 100).

As discussed in a previous study (see Redkva, 2003, p. 147), the notion of *systemicity* most fully manifests itself in Slavic regional (Ukrainian-Polish) oikonymy, its diachronic description in particular. This enables a scholar to objectively analyse oikonyms in respect of their historical (chronologically multi-level) and polyethnic character.

It is necessary to pay special attention to the chronological, linguistic, and ethnic heterogeneity of such oikonymy before conducting a practical analysis of such oikonyms, i.e. their lexico-semantic classification, semantic characteristics, morphological structure, phonetic peculiarities, and etymology — *taxonomic interpretation* (Frolov’s term). The latter is understood as their lexico-semantic classification, the grouping of the names “based on taxonomic systematization of linguistic (toponymic) units in their evolution deriving from common characteristics, objects that are named and inter-related” (Frolov, 2002, p. 103). In this respect we cannot but introduce a notion that would encompass the meaning of the toponymic landscape of the area under study (linguistic, ethnic, and state formation processes), i.e. the one that Frolov treats as *toponymic space*.

At present a great number of studies dedicated to the analysis of regional oikonymy are focused on formal structuring of such names and the productivity of their derivational patterns. Firstly, this makes it impossible to establish ob-

jectively their etymology as the analysis is conducted on the synchronous level. Secondly, it complicates the problem of further differentiation, e.g. oikonyms formed from appellatives derived from anthroponyms. The biggest mistake, in our view, lies in the fact that place names, as elements of toponymic space, are not treated diachronically. The historical aspect (the source base, in particular), the polyethnic character of the area and the chronological multi level character is neglected.

Historical oikonyms of the Ruske Principality (Voivodeship) may serve as a solid basis for such theoretical speculations. The Ruske Voivodeship was founded in 1434 after the then Red Rus lands had been taken by the Polish king Kazimierz the Great in 1340. Then, after almost a centennial struggle for the lands with the Hungarian rulers, their annexation to the Polish state followed (1372), with their retake by Queen Jadwiga occurring in 1387. This chronological time span is the most important, and it may be considered the starting point for studying the development and formation of the regional oikonymic system for a number of reasons:

1) the absence of sufficient sources from these territories (in particular from the Polish and Ukrainian borderland or further — lands over the Bug, and the Sian rivers, and upper and medium reaches of the Dniester up to 981, the time when the Kievan Rus prince Volodymyr retook the ancient cities of Cherven and Przemyśl (Łowmiański, 1973, p. 563–567);

2) the scarcity of written records from 981 to 1340, except the Southern Rus chronicles such as “The Primary Chronicle Tale of Bygone Years”, “The Hypatian Codex” (also known as “The Hypatian Chronicle”, “Ipatiev Chronicle”), the twelfth-century “Kyiv’s Chronicle”, thirteenth-century Halych and Volhynnia Chronicle”, separate fragments of Northern Rus Chronicles (“Novgorod”, “Moscow”, “Nykon”, “Suzdal Chronicles”); “Thietmar of Merseburg Chronicles” (beginning of eleventh century), Gallus Anonymus’ and Kadłubek’s Chronicles (twelfth- and thirteenth-century Polish chronicles), Vatican Archive Acts (Kotliar, 1998, p. 12).

The data is insufficient for objective onomastic study as only big town status localities and the rivers they stood on are mentioned.

Quite a different situation can be observed beginning with 1340. Having no possibility to demonstrate within one paper the genesis of (urbanization, populating, settlement) towns and villages of all of the Red Rus or Ruske Voivodeship, we shall try to demonstrate it by an example of the smallest administrative unit — a *povit* (district/county) (Pol. *powiat*, Lat. *districtus*), or *volost* (Pol. *włość*, Lat. *ambitus*, Old Church Slavonic *уѣздъ* (*uyizd*)), meaning *povit*. These examples show that there was no strict difference between *volost* and *povit* even in these definitions. A well-known Polish historiographer who studied Polish

law, Przemysław Dąbkowski, on the basis of the written sources from Halych Rus in Latin, came to the conclusion that *ambitus* means “a territory smaller and lower in subordination than *districtus*, it is smaller in size and legal status. *Districtus* is of higher hierarchy, has autonomy, while *ambitus* is only partially independent. *Ambitus* has town rule whereas *districtus* shares both town and village jurisdiction” (Dąbkowski, 1926, p. 13). It is interesting to mention that in the end of the fourteenth and during all of the fifteenth centuries, there were many *ambituses* as well as Red Rus towns meeting the local needs of Halych and Lviv lands. Later *ambituses* were integrated into districts, which may be explained by the fact that during that period, *volost* centres such as Hlyniany, Olesko, Schyrets, Chervonohrad and Koropets had court jurisdiction and were much more important economically and politically than later *povit* centres — the districts such as Halych, Lviv, Peremyshl, and Sanok. All of the archive source data must be considered in order to reconstruct the administrative division of the Ruske Voivodeship starting with the end of the fourteenth to the fifteenth centuries. One of the most important documents for this are the court notes (town and landowners’ acts), most of which have been lost by now. But in the sources available today one of the most important is “Akta grodzkie i ziemskie...” [town and land acts] (Akta grodzkie, 1868–1935), that offer the oldest evidence about the foundation of the settlements (villages and towns) based on Polish and German Magdeburg law. The latter fact positively influenced the population of this land, promoting the increase in population in old towns and cities and the foundation of new ones where craft and trade, and agriculture were intensively growing (Horn, 1974, p. 59).

Along with a number of negative issues that were caused by the colonization of the Halych Rus lands (limiting liberties for autochthonous Ukrainian population, e.g. levying plough and land taxes on Ukrainian peasants for the benefit of townspeople, mostly of Polish origin), the formation of the Ruske Voivodeship and the establishment of Magdeburg law enabled the expansion of old towns and villages, and the foundation of new ones (very often due to incomers who were mostly Poles and Germans). According to a nineteenth-century Ukrainian historian, Isydir Sharanevych, incomers mostly settled new areas and founded towns while old settlements (villages) were outskirts to these newly formed settlements and were adjacent to the towns.

Newly settled villages were subject to Magdeburg law, which freed their citizens from paying different taxes and duties, whereas peasants followed the Rus law and they had to pay taxes. Magdeburg law formed a system of prefects according to which a prefect was in charge of allocating plots of land to settlers, who were mostly Poles, and that way the new suburbs appeared along with the towns that were already under Magdeburg law (Sharanevych, 1863, p. 384–385).

Broadly speaking, the annexation of Halych Rus caused a clash between Ukrainian and Polish social and economical systems, a fact that is referred to and agreed upon by modern historians. Janeczek states that the confrontation of these systems was reflected in the sources that described Rus as a country being desolated because of frequent military devastations in the fourteenth century, subjugation by the Gold Horde, ineffectiveness of old prince law and the weakening of principalities. Prince order in Poland declined earlier as eastern nations were assimilated by western colonising movements, and the introduction of reforms and German laws to town government, a form of internal colonization. This facilitated the rebirth of the whole of Europe and impacted societal development, social and economic organization, demographic growth, and what is more important — the development of villages and towns. Thus, Janeczek writes that “despite political and territorial expansion, religious peculiarities of Orthodoxy and Catholicism, changes in ethnic composition, a mediaeval European colonization — is first and foremost a reform, a settlement and economic movement” (1995, p. 55–56). Furthermore, Red Rus towns were founded on desolate places; this process also took place along the old settlements, as they could be used to build castle fortifications and in such a way to turn ancient towns and suburban settlements into outskirts (examples may be Halych, Hlyniiany, Lviv, Schyrets). The lack of sufficient source data complicates the establishment of the causes of such practices, but as historian Serhiy Krawcow holds, “the founder of the estate wanted to preserve the established within other jurisdiction property division, tried to prevent people of other religions from allowing entry into towns or reserved the place for guests from the West” (1995, p. 77).

So, if we consider the formation of the oikonymic system, toponymic space and toponymic landscape within a separate *povit*, it would be reasonable to limit our choice to one administrative unit, e.g. Schyretskyi *povit* in Lviv Land of the Ruske Voivodeship.

The *povit* was one of thirty-eight *povits* of the Ruske Voivodeship that existed in the fourteenth century, and one of the thirty in the fifteenth century. Administratively it belonged to six *povits* of Lviv Land (along with Lviv, Hlyniansky, Horodotskyi, Oleskyi, and Zhydachivskyi).

In the north and east, the Schyretskyi *povit* bordered on Lviv *povit*, in the south it reached the Dniester and the Dniester marshes, crossed the Dniester and reached Drohobytskyi *povit* (Dąbkowski, 1926, pp. 319–320).

Another characteristic feature of the Ruske Voivodeship as well as Lviv Land was the fact that before the beginning of sixteenth century, there were no clear borders of lands: from 1387, Rus was moved from Hungarian to Polish rule and comprised the following lands: Lviv, Halych, Peremyshl and Sanok (without Belz and Holm); from 1434, the following lands belonged to Poland: 1. Lviv

and Halych Rus (Lviv, Halych, Przemyśl and Sanok Lands); 2 Belz and Holm Lands; 3. Podillya (Przyboś, 1987, pp. 7–8) and *povit/districtus* borders within the lands.

Polish historians of the early twentieth century (Hładyłowicz, 1931, p. 101; Jabłonowski, 1903, p. 18) state that in 1376, the Buskyi *povit* belonged to Lviv Land which was later integrated into the Belzke Voivodeship. From 1439–1443 Oleskyi belonged here as well; from 1448–1469 — Horodotskyi, in 1442 — the Schyretskyi *povits*, and later the Zolochivskyi *povit* was integrated, as well as the Zhydachivskyi *povits* (up to 1530). The latter belonged to Przemyśl Land and with time was considered a separate land. In the sixteenth century, the Horodotskyi, Schyretskyi, Oleskyi *povits* were united in one Lviv *povit* that, together with Zhydachiv, formed the administrative unit of Lviv Land. (See also Przyboś, 1999, p. 3–13).

We have made such a detailed historical digression to outline the factors that influenced the formation of the oikonymic system within one administrative unit. This was important to take into account when considering the reasons why smaller settlements were founded around an administrative centre (in our case the town of Schyrets — one of the nine king's towns of Lviv Land of the end of the fifteenth century (Horn, 1974, p. 68)). They formed the regional oikosystem of specific *povits (ambitus/districtus)* according to a nesting principle. Under such an approach, having written records (court notes, governmental acts, diplomatic codes, registers of royal's office), we may re-create in detail the chronological and topographical peculiarities of the toposystem.

It would be reasonable to analyse the above-mentioned historical documents from the time span when records of the Schyretskyi *povit* settlements first began to appear. We believe that they were formed from parts of the main settlements or their suburbs. We can speak with relative accuracy about almost simultaneous time of their foundation and hypothetical large source database. Of course, we have to make a reservation about possible existence of mostly considerable oikonoms much earlier than they are mentioned in the records. We did not take into account separate chronicles for Schyrets (as one of the most ancient Rus towns) that reach the beginning of the twelfth century (see, e.g., Zubrytskyi, 1852, p. 54) or beginning of XIIIth century 1219 (Hypatian Chronicle, 1962, p. 733). As Yurii Karpenko correctly mentioned, “only a considerable number of toponymic material in historical documents may reconstruct a real picture of the origin of the respective settlements” (1973, p. 45), and thus, oikonymic system of the region.

The main sources for the analysis were materials from the multivolume work “Akta grodzkie i ziemskie” (Akta grodzkie, 1868–1935), and also registers of the king's chancery (Wierzbowski (wyd.), 1905–1961); the works of P. Dąbkowski

on the administrative division of the Ruske and Belzke Voivodeship in the fifteenth century; S. Sochaniewicz's works on the *starosta* and *vijt* [elder] system of Lviv Land (Sochaniewicz, 1921); J. Hładyłowicz's works on the change of landscape in Lviv Land (Hładyłowicz, 1931); M. Baliński and T. Lipiński's works about old Poland (1885); M. Horn's works on the settlements of Red Rus towns (1974).

In the time span under consideration, according to J. Hładyłowicz, there were 496 settlements in Lviv Land (only fourteen were mentioned in the documents of the second half of the fourteenth — first half of the fifteenth century) (1931, p. 108). As far as Schyretskiy *povit* is concerned, P. Dąbkowski singles out fourteen settlements. We should mention that on the map, which is an appendix to his work, the area of the *povit* is surveyed quite incorrectly (it includes thirteen settlements). But the problem is that most of the place names mentioned in the work do not correspond to their names in the index (1926, p. 167–168).

Let us consider these place names in the work of the Polish historian in chronological order, that is, from the earliest mention.

The most ancient is, of course, the *povit* centre — the town of Schyrets (modern village of Schyrets Pustomytivskiy Rayon Lviv Oblast (Administratyvno terytorialnyi, 1987, p. 183)), (Istoriya mist, 1968, p. 592–595) recorded as *Szczerzec* (*Szczerzec*, *Scirzec*, *Sczyrzecz*) (Akta grodzkie, vol. 9, record # 1883; Akta grodzkie, vol. 10, p. 2) in 1397; (Akta grodzkie, vol. 3, p. 71) in 1399; (Akta grodzkie, Vol. 2, record # 1870) in 1443. Schyrets for some reason is mentioned as a village (Akta grodzkie, Vol. 11, record # 1728). The next mention is in 1445, 1447, 1454, 1456, where the Schyrets *povit* is defined as *ambitus* (*volost*) (Akta grodzkie, vol. 11, record # 1380, 3820, 3707, 1857, 1983, 1995, 2239, 2256, 2341, 3820); in 1490 and 1494 it is mentioned as a township (*oppidum*) (Wierzbowski (wyd., 1905, p. 2117), and in 1497 it is mentioned as *capitaneatus* (a seat of an elder; Wierzbowski (wyd.), 1907, pp. 327, 729).

Before Shchyrets received Magdeburg law (1397) by king Jagailo from a *voivode* Yan Tarnowski, the township was in a state of complete decline as a result of feuds between Rus princes and due to Tartar incursions (Baliński, Lipiński, 1885, p. 724). This fact played an important role in the genesis of the township and surrounding villages. Studying Schyrets town books up to the end of the first half of the fifteenth century in Lviv archives, P. Dąbkowski theorised that they may have been written in 1446–1496 (or close to this time). As proof, he provides records about Schyrets judges in 1446, 1453, 1490, 1496, the village constable (1447–1453), and separate elders (1448–1450) (Dąbkowski, 1926, pp. 24–25). However, the oldest act record of 1396 should be considered, as it contains mention of an old road that connected Lviv and Schyrets as the *povit* capital: “Antiqua strata, quae de Lemburga versus Sczyrzecz vadit” (Akta

grodzkie, vol. 2, p. 23). This is not by chance, as important trade roads (so-called ‘salt roads’ from Drohobych through Schyrets to Lviv and further to the east, and also an old road from Volhynia through Belz, Lviv, Schyrets, and further — to Hungary [Istoriya mist, 1968, p. 512–593]) passed through the township.

The first, village belonging to the Schyrets *povit/uyizd*, a part of Lviv *povit* (districtus Leopoliensis ambitus Szczyrzecensis), was *Werbiż / Werbeż / Werbiqż* (modern Werbizh, Mykolayivskiy Rayon, Lviv Oblast (Administratyvno terytorialnyi, 1987, p. 180)), first mentioned in documents in 1407, later — in 1423 and 1427 (Akta grodzkie, vol. 2, pp. 35, 42, 46, 59). A settlement, *Zubrza*, was mentioned for the first time the same year (modern Zubra Pustomytivskiy Rayon (Administratyvno terytorialnyi, 1987, p. 183; Istoriya mist, 1968, p. 602), and later — a record in 1445 (Akta grodzkie, vol. 14, 1380). Dąbkowski provides the place name as it was recorded by Mytko, mentioned in Wierzbowski, in 1417 (Wierzbowski (wyd.), 1905, p. 45). We can speak about it only hypothetically as long as it was the family name of one of its owners — Stanisław Mytski or his Christian name was Mytko (personal name Mytko < Dmytro) Symeonowicz Drucki — the owner of the settlement *Klecko*. Notably, the place name *Klecko / Klicko* (modern Klitsko Horodotskyi Rayon Lviv Oblast (Administratyvno terytorialnyi, 1987, p. 173)) would be the next according to chronology, and is first dated 1427 (Materiały archiwalne, 1890, p. 64), and later in 1454 (Akta grodzkie, vol. 14, p. 406). The now non-existent settlement of *Karcz* — mentioned also in 1427 as *Karcz ad Werbiż* (Akta grodzkie, vol. 2, 49) — can only be presumed to have been located near the village of Verbizh (see above).

The place name *Tatarynów* (Akta grodzkie, vol. 14, p. 21) is first mentioned in 1440 (mod. Tataryniv Gorodotskyi Rayon (Ukrainski Karpaty, 2001). P. Dąbkowski confirms this name (Akta grodzkie, vol. 17, # 4113) only up to 1504 with a quite distant reference to the *povit* of Rudki (Dąbkowski, 1926, p. 168). But this inconsistency seems unimportant in view of a mistake made by the compilers of the modern reference book “Administrative division. Ukrainian SSR”, where settlement Tataryniv is not mentioned in the main register either among renames or settlements removed from the registry (Administratyvno terytorialnyi, 1987). On the topographic map issued in 2001, this location is referred to Horodotskyi Rayon Lviv Oblast to the south of the village of Pidzvirynets (Ukrainski Karpaty, 2001). According to the administrative division, it should be referred to Pidzvirynetska village council (along with villages: Pidzvirynets, Hrabyne, Livchytsi, Palanyky, Rubanivka [Administratyvno terytorialnyi, 1987, p. 1773]).

The place name “*Kahujów/Kahujewo na rzece Szczercu*” (Akta grodzkie, vol. 2, p. 69, 121; vol. 14, 3820), is first mentioned in 1444: later in 1454, now village Kahuyiv is in Mykolayivskiy Rayon Lviv Oblast (Administratyvno terytorialnyi,

1987, 180). *Łubiana/Łubiany* (modern Lubyana, Mykolayivskyi Rayon Lviv Oblast (Administratyvno terytorialnyi, 1987, 180; Akta grodzkie, vol. 14, 145), later — only in 1498 (Akta grodzkie, vol. 15, record # 2666).

A certain location problem appears with the names of the two villages listed as *Chłopy* (1454; Akta grodzkie, Vol. 14, 432) and *Szczyrzecka Dambrowa vel Chłopy* (1473; (Akta grodzkie, Vol. 6, record # 114)). The former was located to the west of the township of Komarne (Horodotskyi Rayon Lviv Oblast; Administratyvno terytorialnyi, 1987, p. 177), and the latter, judging from its name *Dambrowa*, with the attributive *Szczyrzecka*, should have been in close proximity to Shchyrets. It is therefore difficult to say why the names of the toponyms are considered identical. Dąbkowski on the map indicates the toponym *Chłopy* for some reason as a location in the Horodotskyi *povit* (Dąbkowski, 1939, map), and in the register it is listed under the Schyrets *povit* (Dąbkowski, 1939, p. 168).

The settlement *Dmyrże* (modern. Dmytre Pustomytivskyi Rayon Lviv Oblast (Administratyvno terytorialnyi, 1987, p. 183) is listed as a suburb (*suburbium*) of Shchyrets and is dated 1464 (Jabłonowski, 1903, p. 12) (compare in Dąbkowski — from 1515 also based on (Jabłonowski, 1903, p. 152). The authors of the *History of Towns and Villages of Ukrainian SSR. Lviv Oblast* indicate the first mention of this place (the name is provided incorrectly though — as Dmytriv [Istoriya mist, 1968, p. 602]) as occurring in 1417 (Istoriya mist, *ibid.*). We could not find the documents that would indicate the location was first mentioned that year, and cannot be certain of this fact. We cannot agree with J. Hładylowicz's reference of the place name Dmytre as mentioned only in the sixteenth century (in 1578 based on Jabłonowski, 1903; Hładylowicz, 1931, p. 128, as in the source on page 123 the date is mentioned: 1464, and further on 152 page — 1515. We believe that the author was inattentive here.

The Shchyrets outskirts (*suburbium*) became *Ostrów* after 1466 (Akta grodzkie, vol. 15, p. 333), see also (Akta grodzkie, vol. 14, p. 179) — 1475, Jabłonowski (1903, p. 153) — 1515. And though today in Lviv Oblast we have only four locations with identical names (Administratyvno terytorialnyi, 1987, pp. 176, 180, 185, 186), we believe that *Ostrów ad Szczerzec* was joined with Shchyrets, and it happened at some point during the end of the eighteenth century, as the tax document of 1765 demonstrates: “at the outskirts of Ostrowie, 211 houses...” (Baliński, Lipiński, 1885, p. 725). On Dąbkowski's map, *Ostrów* is situated to the north of Shchyrets (Dąbkowski, 1939, map). The first mention of *Piaski / Pyaski / Piaski ad Szczerzec* (mod. Pisky Pustomytivskyi Rayon (Administratyvno terytorialnyi, 1987, p. 184), later data about this village is dated 1497 (Akta grodzkie, vol. 15, record #2562) and in 1515 (Jabłonowski, 1903, p. 153). The historiographer made a mistake also in relation to the village *Koniuszki / Conyuschky / Koniuszki ad Szczerzec*, listing it under the Shchyrets

povit in the register (Dąbkowski, 1939, p. 167), but on the map it is marked in the form of two separate place names – *Koniuszki Królewskie* and *Koniuszki Tuligłowskie* (and this was attributed to the neighbouring Horodotskyi *povit* (Dąbkowski, 1939, map)). The name *Koniuszki Królewskie* (mod. Koniushky Korolivski Sambirskyi Rayon (Administratyvno terytorialnyi, 1987, p. 185)) was mentioned for the first time in 1471 (Akta grodzkie, vol. 17, p. 50), later in the form of Conyuschky (Wierzbowski (wyd.), 1907, p. 1024) without the attribute ‘Królewskie’ in 1497. And though the names of the villages *Koniuszki Tuligłowskie* (mod. Koniushky-Tuligolovy (Administratyvno terytorialnyi, 1987, p. 185)) and *Koniuszki Królewskie* were not traced by us in the sources from the period of the end of the fourteenth — beginning of the fifteenth centuries, both settlements, which are situated closely to one another, may have emerged from a common settlement under the name of Koniushky (with the adjective that functions as a modifier having a differentiating function on the terrain).

Having analysed fourteen names of settlements that Dąbkowski attributed to the Shchyrets *povit*, we can paint quite a “dense” chronological picture of the origins of the settlements, even due to the noticeable inaccuracies in the localization of separate settlements and differences in borders in the register and on the map.

If we go beyond the fifteenth-century time span, we can trace an interesting urbanizing picture at the beginning of the sixteenth century in the sources, according to which, in 1515, on the territory of the Szczyrzec *povit*, there were only twelve separate settlements. Most of them we can consider to be settlements, with some reservations, as they are mentioned with Latin attributives as *desertum/deserta* (deserted place) or *lan* (field as a plot of land). The following names of *Ruskie Dmytrze*, *Popyelany*, *Demnya*, *Horożana*, *Humyencze*, *Czaszow*, *Zabloteze*, *Jastrapkow*, *Lany* had the the above-mentioned attributes. Only names having the appositive *suburbium* (suburb) can be presumed to be separate settlements, and these are: *Suburbium Dmytrze*, *Suburbium Ostrow*, *Suburbium Pyaski* (Jabłonowski, 1903, pp. 152–153). The reason for such a sharp decrease in the number of settlements is the burning of Shchyrets and the whole *povit* by Tartar hordes. This is also the reason why king Zygmunt abolished all kinds of township taxes in 1516 for eight years (Baliński, Lipiński, 1885, p. 724).

As shown, the settlement grid consisting of fourteen settlements, reconstructed by the historiographer, makes up the toponymic space for the territory to a certain extent, despite its incompleteness and inaccuracies.

By considering the centre of the Schryrets *povit* a landmark based on the sources, we could locate with confidence ten more settlements (see the table). The earliest mention of one of them — the village of Honiatychi, Mykolayivskyi Rayon (Administratyvno terytorialnyi, 1987, 180) — goes back to 1391, i.e. six years before the date of the *povit* centre foundation.

More accurate localisation of ten additional villages in the Shchyrets povit

№	Place name in sources	Year first mentioned	Source	Present day name of the place name, its location (according to administrative division)	Notes
1.	<i>Honiatyce</i>	1391	Akta grodzkie, vol. 10, p. 2	Honiatychi, Mykolaivskiy Rayon (Administratyvno terytorialnyi, 1987, p. 180)	
2.	<i>Szczerzecka Wola</i>	1407	Akta grodzkie, vol. 2, p. 59	Settlement that merged with Schyrets	Settlement existed in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries (Hladylowicz, 1931, p. 126)
3.	<i>Sroki</i>	1441	Akta grodzkie, vol. 14, p. 30	Soroky, Pustomyivskiy Rayon (Administratyvno terytorialnyi, 1987, p. 183)	
4.	<i>Dobrzany</i>	1442	Akta grodzkie, vol. 14, p. 57)	Dobriany, Mykolayivskiy Rayon (Administratyvno terytorialnyi, 1987, p. 181)	
5.	<i>Krasów</i>	1443	Akta grodzkie, vol. 14, p. 103	Krasiv, Mykolayivskiy Rayon (Administratyvno terytorialnyi, 1987, p. 180)	
6.	<i>Siemianówka</i>	1448	Akta grodzkie, vol. 14, p. 259	Semenivka, Pustomyivskiy Rayon (Administratyvno terytorialnyi, 1987, p. 184)	
7.	<i>Czerkasy</i>	1464	Akta grodzkie, vol. 5, p. 208	Cherkasy, Pustomyivskiy Rayon (Administratyvno terytorialnyi, 1987, p. 183)	
8.	<i>Chrusno Stare</i>	1472	Akta grodzkie, vol. 15, p. 144	Horosno, Pustomyivskiy Rayon (Administratyvno terytorialnyi, 1987, p. 184)	
9.	<i>Nowosiółki</i>	1472	Akta grodzkie, vol. 15, p. 139	Novosilka, Pustomyivskiy Rayon (Administratyvno terytorialnyi, 1987, p. 184)	
10	<i>Horbacze</i>	1477	Akta grodzkie, vol. 15, p. 103	Horbachi, Pustomyivskiy Rayon (Administratyvno terytorialnyi, 1987, p. 183)	

Therefore, by increasing the number of settlements to 24 (14 + 10), we can qualify the settlement of the area under study as quite even (in relation to settlement density) and lengthy (with a period in approximately 5 years). We can draw the conclusion that the toponymic composition of the business documentation of the time comprised acts, court notes and the like, that did not define macrooikonyms (e.g. names of big towns), but microoikonyms, i.e. names of settlements that formed the local oikonymic system.

Of course, it is inexpedient to discuss the structural use of oikonyms within such an insignificant administrative unit as a *povit* (it can be done while the analyzing oikonymic systems of the Lviv and Halych Lands), but we can observe the formation of certain wordbuilding and semantic types of models of oikonyms: **-any* (Dobrzany, Lubiany), **-ovъ* (*Krasów*; *Kahujów*; *Tatarynow*), plural (patronymic, family, ethnic) names (*Horbacze*, *Honiatycze*, *Koniuszki*, *Sroki*, *Czerkasy*, *Nowosiółki*), and physiographic names (*Piaski*, *Ostrów*) on the basis of the place names in a specific period of time.

Even on the basis of these names we can also discuss the oikonym structural variability in a specific time frame which “is the result of interlanguage and interdialectal interference” (Franko, 1984, p. 44). The Polish standard forms of place names under analysis, though they are modified old Ukrainian forms, make it quite easy to trace common Ukrainian and Polish structural characteristics. The mixed character (in terms of settlement) of these areas led to a situation where orally they had Ukrainian pronunciation, but in written standard form it was Polish through intermediary Latin language. Such a situation caused misrepresentation and numerous distortions in the presentation of the oikonyms. But place names as elements of the linguistic system (or to be more specific of two intermixed systems — Ukrainian and Polish) were formed and adapted by its speakers according to the laws of the system. Such names, as claimed by the Polish onomast K. Rymut, “are genetically connected with the population that inhabited the area” (Rymut, 1986, p. 222).

Oikonyms as a whole within one micro- or macrosystem within different time spaces are the can be used by Onomasts to analyse the structural characteristics of a toponymic system, taking into account both thechronological and ethnolinguistic aspects. Hence, the opinion of the Russian onomast M. K. Frolov “about participation of a certain ethnic group or a number of ethnic groups in the formation of a specific regional toponymic system” (Frolov, 2002, p. 102) is timely and convincing.

REFERENCES

- Administratyvno terytorialnyi ustriy. Ukrainaska RSR [Administrative territorial division. Ukrainian SSR]. (1987). Kyiv: Holovna Redaktsiya URE.
- Akta grodzkie i ziemskie czasów Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej z Archiwum tak zwanego Bernardyńskiego we Lwowie. (1868–1935). Vols. 1–25. Lviv: wyd. staraniem Galicyjskiego Wydziału Krajowego.
- Baliński, M., Lipiński, T. (1885). Starożytna Polska pod względem historycznym, jeograficznym i statystycznym opisana. T. 2, zes. 6. Wyd. 2 popr. Warszawa: Orgelbrand.
- Dąbkowski, P. (1926). Zaginione księgi sądowe województwa ruskiego i bełskiego. Studya nad historią prawa polskiego. Lwów: Tow. Naukowe.
- Dąbkowski, P. (1939). Podział administracyjny województwa ruskiego i bełskiego w XV wieku. Zabytki Dziejowe, 5. Lwów: Tow. Naukowe.
- Franko, Z.T. (1984). Slovtvorchi typy mikrotoponimiv staroukrainskoyi movy 14–15 stolit. [Derivational types of microtoponyms of Old Ukrainian in 14–15 centuries]. Movoznavstvo, pp. 4, 44–50.
- Frolov, N. K. (2002). K probleme taksonimizatsiyi toponimov [To the issue of toponym taxonomization]. In: V prostranstve filologii. Donetsk: Yuho-Vostok, pp. 100–110.
- Hładyłowicz, K. J. (1931). Zmiany krajobrazu w ziemi lwowskiej od połowy XV do początku XX wieku. In: Studja z historii społecznej i gospodarczej poświęcone prof. dr. Franciszkowi Bujakowi. Lwów: Drukarnia Naukowa, pp. 101–132.
- Horn, M. (1974). Miejski ruch osadniczy na Rusi Czerwonej do końca XV wieku. Roczniki Dziejów Społecznych i Gospodarczych, 35, 49–75.
- Hypatian Chronicle. (1962). In Polnoye sobraniye russkikh letopisey. T. 2. Moskva: Izdatelstvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.
- Istoriya mist i sil Ukrainskoyi RSR. Lvivska oblast [History of towns and villages of Ukrainian SSR]. (1968). Kyiv: Holovna Redaktsiya URE.
- Jabłonowski, A. (ed.) (1903). Polska XVI wieku pod względem geograficzno-statystycznym. Ziemia Ruskie: Ruś Czerwona. T. 18, cz. 2. Warszawa: Główny skład u Gebethnera i Wolffa (Supp.).
- Janeček, A. (1995). Miasta Rusi Czerwonej w nurcie modernizacji. Kontekst reform XIV–XVI w. Kwartalnik Historii Kultury Materialnej, 43, pp. 55–66.
- Karpenko, Y. O. (1973). Toponimia Bukovyny [Bukovynian Toponymy]. Kyiv: Naukova Dumka.
- Kotliar, M. F. (1998). Halytsko-Volynska Rus [Halych-Volhynnia Rus]. Vol. 5. Kyiv: Alternatyvy.
- Krawcow, S. Topografia wspólnot wyznaniowych w miastach Rusi Czerwonej XIV–XVII w. Kwartalnik Historii Kultury Materialnej, 43, pp. 77–79.
- Kyiv military cartographic factory. (2001). Ukrainski Karpaty [Ukrainian Carpathians] (map). (1 : 200 000). Kyiv: Kyiv military cartographic factory.
- Łowmiański, H. (1973). Początki Polski. Vol. 5. Warszawa: PWN, 563–567.
- Materialy archiwalne wyjęte głównie z Metryki Litewskiej od 1348 do 1607 r. (1890). Lviv: A. Prochaska.
- Przyboś, K. (1987). Urzędnicy województwa ruskiego XIV–XVIII wieku. Spisy. Wrocław [etc.]: Ossolineum.
- Przyboś, K. (1999). Granice ziemi lwowskiej wraz z powiatem żydaczowskim. Rocznik Przemyski, 35, nr 4, pp. 3–13.
- Redkva, Y. P. (2003). Hronolohizatsiya ta lokalizatsiya yak systemnyi yavshcha v rehionalnyi oikonimiyi [Chronologization and localization as systemic phenomena in regional oikonymy]. Naukovi Zapysky TDPU. Movoznavstvo Series. Onomastics, 1 (9), pp. 147–153.

- Rymut, K. (1986). Pogranicze polsko-ukraińskie w świetle nazw miejscowych. In: S. Warchoł (red.), *Formacje hybrydalne w językach słowiańskich. Rozprawy Slawistyczne*, 1. Lublin: UMCS, pp. 221–226.
- Sharanovich, I. (1863). *Istoriya Halytsko-Volodymyrdkoy Rusi ot naidavnishyh vremen do roku 1453* [History of Halych-Volhynia Rus from Oldest Times to 1453]. Lviv: Institute Stavropihiyskiy Publishers.
- Sochaniewicz, S. (1921). Wójtostwa i sołtysostwa pod względem prawnym i ekonomicznym w ziemi Lwowskiej. In: *Studia nad Historią Prawa Polskiego*, 7. Lwów: nakładem Tow. Naukowego.
- Wierzbowski, T. (wyd.) (1905–1961). *Matricularum Regni Poloniae summaria*. Vols. 1–4. Warszawa: Naczelna Dyrekcja Archiwów Państwowych.
- Zubrytskyi, D. (1852). *Istoriya drevnego Halichsko-russkogo kniazhestva* [History of ancient Halych Rus Principality]. 2. Lviv: Stavropihianska Publishers.

SUMMARY

The article traces the formation of the oikonymic system, toponymic space and toponymic landscape, twenty-four place names of Shchyrets *povit* in the Lviv Land Ruske Voivodeship over the 14th to the 15th centuries, using a systemic approach to analysis of historical Western Ukrainian oikonymy. The onset of certain derivational and semantic types of place names models are also established in the article, i.e.: *-any (*Dobrzany/Dobriany, Łubiany/Liubiany*), *-ovъ (*Krasów/Krasiv, Kahujów/Kahuyiv, Tataryńów/Tataryńiv*), plural (patronymic, lineage, ethnic) names (*Horbacze/Horbachi, Honiatycze/Honiatychi, Koniuszki/Koniushky, Sroki/Soroky, Czerkasy/Cherkasy, Nowosiółki/Novosilky*), physiographic names (*Piaski/Pisky, Ostrów/Ostriv*). These names are elements of a language system (to be more precise of two intertwined systems — Ukrainian and Polish), and they were created and adapted by their speakers in accordance with the laws of the system, and genetically connected with the community that populated the area.