

Agnieszka Piotrowska-Wojaczyk

Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu

Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań

ORCID: 0000-0002-4103-6355

On the Usefulness of Erazm Rykaczewski's *Słownik języka polskiego* in Research on the Territorial Diversification of Old Polish (Preliminary Remarks)

The *Dictionary of the Polish Language* by Erasmus Edward Rykaczewski [SR¹], published in Berlin in 1866, which forms the material basis for the analyses presented here, has received little attention from linguists. It is usually not even included in studies of historical lexicography [see Doroszewski 1954; Doroszewski 1958: VII–XLIII; Kania, Tokarski 1984; Piotrowski 1994; Urbańczyk 2000] or is treated with apparent disregard in them. For example: Zenon Klemensiewicz, in his *History of the Polish Language*, when discussing the works of the New Polish Era, devoted one sentence to the dictionary in question: “A brief mention is enough of E. Rykaczewski’s work, compiled not without external aid [...]” [Klemensiewicz 2002: 656]. Additionally, Klemensiewicz misquoted the title of the work, namely: *Dictionary of the Polish language compiled according to Linde work and other more recent sources*, when in fact the title reads *Dictionary of the Polish language according to Linde and other more recent sources. Compiled by E. Rykaczewski*. Klemensiewicz’s mistake seems to have left its mark on the reception of this work by subsequent researchers and the recognition of the dictionary as a derivative work not compiled independently. “The title itself indicates that it was an unoriginal work” – Piotr Źmigrodzki wrote about the dictionary in his *Introduction to Polish Lexicography* and, just like Klemensiewicz, he gave an incorrect form of the title [Źmigrodzki 2003: 145]. Tadeusz Piotrowski, on the other hand, described Rykaczewski’s work as a “tiny”

1 I also use abbreviations for the [Polish] names of specific works in the rest of the paper.

dictionary [Piotrowski 2001: 176], which did not play a major role in the history of lexicography.

A different opinion on the dictionary was presented by Mirosław Bańko in his article “*Dictionary of the Polish Language*” by Erazm Rykaczewski – *the first popular dictionary of the Polish language* [Bańko 2002]. He stated that the work in question deserves the attention of lexicographers (a statement with which I fully agree), and that many of the solutions used therein place Rykaczewski among the forerunners of popular lexicography:

First, Rykaczewski’s dictionary, [...] was only the third general dictionary of the Polish language to appear in print, and as such, represents an important stage in the formation of the Polish monolingual dictionary model. Secondly, Rykaczewski’s dictionary was in fact the first Polish popular dictionary – as evidenced by its content, format, and number of entries, as well as the number of editions and price. Third, many issues related to the history of this dictionary, its authorship, its source material, its alleged dependence [...] and even the number of editions are unclear and need to be investigated. [Bańko 2002: 8]

I intend to address the above issues in a planned monograph; in this text, however, I will focus on the question of the usefulness of this work in lexical research. This issue interests me all the more because Bańko, despite his positive assessment of the work, speaks unequivocally negatively about it:

Rykaczewski’s dictionary [...] means little as a document for the history of the Polish language. It is of no value as a source of information about the lexical resources of Polish in the mid-19th century, since there are larger and better documented dictionaries providing such data. [Bańko 2002: 7]

I find it difficult to agree with such a radical assessment. Of course, we have more extensive works, with richer hash documentation, but the lack of comprehensive corpora of texts from different eras means that we should not give up on any source available for analysis, despite all its possible shortcomings. The shortcomings of Rykaczewski’s work (the small size of the dictionary, lack of documentation of the headwords, or the short, prepared examples of usage) are a consequence of the concept behind the work; for it was to be a popular dictionary, not a scientific one.

Since my research interests focus on issues in regional Polish, in this article I have decided to look at the provincialisms recorded in Rykaczewski’s work in order to respond to Bańko’s opinion on the little value or uselessness of this

dictionary in lexical research. I did not use the first edition from 1866, but the later Berlin edition from 1913.² However, since they differ only in secondary features (binding, thickness of spines, method of colouring paper edges), the edition used as the basis for my inferences fully reflects the state of Polish in the second half of the 19th century.

In my research to date on the historical regional variation of the Polish language in the modern Polish era, I have analysed four lexicons.³ They were: *Słownik języka polskiego* by Samuel Bogumił Linde [L]; *Słownik języka polskiego* by Aleksander Zdanowicz, Michał Bohusz Szyszko, January Filipowicz and others (the so-called Vilnius dictionary) [SWil]; *Słownik języka polskiego* by Jan Karłowicz, Adam Kryński and Władysław Niedźwiedzki (the so-called Warsaw dictionary) [SW] and *Słownik języka polskiego* edited by Witold Doroszewski [SJPDor]. Based on all the geographical information noted in the above works (indications of their creators in the form of the geographical labels *provincial* and *regional*), indications contained explicitly or implicitly in the definitions, examples of the use of the headword [see Walczak 1997: 157–167] or resulting from knowledge of the linguistic biography of the authors of the cited examples⁴) I extracted a set of 4940 lexemes, consisting of 430 L provincialisms, 2520 SWil provincialisms, 1262 SW provincialisms and 1709 SJPDor regionalisms⁵.

It should be clarified that in Linde's *Słownik*, the Vilnius dictionary and the Warsaw dictionary – like Rykaczewski's work – the label *reg.* [*regionalny* – regional] or the term *regionalism* does not appear at all, and territorial distinctions of the general language are referred to, as mentioned earlier, as provincial words (labeled as *prow.* [*provincjonalny* – provincial]). Indeed, the adjective *regional* is first used in SJPDor. This qualifier became widespread in linguistics only in the 20th century, [...] – motivated by the meaning of the root word *region* 'area', 'part of the whole (area)', while the analogous original relationship between the term *provincialism* and the root word *province* ceased to function due to a change in the scope of the meaning of the word *province* (originally also 'area', 'part of the whole [area]', especially an 'administrative unit' – today a synonym

2 It was to be published by Berlin SW. Verlag von Neufeld & Henius with no information on the year of publication. However, the Catalog of the National Library in Warsaw features a date of 1913 [see Bańko 2002: 13–14].

3 I presented the results of my research in the monograph *Lexical regionalisms in the dictionaries of the New Polish Era* [see Piotrowska-Wojaczyk 2011].

4 Consideration of the latter type of guidelines is necessary especially when analysing L material due to the lack of an elaborate system of labels.

5 I use the term **headword** to denote each properly qualified meaning of a lexeme, and not just the word form (the analysed works recorded 4409 instances of the latter).

for inferiority to the centre, such as the capital – *provincja* (the provinces, the country) or *provincja kulturalna* (cultural backwater) [Handke 1993: 10]. I will therefore use these terms interchangeably, as synonyms.

Having collected lexical distinctions of the general language obtained through excerpting Modern Polish dictionaries, I decided to confront the obtained collection of units with the lexical material of SR in order to determine what part of these entries are also qualified in this work as components of territorially differentiated Polish.

The analysis showed that SR recorded only 176 provincialisms from the collection of the New Polish regionalisms I compiled. These include:

- a) **akafist** ‘a Ruthenian mass at the Czerniec to worship the name of Jesus’;⁶
- b) **bajdak** ‘ships floating goods on the Pripyat, Dniester and Nemunas rivers. – *prow.* żerdź’;
- c) **bajrak** *leś. prow.* ‘dwarf pine’;⁷
- d) **bojar (boyar)** ‘boyars in Lithuania constituted the middle class between the nobility and the peasantry, this name was given to the Lithuanian-Ruthenian nobility [...]’;
- e) **brus** *prow.* ‘beam’;
- f) **chmyz** *prow.* ‘dry branches, dry sticks’;
- g) **ciupas** *prow.* ‘sending the culprit away under guard’;
- h) **dydek** ‘devil in Ruthenia’;
- i) **futor** ‘in Ukraine a forest hilled up with an orchard’;⁸
- j) **general** ‘in Lithuania in each province – the oldest usher’;
- k) **horodniczy** ‘a guardian of a castle or fortified castle in the provinces of W.X. Lit.’;
- l) **kaczan** ‘(in Lithuania and Ruthenia) a cabbage stump, a corncob’;
- m) **mohorycz** ‘means the same thing in Ruthenia as *litkup* in other parts of Poland’;
- n) **opryszek** ‘a brigand in the Carpathian Mountains from Hungary and Bukovina’;
- o) **praźnik** ‘in Ruthenia, the annual feast of the consecration of the church’;

6 I cite explanations of the meanings of various entries in the forms according to dictionary notations.

7 In the entry for **bajrak**, there was a transfer of the final part of the first line of the entry to the unfilled last line of the previous entry. Such a practice served to save money in the typesetting of the work.

8 In the entry for **futor**, there was a transfer of the final part of the first line of the entry to the unfilled last line of the previous entry. Such a practice served to save money in the typesetting of the work.

- p) **pyrka** 'the name for a potato in some areas north of Silesia';
- q) **radno** 'a sheet of sackcloth linen in Ruthenia to cover oneself in the rainy weather, and also for various farm uses';
- r) **stójka** 'in Lithuania and Ruthenia, a peasant at a land or lower court serving as a messenger on horseback';
- s) **surogator (surrogate)** 'a deputy starost in the provinces of Greater Poland';
- t) **szwendać się (to hang about) prow.** 'to walk aimlessly, wander';
- u) **tok** 'in Ruthenia, a threshing floor';
- v) **wybory (elections)** 'assembly of nobles in Lithuania and Ruthenia to select certain officials';
- w) **zańcianek** 'a piece of land with a house and garden of the petty nobility in Lithuania';
- x) **znachor** *prow.* 'one who knows about diseases without being a doctor.'

As can be inferred from the examples cited above, the qualifier *prow.* (provincial) is used only occasionally in the dictionary. This is because, most often, geographic information about restrictions on the use of a headwords appears as part of a semantic definition, less often in an example of use.

SR shows the greatest agreement in identifying the regional nature of the headwords, and the method of their explanation with SWil. Such a practice can be noted in 122 units (about 73% of the New Polish Era provincialisms registered in the SR). This fact should not be surprising if one considers the approximate time of publication of these works⁹ and the conceptual similarity between the two works. This is because both dictionaries were conceived as non-specialist extracts of L material.

The intended brevity – including in the compilation of regionalisms – was also achieved in SR by the deliberate omission of derivative words, formed in accordance with the language's word-forming rules. For example: in addition to the entry for **bojar** cited above, it also featured **bojarzyn**, **bojarski** and **bojarstwo**, omitting a number of other forms, but noted, among others, in the SW – **bojarczyk**, **bojarka**, **bojarowa**, **bojarna**, **bojarszczyzna**, **bojaryzm**, **bojarzątko**, etc.

Additionally, tracing the lexicographic particulars of SR regionalisms showed that they are most often entries not listed in L, and included only in SWil, and – in accordance with the typical trend of regionalization of vocabulary in this period [see Piotrowska 2006: 178–203] – described as provincial therein.

⁹ There is a five-year difference between the publication of each work: SWil – 1861, SR – 1866, with a draft of the latter published as early as 1848.

Moreover, SR definitions are generally more similar to those of SWil than to Linde's definitions or definitional citations. The citation of Linde's work in the title, therefore, had no factual basis in this case, but was rather a publicity stunt – Linde's authority was used as a prop and the titles of other more recent competing works, including SWil, were omitted.

The eight provincialisms in Rykaczewski's work, are either not recorded in L or SWil, or are lacking geographical information. Only later works – SW and SJPDor – define them as components of territorially differentiated Polish. These include:

- a) **Lach** 'A Pole in Ruthenian' [no geographical information in L, SWil, SW; in SJPD or we find the labels *reg. daw.* (historical use)];
- b) **odryna** '(in Lithuania) a building usually made of brushwood, covered with straw, for hay storage, or protecting various kinds of farm equipment from the rain' [unit included in the definition of the word **szopa** (**shed**); noted separately without geographical indication; in L and SWil – no geographical information, in SW – dialect word¹⁰, in SJPDor – *reg.*];
- c) **rumówka** 'rum salt, imported from Wieliczka in barrels' [entry noted only in SW with additional profinolectal qualifier *górz.* (mining)];
- d) **stoboda** 'a settlement of free peasants in Ukraine' [no geographical information in L, SWil, SW, in SJPDor the label *hist.* is placed next to the geographical indication.].

In addition, SR enriches the register of the 19th-century provincialisms I compiled with 27 new units, either not recorded at all or not classified as components of regional Polish in any of the works I analysed. Frequently, they are not listed as a separate headword, but hidden in the semantic definitions of other units, and in exceptional cases – in examples of use. These include, for example:

- a) **boże poszycie** 'hair on the head, crop of hair (an expression of Mazovian peasants).' [phrase included in the entry for **boży** (**God's**)];
- b) **czerdak** 'a house in the Carpathian Mountains on a gravel road for military guards';
- c) **derkacz** (**corncrake**) *zool.* 'in Ruthenia and Lithuania a bird of the Himantopus order, digitate.' [unit included in the definition of the entry for **chróściel**; also noted separately, but without geographical indication];
- d) **doświtek** 'common work and play in Ruthenia of farmhands with maids in winter before dawn'¹¹;

10 To designate dialects, SW authors use a non-letter label [], which is rare in Polish lexicography.

11 SWil noted the phrase **doświtka** in the sense analysed.

- e) **horodnica** 'the town where the courts were held' [from: **Horod**, 'a Ruthenian word, in Polish *gród*']¹²;
- f) **makówka** 'a variety of green, grainy salt, in Wieliczka' [unit included in the definition of the entry for **makowica**; also noted separately, but with the analysed meaning omitted];
- g) **nakaźny** 'deputy hetman in Zaporozhian Cossacks';
- h) **oczeret** 'a common reed name in Ruthenia and Lithuania';
- i) **pomocne** 'the duty of landowners in the Crown to siphon grain into the treasury' [unit included in definition of **dziakło**; not recorded separately];
- j) **przczysta** 'The Blessed Virgin of Ruthenia is called *przczysta*, we call her immaculate' [unit included in an example of the use in the entry for **przczysty**];
- k) **rzepołuch** *zool.* 'in Mazovia, in commoners, a species of linnet.' [unit included in the definition of for **macaw**; not recorded separately];
- l) **świetlica** 'in Ruthenia – a room, chamber';
- m) **łokno** 'a dish of rural people in Ruthenia made from oat flour ground from grains steamed with hot water and dried.'¹³

In conclusion, the findings presented, as indicated in the subtitle (*Preliminary remarks*), do not provide a comprehensive view of the provincialisms included in SR. Many issues, such as the origin of selected units or providing territorial indications, require more thorough research. Nevertheless, based on the analysis presented, I believe that treating Rykaczewski's *Dictionary* as a secondary, unoriginal work is unfair. Its independence is determined by the creative treatment of the source material, the compilation of a list of entries based on two previous dictionaries of Polish, but also, as I have shown, going extending beyond the earlier works. This is because, in my opinion, this dictionary provides an interesting material basis for lexicological research on the territorial variation of Polish. And in this respect its value cannot be belittled.

Translated by Magdalena Perdek

¹² SJPDoR noted the form **horodnia** in the analysed meaning.

¹³ L recorded the phrase **tołokno** in the sense analysed.

List of label abbreviations and designations

<i>daw.</i>	dawny, dawniej (historical use)
<i>gór.</i>	górnictwo (mining)
<i>hist.</i>	historia (history)
<i>leś.</i>	leśnictwo (forestry)
<i>prow.</i>	provincjonalny
<i>reg.</i>	regionalny
<i>zool.</i>	zoologia
[]	dialect

References

Dictionaries (including the abbreviations used)

- L – Linde Samuel Bogumił (1807–1814), *Słownik języka polskiego*, vol. 1–6, Warszawa.
- SR – Rykaczewski Erazm (1866), *Słownik języka polskiego podług Lindego i innych nowszych źródeł. Wypracowany przez E. Rykaczewskiego*, part 1–2, Berlin // Rykaczewski Erazm (1913), *Dictionary of the Polish language according to Linde and other more recent sources. Wypracowany przez E. Rykaczewskiego*, part 1–2, Berlin.
- SWil – Zdanowicz Aleksander, Bohusz Szyszko Michał, Filipowicz January et al. (1861), *Słownik języka polskiego*, part 1–2, Vilnius.
- SW – Karłowicz Jan, Kryński Adam, Niedźwiedzki Władysław (1900–1927), *Słownik języka polskiego*, vol. 1–8, Warszawa.
- SJPDor – Doroszewski Witold, ed. (1958–1969), *Słownik języka polskiego*, vol. 1–11, Warszawa.

Literature

- Bańko Mirosław (2002), *Słownik języka polskiego Erazma Rykaczewskiego – pierwszy popularny słownik polszczyzny*, “Prace Filologiczne”, vol. 47, p. 7–26; available online at: <http://banko.polon.uw.edu.pl/pliki/inne/Rykaczewski.rtf.pdf>.
- Doroszewski Witold (1954), *Z zagadnień leksykografii polskiej*, Warszawa.
- Doroszewski Witold (1958), *Uwagi i wyjaśnienia wstępne*, in: idem (ed.), *Słownik języka polskiego*, Warszawa, vol. 1, p. VII–XLIII.
- Handke Kwiryna (1993), *Foreword*, in: eadem (ed.), *Region, regionalizm – pojęcia i rzeczywistość. Zbiór studiów*, Warszawa, p. 7–11.
- Kania Stanisław, Tokarski Jan (1984), *Zarys leksykologii i leksykografii*, Warszawa.
- Klemensiewicz Zenon (2002), *Historia języka polskiego*, Warszawa.

- Piotrowska Agnieszka K. (2006), *Regionalizacja słownictwa dziewiętnastowiecznej polszczyzny*, in: Świącicka Małgorzata (ed.), *Miasto. Przestrzeń zróżnicowana językowo, kulturowo i społecznie*, Bydgoszcz, p. 178–203.
- Piotrowska-Wojaczyk Agnieszka (2011), *Regionalizmy leksykalne w słownikach doby nowopolskiej*, Poznań.
- Piotrowski Tadeusz (1994), *Z zagadnień leksykografii*, Warszawa.
- Piotrowski Tadeusz (2001), *Zrozumieć leksykografię*, Warszawa.
- Urbańczyk Stanisław (2000), *Słowniki i encyklopedie. Ich rodzaje i użyteczność*, Kraków.
- Walczak Bogdan (1997), *Kontekst wyrazowy w leksykografii*, "Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego", vol. 53, p. 157–167.
- Żmigrodzki Piotr (2003), *Wprowadzenie do leksykografii polskiej*, Katowice.

Agnieszka Piotrowska-Wojaczyk

On the Usefulness of Erazm Rykaczewski's *Słownik języka polskiego* in Research on the Territorial Diversification of Old Polish (Preliminary Remarks)

The aim of the article is to demonstrate the usefulness of Erazm Rykaczewski's *Słownik języka polskiego* for the research on the regional diversity of Polish. The comparison of the register of 19th-century Modern Polish regionalisms, which I compiled, with the provincialisms recorded in SR showed that, although the dictionary only included 176 of the analysed units, it also collected 27 new units, not recorded at all or not classified as elements of regional Polish in any of the dictionary publications I analysed. Hence, the results prove that SR is an interesting material base for lexicological research on regional Polish.

KEYWORDS: historical lexicography; Polish language dictionary; provincialism; regionalism; regional Polish.

Agnieszka Piotrowska-Wojaczyk, Ph.D. – Department of Anthropological Linguistics, Faculty of Polish and Classical Philology, Adam Mickiewicz University. Her research interests include lexicology and historical lexicography, as well as regional diversity of Polish