

# Bulaestian /малай'еш/ 'hawthorn, Crataegus laevigata' as a result of early Romanian-Bucovinian interactions

Aleksey Romanchuk <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2021-7958>

Institute of Cultural Heritage, Chisinau, Republic of Moldova

Надійшла до редакції: 20.04.2025 • Схвалено до друку: 28.05.2025

## Abstract

More than fifteen years ago, Bulaestian /малай'еш/ 'hawthorn, Crataegus laevigata' was introduced into scientific circulation. This phytonym is a non-trivial Romanianism in the dialect of the Bulaestian Ukrainians. Despite its non-triviality, however, over the past time this Romanianism has not become the subject of a special scientific examination, which would allow us to clarify both the conditions of its appearance in the dialect of the Bulaestian Ukrainians, and, in fact, its original Romanian source. This is what makes this study, as it seems, very **relevant**. Thus, the **purpose** of the article is to analyze in detail the context of the emergence of the Bulaestian Romanianism /малай'еш/ 'hawthorn, Crataegus laevigata', and to establish both its original Romanian source and the circumstances of the formation of this phytonym in Romanian language, and its subsequent borrowing by the Bulaestian dialect. Thus, Bulaestian /малай'еш/ 'hawthorn, Crataegus laevigata' is formed from Romanian *mălai* 'millet, Panicum miliaceum', using the Romanian diminutive suffix -eș. However, when referring to the actual Romanian data, the original Romanian phytonym, the source for Bulaestian /малай'еш/ could not be found. The main term denoting hawthorn in Romanian is *păducel*. In Ukrainian dialects, a direct analogy to Bulaestian /малай'еш/ is also not found. However, in some Bukovinian dialects (specifically: Zastavna, Kitsmani, Storozhinets, Novoselytsia), the phytonyms *малай*, *малаец*, *малайок* are known, and precisely with the meaning 'hawthorn, Crataegus oxyacantha L.'. Also, in four villages in the area of the Central Podolian dialects, the phytonyms *кашка-малашка*, *мамаличка* 'hawthorn, Crataegus monogyna Jacq.' are recorded. The phytonyms *кашка-малашка*, *мамаличка* 'hawthorn, Crataegus monogyna Jacq.', despite their obvious inequality to both Bulaestian /малай'еш/ 'hawthorn' and the Bukovinian *малай*, *малаец*, *малайок* 'hawthorn', are nevertheless also obviously etymologically related to the Romanian *mălai*. Thus, we have a specific Bulaestian-Bukovinian parallel, absent even in the Hutsul dialects (also closely related to the Bulaestian dialect). And some facts allow us to assume that both the appearance of the Bulaestian /малай'еш/ 'hawthorn' and the emergence of the Bukovinian *малай*, *малаец*, *малайок* 'hawthorn' were part of a common episode in the history of the Bulaestian Ukrainians and speakers of the Bukovinian dialects, and were associated with Bukovina. First of all, this includes the fact that the semantics of the main Romanian name for hawthorn, *păducel*, is accompanied in the Romanian folk tradition by significant negative connotations. Which, in all likelihood, should have prevented the transfer of the meaning of *mălai* to hawthorn. Indeed, the etymology of the Romanian name for hawthorn, *păducel*, is associated with the Latin (and Romanian) word meaning 'louse'. Moreover, in the Romanian folk tradition there is a widespread belief that whoever eats hawthorn fruits will be filled with lice. Moldova is included in the zone where the phytonym *păducel* is used as the name of hawthorn. That is, accordingly, in the zone of distribution in the popular consciousness of negative connotations associated with this phytonym. Accordingly, in all likelihood, the transfer of the name of millet to hawthorn was possible only in some, fairly narrowly localized zones of the Romanian linguistic space, where the attitude to hawthorn was different, and just as positive as to millet. And these, in all likelihood, were just some mountainous zones of the Carpathians, where hawthorn, in conditions unsuitable for agriculture, could be actively used in food as at least a partial substitute for cereals. In this regard, it is noteworthy that it is the Ukrainian Carpathian region (including Bukovina) that is included in the area of such a species of hawthorn as 'Ukrainian hawthorn, Crataegus ucrainica'. Its fruits, 11-13 mm in diameter, are almost twice as large as the fruits of the common hawthorn, Crataegus laevigata (7-10 mm in diameter). Which, obviously, significantly increased its food appeal in the eyes of people of traditional cultures. Based on the facts presented, it seems more likely that Bulaestian /малай'еш/ 'hawthorn, Crataegus laevigata' arose precisely in the Bukovinian period of the history of the Bulaestian Ukrainians, in the region of Bukovina, and, in all likelihood, as a result of interaction with the same group of the Romanian population.

**Keywords:** dialectology, Ukrainian dialects, Republic of Moldova, Romanianisms, phytonyms, Bukovina, Shipin land

# Булаєштське /мала'йеш/ 'глід, *Crataegus laevigata*' як результат ранньої румуно-буковинської взаємодії

Олексій Романчук <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2021-7958>

Інститут культурної спадщини, Кишинів, Республіка Молдова

Received: 20.04.2025 • Accepted: 28.05.2025

## Анотація

Більше як 15 років тому до наукового обігу введено булаєштське /мала'йеш/ 'глід, *Crataegus laevigata*'. Цей фітонім є нетривіальним румунізмом у говірці булаєштських українців Молдови. Проте цей румунізм так і не став предметом спеціального наукового аналізу, який би дав змогу з'ясувати умови його появи в говірці булаєштських українців, і, власне, його вихідне румунське джерело. Саме це й робить наше дослідження **актуальним**. Отож **мета** статті полягає в тому, щоб детально проаналізувати контекст виникнення булаєштського румунізму /мала'йеш/ 'глід, *Crataegus laevigata*' і встановити його вихідне румунське джерело й обставини формування фітоніма на румунському ґрунті, а також його подальшого запозичення булаєштською говіркою. Отже, булаєштське /мала'йеш/ 'глід, *Crataegus laevigata*' утворене від румунського *mălai* 'просо звичайне, *Panicum miliaceum*' за допомогою румунського деминутивного суфікса -eș. Однак навіть звернення до власне румунських даних – вихідного румунського фітоніма – не дало змоги виявити джерело булаєштського /мала'йеш/. Основним терміном, що позначає глід у румунській мові, є *păducel*. В українських говорах прямої аналогії булаєштського /мала'йеш/ теж не виявлено. Проте в деяких буковинських говірках (Заставна, Кіцмань, Сторожинець, Новоселиця) відомі фітоніми *малай*, *малаєць*, *малайок* – і саме зі значенням 'глід, *Crataegus oxyacantha*'. Також у чотирьох селах в ареалі центральноподільських говірок зафіксовано фітоніми *'кашка-ма'лашка, мама'личка* 'глід одноматочковий, *Crataegus monogyna* Jacq'. Незважаючи на їхню очевидну нерівнозначність і булаєштському /мала'йеш/ 'глід', і надпрутсько-буковинському *малай*, *малайок*, *малаєць* 'т.с.', очевидно, що у своїй етимології назви пов'язані з тим самим румунським *mălai*. Отже, перед нами специфічна булаєштсько-буковинська паралель – відсутня, що важливо, навіть у гуцульських говірках (також найближче споріднених булаєштській говірці). І деякі факти дозволяють припустити, що і поява булаєштського /мала'йеш/ 'глід', і виникнення надпрутсько-буковинського *малай*, *малайок*, *малаєць* 'т.с.' були частиною загального епізоду історії булаєштських українців і носіїв надпрутсько-буковинських говорів, і це було пов'язано саме з Буковиною. Насамперед зауважимо, що семантика основної румунської назви глоду *păducel* супроводжується в румунській народній традиції суттєвими негативними конотаціями, які, припускаємо, мали перешкоджати перенесенню значення *mălai* на глід. Справді, етимологія румунської назви глоду *păducel* пов'язана з латинським (і румунським) словом, що означає 'воша'. І в румунській народній традиції поширене повір'я, що той, хто їсть плоди глоду, наповниться вошами. Молдова входить саме в зону, де для номінації глоду використовують фітонім *păducel*. Тобто відповідно до зони поширення в народній свідомості негативних конотацій, пов'язаних із цим фітонімом. Припускаємо, що перенесення назви проса на глід було можливим лише в деяких досить вузьколокальних зонах румунського мовного простору, де ставлення до глоду було іншим, а саме таким же позитивним, як і до проса. І це, вважаємо, були окремі зони Карпат, де глід, в умовах, малоприсаєднаних для землеробства, міг активно використовуватися принаймні як частковий заміник зернових. Зауважимо, що саме Прикарпаття (включно з Буковиною) входить до ареалу такого виду глоду, як 'глід український, *Crataegus ucrainica*'. Його плоди, розміром 11–13 мм у діаметрі, практично вдвічі більші, ніж плоди глоду звичайного, *Crataegus laevigata* (7–10 мм у діаметрі). Це, очевидно, істотно употужнювало його харчову привабливість для людини. Ураховуючи викладені факти, припускаємо з високою долею вірогідності, що булаєштське /мала'йеш/ 'глід, *Crataegus laevigata*' виникло саме в надпрутсько-буковинський період історії булаєштських українців у регіоні Надпрутської Буковини внаслідок узаємодії з однією групою румунського населення.

**Ключові слова:** діалектологія, українські говори, Республіка Молдова, румунізми, фітоніми, Буковина, Шипинська земля

**Statement of the problem.** More than fifteen years ago, the Bulaesti /mala'yesh/ 'hawthorn, *Crataegus laevigata*' was introduced into scientific circulation (Романчук, Тащи, 2010, с. 121). This phytonym is, in all likelihood, a Romanianism in the dialect of the Bulaestian Ukrainians. And a very non-trivial Romanianism due to a number of reasons that will be set out in the main text of the article.

Despite its non-triviality, however, over the past time, this phytonym has not become the subject of a special scientific examination, which would allow us to clarify both the conditions for the appearance of this Romanianism in the dialect of the Bulaestian Ukrainians, and, in fact, its original Romanian source.

It was the awareness of this omission and the desire to correct it that became the motive for conducting this study.

**Analysis of the latest achievements and publications.** The dialect of Bulaieŝtian Ukrainians has been intensively studied for over twenty years. During this time, several dozen articles and two monographs devoted to this topic have appeared. Without the opportunity to present or even mention them all here, I will limit myself to indicating only some of the works of researchers who are particularly actively engaged in its study, I. V. Horofianiuk and A. A. Romanchuk (Романчук, Тащи, 2010; Гороф'янюк, 2012а, 2016а, 2020б; Гороф'янюк, Романчук, 2017; Романчук, 2024).

The topic of interactions between Bulaieŝtian Ukrainians and Romanians was specifically considered in a number of studies by A. A. Romanchuk, which were summarized in a monograph published last year (Романчук, 2024). However, the actual phytonyms (and especially the phytonym-Romanisms of the Bulaestian dialect) were practically not touched upon in these studies.

The phytonyms recorded in the Bulaestian dialect were not the subject of a separate special consideration either. Although some of them were analyzed in a number of works by I. V. Horofianiuk (Гороф'янюк, 2014, 2016а, 2016б).

It is precisely all of the above that makes this study, as it seems, very relevant.

Thus, the **purpose of the article** is to analyze in detail the context of the emergence of the Bulaestian Romanianism /mala'yesh/ 'hawthorn, *Crataegus laevigata*', and to establish both its

original Romanian source and the circumstances of the formation of this phytonym in Romanian language, and its subsequent borrowing by the Bulaestian dialect.

**Discussion.** У Thus, interpreting Bulaestian /mala'yesh/ 'hawthorn, *Crataegus laevigata*' (Романчук, Тащи, 2010, с. 121) as a Romanianism (Романчук, 2024, с. 478), I proceeded from the obvious fact that this word is derived from the Romanian *mălai*/мэлай (since the dictionaries of the "Moldovan language" published in Soviet times used Cyrillic graphics, then in those cases when a reference is given to them, the Cyrillic spelling of the quoted word is also given, through a slash), and specifically in one (and, obviously, primary) of its meanings, 'millet, *Panicum miliaceum*' (DEX, *mălai*; MPC, 1961, с. 402; ДМР, 1987, с. 286; СДЕЛМ, 1978, с. 272; ЕСУМ, 3, с. 369), with the help of the Romanian diminutive suffix -eș. That is, literally Bulaestian /mala'yesh/ originally meant "little *mălai*" where *mălai* meant "millet, *Panicum miliaceum*". In Romanian, with the help of the same diminutive suffix -eș (as well as the suffix -aș, which is basically equivalent to it), several more phytonyms were formed. First of all, it is such an important phytonym in this context (we will address it in more detail below) as *măcieș*/мэчеш (*măceș*/мэчеш; Romanian dictionaries prefer this form of the word, but in Moldovan dictionaries it is *măcieș*/мэчеш that is given as the main (or even the only) meaning (СДЕЛМ, 1978, с. 273). As well as *toporaș*/мопораш 'fragrant violet' (ДМР, 1987, с. 462); by the way, the same dictionary also gives the homonym *toporaș*/мопораш, with the meaning 'small hatchet'<sup>1</sup>.

However, when referring to the Romanian data proper, despite all my efforts, I was unable to find the original Romanian phytonym, the source for Bulaestian /mala'yesh/. And this, in itself, is quite interesting.

Well, let's consider the question in more detail.

Thus, according to dictionaries of the Romanian language, the main term denoting hawthorn in the Romanian language is *păducel*/пэдуцел (DEX, [păducel](#)). What is noteworthy is that the phytonym *păducel* is also

<sup>1</sup> I mention it here specifically because the Romanian *toporaș* was borrowed into the Bulaestian dialect as /топ'ораш/, with the same meaning.

formed with the help of a diminutive suffix, but a different one, the suffix *-eŕ*.

For some reason, this phytonym, *păducel*/пэдучел, was not included in the dictionaries of the Moldavian language published in Soviet times (ДМР, 1987; МРС, 1961). However, the etymological dictionary mentions it (СДЕЛМ, 1978, с. 345). And, as far as I can see, in the Romanian/Moldavian dialects on the territory of the Republic of Moldova, this phytonym is the only known designation of hawthorn.

In any case, it is precisely and exclusively as *păducel* that hawthorn is known in the Moldovan villages of Mîrzaci and Mîrzeşti, which are neighbors of Bulaesti village. And, in general, my attempts to interview informants, natives of Moldovan villages in different regions of the Republic of Moldova, gave a similar result.

All they know is the phytonym *păducel* 'hawthorn'. And never, in any context (not only to denote hawthorn) have they heard a word similar to the Bulaestian /малайеш/.

In some Romanian dialects, however, other phytonyms are used to denote hawthorn, in addition to *păducel* (DEX, [păducel](#)).

Thus, let's cite: «PĂDUCEL s. 1. (BOT.; Crataegus monogyna) (reg.) căcădară, gherghin, mărăcine. 2. (BOT.; Crataegus oxycantha) (reg.) gherghin, măceş, (inv.) ramn» (DEX, [păducel](#)).

That is, in general, in the Romanian space, at least six more words are known that denote hawthorn. Such a variety of Romanian phytonyms for hawthorn is already interesting and indicative in itself. It is worth noting separately that of these Romanian phytonyms, the use of the word *măcieş*/мэчиеш to denote hawthorn attracts special attention. But, as we can see, Romanian dictionaries do not list anything similar to Bulaestian /малайеш/ among the names of hawthorn either.

Thus, we have a very curious situation: the Bulaestian dialect contains obvious Romanianism, which, however, is not found anywhere in the Romanian language itself, or at least in its individual dialects<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> By the way, the same suffix is also used to form the attested Romanian phytonym, derived from *mălai*, denoting *Lithospermum officinale*: «mălăcel ... (Bot; rar) Mei-păsăresc (*Lithospermum officinale*)» (DEX, *mălăcel*).

<sup>3</sup> This is, in fact, not an isolated example of similar Romanianisms of the Bulaestian dialect, not found in the

That is, we are dealing either with a Romanian archaism that has not been preserved anywhere in the Romanian language space itself, or, more likely, with a Romanian archaic dialectism, but again, not preserved. In this situation, it is certainly fundamentally important (and interesting) to take a look at the Ukrainian dialect space: are there any analogies there to Bulaesti /малайеш/?

The efforts undertaken in this direction have shown that, firstly, there is no direct analogy to Bulaestian /малайеш/ in any of the Ukrainian dialects. At least, according to the dictionaries of these dialects known to me. However, secondly, there is still, albeit indirect, an analogy to Bulaestian /малайеш/ in Ukrainian dialects, and specifically in Bukovinian ones. Namely, in some Bukovinian dialects (specifically: Zastavna, Kitsmani, Storozhinets, Novoselytsia, which is indicative (Романчук, 2024, с. 43–68, 131–148)), phytonyms *малай*, *малаец*, *малайок* are known and precisely with the meaning 'hawthorn', *Crataegus oxyacantha* L.' (СБГ, 2005, с. 274)<sup>4</sup>.

Finally, thirdly, there is another, albeit even more distant analogy (and, what is also noteworthy, in the immediate vicinity of Bukovina). These are the phytonyms recorded in four villages in the area of the Central Podolian dialects *кашка-малашка*, *мамаличка* 'Hawthorn monogyna, *Crataegus monogyna* Jacq.' (Гороф'янюк, 2012б, с. 113; Гороф'янюк, 2020а, с. 124). Specifically, these are the villages of Pechera (Tulchyn district), Balanivka (Bershad district), Bronnytsia (Mohyliv-Podilskyi district), Vilshanka (Kryzhopil district) (Гороф'янюк, 2012а, с. 112, карта 23). All of this is the southern

Romanian language itself. Thus, one can also note here the Bulaestian /н'інта'пеш:/ 'a species of mint'. Based on the established patterns of transmission of Romanian phonetics by the Bulaestian dialect (Романчук, 2024, с. 405–434), Bulaestian /н'інта'пеш:/ is obviously derived from a Romanian etymon that must have had the form *mintăreş* (in turn, derived from the diminutive suffix *-eş* from Romanian *mintă* 'mint'). In this case, the Romanian /ş/, according to a rare but still recorded model in the Bulaestian dialect (Романчук, 2024, с. 431), gave /ш/-. And the Romanian /m/, following the tendency characteristic of the Bulaestian dialect as a whole to shift the pronunciation of sounds to the middle palatal zone, eventually moved into Bulaestian /н/.

<sup>4</sup> *Crataegus oxyacantha* L. is an earlier botanical designation of the same '*Crataegus laevigata*'. But in general, it should be noted that the abundance of hawthorn species in the area under consideration (in total, there are about 230 hawthorn species (according to other sources, up to 1250) in Eurasia and especially in North America), and the use of identical phytonyms in Romanian to designate different hawthorn species - requires us to take into account the genus *Crataegus* as a whole when discussing this, regardless of which specific species are being discussed.



part of the Vinnytsia region; the Mogilev-Podolsk district is located on the banks of the Dniester (and is adjacent to the area of Bukovinian dialects, bordering on Khotynshchyna), and the Tulchinsky, Kryzhopolsky and Bershadsky districts located in the Southern Bug basin are adjacent, forming a compact area of the indicated phytonyms.

Phytonyms *кашка-малашка*, *мамалычка* 'Hawthorn monogyna, Crataegus monogyna Jacq.', despite their obvious disparity to Bulaestian /малайеш/ 'hawthorn', as well as to the Bukovinian *малай*, *малайок*, *малаец* 'hawthorn', it is also obvious in its etymology that it is related to the same Romanian *mălai*/мэлай<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> Actually, this is obvious even when taking into account the Russian dialect (Southern Russian) *малай* 'millet flour porridge' (ЕСУМ, 3, с. 369). From this is derived Russian *каша-малаша*, *кашка-малашка*. Besides, *мамалыга* is also a very thick, tough porridge (ЕСУМ, 3, с. 376).

It is important to note that although the origin of both Romanian *mălai* and *mămăligă* is generally considered unclear (СДЕЛМ, 1978, с. 272; ЕСУМ, 3, с. 369), but it is also common that they are etymologically related (СДЕЛМ, 1978, с. 272; ЕСУМ, 3, с. 376). Concerning *mălai*/мэлай, the most obvious is the noted (СДЕЛМ, 1978, с. 272) its connection with the meaning 'soft, crumbly, loose, juicy'.

I would also add the Romanian regional one (apparently, primarily Transylvania and Moldova; in Transylvania it has a wider range of meanings, including: 'hand mill; windmill millstone...' (DEX, melesteu)) *melesteu* 'a stirrer for mamalyga'. Its origin is from Hungarian *mallaszto* (ЕСУМ, 3, с. 371) It is obvious and universally recognized. However, it is interesting that the meaning of the original Hungarian verb, from which the Hungarian *mallaszto* is derived, is nothing more and nothing less than 'to grind, to crush'. That is, *melesteu* is obviously and semantically connected with *mălai* and *mămăligă*.

In other words, we have a cultural complex *mălai* 'cereal and flour, groats from it' – *mămăligă* 'basic dish of the diet from flour, groats of this cereal' – *melesteu* 'a mixer used for preparing this dish', the components of which are also semantically connected. And, according to historical and ethnographic data, we clearly attribute this cultural complex primarily to the Romanian groups of the mountainous regions of the Carpathians (Transylvania, Maramures) – the zone of Romanian-Hungarian interference. Apparently, it is precisely with this zone that we should associate both the emergence of this cultural complex and the etymology of its constituent parts, based on the fact that it should ultimately lead us to a common root-source.

However, I do not think that the search for this root-source should be done on Hungarian soil (rather, the question should be asked about the origin of the Hungarian *mallaszto* itself and the Hungarian verb that is its source). Rather, the reference point should be the noted (СДЕЛМ, 1978, с. 272; ЕСУМ, 3, с. 376) connection between the Romanian *mămăligă* and the Italian *meliga* 'millet, corn', despite the phonetic difficulties of such a comparison.

Based on all the information at our disposal, it seems to me that the etymology of *mălai* should be sought either based on the long-standing idea of a Celtic-Italic community. Thus, it should be associated with the languages of the population of Raetia and Noricum before their conquest by the Romans, which brings to mind the "Eastern Alpine" hypothesis of the origin of the Vlachs by M. E. Tkachuk (Пабинович, 2000, с. 370). Or it comes (as it was suggested (ЕСУМ, 3, с. 376)) to the Latin *Panicum*

However, with the exception of those mentioned above, there are no analogies to the Bulaestian /малайеш/ 'hawthorn' in the Ukrainian language space.

This conclusion is confirmed by reference to the fundamental work of Yu. Kobiv, dedicated to Ukrainian folk phytonymy (Кобів, 2004). According to the data he cites, in Ukrainian dialects, in general, the names of hawthorn (its various species) are quite uniform, and mainly represent various variants and derivatives of the common Ukrainian word *глид* (Кобів, 2004, с. 143). Hutsul dialects stand out against the general background, where this plant is designated by the term *каркадур* (obviously corresponding to the Romanian *căcădară*, and either directly representing Romanianism, or still somehow connected with the Romanian *căcădară*), and Transcarpathian and Boykov's dialects, in which is used respectively *драча* and *драчина*<sup>6</sup>.

Thus, we have before us a specific Bulaestian-Bukovinian parallel, absent, which is noteworthy, even in the Hutsul dialects (also closely related to the Bulaestian dialect). Does this mean, however, that this analogy owes its origin to the Bukovina region, and marks the Prut-Bukovinian stage and

*miliaceum* also (from which three other names for millet in the Romanian language are derived (*mei*, *pârâng*, *pâsat*). The second option obviously implies that we should be talking about dialectal development within one of the Romanian groups of the Carpathians (and, in all likelihood, also the Alpine zone).

<sup>6</sup> Bulaestian /д'рач'а/ 'a type of thorny shrub' (Романчук, Тащи, 2010, с. 113) means *Lycium barbarum* L. Among the Ukrainian phytonyms denoting this plant, the only analogy to the Bulaestian term is *дереча*, known in Volynian dialects (Кобів, 2004, с. 262). Although as a designation for other thorny bushes (and not only bushes) *драча* in Ukrainian dialects it is known more widely: «драча – *Arctium lappa*, *Cirsium arvense*, *Crataegus monogyna*, *Rosa canina*» (Кобів, 2004, с. 530). But all this, what is characteristic, is the Transcarpathian dialects: *Arctium lappa* (Кобів, 2004: 64), *Crataegus monogyna* (Кобів, 2014, с. 143), *Cirsium arvense* (Кобів, 2004, с. 128), *Rosa canina* (Кобів, 2004, с. 350).

That is, apparently, *драча* – represents yet another piece of evidence of ancient connections between the Bulaestian and Transcarpathian dialects (Гороф'янюк, 2012а, с. 281; Гороф'янюк, 2016а; Романчук, 2024, с. 63–68, 134–140).

The variant *драчина* although more widespread, it also refers us as a whole to the Carpatho-Ukrainian region and the territories immediately adjacent to it from the north: *Berberis vulgaris* – Lemkov's dialects (Кобів, 2004, с. 81), *Crataegus monogyna* – Boikov's (Кобів, 2004, с. 143), *Rubus caesius* – Lemkov's and San River region's dialects (Кобів, 2004, с. 355), *Rubus nessensis* – Lemkov's dialects again (Кобів, 2004, с. 355).

In this regard, one cannot help but recall the Romanian *dracilă*/драчилэ (*dracină*/драчинэ) 'barberry' (МРС, 1961, с. 192; СДЕЛМ, 1978, с. 120), which is considered a late Proto-Slavic borrowing, and its numerous South Slavic (Bulgarian and Serbo-Croatian) parallels.

component (Романчук, 2024, с. 43–68, 131–148) genesis of the ethnographic group of Bulaesti Ukrainians?

I believe that the fact of this analogy in itself is not a sufficient basis for such a conclusion. It is quite possible that the Bulaestian /малайеш/ 'hawthorn' and Bukovinian *малай*, *малайок*, *малаец* 'hawthorn' arose, although under the general Romanian influence, but completely independently of each other.

Moreover, as we can see, the analogy is not direct. And if in the Bukovinian dialects we are, in all likelihood, dealing with a tracing from Romanian, then in the Bulaestian dialect the /малайеш/ is a direct borrowing. It seems that behind this difference there is also a difference in the nature and context of interactions with the Romanian language environment of the ancestors of the Bulaestian Ukrainians, on the one hand, and the ancestors of the speakers of the Nadprut-Bukovinian dialects, on the other. Nevertheless, some other facts allow us to assume that both events – and the emergence of the Bulaestian /малайеш/ 'hawthorn', and the emergence of the Nadprut-Bukovinian *малай*, *малайок*, *малаец* 'hawthorn' – were part of a common episode in the history of the Bulaestian Ukrainians and the speakers of the Nadprut-Bukovinian dialects, and were associated specifically with Bukovina.

What are these facts?

First of all, let us note that in the Romanian linguistic space there is a considerable diversity of not only the names of hawthorn (which was noted above), but also of common millet. Moreover, the main, most widespread name is by no means *mălai*, but another name, *mei*: «MEI s. (BOT.) 1. (*Panicum miliaceum*) (reg.) părâng, păsat, (Mold. și Transilv.) mălai» (DEX, mei). While *mălai* 'millet, *Panicum miliaceum*' is a regionalism, which obviously already limits the area in which the transfer of the meaning of Romanian *mălai* to hawthorn could have occurred. However, the area of distribution of Romanian *mălai* 'millet, *Panicum miliaceum*' is still too vast to clarify the question of interest to us<sup>7</sup>.

<sup>7</sup> As Romanian dictionaries usually indicate, the regionalism *mălai* 'millet, *Panicum miliaceum*' is widespread in Moldova and Transylvania, which is already quite widespread. Plus, to Moldova and Transylvania as the area of this regionalism, we should still add Banat (indicated by some dictionaries). And also Maramures, where until the 17th century, before the spread of

What is much more promising here is that the semantics of the main Romanian name for hawthorn, *păducél/пэдучел*, is accompanied in Romanian folk tradition by significant negative connotations. Which, apparently, should have prevented the transfer of the meaning *mălai* to hawthorn. Indeed, the etymology of the Romanian name for hawthorn, *păducél/пэдучел*, is related to the Latin (and Romanian) word for 'louse'. And in Romanian folk tradition, there is a widespread belief that whoever eats hawthorn fruits will be infested with lice. And also, the same word, *păducél/пэдучел*, has parallel meanings of 'sheep scabies' and 'itching or goosebumps on the soles of the feet': «păducél ... (lat. \*peducellus, ... după credința că cine mănâncă fructele lui se umple de păduchi); ... 1. Scaiete (*Crataegus oxyacantha*). 2. Rîie a oilor. 3. Mîncărime sau furnicătură pe tălpile picioarelor» (DEX, păducel).

Moldova, as noted above, is included in the zone where the phytonym *păducél/пэдучел* is used as the name of hawthorn. That is, accordingly, in the zone of distribution in the popular consciousness of negative connotations associated with this phytonym. Meanwhile, as is obvious, earlier it was *mălai* 'millet, *Panicum miliaceum*' that served as one of the key (or even the main) cereals not only in Maramures, but also in the foothill and mountainous regions of the Romanian space in general. And this, accordingly, determined the emergence in the Romanian popular consciousness of unconditionally positive connotations in connection with this cereal. Accordingly, in all likelihood, the transfer of the name of millet to hawthorn was possible only in some, rather narrowly localized zones of the Romanian linguistic space, where the attitude to hawthorn was different, and precisely similarly positive, as to millet. And these, in all likelihood, were precisely some mountainous zones of the Carpathians, where hawthorn, in conditions unsuitable for agriculture, could be actively used as

---

corn, millet was the main grain (and agricultural crop in general) crop and the basis of nutrition for the population («mei, s.m. – (bot.) Plantă erbacee din fam. gramineelor (*Panicum miliaceum*). Cultură tradițională în satele din zona Maramureș până la apariția porumbului ...» (DEX, mei). Today, in the Maramures dialect, corn is called *mălai*, which obviously means that the name has been transferred from the old staple grain (millet) to the new one (corn).

food as at least a partial substitute for cereals<sup>8</sup>.

This was also facilitated by the taste of hawthorn fruits - it is no coincidence that, judging by ethnographic data, they are compared with *matalyga*: «йі́йі йак ку́сайіш / о́ц'і́ йагоди / во́ни ўсе́редин'і йак мамаліга» (Гороф'янюк, 2012б, с. 113; Гороф'янюк, 2020а, с. 124).

It should be noted here that a number of peoples of Europe (and, in particular, in Crimea) previously actively used hawthorn fruits (of various species) in cooking, including making flour for baking bread. At the same time, the nutritional value (and taste) of the fruits of different types of hawthorn differs significantly – which, among other things, depends on the size of the fruit.

And in this regard, it is noteworthy that it is the Carpathian region (including Bukovina) that is included in the range of such a type of hawthorn as 'Ukrainian hawthorn, *Crataegus ucrainica*'. Its fruits, 11-13 mm in diameter, are almost twice as large as the fruits of the common hawthorn, *Crataegus laevigata* (7-10 mm in diameter). Which, obviously, significantly increased its nutritional attractiveness in the eyes of people of traditional cultures.

**Conclusions.** Based on the facts presented, it seems more likely that the Bulaestian /мала́йеш/ 'hawthorn, *Crataegus laevigata*' arose precisely in the Bukovinian period of the history of the Bulaestian Ukrainians, in the region of Bukovina, and, in all likelihood, as a result of interaction with the same group of the Romanian population. The

outlined conditions of this event (where the final separation of the Bulaestian dialect from the Bukovinian, which occurred, as was shown earlier (Романчук, Тащи, 2010; Романчук, 2024) no later than the turn of the 15th-16th centuries, gives us the terminus ante quem), as well as the absence of its traces in the Hutsul dialects (which adopted a different Romanianism, каркадир, as a designation for hawthorn) – give us, in general, both the chronological framework and the general context of the emergence of the Bulaestian /мала́йеш/ 'hawthorn' and Bukovinian малай, малайок, малаец 'hawthorn'. Apparently, the emergence of these phytonyms should be associated with the cultural and historical situation of interaction between the East Slavic and Romanian populations that developed in Bukovina as a result of the formation of the so-called “Shipinskaya zemlya” in the 14th century (Балух, 2010).

**Prospects for further research.** It seems that further research should focus on clarifying both the original Romanian area where the sought-after etymon of Bulaestian could have originated /мала́йеш/ 'hawthorn'. And also the search for possible new analogies to it in the Ukrainian dialect continuum itself.

<sup>8</sup> Let us note in this connection that it is precisely one of these mountain and foothill zones, South-Eastern Transylvania, that is the locus where the phytonym *mălai* was transferred (using the augmentative suffixes -oi or -on) to two species of alpine plants: «mălăoi, ... Numele a doi arbuști care cresc pe stînci și au flori galbene și frunze liniare, acoperite cu peri. (*Helianthemum alpestre* și *rupifragum*); ... (Regional) 1. (Prin sud-vestul Transilv. ...)» (DEX, mălăoi).

## Literature

- Балух, А. В. (2010). «Шипинская земля»: истоки и судьбы. *Stratum plus*, № 6, с. 27–39.
- Гороф'янюк, І. (2016а). Стійкість і динаміка частин мови в українській говірці с. Булаєшти Республіки Молдова. *Українсько-молдовські етнокультурні зв'язки*, Т. II, Chişinău: Elan-Poligraf, с. 228–239.
- Гороф'янюк, І. (2016б). Консервація лексичних архаїзмів в українських анклавних говірках (на матеріалі говірки с. Булаєшти Республіки Молдова). *«Трансформація діалектного континууму і проблеми лінгвоекотології. До 30-річчя Чорнобильської трагедії»: Матеріали Міжнародній науковій конференції (м. Київ, 10–13 квітня 2016 р.)*. Київ: Наукова думка, с. 28–35.
- Гороф'янюк, І. (2020б). Фонетичні архаїзми української говірки с. Булаєшти Республіки Молдова: система консонантизму. *SLAVIA ORIENTALIS*, Т. LXIX, № 3, с. 675–681. DOI: [10.24425/slo.2020.134743](https://doi.org/10.24425/slo.2020.134743).
- Гороф'янюк, І. В. (2012а). До характеристики морфологічної системи української говірки с. Булаєшти Республіки Молдова. *Наукові записки Вінницького державного педагогічного університету імені Михайла Коцюбинського. Серія: Філологія (мовознавство)*: зб. наук. праць, вип. 16, с. 275–283.
- Гороф'янюк, І. В. (2012б). *Ботанічна лексика центральноподільських говірок: Матеріали до Лексичного атласу української мови*. Вінниця: ПП Балюк І. Б., 304 с.
- Гороф'янюк, І. В. (2014). Лексична архаїка української говірки с. Булаєшти Республіки Молдова. *Jahrbuch der IV. Internationalen virtuellen Konferenz der Ukrainistik «Dialog der Sprachen – Dialog der Kulturen. Die Ukraine aus globaler Sicht»*. Reihe: Internationale virtuelle Konferenz der Ukrainistik. Bd. 2013 Herausgegeben. München–Berlin, с. 28–35.
- Гороф'янюк, І. В. (2020а). *Ботанічна лексика центральноподільських говірок: структурна організація та ареалогія*. Вінниця: ТОВ «ТВОРИ», 632 с.
- Гороф'янюк, І. В., Романчук, А. А. (2017). Фонологическая система украинского говора с. Булаешты (Орхейский р-н, Республика Молдова) и её отражение в транскрипции. *Українсько-молдовські етнокультурні зв'язки: міжнародні наукові читання пам'яті академіка Костянтина Поповича*, т. III, Chişinău: Stratum plus, с. 311–326.
- ДМР 1987 – *Дикционар молдовенеск-рус*. Ецко И., Урсу Т., Челак Т. (ред.). Кишинэу: РПЕСМ, 576 п.
- ЕСУМ, 3 – *Етимологічний словник української мови*. 1989. Гол. ред. О. С. Мельничук. Т. 3. Київ: Наукова думка, 552 с.
- Кобів, Ю. Й. (2004). *Словник українських наукових і народних назв судинних рослин*. Київ: Наукова думка, 800 с.
- МРС 1961 – *Молдавско-русский словарь / Дикционар молдовенеск-русеск*. 1961. Ред. А. Т. Борщ. Кишинэу: Штиинца, 781 п.
- Рабинович, Р. А. (2000). Искушение «волошским орехом», или Балканские волохи и русские волхвы. *Stratum plus*, № 5, с. 282–390.
- Романчук, А. А. (2024). *Булаештские украинцы в контексте славяно-восточнороманских взаимодействий Карпато-Днестровского региона*. Кишинэу: Stratum plus, 487 с. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13144548>
- Романчук, А. А., Тащи, И. Н. (2010). *Ранняя история украинского села Булаешты в контексте истории Молдовы (XIV — начало XVII вв. от Р. Х.)*. Кишинев: Высшая Антропологическая Школа, 144 с.
- СБГ 2005 – *Словник буковинських говірок*. Ред. Н. В. Гуйванюк, К. М. Лук'янюк. Чернівці: Рута, 688 с.
- СДЕЛМ 1978 – *Скорт дикционар етимоложик ал лимбий молдовенешть*. Н. Раевский, М. Габинский (Ред.). Кишинэу: РПЕСМ, 680 п.
- DEX – *Dictionare ale limbii română*. <https://dexonline.ro/> (15.03.2025).

## References

- Balukh, A. V. (2010). «Shypynskaia zemlia»: istoki i sudby ["Shipinskaya land": origins and destinies]. *Stratum plus*, no. 6, pp. 27–39. (in Russian).
- DEX: *Romanian language dictionaries*. <https://dexonline.ro/> (15.03.2025). (in Romanian).
- DMR 1987: *Moldovian-Russian dictionary*. Chisinau: RPESM, 576 p. (in Romanian).
- ESUM 3: *Etymolohichnyi slovnyk ukrainskoi movy [Etymological Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language]*. 1989, vol. 3. Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 552 p. (in Ukrainian).
- Gorofyanyuk, I. V. (2014). Leksychna arkhayka ukrainskoi hovirky s. Bulaieshty Respubliky Moldova [Lexical archaic Ukrainian dialect of the village of Bulaesti, Republic of Moldova]. *Jahrbuch der IV. Internationalen virtuellen Konferenz der Ukrainistik «Dialog der Sprachen — Dialog der Kulturen. Die Ukraine aus globaler Sicht»*. Reihe: Internationale virtuelle Konferenz der Ukrainistik. Bd. 2013 Herausgegeben. München–Berlin, pp. 28–35. (in Ukrainian).



- Gorofyanyuk, I. V. (2012a). Do kharakterystyky morfolohichnoi systemy ukrainskoi hovirky s. Bulaieshty Respubliky Moldova [To the characteristics of the morphological system of the Ukrainian dialect of the village of Bulaesti, Republic of Moldova]. *Scientific Notes of Vinnytsia Mykhailo Kotsiubynskyi State Pedagogical University. Series: Philology (Linguistics)*, no 16, pp. 275–283. (in Ukrainian).
- Gorofyanyuk, I. V. (2012b). *Botanichna leksyka tsentralnopodilskykh hovirok: Materialy do Leksychnoho atlasu ukrainskoi movy* [Botanical vocabulary of Central Podolian dialects: Materials for the Lexical Atlas of the Ukrainian Language]. Vinnytsia : PP Balyuk I. B., 304 p. (in Ukrainian).
- Gorofyanyuk, I. V. (2016a). Stiikist i dynamika chastyn movy v ukrainskii hovirtsi s. Bulaieshty Respubliky Moldova [Stability and dynamics of parts of speech in the Ukrainian dialect of the village of Bulaesti, Republic of Moldova]. *Ukrainian-Moldovan ethnocultural ties*, vol. II, Chişinău : Elan-Poligraf, pp. 228–239. (in Ukrainian).
- Gorofyanyuk, I. V. (2016b). Konservatsiia leksychnykh arkhazmiv v ukrainskykh anklavnykh hovirkakh (na materiali hovirky s. Bulaieshty Respubliky Moldova) [Conservation of lexical archaisms in Ukrainian enclave dialects (based on the dialect of the village of Bulaesti, Republic of Moldova)]. *"Transformation of the dialect continuum and problems of linguistic ecology. To the 30th anniversary of the Chernobyl tragedy": Materials of the International Scientific Conference (Kyiv, April 10-13, 2016)*. Kyiv : Naukova Dumka, pp. 28–35. (in Ukrainian).
- Gorofyanyuk, I. V., Romanchuk, A. A. (2017). Fonolohycheskaia sistema ukrainskoho hovora s. Bulaeshty (Orkheiskyi r-n, Respublika Moldova) i yeyo otrazhenie v transkripsii [Phonological system of the Ukrainian dialect of the village of Bulaesti (Orhei district, Republic of Moldova) and its reflection in transcription]. *Ukrainian-Moldovan ethnocultural ties*, Vol. III, Chişinău : Stratum plus, pp. 311–326. (in Russian).
- Horofianiuk, I. V. (2020a). *Botanichna leksyka tsentralnopodilskykh hovirok: strukturna orhanizatsiia ta arealohiia* [Botanical vocabulary of Central Podolian dialects: structural organization and areology]. Vinnytsia : TOV «TVORY», 632 p. (in Ukrainian).
- Horofianiuk, I. V. (2020b). Fonetychni arkhazmy ukrainskoi hovirky s. Bulaieshty Respubliky Moldova: systema konsonatyzmu [Phonetic archaisms of the Ukrainian dialect of the village of Bulaesti, Republic of Moldova: system of consonantism]. *SLAVIA ORIENTALIS*, T. LXIX, no. 3, pp. 675–681. <https://doi.org/10.24425/slo.2020.134743>. (in Ukrainian).
- Kobiv, Yu. Y. (2004). *Slovnyk ukrainskykh naukovykh i narodnykh nazv sudynnykh roslyn* [Dictionary of Ukrainian scientific and folk names of vascular plants]. Kyiv : Naukova Dumka, 800 p. (in Ukrainian).
- MRS 1961: Moldavian-Russian dictionary. 1961. Chisinau: Shtiintsa, 781 p. (in Romanian).
- Rabinovich, R. A. (2000). Iskushenie «voloshskim orekhom», ili Balkanskyye volokhy i russkie volkhvy [Tempted by “Nux Gallica”, or the Balkan Wallachians and the Russian Magi (volkhvy)]. *Stratum plus*, no. 5, pp. 282–390. (in Russian).
- Romanchuk, A. A. (2024). *Bulaeshskie ukraintsy v kontekste slaviano-vostochnoromanskikh vzaymodeistvii Karpato-Dnestrovskoho rehiona* [Bulaestian Ukrainians in the context of Slavic-Romanian interactions in the Carpathian–Dniester region]. Chisinau : Stratum plus, 487 p. (in Russian).
- Romanchuk, A. A., Tashi, I. N. (2010). *Ranniaia istoria ukrainskoho sela Bulaeshty v kontekste istorii Moldovy (XIV — nachalo XVII vv. ot R. Kh.)* [Early history of the Ukrainian village of Bulaesti in the context of the history of Moldova (14th - early 17th centuries A.D.)]. Chisinau : High Anthropological School, 144 p. (in Russian).
- SBG 2005: *Slovnyk bukovynskykh rovipok* [Dictionary of Bukovinian dialects]. Chernivtsi : Ruta, 688 p. (in Ukrainian).
- SEDML 1978: Short etymological dictionary of the Moldavian language. 1978. Chisinau, РПЕСМ, 680 p. (in Romanian).

## Автор

**Олексій Романчук**, доктор філософії з теорії та історії культури, науковий співробітник Інституту культурної спадщини (Кишинів, Республіка Молдова)  
e-mail: dierevo5@gmail.com  
<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2021-7958>

## Author

**Aleksey Romanchuk**, PhD in Theory and History of Culture, Researcher at the Institute of Cultural Heritage (Chisinau, Republic of Moldova)  
e-mail: dierevo5@gmail.com  
<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2021-7958>

## Конфлікт інтересів

Автор засвідчує про відсутність конфлікту інтересів

## Conflict of Interests

The author declares that he has no conflict of interest