Borrowings from Lithuanian in the subdialect of the western Bryansk region of Russia

Vasiliy Glushak – Marina Kovac

Abstract
This article concerns the Lithuanian lexical borrowings in one of the least-studied Russian subdialects of the western Bryansk region, located in the territory of centuries-old interaction of the Baltic and East Slavic language areas. Based on lexicographic sources and field research material, a list of Lithuanisms was compiled, including those with lexemes, previously not considered Lithuanian borrowings in East Slavic languages and dialects. The borrowings are divided into reliable and controversial Lithuanisms and Lithuanian borrowings, which either have or do not have parallel lexemes in other Slavic languages and their dialects. Borrowed lexemes are distributed according to thematic areas related to the name and characteristics of people, their behavior, work, everyday life and the world around them. Depending on the stylistic connotation, Lithuanisms are divided into neutral and pejorative. The assumption is made that the Eastern Slavs perceived the Balts as representatives of an equal culture and, in part, a 'lower' culture in relation to 'their' own. *The research concludes that* many people were bilingual in the territories of Baltic–East Slavic interaction, as well as the requirements for sufficient knowledge of neighboring tribes when transferring abstract and specific meanings from one language to another.
Key words: subdialects of the Bryansk region, contact linguistics, borrowings, Lithuanism, Baltism, language contacts, Balto-Slavic contacts

1. Introduction

The thesis regarding the presence of a significant layer of Baltic borrowings in a vast part of the Slavic-speaking territory no longer requires argumentation. The subdialect of the Bryansk region of Russia also contains words of Baltic (mainly Lithuanian) origin.

The dialect of the western regions of the Bryansk region of Russia occupies a special place in East Slavic dialectology. For many centuries this region witnessed the most important events in history. Until the 9th century, the territory corresponding to the modern Bryansk region was in the possible zone of contacts of four Slavic tribes: Severians, Vyatichs, Radimichs, and Smolensk-Polotsk Krivichs, and in the north and northeast with the Baltic and Finno-Ugric tribes. In the 9th century, after joining Kiev, all the tribes continued cultural and economic contacts with the Baltic community and maintained active external ties. Later, these lands were repeatedly passed into the hands of neighboring princes of Ryazan, Lithuania, Smolensk, and Moscow. From the 14th century and throughout the 15th century, the territory corresponding to the modern Bryansk region was under the rule of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. In 1500, Moscow troops returned the Bryansk territories. According to the Truce of Deulino in 1618, the Moscow principality gave Rzeczpospolita 29 towns, including the settlements Starodub, Popova (now Krasnaya) Gora, and other settlements of the Bryansk region. According to the Truce of Andrusov in 1667, Russia regained Smolensk and acquired the Seversk lands and territories on the left bank of the Dnieper, among which were the Bryansk lands.

Even from such a concise retrospection, it follows that in the Bryansk region, economic, cultural, and linguistic contacts were constantly, and for a long time, conducted not only between the Russian, Ukrainian, and Belarusian populations, but also among others, primarily Lithuanian and Polish. From the moment of the final return of the western territories of the modern Bryansk region to the Principality of Moscow, and then to the Russian Empire, contacts with the Polish and Lithuanian populations practically ceased. The territory has become remote and provincial, far from the center of the country's political, social, and cultural events.

Due to its geographical position – it borders Ukraine in the south and Belarus in the west – a unique situation has developed in the Bryansk region in ethnographic and linguistic terms. Until the middle of the 20th century, the Great Russian language had no significant influence on the dialect of the west of the Bryansk region, meaning the dialect was able to preserve its phonetic, grammatical structure and lexical composition. The situation began to change only in the second half of the 20th century with the development of social mobility, the spread of the media, and the introduction of universal school education with teaching in literary Russian.

Currently, there is a generally accepted viewpoint of Chagisheva regarding the linguistic status of the subdialects of the western Bryansk region. She qualifies the subdialects as a special group of the South Great Russian subdialects, possessing a certain unity but not representing uniformity (Chagisheva, 1978: 3-7). This factor is rarely considered regarding the subdialects of the Bryansk region, which leads to a misconception about their homogeneity. In the territory of the Bryansk region are four groups of subdialects. The first three – western, Upper Desna, and transitional to Kursk-Oryol subdialects – are in a larger territory of the region and belong to the southern Russian dialect of early formation prior to the 15th century. The subdialect to the west of the Surazh-Starodub line does not belong to Russian dialects of early formation. According to the dialectological atlas of the Russian language, in the subdialect in the west of the Bryansk region are found characteristics of the Middle Belarusian type with features of the transition to the South Russian ones (Avanesova & Bromley, 1986: 6-7). Rastorguev concludes that the subdialect in the west of the Bryansk region is a special subdialect of the Belarusian language, and he introduced the name 'Severian-Belarusian' for it, as he saw in it a descendant of the subdialect of the ancient tribe of the Severians. However, later, he singled out this subdialect of the western Bryansk region into a separate group and defined it as belonging to the South Great Russian dialect, which developed in the past and is developing in the present based on Belarusian (Rastorguev, 1973: 14).

Today, the subdialect of the western Bryansk region represents the so-called 'trasyanka' – a mixed language based on Belarusian, contamination of the phonetic and grammatical structure of the Belarusian type, and the prevailing layer of the vocabulary of the modern Russian literary language (Hentschel, 2018: 192-193). Nevertheless, to this day, the vocabulary of the subdialect contains a solid volume of the Belarusian lexicon, with words borrowed from the Baltic languages, mainly from Lithuanian (for the Lithuanisms in the Belarusian language, see Aksamitov, 2000; Starichenok, 2012). The subdialect prevailing in the western Bryansk region clearly differs from other southern Russian dialects and forms a unity within the territory of its distribution. Therefore, in those few studies that mention the Baltisms in the Bryansk subdialects, the fundamental difference between the dialects of the western region and the dialects of the rest of the Bryansk region is rarely considered. Another circumstance that allowed the subdialect of the western Bryansk region to remain a 'blank spot' for a long time in the study of Baltisms in Slavic languages is the absence of lexicographic data from the western part of the Bryansk region in the only authoritative dictionary of Balticisms (Lauchyute, 1982). In fairness, Lauchyute used the research data of P.A. Rastorguev's "Severian-Belarusian dialect" of 1927, but she

missed "Dictionary of folk subdialect of western Bryansk region" (Rastorguev, 1973), which contains about 8,000 words.

This article identifies the Lithuanian–Slavic lexical parallels in the subdialect of the western Bryansk region, which does not belong to the southern Russian dialects of early formation. The purpose is to present the dialect's structure and semantics and to reveal the peculiarities of the functioning of Lithuanisms, considering the former Balto-Slavic interaction.

2. Material and method of its analysis

The material for the research was Rastorguev's "Dictionary of Folk Dialects of western Bryansk region" (Rastorguev, 1973), and materials of the language corpus compiled by the author of this article as a result of numerous field studies in the western Bryansk region (Gordeevka, Klintsy, Krasnaya Gora, Unecha).

For words not recorded in the dictionaries of the modern Russian language but with similarities to lexemes in the Lithuanian language, the etymology was determined, and words with a similar meaning in other languages were excluded, except for the languages of contiguous territories – Belarusian, Ukrainian, and Polish, as well as Russian dialects bordering the Baltic area. Particular attention was paid to those lexical matches recorded only in the subdialect of the western Bryansk region and in the Lithuanian language and absent in the multivolume edition of the "Dictionary of Russian Folk Subdialects" (Dictionary ..., 1965–2021). This is highly likely evidence of Lithuanian borrowings in the subdialect of the western Bryansk region.

The revealed words were grouped thematically. Then, the possibility of their common relationship was investigated. In addition, the further development of the structure, semantics, and functioning of Lithuanisms in the subdialect of the western Bryansk region after ceasing close contact with the Lithuanian population was studied by comparing the volume of the meaning of borrowing in the Lithuanian language and the subdialect of the western Bryansk region.

3. Results: Lithuanian–Slavic lexical parallels in the subdialect of the western Bryansk region

In this article, the corpus does not include words reflecting the Balto-Slavic relationship. Such words contain one root; they arose during the linguistic unity of the Slavic and Baltic languages, or even earlier – in the common Indo-European period, and over time they could be subjected to phonetic changes. Directly related words represent a fairly wide layer of vocabulary both in modern Russian and in the dialects of the western Bryansk region. In the latter, however, these words are phonetically designed according to the Belarusian type, for example:

rus. *берёза* – w-br. *бярёза* – lit. *beržas* (birch),
rus. *вечер* – w-br. *вечар* – lit. *vakaras* (evening),
rus. *волк* – w-br. *воўк* – lit. *vilkas* (wolf),
rus. *железо* – w-br. *зялеза* – lit. *geležis* (iron),
rus. *огурец* – w-br. *гурок* – lit. *agurkas* (cucumber),
rus. *принимать* – w-br. *прымать* – lit. *priimti* (to take, to receive),
rus. *четыре* – w-br. *чатыры* – lit. *keturi* (four) and many others.

In the vocabulary of the subdialect of the western Bryansk region, a subgroup of indirectly related words is distinguished: the direct meaning in one language is conveyed by another lexeme in the compared language, but the synonyms in the history of the development of one language or in its dialects and subdialects are close

in meaning to a word in another language. In the dialect of the western Bryansk region, some words are directly related to the Lithuanian language, which in modern Russian are already outdated, for example:

o-rus. *гадить* (to ruin, to damage) – w-br. *гáдить* – lit. *gadìnti* (to ruin, to damage; to shame),
o-rus. *гулять* (to rest) – w-br. *гуля́ть* – lit. *gulė́ti* (to lie),
o-rus. *курить* (to burn up) – w-br. *раскуры́ть* – lit. *kùrti* (to heat, to burn),
o-rus. *мызгать* (to drag in) – w-br. *мы́згать* – lit. *mazgõtė* (rag),
o-rus. *скусть* (to pluck) – w-br. *скусь́ть* – lit. *skùstis* (to shave),
o-rus. *ректи* (to speak) – w-br. *ры́кать* – lit. *rė̃kti* (to shout, to cry),
o-rus. *шалить* (to rave about) – w-br. *шал* – lit. *šė̃las* (rampage, madness, rage).

Some words in modern Russian are outdated, directly related words to the Lithuanian language. The immediate meaning in both languages is expressed by one root, whereas in the literary version of the Russian language, the meaning is outdated or out of use but preserved in its subdialects; for example, in the subdialect of the western Bryansk region:

o-rus. *верещать* (to cry, to blubber) – w-br. *вирыщáть* – lit. *vẽrkti*,
o-rus. *волна* (wool) – w-br. *вóўна* – lit. *vìlna*,
o-rus. *доколь* (how long) – w-br. *дакýль* – lit. *kõl*,
o-rus. *дотоле* (till then) – w-br. *датýль* – lit. *tõl*,
o-rus. *дужий* (big) – w-br. *дýжа* – lit. *daũg*,
o-rus. *каяти* (curse_ damn) – w-br. *хáйть* – lit. *kéikti*,
o-rus. *клеть* (storehouse) – w-br. *клеть* – lit. *klė́tis*,
o-rus. *луспина* (husk, peel) – w-br. *лузкá* – lit. *lùpena*,
o-rus. *мурза* (dirty) – w-br. *мýрза, мурзáты* – lit. *muřzinas*,
o-rus. *паха* (underarm) – *w-br. nax(a)* – lit. *pažastìs*,
o-rus. *поуга* (stick) – w-br. *пýга* – lit. *pagalỹs*,
o-rus. *прати* (to wash) – w-br. *прать* – lit. *praũsti*,
o-rus. *путы* (fetters) – w-br. *пýты* – lit. *pánčiai*,
o-rus. *рупливы* (careful) – w-br. *руплúвы* – lit. *rūpėstìngas*,
o-rus. *скрыня* (box, dower chest) – *w-br. скры́ня* – lit. *skrynìa*,
o-rus. *слизко* (greasy) – w-br. *сьлизка* – lit. *slidù*,
o-rus. *цыбарка* (bucket, pail) – w-br. *цэ́бирь; цыбáрка* – lit. *kìbiras*.

The next layer of vocabulary is formed by Lithuanian borrowings, which are present both in the modern literary Russian language (more about the Baltisms in the modern Russian language; Kasimov, 2016) and in the dialect of the western Bryansk region. Of the 10 borrowings from the Lithuanian language recorded in the explanatory dictionary of the Russian language (Shvedova, 2007), only five words are used in the subdialect of the western Bryansk region:

rus. *валандаться* – w-br. *валáндацца* – lit. *valandà* (time interval, hour),
rus. *ковш* – w-br. *кóўш* – lit. *káušas* (ladle, scoop; big spoon),
rus. *кувшин* – w-br. *куўшы́н* – lit. **kaušinas/*kaušynas* (big ladle),
rus. *скирда* – w-br. *ськирдá* – lit. *stìrta* (haystack),
rus. *янтарь* – w-br. *янтáрь* – lit. *gintã̃ras* (amber).

In the subdialect of the western Bryansk region, there are recorded Lithuanian borrowings. Most of these borrowings are also found in other Slavic languages and their dialects, primarily in Belarusian, Polish, and Ukrainian, as well as in various

subdialects of the Russian language directly bordering on the area of the Lithuanian language. Words or meanings not previously presented in dictionaries and scientific research as possible Lithuanisms in Slavic languages are marked in bold:

w-br. *ардá* (noise, mess; children in a large family), bel., sml. *ардá* (noise, mess, rowdy) – lit. *ardà* (noise, mess, swearing). Anikin rejects the purely Turkic origin of this borrowing and names, in the semantic structure of the lexical parallel in the Slavic languages, a possible contamination of the Lithuanian meaning 'noise, mess' and the Turkic meaning of 'family, many children'. The main meaning of the lexeme 'orda' in the Turkic languages is 'palace, tent of the sultan, khan'; therefore, in some Turkic languages, for example, in Kazakh, 'noise, disorder' could be borrowed from Russian (Anikin, 2003: 109-110).

w-br. *атóса* (metal cable connecting the thill to the front axle of the wagon), bel., psk., sml., orl., krs. *атóса*, ukr. *отéса*, *отóса* (rope connecting the thill to the front axle of the wagon), pol. *ociosy*, *otosa* – lit. *atãsaja*, *atãsėja* и др.

w-br. **балбатáть**, **балматáть**, (to mutter, to speak unclearly, indistinctly), **балбатýн** (chatterbox), psk., sml. *балбатýн*, bel. *балбатаць* – lit. *kalbéti* (to speak). Perhaps, here, there is a contamination of the onomatopoeic *bu / bu-bu* to denote dissatisfaction with what and how the interlocutor says and the Lithuanian word *kalbéti*.

w-br. *бýрбалка* (water bubble), *бурбатéть* (to bubble; to boil), bel., krs., orl. *бýрбалка* – lit. *buȓbulas* (water bubble; water lily)

w-br. *бурчáть* (to grumble), bel. *бурчáць*, krs., tvr., psk., tmb., vrn. *бурчáть* – lit. *burkúoti* (to coo)

w-br. *бýча* (genus fish basket), bel. *буч* – lit. *bùčas* (fish-trap for small fish)

w-br. *вилúть* (to deceive, to distort), bel. *віліць* – lit. *vilióti* (to deceive)

w-br. *вя́кать* (to ask annoying; to say things that the listener doesn't like), bel. (dial.) *вя́ркаць* (to squeal and cry, to speak in an instructive tone), psk. *вя́ркать* (to bleat; scream (about a cat); grumble) – lit. *vérkauti* (to scream, to moan (about an owl)), *veȓkti* (to cry)

w-br. *гáплик/чáплик* (fastening hook), krs., sml., rzn., orl., tmb. *гáплик / гапéлька* (fastener on outerwear; eyelet with hook) – lit. *kablẽtis* (hook)

w-br. *глей* (light-colored clay sticky mud in water bodies), orl., tul., krs., klg. *глей*, pol. *glej* (muddy ground) – lit. *glègus* (sticky earth, mud) / *gleĩvės* (slime)

w-br. *грáбать* (to rake), psk., sml., vlg., arkh., nvg. (to rake, to rake hay) – lit. *grebóti* (to rake). Obviously, *грáбать* and *greboti* are related words. The common Slavic *grebti is considered the starting point for *грáбать*. The Old Russian word *грети* changed into *грести* under the similar influence of verbs ending in *сти,* such as *плести*. *Грабать,* in the subdialect of the western Bryansk region, may indicate the influence of the Lithuanian *greboti*.

w-br. *грынджóлы* (small toboggan run), bel. *гринджóлы*, *крынджáлы* (large sled for transporting large logs), ukr. *тринджóла* (sled), pol. *grandżoły* – lit. *grĩžulas*, *grĩžulẽ*, *grĩžalas* (drawbar; turntable)

w-br. *гýдить* (to blaspheme, to blame, to make a bad light), sml., krs., orl. *гýдить*, bel. *гýдзіць* – lit. *gùndyti*, *gùdynti* (to accustom, to educate, spiritually instruct)

w-br. *гуз* (lump, excrescence), psk., sml. *гуз* – lit. *gùzas* (lump on the body; nodule)

w-br. **далдóнить** (repeat stubbornly the same thing), **далдóн** (a person who stubbornly repeats the same thing, stupid and stubborn person), don., klg., orl. *далдóнить*, *далдóн* – lit. *dodõnė* (talkative)

w-br. **даўбéнь / даўбня́** (slow of wit, stupid person), orl., krs., klg., kst. *долбня́* – lit. *daũbas* (slow of wit, stupid)

w-br. *дра́нка* (splintered splinter), pol. *dranka* – lit. *dránga*

w-br. *дуньде́ть*, nvg. *дунди́ть* (to speak monotonous and annoying), pol. *dundzieć* (to be heard (about stomping)) – lit. *dundéti* (to boom, to buzz, to rumble)

w-br. *жлу́кта* (tub or trough for washing / whiping linen; one who drinks a lot of water), **жлу́ктить** (to drink a lot of water; **drink a lot of alcohol**), bel., psk., sml., krs., orl. *жлу́кта* (whip, soak laundry), ukr. *жлу́кто*, *жлу́ктити*, pol. *żłukcić*, *żłouko* – lit. *žlùktas* (barrel for soaking and steaming linen; laundry soaked for washing), *žlùkti* (to soak linen), *žliaũkti* (to flow, to moisturize)

w-br. **жы́чка** (string, braid, mostly red cotton ribbon woven into a plait, arkh., vlg., krs., nvg., sml., psk., rzn. *жи́ча, жи́чка* (colored, mostly red wool yarn – lit. *žìčkai* (colored woolen threads)

w-br. **зьвига́ть** (pester with annoying requests – omainly in conversation with children) – lit. *žviẽgti, žvýgauti* (squeal)

w-br. I. *ка́ўкать* (to meow shrill), bel., sml. *ка́ўкаць* – lit. *kaũkti* (to scream in a wild voice; to howl; to cry); II. *ка́ўкать* (synonym: *зьвигать* – pester with annoying requests (mainly in conversation with children), bel. *ка́ўкаць*, sml. *ка́вкать* (to give voice (about a human) – lit. *kaũkti* (to scream in a wild voice, to cry, to howl (about a wolf, a dog), *kaũlyti* (to beg, to beseech)

w-br. **кало́ша** (trouser-leg), sml., orl., krs. *кало́ша* – lit. *klẽšnė* (trouser-leg)

w-br. *ка́нькать* (to bore begging), *ка́нькала* (beggar), sml. *ка́нькать*, *ка́нкать* – lit. *kankìnti* (to torment, to torture). Before now they called lit. *kañkalas* (bell) as a borrowing.

w-br. **капа́ч** (gravedigger, graundsman) – lit. *kãpas* (grave, tomb)

w-br. **каса́** (pancreas in animals), sml., psk. *каса́* (pancreas; spleen) – lit. *kasà* (pancreas)

w-br. **качу́лка** (rolling pin; ribbed roller for rolling linen; pestle), orl., krs. *кача́лка* (dough rolling pin) – lit. *kočẽlas* (rolling pin)

w-br. *клу́ня* (1. shed for straw, hay), bel., ukr., many Russian subdialects *клу́ня* – lit. *klúonas* (threshing floor)

w-br. **клы́гать**, bel. *клы́пать*, *клыба́ць* (to limp, to walk slowly limping, to hobble) – lit. *klỹpti* (to walk slowly, to hobble), *klibéti* (to totter), *klùpti* (to stumble)

w-br. **ко́мин** (the front of the stove for smoke and flames; part of the chimney leading to the roof), krs. *ко́мин / ко́мен* – lit. *kãminas* (chimney)

w-br. **круте́ль** (fidget), **крути́цца** (to twirl), bel. *кру́таць* (to stir) – lit. *krutùs* (agile, restless), *krutéti* (to stir, to move)

w-br. *ку́бел* (a small tub with a lid and a lock for storing salted meat, lard, flour, and also clothes), bel., psk., sml., tvr. *ку́бел* – lit. *kùbilas* (tub)

w-br. *куль* (threshed sheaf; bunch of straw), bel., ukr., sml., psk., krs. *куль*, pol. *kul* – lit. *kūlỹs* (bunch, sheaf of long straw)

w-br. **кура́па** (toad; frog), bel. (dial.) *курапа*, ukr. *коро́па*, *коро́павка*, orl. *кура́па / куро́па* – lit. (dial.) *krùpis*, *krùpė*, *kriùpis*, *kriùpė* (toad; little creature), lat. *krúpis* (toad). Bruckner explains the origin of the name of the toad in the South Russian and West Russian subdialects as *ponyxa*, in Ukrainian *ponyxa*, *ponavka*, in Belarusian *panyxa*, in Polish *ropucha* from the Proto-Slavic **korp- / xorp-* (Bruckner, 1985: 463). It is assumed this word has a common origin in the Slavic and Baltic languages. However, the further development of this word has more parallels in the Lithuanian and Slavic dialects bordering on the territory of the Balts.

w-br. **курня́кать, курня́ўкать** (speak indistinctly, darkly), bel. *курня́ў* (onomatopoeia about meowing), sml., psk. *курня́вкать* – lit. *kurniaũ* (onomatopoeia about meowing)

w-br. *ла́іцца*, *ла́ить* (to swear), *ла́йка* (swearing) – lit. *lajùs* (barking too much; talkative), *loja* (barking; swearing). The association of swearing with the barking of a dog is recorded in the phraseological unit '*Па сабаку из рота*' ('From your mouth like from a dog jaw'. = Swear like a trooper).

w-br. *ла́пик* (patch), *ла́пить* (to sew on a patch), sml. *ла́пик*, bel. *ла́па* – lit. *lópyti* (to patch, to mend, to patch up), *lõpas* (patch)

w-br. **малмата́ть, балбата́ть, балмата́ть**, **барбата́ть** (to speak indistinctly, to mumble), bel. *мармы́ль* (unsociable person; slurred one), sml. anthroponym 'Murmúl' – lit. *marmė́ti*, *murmė́ti* (to mumble, to grumble, to speak unclear), *marmė̃klis* (chatterbox, talker), *murmŭlis*, *murmulỹs* (who speaks indistinctly, mutters)

w-br. *мантá́шка* (spatula for sharping a scythe), bel. *ментá́шка*, ukr., krs. *мантá́чка*, pol. *mienta* – lit. *mẽntė*, *mentė̃*, lit. (dial.) *menčià* (wooden or metal spatula), *mentė̃lė* (sharpener, whetstone)

w-br. *мáра* (death), *мáры* (a special kind of stretcher for the departed), – lit. *mãras* (plague). Perhaps this word dates to the Slavic '*мор*', but the phonetic form suggests that *мара* and *мары* in the subdialect of the western Bryansk region reveal in their development certain parallels with the Lithuanian *mãras*.

w-br. *мýлить* (to rub, press, chafe your leg), bel. *мýляць* (to rub, to press), sml., psk., orl. rzn. *мýлить* – lit. *maŭlinti* (to put on, to pull (the hat) over the head; to go little by little, to trudge), *maŭlyti* (to put on, to pull over)

w-br. *начóўки* (trough), bel. *начóўка* – lit. *nakočià*, *nekočià* (trough)

w-br. **низгрáбны** (awkward, clumsy), sml. *незгрáбный*, ukr. *незгрáбний* (clumsy, awkward), pol. *zgrabny* (slim; careful) – lit. *negrabùs* (bumbling, clumsy, awkward)

w-br. **пáдла** (corpse of a dead animal; burial place for animal corpses), sml., psk., tvr., orl., krs. *пáдла* (corpse of a dead animal) – lit. *pádla*, *padlà* (corpse of a dead animal). The relationship with the Russian word *падла* is evident, but the phonetic form *падла* in the western Bryansk region and the Lithuanian *padla* suggests its development in a single space of active linguistic contacts.

w-br. *парсю́к* (small pig, piggie), bel. *парсю́к / паршу́к* (boar, hog), sml., rzn. *парсю́к / парсу́к* (boar), pol. *parsiuk* (piggie, boar), ukr. *паршук* (piggie) – lit. *paršiùkas* (piggie), *par̃šas* (aper, boar)

w-br.*,* рус (dial.), bel., ukr. *пýня* (сенной сарай; хлев), pol. *punia* (small wooden shed; hay room) – *lit. pŭ̃nė, pūnis* (barn, cowshed; shack)

w-br., orl., krs., bel., ukr. *пéлька* (ice hole), pol. (historical) *pelka / pełka* (bad land; lowland; swamp) – lit. *pélkė* (swamp, bog, wet meadow)

w-br., sml. **прать** (to pommel, to beat somebody) – lit. *per̃ti* (to lay into, to whip)

w-br., sml., psk., nvg. *пячкý́р*, *печкý́р* (stove-maker) – lit. *pẽčkuris* (fireman, stoker)

w-br. *раклó́* (degraded person), psk. *ракá́ля* (scoundrel; prankster) – lit. *rakalỹs* (licentious, mischievous person).

w-br. *рэ́зьвины*, psk., sml., tvr. *ре́звины*, bel. *рэ́згіны / рэ́звіны*, ukr. *ре́згини*, pol. *Rezginy* (hay carrier) – lit. *rezginė̃* (plural: *rẽzginės*)

w-br. **рюсть**, **рють** (to cry out loud, to sob), *рю́мать* (to cry, to whimper), sml. *рюсть* (to cry out loud, to sob) – lit. *riŭkti* (to cry out loud, to sob)

w-br. **сакатá́ть** (to speak fast), **сакату́н** (fast talking person) – lit. *sakýti* (to speak, to say), *sakà* (legend, tale).

w-br. *сéсла* (rise), psk. *сéслы* (very sagging, middle part of the trousers between the legs), bel. *крэ́сла* (ischial part of peasant trousers; the furniture on which they sit) – lit. *krė́slas* (chair). In the case of the word in the dialect of the

western Bryansk region, there seems to be contamination of the Lithuanian *krèslas* and the Slavic *сесть*.

w-br. *секáть / сеч* (observe, watch), bel. *сачы́ць* – lit. *sèkti* (observe, watch).

w-br., sml. **силя́ть** (to scoop) – lit. *semlióti* (to scoop)

w-br., sml., psk., tul., klg., orl., arkh. *скакáть* (to dance; to hop) – lit. *šókti* (to dance; to hop), *skàsti* (to hop)

w-br. *скáбка* (splinter), bel. *скáба* (splinter; pork rib), sml., krs. *скáба* (sliver; splinter) – lit. *skobà* (rib), *skabùs* (edgy), *skabéti* (to prick, to cut)

w-br. **сýвалка** (withered herbs, raked from gardens in autumn, used to insulate cold rooms), psk., nvg. *сýвáл* (piled-up mowed hay, straw) – lit. *suvalýti*, *suvalýti deřlių* (to reap)

w-br. sml., psk., nvg. **сукáла** (thread-winding machine), **сукáть** (to spin, to twist threads) – lit. *sùkalioti* (spin, twirl, twist). Here, there is a sound correspondence in lit. [k] and rus. [ч] in the Russian correspondence *сучить*, but [k] remains in the dialect of the western Bryansk region.

w-br. *сялúба*, sml., klg., orl. *селúба*, bel. *садзíба* (peasant homestead, house; land around the house), ukr. *садúба* (homestead), pol. *sadziba*, *sadyba* (home; abode), *siedziba* (a place where someone always lives) – lit. *sodýba* (peasant homestead, house; land around the house; the place where the peasant house stood). Lauchyute draws attention to the suffix -*ib(a) with a long -ī-, atypical for the Slavic language, which, in contrast, is typical for Lithuanian. Regarding the Polish *siedziba*, this word could have been formed already based on the Polish language under the influence of folk etymology, which brought the word *sadziba* closer to the verb *siedzeć* (to sit; Lauchyute, 1982: 130). In the subdialect of the western Bryansk region, a similar process is possible, where the word *сялúба* approaches the verb *сялицца* (to settle).

w-br. *талакá*, sml., psk., rzn., nvg., tvr., klg., orl. и др. *молóкá*, bel. *талакá*, ukr. *молóкá* (to help with harvesting for a reward), pol. *tłoka* (entertainment on Sunday as a reward for free work done) – lit. *talkà* (help, mutual support)

w-br., sml., psk., krs., klg., tmb., vrn., don. *твань*, bel., ukr. *твань* (swampy and viscous place, swamp) – lit. *tvãnas* (deluge, flood, what remains after the flood)

w-br. *цуры́*, bel. *цурá*, arkh., sml., don., vlg. *тю́ря* (a kind of bread soup with water, milk or kvass) – lit. *tỹrė*, lat. *ķura* (pottage of bread crusts)

w-br. **цýрыть** (to urinate (of children)), **цуркатáть** (flow, splatter), **цы́ркать** (spitting through the upper teeth) – lit. *apčiùrinti* (to pour over, to soak), *čiùrinti* (to jet)

w-br., bel. *шаршáтка* (long thick needle) – lit. *šaršẽ̃* (long thick needle)

w-br. *шкры́ль*, *шкрылёк*, bel. *скрыль* (sliced thin part of an apple), krs. *скрыль* (hunk, slice), sml. *скрыль* (snippet; chunk [of bread]; crusty end; splinter, sliver), ukr. *скрíглік* (скибочка хлеба; кусок дерева) – Baltic word meaning '*snippet' (Lauchyute, 1982: 39), lit. *skrỹlis* (boiled square pieces of rolled dough)

w-br., sml. *шлýньня*, bel. *шлýнне*, ukr. *шлýння*, *шлýнкі* (entrails of domestic animals after slaughtering) – lit. *šlaunìs* (hip, thigh)

w-br. *шлы́ндать* (to stagger, to wander about), bel. *лы́ндаць*, sml., klg., tvr., tmb., tul., orl., vrn. *лы́ндать* (to mess around, to beat the buckets), pol. *łyndać się* (to stagger, to wander) – lit. *lìndoti*, *lindéti* (to lazy, to meander along)

w-br., bel. **шлю́ндра** (plump, clumsy, awkward, sluggish woman or girl), bel., ukr. *шлю́ндра* (slut; slattern) – lit. *šliùndra* (slattern)

w-br., sml., psk., bel. *шýла* (thick post in a fence, usually square in shape), ukr. *шýло*, pol. *szuła* – lit. *šùlas*, *šùlė* (pillar in the fence, in the wall of the hut; doorjamb)

w-br., bel. *шурпа́ты* (rough, uneven), bel. *шу́рпа* (bird with ruffled feathers), psk. *шурпа́тый* ([goose] with ruffled feathers), ukr. *шу́рпа* (ruffled hen), pol. *szurpaty* (rough; bumpy; shaggy), *szurpa* (bird with ruffled feathers) – lit. *šiùrpa* (dishevelled, tousled), *šiur̃pis* (ruffled hen, cock)

4. Discussion

The presence of Baltisms in the Slavic languages bordering on the area of residence of Lithuanians and other Baltic tribes clearly indicates intensive contact between the Slavs and the Balts. It is assumed that the Baltic–East Slavic interaction began more than 1,500 years ago. Furthermore, the active borrowing of Baltic words into Russian dialects finished with the end of the era of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth in the 18th century and the residency of most Lithuanians and Latvians in the Russian Empire and the USSR (Anikin, 2014: 190-193). Regarding unconditional Baltisms in the dialects of the Russian language, the vast majority date to the 13th–18th centuries, when a portion of the East Slavic tribes were part of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth. However, according to Anikin, it cannot be ruled out that in the future, among the East Slavic–Baltic lexical parallels, some words could be defined as primordial Baltisms (Anikin, 2014: 192). This case concerns obsolete indirectly and directly related words from the Proto-Slavic era (no later than the 6th century AD) and the period of Slavicization of the Baltic tribes by the Eastern Slavs (6th century to the beginning of the first millennium).

In this regard, it is worth recalling the instruction of Toporov and Trubachev (Toporov & Trubachev, 1962) to pay more attention to the subdialects of the Smolensk, Kaluga, Tula, Oryol, Kursk, Bryansk, and Chernihiv regions, especially the Bryansk region. Although economic, cultural and, undoubtedly, linguistic contacts of the Russian, Ukrainian, Belarusian, Lithuanian, and Polish populations have occurred in the Bryansk region for many centuries, little is known about the external relations of the subdialect of the western Bryansk region with non-Slavic lexical systems. In her study, Batozhok argues there is a fairly large Baltic lexical layer in the Bryansk subdialects and concludes that such a wide representation of Baltisms suggests that the contacts of the Bryansk dialects with the Baltic languages left a much larger mark on the history of the formation of the Bryansk vocabulary than is commonly thought (Batozhok, 1996). At the same time, the researcher confines herself to the Baltisms recorded earlier without giving new lexical data.

Currently, in various dialects of the Russian language, there are about 70 reliable borrowings from Lithuanian, Latvian, and other extinct Baltic languages, whereas about 50 Baltisms are from Bryansk, Smolensk, Pskov, and related subdialects. Only about 20 words are widely used in the dialects of the Russian language, adjoining 10 Baltisms in the literary language. The wide geographical distribution of these words is due either to diffusion from the main zone of irradiation (distribution) of Baltisms (i.e. from the Belarusian area), or to their origin from extinct Baltic languages. Toporov especially insists on the latter circumstance (Toporov, 1995: 47). Anikin considers irradiation to be the more influential factor and notes that, especially in the Bryansk subdialects, some borrowings or separate meanings of words no longer present in other East Slavic languages have been preserved, and there has also been a further semantic development of borrowings from the Lithuanian language (Anikin, 2014: 194). Our study identified 29 borrowings in the subdialect of the western Bryansk region that had not previously been identified as possible Lithuanisms, and which should, nevertheless, be subjected to a more thorough analysis to exclude their Slavic or other non-Baltic origin. We found that most of the Lithuanian borrowings in the subdialect of the western Bryansk region have close-sounding parallels in the

Belarusian language: for 20 words, no matches have yet been found in other Slavic languages; and for nine borrowings, no matches have yet been found in other Russian subdialects.

Thematically, Lithuanisms can be divided into the following subclasses:
1) Traditional economy
        a) buildings
        b) tools, fixtures
        c) vehicles
        d) business items
2) Food
3) Utensils and other containers
4) Names of a person
        a) looks
        b) character traits, mental abilities
        c) communities
5) Professions
6) Names of representatives of animals and plants
7) Names of fishing accessories
8) Verbs expressing the specifics of human speech
9) Verbs of motion
        a) intensity of action
        b) orientation of movement in space
10) Verbs for designating labor activity
11) Nominations of natural and physical phenomena
12) Nominations of properties of objects
13) People's behavior
14) Clothes

The thematic fields that represent Lithuanian borrowings in the Slavic languages testify to the close cultural and everyday interaction between the Baltic and East Slavic peoples in the past. The nature of intercultural interaction is also evidenced by the fact that among the Baltisms of various subdialects of the Russian language, there is a small number of words meaning phenomena and objects of nature (in part, only "amber" can be recognized as such). Most lexical units mean cultural objects and phenomena. The vocabulary testifies to the close contact of the Baltics and the Eastern Slavs in everyday life and in the sphere of traditional production (agriculture, fishing, constructing). It can be assumed that the natural environment was common to all tribes. We agree with Anikin, who calls this circumstance one of those factors that makes it difficult to differentiate the Old Baltic and Old Slavic vocabulary [Anikin, 2014: 191].

The semantic development of borrowed Lithuanisms in the subdialect of the western Bryansk region occurs in several directions:
a) maintaining full compliance with the meaning of the Lithuanian word (*атоса, каса, курапа, лапик, пуня, ракло, рупить, рэзьвины, скирда, скрыня* et al.);
b) preservation of part of the meaning of the Lithuanian word (*грынджолы, капач, мара, сувалка, цуры, шлуньня, шурпаты* et al.);
c) semantic deviation from the prototype (*арда, жлуктить, мулить, пелька, сесла, скабка, шлюндра* et al.);
d) in opposition to other Slavic designations, Lithuanian borrowings often acquire a pejorative connotation (*даўбня, далдон, зьвигать, лаицца, марматать, ракло, шлындать, шлюндра* et al.).

In addition, some borrowed words from the Lithuanian language underwent lexical and structural changes (*манташка, сялиба, шаршатка, шлындать* et al.). The fact that indirectly related words have been preserved in the subdialect of the western Bryansk region is evidence that their speakers were, for a long time, in close cultural and everyday contact with the Baltic tribes and in limited contact with representatives of the South Russian language area.

It is worth noting that Lithuanian borrowings are generally stylistically neutral vocabulary regarding borrowings from the material spheres, denoting the organization of everyday life and labor activity. If the borrowed words belong to the conceptual sphere of a person as a biological and social being, then in many cases, they pass into the category of vocabulary expressing a negative assessment of certain characteristics of a person's appearance, character, and behavior. This category may indicate that, for the Eastern Slavs, the Balts were perceived as representatives of culture equal and, in part, 'lower' in relation to the culture of the Eastern Slavs. Examples of 'lexical arrogance' include the following borrowings in the subdialect of the western Bryansk region: *арда, балбатать, балбатун, бурчать, вякать, далдонить, далдон, даўбень, дуньдеть, зьвигать, каўкать (приставать с назойливыми просьбами), клыгать, лаицца, малматать (балбатать, балматать, барбатать), низграбны, ракло, рюсть, рють, сакатать, сакатун, шлындать, шлюндра.*

Many borrowed lexemes denoting intangible objects, which are Lithuanisms from the sphere of speech behavior, character, and actions, may indicate the bilingualism of the Slavs and Balts who lived in the zone of contact or cohabitation. The assumption of bilingualism in the zones of rather intensive and longer-preserved Slavic–Baltic contact was made by Tolstoy. Analyzing the different meanings of the borrowed word *пелька* in various areas of East Slavic languages: 'swamp, swampy area', 'ice-hole', 'part of clothes', 'chest', 'button', 'scoop', etc., Tolstoy concludes that those Slavic zones where the lexeme **pelьka* means a swamp term was most likely characterized by Slavic–Baltic bilingualism (Tolstoy, 1969). The legitimacy of the existence of the version of bilingualism in the zones of Baltic–East Slavic interaction is also supported by the transfer of abstract and specific meanings, including those expressed by verbs, from one language to another, requiring sufficient knowledge of the languages of neighboring tribes.

5. Conclusion

The study made it possible to discover new Lithuanian–Slavic correspondences not previously considered borrowings. These findings confirm the assertion of some linguists about the need to study the outlying West Russian and South Russian dialects to identify previously unknown Baltic borrowings. The territory of the western Bryansk region was, until the middle of the 17th century, at the epicenter of the Balto–East Slavic interaction, which contributed to the widespread bilingualism of the population, and as a result, mutual lexical borrowings and infiltrations. Although in the modern literary Russian language, as well as in dialects and subdialects far from the Baltic area, many indisputable Baltic borrowings are present in small numbers, in the subdialect of the western Bryansk region, they form a significant layer of vocabulary. Lexico-semantic variants of Lithuanian borrowings in the western Bryansk subdialect include borrowings with identical semantics, copying Lithuanian units, borrowings with non-coincidence relations, and borrowings with semantic divergence from the Lithuanian source. The subdialect of the western Bryansk region is characterized by the development of new meanings of Lithuanian borrowings: the development of only a part of the meaning of the Lithuanian word and the emergence of locatives – new lexico-semantic variants previously unknown to the Lithuanian

word. Changes in the meanings of Baltic borrowings and infiltrations in the subdialect of the western Bryansk region very often led to a marked (with a pejorative tinge) opposition to the original Slavic word.

The results of the study are relevant because they can encourage the faded scientific interest in the study of language contacts of two or more languages to describe the Baltic substratum in East Slavic languages in greater detail and clarify the boundaries and active Balto-Slavic interaction in the past.

Bibliographic references

Aksamitov, A., (2000). Belarusian-Lithuanian lexical-phraseological interference. Acta Baltico-Slavica, 25, 89-104.

Anikin, A. E., (2003). Slavic vocabulary on a non-Slavic background. In Zh. Varbot (Ed.), Etymology 2000-2002. Moscow: Nauka, 109-116.

Anikin, A. E., (2014). Problems of studying Baltisms. Russian Siberian Journal of Philology, 4, 189-194.

Avanesova, R. I., & Bromley, S.V. (Ed.), (1986). Dialectological atlas of the Russian language. Center of the European part of the USSR. Issue I: Phonetics. Moscow: Nauka.

Batozhok, N. I., (1996). Bryansk dialects in the East Slavic dialect landscape: spatial and temporal parameters. St. Petersburg: RGPU, 1996.

Bruckner, A., (1985). Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna.

Dictionary of Russian folk dialects. (1965-2021). Issues 1-52. Leningrad, St. Petersburg: Nauka.

Kasimov, R. Kh., (2014). Baltisms in modern Russian as a semantic field. Philological Sciences. Questions of Theory and Practice, 2, 1 (56), 108-110.

Lauchyute, Yu. A., (1982) Dictionary of Baltisms in Slavic Languages. Leningrad: Science.

Rastorguev, P. A., (1973). Dictionary of folk dialects of the Western Bryansk region (Materials for the history of the vocabulary of dialects). Minsk: Science and technology.

Starichenok, V. D., (2012). Lithuanisms in the Belarusian language: structure, semantics, functioning. Žmogus ir žodis. Svetimosios kalbos, 14(3), 38-42.

Shvedova, N. Yu. (Ed.), (2007). Explanatory dictionary of the Russian language with the inclusion of information about the origin of words. Moscow: Azbukovnik, 2007.

Tolstoy, N. I., (1969). About one Baltism in East Slavic languages. In Zh. Varbot (ed.), Etymology. 1967. Moscow: Nauka, 145-157.

Toporov, V. N., (1995). On the Balto-Slavic dialectology (a few considerations). In G. P. Klepikova (Ed.), Dialectologia slavica: Collection of research papers for the 85th anniversary of S. B. Bernstein. Moscow: Indrik, 40-53.

Toporov, V. N., & Trubachev, O. N., (1962). Linguistic analysis of the hydronyms of the Upper Dnieper region. Moscow: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR.

Hentschel, G., (2018). Belarusian "trasyanka" and Ukrainian "surzhik": about the main differences in the degree of influence of the Russian language. Przegląd rusycystyczny, 2 (162), 190-207.

Chagisheva, V. I., (1978). The study of Bryansk dialects for 60 years. In V. I. Chagisheva (Ed.), Bryansk dialects. Leningrad: LGPI, 3-7.

Words: 6469
Characters: 42 612 (23,67 standard pages)

Prof. Vasiliy Glushak, DrSc.
Russia
glushakvm@mail.ru

Marina Kovac, PhD.
Institute for Optional Studies IOS
University Duisburg-Essen Universitätsstr, 2
45117 Essen
Germany
marina.kovac@uni-due.de

Abbreviations

arkh. – Arkhangelsk dialect
bel. – Belarusian language
dial. – dialect
don. – Don dialect
klg. – Kaluga dialect
kst. – Kostroma dialect
krs. – Kursk dialect
lat. – Latvian language
lit. – Lithuanian language
nvg. – Novgorod dialect
orl. – Oryol dialect
o-rus. – Old Russian
pol. – Polish language
psk. – Pskov dialect
rus. – modern Russian language
rzn. – Ryazan dialect
sml. – Smolensk dialect
tmb. – Tambov dialect
tul. – Tula dialect
tvr. – Tver dialect
vlg. – Vologda dialect
vrn. – Voronezh dialect
w-br. – subdialect of the western Bryansk region
ukr. – Ukrainian language