



SVITLANA GRYTSENKO

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kiev, Ukraine  
Taraso Ševčenkos Kijevo nacionalinis universitetas, Ukraina

# UKRAINIEČIŲ KALBOS LITUANIZMAI KAIP RYŠIO TARP KALBOS IR KULTŪROS ŽYMEKLIAI

Lituanisms in Ukrainian as Markers of Language  
and Cultural Relationship

## SUMMARY

The article deals with the consideration of Lituanisms in the history of the Ukrainian language as determinants of cultural and language contacts. For these Lituanisms simultaneously represent the result and productive factor in the dynamics of Lithuanian-Ukrainian relations (political, social and economic, historical and cultural, etc.). Particular attention is paid to the Lithuanian-Ukrainian ethnic and language interaction in the period of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. As a result, a significant amount of Lituanisms appear in Ukrainian written sources of the 16–17 centuries of the later period, as is illustrated by the examples from multi-genre sources. The cited factual language material represents the dynamics of the lexical composition of the recipient language (Ukrainian) at the diachronic level. The influence of borrowings from the Lithuanian language is postulated not only on the lexicon of the Ukrainian language but also on the formation of its literary form and on the language / communicative consciousness of Ukrainians. The latter position requires an appeal both to the genetic code of the Baltic-Slavic language / ethnocultural unity and to the fruitful development of the Lithuanian-Ukrainian interaction in the cultural, scientific and educational sectors.

## SANTRAUKA

Straipsnyje nagrinėjami ukrainiečių kalboje istoriškai atsiradę lituanizmai. Tai kultūrinių ir kalbinių kontaktų tarp Lietuvos ir Ukrainos rezultatas, atspindintis politinius, socialinius, ekonominius, istorinius ir kultūrinius procesus. Itin daug dėmesio skiriama Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštystės laikotarpio lietuvių ir ukrainiečių etninei ir kalbinei sąveikai, kuri lėmė tai, kad XVI–XVII a. ukrainiečių rašytiniuose šaltiniuose atsirado daug

RAKTAŽODŽIAI: lituanizmai, ukrainiečių kalba, kalba kaip tarpininkas, skoliniai, istorizmai, etimonas, išvestinis žodis.  
KEY WORDS: lituanism, Ukrainian, language-mediator, borrowings, historism, etymon, derivative.

lituanizmą. Straipsnyje pateikiami įvairių žanrų rašytiniai šaltiniai parodo priimančiosios kalbos (ukrainiečių) leksinės sudėties dinamiką diachroniniu lygmeniu. Straipsnyje keliama mintis, kad skoliniai iš lietuvių kalbos ne tik veikė ukrainiečių kalbos leksiką, bet ir jos literatūrinę formą bei formavo ukrainiečių kalbinę ir komunikacinę sąmonę. Analizuojama medžiaga atitinka ir baltų-slavų kalbų etnokultūrinės vienybės genetinį kodą ir veiksmingą Lietuvos ir Ukrainos bendradarbiavimą humanistikos srityje, ypač jos kultūros, mokslo ir švietimo sektoriuose.

## INTRODUCTION

The relevance of the proposed article is the need for further clarification of the linguistic perspective of Lithuanian-Ukrainian contacts, which will bring scientists closer to solving the conceptually deeper issue of Lithuanian-Ukrainian relations (genetic, historical, cultural, political, socio-economic, etc.) at the diachronic level. The appropriate formulation of the problem benefits the development of the theory of the Balto-Slavic language community (J. Kurylovich, A. Nepokupnyj, O. Szemerényi, A. Shamatov; F. Fortunatov; I. Ogienko; V. Ivanov, V. Toporov).

It should be noted that formation of the Ukrainian literary language was, in particular, influenced by borrowings from different languages, including Polish, Lithuanian, Latin, Greek, German, Turkish, Crimean-Tatar, Russian, Belarusian, Romanian, Czech, Hungarian, Italian, Dutch, Persian, Arabic and more. O. Tkachenko points to the multifaceted ways of appearance of literary forms of national languages:

„the birth of new literary languages did not necessarily begin with the search for the origins of the national tradition. But it was always from them that their flowering and maturity began: for Estonians it is the epic „Kalevipoeg”, Latvians have „Lāčplēšis” (The Bear Slayer), Serbs have the heroic

songs issued by Vuk Karadzic, Czechs have „*Rukopis Zelenohorský*” and „*Rukopis Královédvorský*” (in Czech – S. G.) manuscripts. Lithuanians could be inspired by their very ancient language, the realization that still on the verge of the 21st century a Lithuanian peasant speaks a language that is not inferior to the ancient Indian language of the Rig Veda hymns or the ancient Greek language of the Homeric poems. They were encouraged by the glorious times of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, whose lands in Vytautas stretched from the waves of the Baltic to the shores of the Black Sea. Due to the union with Lithuania, Poland became a state from sea to sea. In the inspired poetry of Maironis, in the brilliant paintings of Čiurlionis (in Lithuanian – S. G.), this glorious antiquity came to life... Meanwhile, the Lithuanian language has strengthened as never before” (Ткаченко 2014: 370).

Mother tongue is the deep layer of the spiritual people’s life, their historical memory, the most valuable heritage of the ages (O. Oles’), the genetic code of national culture, the pledge of identity and self-preservation (D. Ovsyaniko-Kulikovskij), the universal reality of social existence (M. Heidegger), person identity formant (Darginavičienė 2018). The words of Joseph Vendryes about the „closest dependence” of the language development from historical conditions

became axiomatic today; the development of society „lures“ language into some definite path, and as a result, the history of culture is reflected in the history of language.

The „Lithuanian-Polish“ day in Ukraine, which, being interrupted, has lasted for almost six centuries, is interpreted by modern Ukrainian historians and cultural scientists as „a stateless period in the history of the Ukrainian people“ (Книш 2001: 44). Appropriate assessment of political „engagement“ can be accepted with great caution, since governmental and „... cultural ties between the Ukrainian and Lithuanian peoples have a long tradition and date back to prince-

ly times, including the period of the Galicia-Volyn principality, constituting a significant segment of the historical memory“ (Туряниця 2012: 39).

The aim of the article is the consideration of Lithuanian-Ukrainian language and cultural relations through the prism of the study of Lituaniisms and their significance in the history of the Ukrainian, in particular, coverage of their influence not only on the Ukrainian language lexical composition, but also on the formation of its literary form, as well as on the language / communicative consciousness of Ukrainians and the dynamics of multi-vector interaction between these two nations.

## INTERACTION OF LANGUAGES AT DYNAMICS OF LEXICON AS AN OBJECT OF LINGUISTIC DESCRIPTION

Here is a brief overview of studying the Lithuanian-Ukrainian language interaction which serves as the methodological basis for the study.

The history of vocabulary has always attracted linguists' attention; a special actualization of this direction of studies has been observed in Ukraine since the middle of the 20th century: they touch on the history of vocabulary of different ideographic spheres, in particular, this study of the nomination of a person as the center of the whole universe, in particular, a person in society (D. Grinchishin, A. Buryachok, O. Krovytska), human life support (V. Gorobets, S. Grytsenko, G. Didyk-Meush), human environment (I. Sabadosh, G. Nayenko, E. Chernov), human occupation in material sphere (G. Halimonenko, O. Serbenskaya), spiritual and intellectual life of a

human being (L. Hnatyuk, L. Polyuga).

Much research has been devoted to the history of individual lexemes or groups of lexemes, phraseologisms, their semantics and peculiarities of functioning (Z. Goldfein, Y. Dzendzelivsky, Y. Otkupshchikov, E. Otin, I. Lutovinov); the language study of memos of the respective styles and genres (V. Yaroshenko, I. Swiecki, M. Stanivsky, L. Hnatenko, V. Nimchuk, V. Moisienko, O. Nika); research of dialect features of written memos of different chronological periods (A. Moskalenko, H. Makovich, S. Samyilenko, S. Shevchenko, G. Shilo); the study of speech-making by representatives of literature (L. Dezhe, O. Lazarenko, M. Markovsky, etc.).

A separate series of scientific studies highlights the role of foreign language influences on the Ukrainian language

development; among these, the most prominent are the multifaceted studies of the influence of Polish, Belarusian, German, Greek, Latin, Romanian, Turkish on Ukrainian (for a detailed review of these studies see: Гриценко 2017). The impact of the Lithuanian language on Ukrainian at different chronological periods in linguistics is fragmentary represented (Jablonskis 1941; Булаховський 1956; Непокупний 1964, 1968, 1970, 1972, 1976, 1994, 1996; Туряниця 2012; Ткаченко 2014; Вакулич 2016) and it needs to be refined today, taking into consideration the expanded empirical base of the study – making new written memos and lexicographic sources available for the number of researchers.

The source base of the study from which the actual material was extracted is: 1) Ukrainian-language written different styled memos of the 16th-17th centuries: formal and business (legal genre and government (administrative) management (acts; town hall, castle, city, customs books; protocols, articles; diplomas, universals, law; documents of

voivodships, fraternities, schools; inventories, registers, audits; descriptions of castles, boundaries of possessions; denominational (catechisms, apostles, statutes, ordinances, prayers, Gospels); fiction (verses, songs, elegies, dedications, thanksgiving, interludes, chronicles and memoirs); journalistic (polemical genre, oratory and preaching genre); scientific; epistolary; 2) lexicographic sources (ССУМ; ІСУЯ; МСТ), as well as published issues of ІСУМ and its filing cabinet (stored at I.P Krypiakevych Institute of Ukrainian NAS, Lviv).

The specificity of the object and subject, as well as the aim of the article led to the use of general scientific (induction, deduction, analysis, synthesis) and special linguistic methods and techniques: descriptive – for the analysis and presentation of language material, the assessment of phenomena of language history, language contact; linguacultural – for cognition of influence of extralinguistic factors on changes in vocabulary and language consciousness of Ukrainians.

## CONTACTS BETWEEN LITHUANIA AND UKRAINE THROUGH THE PRISM OF TIME

Considering Litanisms in the history of the Ukrainian language, it is worth paying much attention to the times of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, especially to the period of the 15th-16th centuries, when a large territory of modern Ukraine was a part of it. According to O. Tkachenko:

„joining the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, while maintaining autonomy of Ukraine

and considerable independence in resolving its own economic, political and cultural issues, without affecting the rights of the language (the official language of the state was Western Russian, which could be considered as book Ukrainian language at the time), it was also important for Ukraine as this state, having access to the Baltic Sea, at the same time reached the possession of the Black Sea coast. This allowed Ukraine to continue

to be independent from other countries in economic policy. In fact, it laid a solid foundation for the development of Ukraine as an independent state" (Ткаченко 2014: 27).

It should be noted that the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was largely based on the structural and cultural bases that were formed and developed in Kyiv and Halych-Volyn Rus; in the 60's of the 16th century this principality subordinated most of the Ukrainian lands, as the local population willingly accepted the rule of Grand Duke of Lithuania in Vilna, which was conditioned by promises „not to violate local customs“, to defend against the Tatars. This is evidenced by a fragment from the Lithuanian-Belarusian chronicle:

„When Grand Duke Algirdas was the master of the Lithuanian land, he went into the steppes with the Lithuanian army, and killed three brothers in the Blue Water: Prince Hachibey, Kutlubug and Dmytro. These three brothers – the Tatar princes – were the hereditary owners of the Podolsk land... The Grand Prince Algirdas' brother, Prince Koriat ... had four sons ...; three (senior) of those by permission of The Grand Prince Algirdas and the help of the Lithuanian land then went to Podolsk land, and having come..., they became friends with the atamans, began to defend Podolsk land, and stopped giving tribute to the Basques" (Грушевський 1993: 79).

The political success of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania on the territory of Ukraine in the 16th century was caused, in M. Hrushevsky's opinion, by a „Russian“ feature of government, and this continued until the Lithuanian central government changed its state orientation

by concluding a union with Poland (ib.: 99). In the 15th century and the first half of the 16th century, despite the presence of the word „Russian“ in the titles of princes, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was not „Lithuanian-Russian“ (Ісаевич 2001: 57), as it was claimed by M. Lyubavskij and other scholars (Любавский 1915: 85–89), although it was based on the norms of „Russian Truth“ and canon law of Kyiv Rus (not without influence of Polish, more broadly – European law).

„During Lithuanian time“ everywhere in Ukraine were developing „government offices – princely offices, court offices etc., as well as bishops' offices“ (Ogienko), in which Russian was the governmental language. It should be noted that the first act books of such offices appeared in the Czech Republic in the 13th century, in the 14th century these written memos were spread in Poland and in the early 16th century appeared in Ukraine. It is supposed that the oldest Ukrainian act book is *Книга Кам'янецького міського магістрату 1519–1520 р.* and *Кам'янецька земська книга 1521 р.*; we have the shabby remnants of *Кременецької Книги 1514 р.* in bad condition. It should be noted that according to the Lithuanian Regulations of 1529, act books were introduced throughout Ukraine in every town, that increased the number of offices and thus accelerated the development of Ukrainian literary language. The meaning of so-called actual language in the history of the development of Ukrainian literary language is very great, paramount, because it has become the conduit of our live language to the literary language“ (ibid.).

LITHUANISMS IN UKRAINIAN SOURCES OF THE 16–17TH CENTURIES:  
ISSUES OF INVESTIGATION

Lithuanian-Ukrainian ethnic and language interaction has been developing for several centuries. „Borrowings from the Baltic languages, above all Lithuanian, are not simply numerous; they form one of the most colorful layers of the Ukrainian „lexical mentality“, Ukrainian worldview” (Туряниця 2012 (a): 39; Туряниця 2012 (b)). The purpose of our unit is not a detailed analysis and registration of the Ukrainian written memos of the Litanism, but we rather seek for accumulation of attention to the problems that accompany contemporary historians of language, dialectologists, lexicographers, etymologists in the study of vocabulary of Lithuanian genesis.

The origins of individual borrowings and their reciprocal path provoke debate among scholars, in particular the lexeme *ґринджоли* (*дранджоли, кринджоли, гринджолята, дранджолята*) in Ukrainian means ‘simple sleigh; low and wide sleigh with sides extending from the front; little baby sledges’. It was first attested in the *Актах Переяславського полка XVII–XVIII в.:* „Комору дручемъ подваживали и на гринжола великіе зваливши, опалиль” (1688); memos of the 18th century preserved the forms of *ґриніоли, гринчола*; this word is also actively used in modern Ukrainian (СУМ 2: 169). Ukrainian etymologists claim that this lexeme is of Romanian origin (Romanian *gringioară*, which is a diminutive form to the *grindă* ‘pole, beam’ (ЕСУМ 1: 596). It should be noted that Romanians called this vehicle as a *tirsitoăre* (Нікуліна 2008: 40-46), which makes it

doubtful about the outlined genesis. J. Laučiūtė points to the Lithuanian origin of the word: *grįžulas* ‘the drawl, a turning circle’ (Лаучюте 1982: 36).

The problem of different interpretation of the genesis of lexemes can be traced not only in the study of Litanisms, but also in borrowings from other languages, in particular Ukrainian *каптуръ* (> *капътуровый*). О. Bulyk (Булыка 1980: 112) which is interpreted as Czech borrowing (och. *kaptour* (Słownik 1963: 324), och. *kaptúr* (Karłowicz: 252)), as Polish borrowing (op. *kaptur*) – J. Tymchenko (МСТ I: 357), as Italian (it. *capparo, capero*) – E. Berneker (Berneker: 487), A. Preobrazhenskyj (ПЭС I: 294), О. Sobolevskyj (Соболевский 1913: 85), as Latin borrowing (Latin *captura* < f.lat. *cappa*) – F. Slavskyj (Sławski II: 61), as Turkic borrowing (*kaptur*) – F. Miklosich (Miklosich II:142) compilers of ЕСУМ (ЕСУМ II: 377), et ICУМ (ICУМ 14: 46). Etymologists have also not identified a language mediator in the process of taking this borrowing: directly from Turkic, Polish or Czech, or through mediator of Polish, Czech from Italian, Latin or Turkic. These examples *actualize the need for a careful revision and clarification of the etymology of many lexemes in the Ukrainian language* and ways of their entry into the recipient language in the light of new research in linguistics and related fields of knowledge.

In describing borrowings from different languages, including Lithuanian, it is necessary to distinguish between the source language of the borrowing and

the etymon. Many different lexemes were borrowed into the Ukrainian language from different languages, the genesis of which refers to the Lithuanian language: *баланда* the 'liquid lean soup' < rus. *баланда* 'bad food, baddie; quinoa' < lit. *balanda* 'quinoa', lts. *balanda* 'ts'; *бамбула* 'sluggard' < pol. *bam-* 'ring' < lit. *baĩmbalas* 'tumult; chafer', *bamba* 'navel', *bamblys* 'lazy baby; thief'; *бо-биль* 'lonely man, poor man' < rus. *бо-биль* 'ts' < lit. *bumbilas* 'laborer, lazy thing'; *бурба* 'potatoes' < pol. *burbułka* 'bubble' < lit. *burbulas* 'bubble, blister' and more.

A separate layer of vocabulary is made up of words only related to the Lithuanian language (*варга* 'lip' < *raũkas* 'wrinkle, crease', *брякнути* 'bubbly, swell' < *brinkstu, brinkti* 'swell', *бусий* 'drunk' < *bũože* 'bulge, mace, button', *бухта* 'bay' < *bũgti* 'to be frightened', *анкер* 'anchor, bracket, hook' < *ánka* 'cord, zigzags of the way', *альянс* 'union, union based on contractual obligations' < *laĩg(u)onas* 'wife's brother', *альбія* 'pig trough' < *aulỹs* 'hive', *алебарда* 'ts' < *kálpá* 'sleigh', *kilpa* 'stirrup' et *barte* 'ax', *аскариди* 'round white worms parasitizing in the intestines of mammals and humans' < *skẽrỹs* 'locust', *балка* 'bar, log' < *balžiena* 'stalk', *блейвас* 'lead whiteness' < *blỹvas* 'purple' et *weib* 'white', *бретналь* 'roof nail, crutch' < *naga* 'hoof', *бруя* 'fast current; clearness' < *briáutis* 'penetrate, wade', etc.) or with Lithuanian and Latvian languages (*вата* 'kind of seine' < lit. *vadejá* 'fishing net for two fishermen' / lts. *vadás* 'large net'; *верба* 'Salix L.' < lit. *virbas* 'rod, stem' / lts. *virbs* 'stick', *virba* 'rod, spear'; *вер-*

*вечка* 'on which the cradle rises' < lit. *virvẽ* 'rope' / lts. *virve* 'ts.'; *вана* 'the place where water stands' < lit. 'river' / lts. *úpẽ* 'river, stream'; *брунат* 'brown, dark yellow' < lit. *bẽras* 'nits' / lts. *bẽrs* 'brown, swarthy, sorrel', etc.).

The study of Litanisms in the Ukrainian language involves *chronologizing their borrowings into the recipient language*, which ensures the achievement of objective characteristic of the dynamics of language units over the time, as well as the related phenomena of non-language reality – elements of material and spiritual culture (Grytsenko 2019). The oldest borrowings from the Baltic languages (10th century) belongs the lexeme *вентер* (*винтір, в'ятер, в'ятір, ятір*) 'fishing equipment, yatir' (< lit. *vẽnteris* 'ятір', lts. *veĩteris* 'ts.' < \**ventẽ* 'rod') (ЕСУМ I: 349), that functions as a vernacularism in the modern Ukrainian language (СУМ 1: 325).

The Litanism *стырта* for definition of 'stacks of unbundled sheaves stacked in a special way' has been recorded in Ukrainian written memos since the 15th century („давывали ... княгини ... Витовтовою ... сѣна чєтыры стырты" 1444 р. (ССУМ II: 387)), with which А. Непокупный disagrees, having pointed to an earlier imitation of this word – 1347–1349, as evidenced by the manuscripts: „...а сєножати на стирту сїна и на стоїї сїна" (Непокупный 1970: 34). In the memos of the 16th century borrowing retains its value, as evidenced by *Книга Луцька* 1564 („В котором гумне я мел жита чотырнадцат стырт, в кождой стырте по осмидєсяти копѣ" (МСТ II: 374)), though some semantic

shifts – lexeme denotes ‘the totality of something’, in particular, it is stated in *Ревізії Київського замку* (1552): „цеглы 11 громадъ або стырѣтъ”. With the same meanings, this borrowing is also used in modern Ukrainian, „У Жменяковому дворі стояла скирта свіжонамолоченої соломи”, „Поїдав [монах] ковбасок скирту” (СУМ 9: 266).

Certain Litanisms in the modern Ukrainian language refer to historicisms, in particular, the names of monetary taxes and duties: *мезлева* < *mezliava*, *посед* < *posèdis* („Мезлева с.ж.Радуньцы доводили на Круповичъ про мезлеву” 1444 р. (АЮЗР I: 15); „Поседь, с.ж.Пань староста своихъ наместниковъ и тивуновъ, а ни поседей, а ни жадныхъ податковъ въ тыхъ дворехъ и волостехъ не маеть мети” 1619 р. (АЮЗР I: 72)). Litanism *дякло* is ‘tax in kind from the crop and the general profit in the peasant household except cattle’ <\* *dèkla* / *dúokle* / *dòkle* is attested in the written sources of the 15th century. („И тотъ яцко тыхъ ихъ земль половину попродавъ и съ тои земли службы намъ не служиваль и дякла не даваль” 1495 р. (ССУМ I: 342)). In the same period, the memos recorded a derivative *подьяколный* for the designation of ‘various taxes in kind on peasant farms, the deacon’ in 1499 (ССУМ II: 171). In the following period – 15th–16th centuries – this borrowing in Ukrainian written memos was attested by the adjectives-concretizers, which is an evidence for its spread in the recipient language, in particular: *дякло житное* ‘tribute from arable lands to rye’ in 1601 (АрхЮЗР, Ч. 6, т. 1: 284), *дякло ржаное* (*иржаное, оржаное*)ak ‘ts.’ 1522

(ALSS III: 237), *дякло овсяное* ‘a tribute from arable rye lands’ *дякло сенъное* ‘a tribute of hay’: „записуем ему, ... дворей нашъ ключа Луцкого, ... з дяклы житными, овсяными и сенъными” 1566 (АрхЮЗР, Ч. 8, т. 6: 188).

The timing of borrowing in the written memos of the recipient language often serves as an important argument for preferring one of the alternative versions to determine the mediation at the borrowing of a foreign language lexeme. Thus, for some borrowings into the Ukrainian language, the opinions of etymologists do not coincide in determining the language-mediator: old Polish or old Czech mediation is often assumed. However, taking into consideration the time of fixing these borrowings in the possible intermediary languages, we may prefer one of the versions. Consider this as an example of a polysemantic lexeme *берло*, which with the sem ‘grain is milled but not fermented’ is fixed in Ukrainian written memos since 1529 ((ІСУЯ: 85), with the sem ‘scepter, barrel’ – since 1627 (ІСУМ 2: 77; МСТ 1: 53; ІСУЯ: 85), with the sem ‘monarchy power’ – since 1669 (ІСУЯ: 85). J. Tymchenko points out that with the first sem this word was borrowed from the Polish language (ІСУЯ: 85), with which A. Nepokupnyj disagrees, outlining the Lithuanian origin – *bẽralas* ‘ts.’ (Непокупний 1970: 30); with the second and third semes – through Polish mediation borrowed from Czech and reduced to German and Latin (ЕСУМ 1: 175; ІСУЯ: 85; ІСУМ 2: 77). However, the lexeme *берло* with the seeds of ‘grain is milled but not fermented’, in old Polish memos it is not record-



ed till the first part of 16th c., but in the old Czech language with the meaning of 'grain' it has been recorded since 1417 (SSČ I: 41), which reinforces the version of the Czech source of this borrowing in the Ukrainian language, which could later be reinforced by the Polish borrowing of Lithuanian genesis. The lexeme *берло* with the sem 'scepter, the scepter' could enter the language-recipient both through ancient mediation (fixed from the 15th c. (SSČ I: 41)) and through the Old Polish (*berla med.* of the 15th c., *pyorło* 1500 (SSP 1, 2: 74), *barlo* 1532 (SP 2: 46). Borrowing *берло* with the meaning 'monarchy power' in the Ukrainian language evolved semantically from *pol. berło* 'panowanie, rządu, władza' in 1561 (SP 2: 46). This word demonstrates the complex way of borrowing and operating borrowing in intermediary languages and in the recipient language, involving the information about the time of the first written fixation of the lexeme in the intermediary languages and the recipient language helps to understand and clearly define it. So, knowledge of the history of the word, and therefore the history of the lexicon, its dynamics is impossible without retrospective chronologization of language units. The use of exploratory method of the conditional identification of the time of the first fixation and the time of borrowing allows the linguist to:

- set the „exact” time of imitation, which may be indicated by the year noted in the written source or the year of writing the memo;
- outline „relativity” time (indicating a time period, for example, from year to year, or century);
- determine the time from which the borrowed

sign operates in the Ukrainian language, specify the source of the borrowing at condition of a possible or foreseeable alternative, specify the chronological description of the borrowed lexeme in the potential intermediary languages; d) to track the formal and / or semantic changes that borrowings in the recipient language have over the long term.

It remains relevant to apply the method of determining the time of occurrence of lexeme based on the history of marked reality, which at one time was used by V. Bogoroditskyj, I. Ogiyenko, V. Nimchuk, Yu. Sorokin, F. Sorokoletov, F. Filin, W. Witkowski, S. Kochman etc. It facilitates the identification of borrowings that nominate notions of material culture, the history of which allows us to set a time before which these borrowings could not appear in the recipient language. In analyzed borrowings from different languages (weapons names: *мушкетъ, флинта, фузия, аркабузь, карабинъ, сагайдак*; monetary units and cash transactions: *чехъ, чинишь, дукатъ, таляръ, денга/тенга, полугрошокъ, мынца, трыбутъ*; drink *понтакъ*) the interval between the appearance of the designate and the fixation of its name in the memos of the Ukrainian language, which ranges from 14 to 130 years (Гриценко 2017: 264–304) is established. The considered lexemes and the applied methodology actualize statement of Yu. Shevelyov that „one cannot build a history of language creation and language extinction, abstracting from historical facts (processes)” (Шевельов 1996: 195), without taking into account the extensive extracurricular information that V. Vино-

gradov called „the context of the epoch” (Виноградов 1995: 12) which is often defining in the description of the dynamic of lexicon.

Foreign-language elements, Litanisms, in particular, as substitutes for the fixed memos of nominative units or as the names of new concepts, led to a noticeable dynamic of the Ukrainian lexicon of the 16th-17th centuries and later periods and replenishment of its various ideographic spheres (с.: lit. *свирень*, *свиرون* ‘barn’ in 1598 (АЮЗР II: 200), *пуня* ‘room for sheaves, hay, chaff’ in 1693 (ІУМЛФ: 412) / *клуня* / *кляня* 1564 (Книга Луцкая: 183), *кумпь* / *кунпь* ‘ham’ in 1571 (АрхЮЗР, Ч. 8, т. 6: 351) etc). The fate of these borrowings was directly dependent on the semantic adaptation process, on the extent to which their introduction was justified by the need to express particular concepts, new meanings and semantic connotations (Сорокин 1965: 64). It should be noted that the process of adopting Litanism, adapting to the system of the recipient language, „rooting” at the level of dialectal use by the Ukrainians is still ongoing, in particular, actively used in modern Ukrainian dialects Litanisms *версать* ‘mix, flip’, (*verŝti* ‘flip, turn’), *вабити* ‘attract’ (*võbiti* ‘ts.’, com. lts. *vābit*

‘call to court’), *вайтязь* ‘to express displeasure’ (\* *vaitèti*, *vaitóti* ‘to groan, moan’ < *vái* / *vāi* ‘oops’ (Непокупний 1968: 35)), *валандатися* ‘to munch on, to work lazily’ (*valandá* ‘time, hour’ < *vélt* ‘to roll, beat, mix, twist’), *чалити* ‘to tie with a rope; swim ashore; to direct to the goal’ < *kálpa* ‘sleigh slat’, *kilpa* ‘stirrup, loop’ and more.

The study of borrowings from different languages, including the Litanisms, as evidenced in the written sources of earlier epochs, raises another important problem: the question of the role of oral communication in imitating of borrowing, the role of the scribe, his idiolect, language and ethnic identity. Since memos and other sources do not provide such information, modern language historians are often forced to limit themselves to assumptions about the nature of interlingual interaction.

The considered language facts actualize words of H. Paul that „... one cannot talk about language without touching on its historical development. All that would be left to the unhistorical consideration of language would remind us of the general reflections on the individual use of language, the attitude of the individual to the language norm” (Пауль 2008: 192).

## CONCLUSIONS

The illustrated factual language material from both Ukrainian written memos of the 14th–16th centuries and lexicographic sources represents the dynamics of the lexical composition of the recipient language (Ukrainian) in a diachronic di-

mension. In particular, it demonstrates the impact of borrowings from the Lithuanian language not only on the lexical composition of the Ukrainian language and formation of its literary form, but also on the language / communicative

consciousness of Ukrainians. In this context, it is possible to appeal both to the genetic code of the Baltic-Slavic language unity and to the multi-vector development of Lithuanian-Ukrainian relations in the humanitarian sphere (cultural, scientific and educational fields). In 1993 it was legally enshrined by the signing of the Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Lithuania and the Government of Ukraine on cooperation in the field of education, science and culture. The effect of this agreement was a multi-vector implementation: introduction to the printed novelties from Ukrainian history, culture and art on the occasion of the 400th birthday anniversary of the Ukrainian hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky (October 12, 1995, M. Mažvydas National Library, Vilnius); creation of the Taras Shevchenko Ukrainian-Lithuanian Foundation (1999), which annually celebrates prominent figures in the field of literature and art (J. Strelkūnas, A. Baltakis, etc.); establishment of the Institute of Ukraine (2002) in order to facilitate the establishment of partnership contacts between scientists and academic, research institutes of Ukraine and the Republic of Lithuania; with the participation of V. Yushchenko, the President of Ukraine, was opened the auditorium of Taras Shevchenko at the Faculty of Philology of Vilnius University (2006), which in 2007 introduced a new course – Ukrainian Studies. Since 2018 in Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv has been initiated the study of the Lithuanian language as a mandatory discipline within the framework of the Agreement on cooperation with Vilnius University under the project „Lithuanian

Academic Scheme of International Cooperation in Baltic research”. According to the Cooperation Agreement with Vytautas Magnus University, the Lithuanian Studies Center is planned to be opened in Taras Shevchenko National University at the Institute of Philology in 2020.

The list of events, indicating the close cooperation between Ukraine and Lithuania which inevitably leaves an echo in intercultural interaction, in the representatives of linguacultures, can be continued for a long time. The dynamic of Ukrainian-Lithuanian cooperation in the humanitarian sphere, in particular in its cultural, scientific and educational fields, is caused by the absence of „white spots” in the common history, by the universal constants of language / communicative consciousness, and by the similarity of cultural and ethno-national dominants (more details: Корольов 2018; Korolyov 2019).

Despite the successes in the multilateral interstate Lithuanian-Ukrainian relations, creation a thorough monographic study of Ukrainian-Lithuanian language contacts remains the first task for Ukrainian linguists. This work should not only present the results of the interaction, but also Lituansisms certified in the language of various chronological sections. It should reveal the peculiarities of imitation and adaptation process, the completeness of its reconstruction on the basis of different sources for remote epochs. The expanded, updated by the descriptor of new memos empirical research database is to be involved. We should also note the need to create the first Lithuanian-Ukrainian and Ukraini-

an-Lithuanian dictionary. Today, in Ukraine there is a certain lacuna connected with the lack of lexicographic sources, in particular, translated diction-

aries which are foremost required in the training process of future specialists focused on mutually beneficial cooperation between Lithuania and Ukraine.

## References

- Darginavičienė Irena. 2018. The influence of culture and language on the identity of a person, *Logos* 95: 164–176.
- Grytsenko Svitlana. 2019. Dynamics as an immant language sign, *Logos* 99: 189–199.
- Jablonskis Konstantinas. 1941. *Lietuviški žodžiai Senosios Lietuvos raštinių kalboje*. I. Tekstai. Kaunas.
- Korolyov Igor. 2019. Cognitive and communicative category of cooperativity: ontological and gnoseological status, *Logos* 98: 83–93.
- Булаховський Леонід А. 1956. *Питання походження української мови*. Київ: Видавництво АН УРСР.
- Булыка Александр Н. 1980. *Лексичныя запозычанні у беларускай мове XIV–XVIII ст.* Мінск: Навука і тэхніка.
- Вакулич Марія І. 2016. Одноосновні антропоніми литовського походження у староукраїнських пам'ятках : особливості асиміляції та функціонування, *Система і структура східнослов'янських мов*, 10: 3–9.
- Виноградов Виктор В. 1995. Слово и значение как предмет историко-лексикологического исследования, *Вопросы языкознания*, 1: 5–36.
- Гриценко Світлана П. 2017. *Стан і прийоми вивчення лексики української мови XVI–XVII ст.* In Гриценко Світлана П. *Динаміка лексику XVІ–XVІІ ст.* Київ: КММ: 19–47.
- Грушевський Михайло. 1993. *Історія України-Руси*. Київ: Наукова думка. Т. 4.
- Исаевич Ярослав Д. 2001. У складі Литовського князівства: 1471–1569 pp. In *Історія української культури*. Київ: Наукова думка. Т. 2: 57–58.
- Книш Ярослав Б. 2001. *Велике князівство Литовське та його васали*. In *Історія української культури*. Київ: Наукова думка. Т. 2: 44–49.
- Корольов Ігор Р. 2018. *Національна кооперативна комунікативна поведінка: від когніції до дискурсу*. Київ: ВПЦ “Київський університет”.
- Любовский Матвей К. 1915. *Очерк истории Литовско-Русского государства до Люблинской унии включительно: С прил. текста хартий, выданных великому княжеству Литовскому и его областям*. Москва: Моск. худ. печатня.
- Непокупний Анатолій П. 1964. *Ареальні аспекти балто-славянських мовних відношень*. Київ: Наукова думка.
- Непокупний Анатолій П. 1968. Українсько-балтійські студії, *Мовознавство*, 6: 33–42.
- Непокупний Анатолій П. 1970. Литuanізм в лексиці українських пам'яток, *Мовознавство*, № 6: 30–40.
- Непокупний Анатолій П. 1972. Литовские заимствования в письменных памятниках Волины и Среднего Поднепровья, *Baltistica*, 1 priedas: 101–114.
- Непокупний Анатолій П. 1976. *Балто-славянские языковые связи*. Київ: Наукова думка.
- Непокупний Анатолій П. 1994. Вихідці із латвійських, литовських і пруських земель у лавах запорожців, *Золоті ворота*, 2: 74–89.
- Непокупний Анатолій П. 1996. Словотвірні релікти в гідронімії України та Польщі в слов'яно-балто-германській перспективі, *Hydronimia słowiańska. T. 2: Materiały z międzynarodowej konferencji hydronimicznej Mogilany (Kraków, 20–24.IX.1994 r.)*: 137–147.
- Нікуліна Неля В. 2009. Етнографічні матеріали як джерельна база термінологічних студій (на матеріалі транспортної лексики), *Лінгвістика*, 3 (18): 40–46.
- Огієнко Іван. Українська літературна мова XVI ст. <<http://litopys.org.ua/ohukr/ohu07.htm>> [accessed on 2019 08 19].
- Пауль Герман. 2008. *Принципи історії мови*. In *Хрестоматія по общему языкознанию*. Київ: Освіта України: 184–208.
- Соболевський Алексей И. 1913. Изъ истории русскаго словарнаго матеріала. По поводу новыхъ выпусковъ этимологическихъ словарей Э. Бернекера и А. Г. Преображенскаго, *Русскій филологическій вѣстникъ*, LXX, 1, 3: 85.
- Сорокин Юрий С. 1965. *Развитие словарного состава русского литературного языка 30–90-е годы XIX века*. Москва, Ленинград: Наука.

Ткаченко Орест Б. 2014. *Українська мова: сьогодення й історична перспектива*. Київ: Наукова думка.

Турияница Інна А. 2012 (а). Українсько-литовські взаємини у культурно-гуманітарній сфері, *Мандрівець. Наукові виклади*, 2: 38–45.

Турияница Інна А. 2012 (б). *Українсько-литовські*

*взаємини у політичній та гуманітарній сферах (1991–2011рр.)*: автореф. дис ... канд. іст. наук. Львів.

Шевельов Юрій. 1996. *Чому общерусский язык, а не виборуська мова? З проблем східнослов'янської глотогонії* In *Історія української мови: хрестоматія*. Київ: 191–205.

## Abbreviation

АрхЮЗР – Архив Юго-Западной России, издаваемый Временною комиссиею для разбора древних актов, высочайше учрежденною при Киевском Военном, Подольском и Волыньском генерал-губернаторе. Киев: в тип. Федорова [и др.]. 1876. Ч. 6, т. 1: Акты об экономических и юридических отношениях крестьян в Юго-Западной России в XVI–XVIII ст. (1498–1795 гг.), (Приложение); 1911. Ч. 8, т. 6: Акты о землевладении в Юго-Западной России в XV–XVIII вв.

АС – Археографический сборник документов, относящихся к истории Северо-Западной Руси. Вильна: тип. А.Г. Сыркина, 1867–1890. Т. 1–11.

АЮЗР – Акты, относящиеся к истории южной и западной России, собранные и изданные археографическою комиссиею. Санкт-Петербург: тип. Праца. 1863. Т. 1: (1361–1598); 1865. Т. 2: (1599–1637).

ЕСУМ – Етимологічний словник української мови: у 7 т. Київ: Наукова думка. 1982. Т. 1; 1985. Т. 2.

ІУМЛФ – *Історія української мови. Лексика і фразеологія*. Київ: Наукова думка. 1983.

ІСУМ – Словник української мови XVI–першої половини XVII ст. Львів. 1995. Вип. 2; 2008. Вип. 14.

ІСУЯ – *Історичний словник українського язика*. Харків: Державне видавництво України. 1930. Т. 1; 1932. Т. 1. Фотопередрук О. Горбача. Мюнхен. 1985.

Лаучюте – Лаучюте Юрате А. *Словарь балтизмов в славянских языках*. Ленинград: Наука. Ленинградское отделение, 1982.

ЛБ – *Лексикон словенороський Памви Беринди*. [Надрук. з вид. 1627 р. фотомех. способом]. Київ: Вид-во АН УРСР, 1961.

МСТ – Тимченко Євген. *Матеріали до словника писемної та книжної української мови XV–*

*XVIII ст.*: Київ; Нью-Йорк: Літопис-XX. 2002. Кн. 1; 2003. Кн. 2.

ПЭС – Преображенский Александр Г. *Этимологический словарь русского языка*: в 2 т. Москва: Наука. 1959. Т. 1. Вып. 1–9.

ССУМ – Словник староукраїнської мови XIV–XV ст.: у 2 т. Київ: Наук. думка. 1977. Т. 1; 1978. Т. 2.

СУМ – Словник української мови: в 11 т. Київ: Наук. думка. 1970. Т. 1; 1971. Т. 2; 1978. Т. 9.

ALSS – *Archiwum książąt Lubartowiczów Sanguszków w Sławucie*. Lwów: druk. Instytutu Staroupiganiańskiego. 1890. Т. 3: (1432–1534).

Berneker – Berneker Erich. *Slavisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung. 1924. Т. 1.

Karłowicz – Karłowicz Jan. *Słownik wyrazów obcego a mniej jasnego pochodzenia: używanych w języku polskim*, Kraków: drukarnia W.L. Anczyca i Spółki. 1894–1905.

Miklosich – Miklosich Franz. *Die türkischen Elemente in den südost- und osteuropäischen Sprachen*. Nachtrag, Wien: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften. 1890. Т. II.

Sławski – Sławski Franciszek. *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*. Kraków: Towarzystwo Miłośników Języka Polskiego. 1982. Т. II.

*Słownik – Słownik wyrazów obcych*. Wyd. 9. (Red. Z. Rysiewicz). Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy. 1963.

SSČ – Gebauer Jan. *Slovník staročeský*. Druhé, nezměněné vydání. Praha: Academia, 1970. Díl. 1: [A–J].

SSP – *Słownik staropolski*. Т. 1–11. 1953–1993. (Red. S. Urbańczyk). Warszawa [u. a.]: PAN. 1953–1955. Т. 1.

SP – *Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku*. [kom. red.: Stanisław Bąk et al.]. Wrocław; Warszawa; Kraków; Gdańsk: PAN. 1967. Т. 2.