

OLEKSANDRA V. POPOVA

South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University
named after K. D. Ushynsky

ORCID id: orcid.org/0000-0002-6244-5473

Fields of research: teaching English and Chinese to future translators/interpreters (teaching tools and socio-political background for developing skills in listening comprehension, speaking, reading and writing), Translation Studies (discourse analysis, adequacy of translation, translatorial competence, tactic and strategic issues of translation), General Linguistics, Comparative Linguistics, etc.

OLGA A. KOPUS

South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University
named after K. D. Ushynsky

ORCID id: orcid.org/0000-0003-1235-2997

Fields of research: Problems of Linguistic Didactics, Linguistic Stylistics, Cognitive Linguistics, etc.

OLEKSANDRA O. MORHUN

South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University
named after K. D. Ushynsky

ORCID id: orcid.org/0000-0003-3382-0155

Fields of research: Teaching English and Chinese to Future Translators/Interpreters, Translation Studies, etc.

DOI: doi.org/10.35321/all91-06

LITHUANIAN–UKRAINIAN LANGUAGE PARALLELS: ETYMOLOGICAL RELATIONSHIP AND TYPOLOGICAL SIMILARITY

Lietuvių ir ukrainiečių kalbų paralelės: etimologinis ryšys ir tipologinis panašumas

ANNOTATION

The article aims to confirm an important hypothesis about the existence of separate parallels in the Lithuanian and Ukrainian languages. The absence of common areal boundaries of both languages with striking correspondences at different levels indicates the preservation of common lingual relics of the era of ancient contacts between speakers of Baltic and Slavonic dialects. The exclusivity of the Lithuanian-Ukrainian isoglosses, which do not extend to other languages of the Baltic and Slavonic groups of the Indo-European language family, is most likely the result of close lingual interaction between the Eastern Slavs and the ancestors of modern Lithuanians on the territory outlined by the river network of tributaries of the Dnipro in its upper reaches. Some of the relics turned out to be resistant to evolutionary processes, due to which they “survived” to our time as part of the descendant languages of ancient dialects. Preliminary data collection and linguistic analysis show that very close structural-etymological encounters are presented at several levels of the Lithuanian and Ukrainian language systems, namely, lexical, word formation and textual (phrases with a genetically common composition). The authors include typologically very close textual analogies at the phraseological level among the evidence of the development of joint innovations introduced by the ancestors of the speakers of Lithuanian and Ukrainian speech, which are probably based on common semantic-semiotic models generated by common cultural experiences of the two ethnic groups in the process of contacts.

KEYWORDS: vocabulary, word formation, etymology, text, phraseology, Lithuanian, Ukrainian.

ANOTACIJA

Straipsnyje siekiama patvirtinti svarbią hipotezę dėl atskirų paralelių egzistavimo lietuvių ir ukrainiečių kalbose. Abiejų kalbų bendro paplitimo ploto ribų nebuvimas ir ryškūs atitikmenys skirtinguose kalbų lygmenyse rodo, kad yra išlikusių bendrų kalbos relikto iš senovės baltų ir slavų tarmėmis kalbėjusių kontaktų epochos. Lietuvių-ukrainiečių izoglosų išskirtinumas, neapimantis kitų indoeuropiečių kalbų šeimos baltų ir slavų kalbų grupių, greičiausiai yra glaudžios rytų slavų ir dabartinių lietuvių protėvių kalbinės sąveikos jų ankstesnėje teritorijoje, ribojamoje Dniepro intakų tinklo upės aukštupyje, rezultatas. Kai kurie reliktai pasirodė esą atsparūs evoliucijos procesams, todėl jie išliko iki šių laikų kaip senųjų tarmių palikuonių kalbų dalis. Preliminarių duomenų rinkimas ir jų lingvistinė analizė rodo, kad itin glaudžios struktūrinės-etimologinės sankirtos reprezentuojamos keliuose lietuvių ir ukrainiečių kalbų sistemų lygmenyse: leksiniame, žodžių darybos ir teksto (genetiškai bendros struktūros frazės). Tipologiškai labai artimus

teksto analogus frazeologiniame lygmenyje autoriai priskiria prie bendrų inovacijų, vartotų lietuvių ir ukrainiečių kalbėtojų protėvių, raidos įrodymų, kurie, tikėtina, remiasi bendrais semantiniais-semiotiniais modeliais, sukurtais abiejų etninių grupių bendros kultūrinės patirties kontaktų procese.

ESMINIAI ŽODŽIAI: žodynas, žodžių daryba, etimologija, tekstas, frazeologija, lietuvių, ukrainiečių.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Systemic coincidences in related languages are usually not limited to a single tier: the higher the degree of genetic relationship of languages, the greater the number of their subsystems that reveal a single principle of organization. And, of course, the closest relationship of languages determines the specific weight of their common vocabulary, i.e. the presence in their lexicons of whole-lexical analogues with a common root and/or affixes. This is seen in the example of the Romance languages (especially in their most ancient state) and the languages of two branches of the Aryan group – ancient Iranian and ancient Indo-Aryan, demonstrating a significant closeness of grammatical structure and vocabulary.

A similar situation exists in the case of the *Slavonic* and *Baltic languages*, whose grammatical paradigms, lexicon, word morphology, morphemics (repertoire of root and function morphemes), several word-formation models and semantics are often related as “twins”. This is obvious even with the results of phonetic (e.g. contraction of diphthongs, reflection of PIE **k̑*) and morphological evolution, which has alienated the languages. This phenomenon in comparative-historical linguistics is traditionally explained within the framework of several theories, the main ones being: 1) the theory of Slavonic-Baltic or Balto-Slavonic linguistic unity/proto-language (for a discussion, see the works of August Schleicher, Reinhold Trautmann, Jan Otrębski, Vladimir Georgiev, Vytautas Mažiulis, Jonas Kazlauskas, Rainer Eckert and others); 2) the theory of the formation of Slavonic from peripheral dialects of Baltic (Vyacheslav Vs. Ivanov, Vladimir N. Toporov, Viktor V. Martynov, Tadeusz Lehr-Splawiński); 3) the theory of independent development and secondary rapprochement of speakers of Proto-Slavonic and Proto-Baltic languages (Jānis Endzelīns, Oleg N. Trubachev).

No doubt, the system of close correspondences between Slavonic and Baltic cannot be considered in a simplified and straightforward manner, since the systemic similarity is formed by several factors – a common Indo-European heritage and common innovations during areal contacts. This circumstance

alone prompts us to talk about the convergence of the languages of the two groups and the emergence of new joint formations at different times. **However, the common elements of the lexical systems within Slavonic and Baltic are distributed unevenly, i.e. they often connect not all, but only individual languages of both groups.** This is already a direct indication of the ancient dialectal relations of the Proto-Indo-European era, as well as the time of the Balto-Slavonic interaction, which did not have a “frontal” character, covering all dialects at once, but local specificity, since it affected only a part of the Proto-Slavonic and Proto-Baltic dialects. Traces of an ancient map of areal Balto-Slavonic contacts help to clarify the dialectal differentiation of both proto-languages, cf., for example, the separate isoglosses linking Slovene with the Baltic languages (Bezljaj 1966–1968). For individual examples of this type, see also: (Trautmann 1923; Anikin 1998), and also more recently (Iliadi 2023 with important nuances of the isogloss configuration).

2.1. It should be noted that it is not only the units formed during the era of contacts between speakers of the two *proto-languages* that exhibit a systemic character. It is quite possible to speak with confidence about a common (rather old!) Slavonic-Baltic heritage from the era of interaction between *individual languages* of the two groups, cf., for example, isolexes in the languages of the Pomeranian Slavs, Kashubians and Old Prussians (Labuda 1974; Popowska-Taborska 1991), revealing the complex nature of ancient Baltic-Slavonic relations, as well as examples of Belarusian-Lithuanian lexical connections (Čekman 1972).

But in the case of the languages of the Baltic Slavs and Balts, everything is clear: *their territories of residence are contiguous*, and the consequence of historical contacts were common innovations in their speech. On the contrary, the problem is presented by the Lithuanian-Ukrainian parallels, remarkable in that they exist *in languages whose areas do not have common borders*, so a completely fair question arises about the conditions of their origin.

Some of these similarities may date back to the time of the most ancient contacts between the Balts, the ancestors of the speakers of modern Lithuanian, and the Proto-Slavs, whose dialects much later took part in the genesis of the dialects of the Ukrainian language. To a large extent, this idea applies to cases of genetic identity of root lexemes (Ukrainian *яна*: Lithuanian *opà*; see below) or to derivatives from an etymon found only in the root word of the Slavs and Balts (cf. Ukrainian *яжк-ар*: Lithuanian *ežgỹs*, *ežegỹs*; see below). However, most of the Lithuanian-Ukrainian or Ukrainian-Lithuanian parallels examined below at different levels of language, as it seems to us, **reproduce the results of linguistic interaction between the ancient East Slavonic population and the Baltic ethnic group, linguistically close to the Lithuanians**, on the territory of the

Upper Dnipro region. We mean contacts of the era, the upper limit of which is reflected in the Old Russian chronicles. The very fact of communication between the Dnipro Slavs and a branch of the Lithuanian tribe is indirectly confirmed not only by the fact that for Ukrainian language units (Old Russian heritage), there are only Lithuanian parallels. The Baltic hydronymic substrate of the Dnipro region also testifies in its favour, explained only by data from the Lithuanian language. In the literature on onomastics, such hydronyms are attributed to “a relic of the Baltic dialect of the Eastern Lithuanian or, more broadly, Aukštaitian type” (Nepokupnyj 1981: 76).

We emphasize that the problem of identifying the heritage of these separate contacts has not yet been specifically addressed, although it is necessary in the interests of comparative–historical grammar, lexicology, and the etymology of the Baltic and Slavonic languages, which emphasizes the **relevance** of the proposed study.

2. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

The main **purpose** of the proposed study, in our opinion, is *the practical substantiation of the problem related to the common linguistic heritage in Lithuanian and Ukrainian, which distinguishes them from other languages of the Baltic and Slavonic groups*. The stated purpose is achieved by solving several **scientific tasks**:

1) to identify separate etymological parallels in the Lithuanian and Ukrainian languages;

2) to detect the integrity of Lithuanian and Ukrainian derivatives formed according to word-formation models common to them (with genetically identical affixes);

3) to determine genetically identical text units – word combinations that have an etymologically common composition and close semantics in the Lithuanian and Ukrainian languages (including the sum of phrasemes with etymologically identical components and close/identical ideological content for both languages);

4) to single out typologically common Lithuanian–Ukrainian phraseological parallels illustrating a close semantic contour.

3. MATERIAL AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The **study material** was extracted from lexicographic sources of the Lithuanian and Ukrainian languages (dictionaries of literary, dialectal vocabulary, phraseological dictionaries and, to a lesser extent, from folklore materials, onomastic dictionaries and written monuments) utilizing continuous sampling.

The **methods** used in the proposed study are as follows: *etymological* (to clarify the genesis of lexical units and their original morphology), *comparative-historical* (to establish the genetic identity of the compared forms in the two languages, to understand the common paths of their joint evolution and reconstruction of prototypes) alongside the *method of linguistic typology* (to clarify the general patterns of the structure and semantics development of etymologically heterogeneous units in Lithuanian and Ukrainian and to describe the typological similarity in the semantic-ideological contour of phrasemes of the two languages).

The analytical procedure used in the study is based, in general terms, on the scientific methods used in etymology, works on diachronic word formation and comparative semasiology. The logic and sequence of their use follow from the treatment of the material in the next section. Here we would like to emphasize several methodologically important points that correspond to the tasks set above.

1. The presence of separate *whole-lexical* (with homogeneity of the root and affix parts) analogues in Lithuanian and Ukrainian, characterized by the absence of correspondences outside both languages, is interpreted as a product of lingual interaction between some speakers of Old Russian dialects and ancient Baltic dialects (conditionally) of the Aukštai type, preserved by them. However, one should not reject the possibility of reproducing more ancient linguistic relations between some dialects of the Proto-Slavs and Proto-Balts in such isolexes. The authors of the proposed article realize that the area of some parallels may be somewhat expanded over time with the introduction of new dialect data from other languages of both groups into scientific circulation. It should be noted that the exclusivity of isolexes is a fact until proven otherwise. In addition, an important diagnostic criterion for exclusivity is the absence of Russian analogues identical to Ukrainian ones, although they should be expected since the territory of the upper part of the Dnipro is also the area of Russian dialects.

2. We attribute the formation of common word-formation models or their activation (revitalization) during close, long-term communication to the results of separate language contacts between the languages mentioned.

3. Within the framework of contacts, both ancient dialects developed common elements of the text (ritual, mythological, legal, if we consider phraseological units as archaic legal regulations) – word combinations built from homogeneous lexemes. We attribute set expressions with the same image symbols, expressed by words that are genetically identical for Baltic and Slavonic, to examples of the text belonging to this type.

4. In a certain sense, the results of separate contacts can also be manifested in the semantics of lexemes, phraseological units that do not have an etymologically common core, but contain a *typologically identical or close semantic pattern*. They are likely formed according to some common semantic patterns.

4. ANALYSIS OF THE MATERIAL

4.1. Lexical “doubles” (whole-lexemic identities)

Lith. *draūgalas* : Ukr. *дру́голик*

Lith. *draūgalas* ‘comrade’ – a derivative with the formant *-alas* from *draūgas* ‘friend’, ‘pal’ (Smoczyński 2019: 332). This Lithuanian word in Ukrainian corresponds to the colloquial *дру́голик* ‘buddy’, formed by the suffix *-ик-*, added to the stem of the archaic **другол* (cf. also the modern surname *Друголюк* = **Другол-*), where *-ол-* (Proto-Slavonic *-olv*) historically corresponds to Lith. *-alas* (Sławski 1974: 109).

Lith. *ilga-* : Ukr. *довго-* (in composites)

Lith. *ilgabūrnis* ‘having a long mouth (lips)’, ‘long-faced’ (LKŽe¹) ~ Ukr. **довгобёрний*, reconstructed concerning the modern surname *Довгобёрний* (Odesa). As in all other examples considered here, both parts of the Ukrainian composite are etymologically identical to parts of the Lithuanian one. The Ukrainian example is interesting since it may contain the East Slavonic reflex of Proto-Slavonic **bьrna* ‘lip’, the geography of which, according to ESSJ, is limited to the South Slavonic languages (ESSJ III 130);

Lith. *ilgagaĩvis* ‘long-headed’ ~ Ukr. *довгоголови́й* ‘the same’ (used, for example, when tracing the Latin *Cenchrus longispinus* Fernald = *Ценхрус довгоголовий*);

¹ Available at: <https://ekalba.lt/lietuviu-kalbos-zodynas/ilgaburnis?i=0e187e4a-f7b7-4c3f-bf2c-51218035453e> [accessed 30.08.2024].

Lith. *ilgakāsis* ‘long-braided’ ~ Ukr. dial. *довгоко́сий* (although in this case, the isogloss configuration is somewhat more complex: Lithuanian-Ukrainian-South Slavonic, cf. Serbian, Croatian *dugòkos* ‘the one with long hair’, Bulgarian *дългоко́с*, Macedonian *долгоко́с* (Ślowski, ed., 1979: 264 without Ukrainian word);

Lith. *ilgaviñnis* ‘long-haired’ (LKŽe²) ~ Ukrainian *довговóвний* ‘the same’.

Lith. *kìlpa* : Ukr. [чоўн]

Lith. *kìlpa* ‘a loop obtained after crossing or joining the ends of a rope’, ‘stirrup’, ‘bend’ (LKŽe³) ~ Ukr. dial. Podolsk. [чоўн] ‘loop’ in the set expression *зачоўнми чоўн* = *to tie a loop* (about a thread with a needle) (Brods’ka 1979: 35), cf. Proto-Slavonic **čьlpti* ‘to weave’, comparable with Lith. *kìlpoti* ‘to make loops’, ‘to get entangled’, *kìlpa* ‘loop’ (ESUM VI 337).

Lith. *nerūnė* : Ukr. *неру́нь*

Lith. *nerūnė* ‘water plant (Lemanea)’ (LKŽe⁴) ~ Ukr. dial. Chernihiv. *неру́нь* ‘Duck-potato Sagittaria’ (Dialektolohična anketa no. 57, 2015). V. N. Toporov rightly correlates the Lithuanian word, among other cognate forms in Slavonic and Baltic, with Lith. *nérti* ‘to dive’, Slavonic names of a hole, a pit, a pool starting with *ноp-* and further – with the Proto-Indo-European **ner-/ *nor-* (Toporov 2010a: 204, 205). The Ukrainian lexeme reproduces Proto-Slavonic dialectal **nerynъ*, preserving the vocalism *e*, as in the correlative verb **nerti*, **nъrъ*, in contrast, for example, to Russian *но́рица* ‘perennial herbaceous plant (Scrophularia nodosa)’. Thus, it is a complete (in morphological and ablaut respects) analogue of Lith. *nerūnė*. Regarding the suffixal formation, see Ślowski 1974: 140–141 (especially cf. Emile Benveniste’s thesis on the connection between PIE *-ūn-īā-*, Common Baltic *-ūni-*, Tocharian *-ūne*) (Ambrasas 1993: 149–150; 2000: 159).

Lith. *nešikas* : Ukr. *несéуь*

Lith. *nešikas* ‘porter’ (LKŽe⁵) ~ Ukr. dial. *несéуь* ‘the same’ (ESUM IV 77: no exact Lithuanian equivalent). Derivatives from the etymologically identical

² Available at: <https://ekalba.lt/lietuviu-kalbos-zodynas/ilgavilnis?i=451f9700-d14a-486b-a658-6125f8dcea8f> [accessed 30.08.2024].

³ Available at: <https://ekalba.lt/lietuviu-kalbos-zodynas/kilpa?i=07020bef-9484-4c14-a2cb-807382b8beb9> [accessed 30.08.2024].

⁴ Available at: <https://ekalba.lt/lietuviu-kalbos-zodynas/ner%c5%abn%c4%97?i=3d5def6d-61b5-46b5-ab5e-420948e212de> [accessed 30.08.2024].

⁵ Available at: <https://ekalba.lt/lietuviu-kalbos-zodynas/ne%c5%alikas?i=ed642f76-f0a3-41cf-a1dc-c250300a7c98> [accessed 30.08.2024].

verbs *nėšti* ‘to carry’: *несті* ‘the same’ (for relatedness, see: ESSJ XXV 19–22; Smoczyński 2019: 1114–1115), formed according to a common word-formation model with the formant *-ikas* : *-ьсв*.

Lith. *pusbrolis* : Old Ukrainian *Полбратъ*

Lith. *pusbrolis* ‘cousin’ ~ *pus-* ‘half-, semi-’ + *brólis* ‘brother’ (Lyberis 1971: 618) (literally – ‘half-brother’) ~ Old Ukrainian *Полбратъ* – *Vterinus frater* (*Лексикон словено-латинский* by Epifanij Slavineckij and Arsenii Koretsky-Satanovsky) (Leksykony 1973: 486), i.e. “half-brother”. A remnant of the old system of designating the degree of kinship between brothers (cf. Anatolij P. Nepokupny’s idea that “the Slavs also had had the same [as the Lithuanians and Latvians] “semi-brotherly” system of designating kinship, but it disappeared, leaving behind themselves only individual relics” (Nepokupnyj 1979: 91), an echo of which is the Ukrainian dialect **nivcestpa*, preserved in the modern surname *Півцестрин* (Sumy).

Old Lith. (?) **šovėj(a)s* / **sovėj(a)s* : Slav. **savějbnikъ*

Baltic (Old Lith.?) **šovėj(a)s* / **sovėj(a)s* as a ritual term is reconstructed taking into account the name *Совиу*: this was the name of the legendary “founder and disseminator” of the cremation rite among pagan peoples, the story of which is described in the insertion made in 1261 by the copyist of the Russian translation of the “Chronicle” of John Malalas. In essence, this is nom. agent. from the verb **šauti* / **sauti* ‘to poke’, ‘to push’, ‘to move’, ‘to throw’ ~ Slav. **sovati*, **suti*, praes. **sujō*. Cf. phrases Lith. *šáuti* & *ugnīs*, *krósnīs*, Latvian *šāut* & *ugns*, *krāsns* ‘to stick (push) into the fire, into the oven’ (Toporov 1985: 102; for more details see: *ibid.*: 101–104; Toporov 2010b: 386–390).

The Ukrainian counterpart of this word is reproduced in the dialect (steppe dialects) *савійник* ‘hook (for a cast-iron cauldron)’, ‘baking tray for bread’ (Dialektolohična anketa no. 17, 2015) with a prolongation of the root vowel (**a* < **ō*), which is rare for Slavonic representatives of this etymological nest. In contrast to the Baltic lexeme, here a more archaic, profane semantics is presented, isolating the Slavonic technical term from the language of the ritual: Slav. ‘oven-fork’, ‘baking sheet, baking tray’ (= a device with the help of which an object is placed into the fire) alongside Baltic. ‘a priest who places a ritual object in the fire’. But the structural correlation of the Lithuanian and Ukrainian forms shows a simpler morphology of the former with a word-formation complication (suffixal innovation in *-bn-ikъ*) of the latter, cf. Baltic (Old Lithuanian?) **šovėj(a)s* / **sov-ėj(a)s* VS Proto-Slavonic **sav-ěj-bnikъ*.

Lith. *virbū tvorà* : Ukr. *вербо́ва тва́рь*

The *Atlas of the Lithuanian Language* (Lith. *Lietuvių kalbos atlasas*) in the section “Fences names” (Lith. „Tvorų pavadinimai“), devoted to dialectal names of types of fences and enclosures, contains a complex technical term dialectal *virbū tvorà* (Morkūnas, ats. red., 1977: 63), which in its etymological composition and semantics ‘a fence made of rods, vines’ is quite close to Ukr. dialectal Podolsk. *вербо́ва тва́рь* ‘a fence woven from rods’, cf. in the same meaning *вербо́ва пліть* (but also as a collective nomen ‘willow rods’) (Brods’ka 1979: 34). Thus, we have Lith. dialectal *virbū tvorà* : Slavonic **vrb-ova tvarь* with the genetic identity of *viřbas* ‘vine’, ‘rod’ : **vrb-a* ‘willow’, ‘willow rod’ (Old Slavonic *врѣба*, Old Russian *вѣрба*, etc.; Fraenkel 1965: 1259) and *tvorà* ‘enclosure’, ‘fence’, ‘wattle’ : **tvarь* (cf. Upper Sorbian *twar* ‘structure’, ‘construction’; ESUM V 530; Smoczyński 2019: 1963). The second of the given designations of a fence contains the deverbative *пліть* < praes. *плету́* (to *плести* ‘to weave’), actually – *плетёнь*.

Folk geographical terminology

It is especially worth noting several very close parallels in the field of terms of geographical nomenclature:

Lith. *bėdrė*, Latvian *bedre* ‘pit’, ‘swamp’, ‘valley’ (Nevskaja 1977: 19) ~ Ukr. dial. (Rivne Polesie) *бедра* ‘a large pit’ (for more details, see: Nepokupnyj 1976: 27–29; as a Polesian–Latvian isogloss; Anikin 1998: 30);

Lith. *Bėržoras* – the name of a lake and a village (Būga 1958: 525; correlated with *bėržas* ‘birch’) ~ Ukr. dial. *бєpezap* ‘birch forest’ (Iliadi 2013: 169);

Lith. *čiurkšlė* ‘stream, ‘flow’ (Nevskaja 1977: 21) ~ Ukr. dial. *чуркало* ‘flow’. Cf. the hydronym *Чуркало* – a flow in the Ivano-Frankivsk Region; “nad potokiem *Czurkało*”, 1792 (Slovnyk 1979: 616);

Lith. *kaūparas* ‘hill, mound’ – derivative from *kaūpas* ‘pile’, ‘elevation’, ‘top’ (Sławski 1976: 25; Smoczyński 2019: 668), together with which they exactly repeat the etymological and word-formation relations of the Ukrainian *купа* ‘pile’, ‘stack’, ‘embankment’ and dial. **кунор* ‘hill’, ‘embankment’, which has left appellative use, but is sporadically noted in the old microtoponymy of the Poltava Region. The expressive form (with voicing of the labial) of this word is recorded in the dialects of Central Ukraine, cf. *кубѣп* ‘pile’ this is the name of the children’s game “*куча мала*” (Hromko 2017: 246) < **кунор* or **кунур*. The suffixes of Lith. *-aras* and Proto-Slavonic *-orъ* (> *-op-*) are reflexes of a common Indo-European formant (Sławski 1976: 25);

Lith. *Liepora* – a river (left tributary of the Švitinys River), *Lieporai* – the name of a village (Būga 1958: 525; correlated with *liepa* ‘lipa’) ~ Ukr. **Лунap* (*Лунapиθ*) – one of the names of the left tributary of the Netrius along with

Liūnis, *-ovozo* (Slovnyk 1979: 314), similarly integrated into the system of toponyms ending in *-ov* and therefore receiving the corresponding suffix. It should be noted that the Balto-Slavonic isogloss itself is somewhat broader: it goes beyond the Lithuanian–Ukrainian one. The fact is that in Baltic, in addition to Lithuanian, there is also a Prussian correspondence *Lepare* (collect. ‘linden forest, linden grove’) ~ *lipa* ‘linden tree’ (Nepokupnyj 2002: 23; 2013: 216–218: highlights the suffix of collectiveness *-or-*; see also the literature on the name here), and the Ukrainian example marked the second pole of the realization of Proto-Slavonic **liparb* (coll.), which until now, as far as we know, was marked only in the Slavonic South – in Bulgarian and Serbian toponymy, as evidenced by the data of the *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavonic Languages* (ESSJ XV 118–119);

Lith. *sraujỹnė* ‘rapidity’, ‘rapid current’ (*srauja* ‘strong current’) (Nevskaja 1977: 85) ~ Ukr. dial. Chernihiv. [*спруу|на*] ‘fast current’ (Iliadi 2013: 172);

Lith. *ūžtakis*, *užtakỹs* ‘bay’, ‘space along the shore of a lake or a river overgrown with grass’, ‘river bend’, ‘low place flooded with water in spring or after rain’, ‘deep place at a river bend’ (Nevskaja 1977: 93–94) ~ Ukr. dial. *у́стóч*, *-u* ‘lowland river area covered with grass, obolon’, Khmelnytskyi Region (Iliadi 2013: 172) < **уз-мочь* < **vǔz-točь*.

To conclude the analysis of this group of lexemes, we consider it necessary to dwell on one more parallel. It does not belong to the category of whole-lexical ones, but it helps to reconstruct an etymon for Slavonic, which until now, seems not to be known here. We are talking about the pair of Lith. *kūliavà* ‘stone threshold in the river’ (< *kūlis* ‘stone’), *Kūliāvas* – the name of the river (Smoczyński 2019: 821) ~ Ukrainian *Куля́вка* – the name of the left tributary of the Smotrych in the Dniester basin (Slovnyk 1979: 301). Perhaps, *Куля́ва* is an oikonym, Lviv Region (ibid.: 288).

Despite the obvious formal closeness of the Ukrainian hydronym and Proto-Slavonic adj. **kul’avъ(jb)* (see about it: ESSJ XIII 99), they are hardly related, since the reflexes **kul’avъ(jb)* have the semantics ‘crippled, maimed’, ‘lame’, ‘bald’, which in no way contributes to the consolidation of the adjective in the sphere of geographical nomination. Rather, in *Куляв-* we encounter a special Proto-Slavonic **kul’avъ* ‘stone’, ‘rapids’ or ‘located on a cape’ (if we are talking about a settlement), etymologically close to the aforementioned Lith. *kūliavà*, which has a variant vocalism of the root and suffix. Thus, there is a possibility that a derivative of an etymon that is poorly preserved in the Slavonic languages has been preserved in Ukrainian toponymy (for its possible connections, see: Smoczyński 2019: 821). Its exact **root** analogue in Slavonic would be **kyl-* or **kvl-*: the length of the vowel in the Lithuanian word itself is not necessarily original (it could be caused by secondary lengthening in the originally stressed

syllable, which is typical of the Samogitian dialects; Zinkevičius 1966: 75, 491 (map no. 46); see also: Kregždys 2012: 225), therefore for Proto-Slavonic **kul-* (**kouł-*) not only the Lithuanian correlate *kūl-*, but also **kul-* are possible. There is no need to talk about a **whole-lexical** identity, since the Lithuanian formant *-(i)ava* is etymologically not correlated with the Slavonic suffix *-av-*, being a complex of two formants *-(i)a* + *-va* (the word-formation model with *-(i)ava* is noted rather late – from the 16th–17th centuries (Ambrazas 1993: 72)). The genetic analogue of the Proto-Slavonic *-av-* in Lithuanian is *-ovas(-ė)* (see: Ambrazas 2000: 180 with references), and therefore, the full Lithuanian correspondence would have the form **kūlovas* or **kūlovė*.

Other parallels

It seems to be expedient to give a few more examples that have already appeared in the literature on etymology, but their status as narrow isoglosses has not been discussed yet, cf.:

Lith. *ežgỹs, ežėgỹs* ‘ruff’ ~ Ukr. dial. *яшкар, язкар* ‘ruff’ (Anikin 1998: 358);

Lith. *kirtùkas, kertùkas* ‘shrew’ ~ Ukr. dial. Transcarpathian *чepмéу* ‘rodent *Myoxus nitela*’ (ESSJ IV 166; Anikin 1998: 168). Compare it with structurally and etymologically identical, but semantically distant Rus. dial. *чepмéу* ‘cut from a roe deer’ (ESSJ IV 166);

Lith. *opà* ‘ulcer, wound’, ‘damage to tree bark’, ‘blow’ ~ Ukr. dial. *яна* ‘stripe on an animal’s skin from a strong blow with a stick’ (Anikin 1998: 351);

Lith. *skaitýti, skaitaũ* ‘to count, to set a price; to settle accounts’, ‘to look at, to pay attention to, to evaluate’ in Latvian *skàitīt, skàitu* ‘to count, to read’ ~ Ukr. dial. *уimáму* ‘to play odd and even’, *уimáмуся* ‘to worry, to think for a long time’ (< Proto-Slavonic **cětati(sę)*) (Anikin 1998: 114 with references).

4.2. Word-formation parallels

Lith. *bè-* : Ukr. *без-*

Both prepositional prefixes are genetically united, ultimately going back to the common Indo-European etymon **b(h)eǵh-* (Fraenkel 1962: 38; ESSJ II 7–9; Smoczyński 2019: 136). In both languages, *bè-* : *без-* participate in the formation of semantically identical lexemes; moreover, synonymous Lithuanian and Ukrainian nominal compounds are observed, in which the etymological relationship also extends to their second component:

Lith. *beākis* ‘eyeless’ (Baronas 1967: 37) ~ Ukr. *безокуй* ‘the same’ (Nikovskij 1927: 29). This archaic adjective is present not only in Ukrainian, but also

in other Slavonic languages, but the Lithuanian word-formation analogue is usually overlooked (see, for example, in ESSJ II 36: **bezokъ(jb)*);

Lith. *bekraūjis* ‘bloodless’ (Baronas 1967: 46) ~ Ukr. *безкрів’я*, *безкрів’я* ‘bloodlessness’ (Nikovskij 1927: 28);

Lith. *bemeilis* (as an equivalent of Pol. *bezmiłosierny* ‘merciless’, ‘cruel’ (Subačius, par., 1993: 81)) ~ Ukr. *Безмілич* – a modern surname < **Безмил* (at the level of producing bases cf. Lith. *mėilė* ‘love’, *meilūs* ‘affectionate, gentle’ : Proto-Slavonic **milb*; ESSJ XIX 46–47);

Lith. *besarmātis* ‘shameless’ (Lyberis 1971: 112) ~ Ukr. dial. (deriv.) *безсороміт-но* ‘shamelessly’, ‘impudently’ (Želechivskij 1886: 22) < **безсоромот-*. Regarding the identity of the stems of Lith. *sarm-at-* (< **šarm-ata*) : Proto-Slavonic **sorm-ot-* see: (Smoczyński 2019: 1481, as well as Ambrazas 2000: 29, 32: Slavonic *-otb*, *-ota* : Lith. *-atis*, *-ata*);

Lith. *beširdis* ‘heartless’, ‘soulless’ (Lyberis 1971: 113) ~ Ukr. *безсérдий* ‘the same’ (Hrinčenko 1958: 45; ESUM V 222: to Lith. *širdis* ‘heart’);

Lith. *bevaldis* ‘powerless’, ‘powerless’ (Baronas 1967: 36) ~ Ukr. *Безволод*, *Безволодченко* – modern surnames (Kharkov);

Lith. *bevālis* ‘weak-willed’ (Baronas 1967: 37) ~ Ukr. dial. *бéзвіль* ‘weak-willed’, cf. derivative in *-bye безвілля* ‘lack of will’, ‘oppression’, ‘lack of freedom’ (Nikovskij 1927: 26);

Lith. *beveĩdis* ‘faceless’ (Baronas 1967: 39) ~ Ukr. *безві́дий* ‘the same’ (Nikovskij 1927: 25) in the derivative (innovative) form in other languages, cf. Rus. dial. Perm *безвѣднѣй* ‘unsightly’, ‘unattractive’ (Slovar’ 1966: 182);

Lith. *beveĩjis* ‘windless’ ~ Ukr. dial. *безвіі* ‘quiet, windless weather’. At the level of the Indo-European etymon cf. Lith. *vėjas* ‘wind’ : Proto-Slavonic **vĕjati* (ESUM I 408).

Lith. *iš-* : Ukr. *з-*, *с-*

This prefix in Lithuanian also has an older and dialectal form *iž-*, close to Slavonic **jъz-*, together with which they go back to Proto-Indo-European **eghs* (Fraenkel 1962: 188; ESSJ IX 7–8; Smoczyński 2019: 568). In Ukrainian, the Proto-Slavonic reflex **jъz-* in the prefix function is represented as *з-*, *с-*, (dial.) *із-*, *іс-* depending on the nature of a sound following it. This circumstance often does not allow us to formally distinguish between the continuations **jъz-* and **sъ-* (which was emphasized by Oleg N. Trubachev), therefore the statement of **jъz-* in Ukrainian words is further based on their grammatical semantics (near *e*-deixis) in which there is hardly a hint of **sъ-*.

As in the case of derivatives based on the model in *bè-* : *бєз-* (see above), the examples given below are also interesting due to the complete etymological identity of the morphology:

Lith. *išaiškėti* ‘to become clear’ (Lyberis 1971: 240) ~ Ukr. *з’ясувати(ся)* ‘to find out(s)’, cf. Rus. *из-ясниться* with a more complex morphology (*-sk-n-*);

Lith. *išbrìnkti* ‘to swell’, ‘to swell’, ‘to become swollen’ (ibid.: 243) ~ Ukr. *зб’р’якту* ‘the same’;

Lith. *išbùdinti* ‘wake up’, ‘awaken’ (ibid.: 244) ~ Ukr. *збудити* ‘the same thing’;

Lith. *iškrùvinti* ‘to stain with blood’, ‘to bleed’ (ibid.: 257) ~ Ukr. *з(не)кро́виту* ‘to drain blood’ (ESUM III 99);

Lith. *išlàkti* ‘to lap up’ (Lyberis 1971: 259) ~ Ukr. colloquial *злòкту* ‘to drink greedily’, ‘to lick’, ‘to lap up’. On the relationship of the root verbs *làkti* : dial. *лòкату* see: Fraenkel 1962: 337–338; ESUM III 282; Smoczyński 2019: 869;

Lith. *išleñkti* ‘to bend’, ‘to arch’, ‘to curve’, ‘to flex’ (Lyberis 1971: 259) ~ Ukr. *зля́кати(ся)* ‘to be/get scared/frightened’, dial. *зля́ку* with the development of semantics ‘to bend’ → ‘to bend over from fear’ (ESUM III 337: there is no comparison of prefixal Lithuanian and Ukrainian forms);

Lith. *išmiřti* ‘to die out’ (Lyberis 1971: 262) ~ Ukr. **зме́рту* ‘the same’ reconstructed based on its derivative participle *зме́рлий* ‘dead’ (Nikovskij 1927: 321);

Lith. *išnérti* ‘to emerge’, ‘to surface’, ‘to float up’ (Lyberis 1971: 264) ~ Ukr. dial. *знéрти*, *знерáти* ‘to emerge’, ‘to come up’ (Želechivs’kij 1886: 310; ESUM IV 90) as a result of the morphological restructuring **нерету* < **nerti*;

Lith. *išpeřti* ‘to whip’, ‘to flog’, ‘to rip out’ (Lyberis 1971: 265) ~ Ukr. *снéрту* ‘to be stubborn’, ‘to argue’ (Nikovskij 1927: 735), dial. *снéртися* ‘to become stubborn’ (ESUM IV 356: compare with Lith. *peřti* ‘to beat’) < **jbz-perti(sę)* where *z-* is devoiced before *n*;

Lith. *išpìnti* ‘to unbraid’, ‘to weave out’ (Lyberis 1971: 266) ~ Ukr. dial. *сн’я́ту* ‘to pull’, ‘to put’, ‘to build’ (Želechivs’kij, Nedil’skij 1886: 912; ESUM IV 651: compare with Lith. *pìnti* ‘to weave’, ‘to twist’);

Lith. *ištìnti* ‘to beat off’, ‘to carve’, ‘to flog’ (Lyberis 1971: 289) ~ Ukr. dial. *стя́ту* ‘cutting off, separating something’, ‘chopping off’ (Želechivs’kij, Nedil’skij 1886: 932). For a comparison of prefix-less Slavonic and Baltic forms, see Fraenkel 1965: 1099; ESUM V 702; Smoczyński 2019: 1893.

4.3. Textual etymological parallels

Here we present some observations on word combinations whose etymological composition in both languages coincides completely or partially. Moreover, in the semantic-ideological aspect, Lithuanian and Ukrainian units turn out to be equivalent.

1. Phrases with the genetic identity of both components. Examples of this kind are found in phraseology:

Lith. *Akys (akyse) aptemo* (Galnaitytė *et al.* 1989: 16) : Ukr. *в очах темніє* (*akys* : **oko* & *ap-temo* (*témti* ‘to darken’) : **тъм-ьн-ѣти*);

Lith. *Akis į akį* (*ibid.*: 17) : Ukr. *віч на віч* (‘one-to-one’, ‘face-to-face’) < **оць на оць*;

Lith. *Akys limpa* (*ibid.*: 20) : Ukr. *очі злипаються* (“Рученьки терпнуть, злипаються віченьки... Боже, чи довго тягти? / З раннього ранку до пізньої ніченьки / Голкою денно верти” Pavlo Hrabovskij “Seamstress”). That is, *Akys limpa* (*līpti* ‘to stick’, ‘to cling’) : **oči* & **lip(nq)ti*;

Lith. *Imti į širdį* (= *to take to heart; to ache with one’s soul (heart) for someone, for/about something* (Galnaitytė *et al.* 1989: 115) : Ukrainian Podolsk dialect *їм’ати в серце* ‘to worry, to be nervous’, ‘to break one’s heart’ (expeditionary note of the authors), *мату серце на когочо* – to be dissatisfied, to be angry (V. Užčenko, D. Užčenko 1998: 168). Lith. *imti* ‘to take’, ‘to grab’ – an exact structural-genetic analogue of Slavonic **ęti*, praes. **ѣтъ* ‘the same’ (ESSJ VI 71; Fraenkel 1962: 184–185; Smoczyński 2019: 556–558);

Lith. *sàvo baldū* ‘with one’s own mind’, ‘at one’s own discretion’ (*Nedaryk sàvo baldū, pasklausk razumnesnių*) with *tuō baldū* (idiom) ‘meanwhile’, ‘in the meantime’, which should be understood as ‘at that time’. The second component is associated with Lith. *bēlsti* ‘to knock’ (the idea of breaking, smashing) : *baldōti* ‘to knock’, ‘to make noise’ (Toporov 2010a: 390, 392, 395 with literature), i.e. ‘to strike’, ‘to beat’ → ‘one tome’. In Slavonic, this expression can be matched by the Ukrainian dialect expression [св|оїм |боўдом] = *на свій розсуд* (Hromko 2008: 55) with the variability of the root vocalism: Lith. *bald-* : Slavonic **bъld-*. For the homogeneity of the Possessive Pronoun *sàvo* (gen. sing. for *sāvas* ‘one’s own’) : Slavonic **svojь* see: Fraenkel 1965: 767;

Lith. *Už akių* (*in someone’s absence, in absentia*; Galnaitytė *et al.* 1989: 320) : Ukr. dial. *уз очі* (Hromko 2008: 24) – dialectal analogue of the more widespread *поза очі* = *behind the eyes, in someone’s absence, in absentia*. Dial. *уз* is the result of the development of the older **ъуз* < Old Russian *въз*. Regarding the prepositional-case construction: here we need to talk about the etymological unity of not only the noun but also the preposition Lith. *už* : Proto-Slavonic **vbz* (both a preposition and a prefix < PIE **uĝ(h)*); Jānis Endzelīns keeps to the same idea, cf.: Endzelīns 1971: 413; Smoczyński 2019: 1991–1992);

Lith. *vakar dūsavai ant lovėlės, o šiandien ant baltos lentelės* (LD 1882: 287), to be more precise: *Yesterday she was breathing on a bed, and today on a white board* (Nevskaja 1982: 118) : Ukr. *Учора на |л’їуку |дихала, а тиепер на |біл’ім лут’ку завмерла*, Novoarkhangelsk Region (Dialektolohična anketa no. 38, 2015). Ukr. dial. *лут’ок*, gen. sing. *-тк’а* ‘a young linden tree; young

linden bast' continues Proto-Slavonic **lqt-ъkv* < **lqtъ* 'linen', 'a twig, a bark, bast of linden', 'a stick, a pole of a linden' (ESSJ XVI 152). Here *лутóк* is euphemistically used – 'a coffin made of a linden tree'. The Proto-Slavonic word **lqtъ* is associated with the alternation of *e* : *o* – with Lith. *lentà* 'board' (ibid.: 152; Smoczyński 2019: 900), whereas Slavonic **bělъ* (Ukr. *білий*) is related to Lith. *báltas* (Fraenkel 1962: 32; ESSJ II 79–81). Thus, the unified poetic image of *the white board* (coffin, deathbed) in the texts of Lithuanian and Ukrainian lamentations is embodied utilizing synonymous attributive constructions the composition of which in these languages is genetically identical.

Regarding the playing of the name of the board as a euphemistic designation of the deathbed, the coffin in Ukrainian, we should compare it with the dialectal expression (Eastern) *чотири(читипі) дошки збирати; чотири(читипі) дошки найти* (V. Užčenko, D. Užčenko 2013: 182).

2. Phraseological units with the genetic identity of one of the components. This category of examples is also represented by phraseological units with nuclear components – the names of the eye, and heart, which are etymologically identical in Lithuanian and Slavonic:

Lith. *Dingti iš akių* (Galnaitytė et al. 1989: 76) : Ukr. *зникнути з очей* (Lith. *dīngti* 'to disappear', 'to vanish' : Ukr. *зні́кнути* & Lith. *iš* : Ukr. *з*) = *to hide, to vanish*;

Lith. *Iš (nuo) senų senovės* (*from/since ancient times, from time immemorial, from olden days*; Galnaitytė et al. 1989: 125; Lyberis 1971: 657) : Ukr. *з давніх давен*. Very close typological similarity: lith. *sėnas* 'old' + *senovė* 'antiquity', 'antique' with tautological Ukrainian. adj. plur. *давні́й* 'old' + subst. plur. **давна* 'antiquity';

Lith. *Po akių (akimis)* (*before the eyes, in front of the eyes*; Galnaitytė et al. 1989: 271) : укр. *на очах* (V. Užčenko, D. Užčenko 1998: 121);

Lith. *Rėžti akį* (*to catch the eyes*; Galnaitytė et al. 1989: 282) : Ukr. *різати око (о́чі)* (*stand out sharply, be noticeable*), cf. "Здалеку ця мішанина стилів різала око, псувала архітектурний ансамбль. Але зблизька ті будинки виростали в усій величі й красі" (V. Kucher) (Horox⁶);

Lith. *Ryti akimis* (*to eat (devour) someone with one's eyes, to keep one's eyes on someone/something, to fix one's gaze on someone/something*; Galnaitytė et al. 1989: 283) : Ukr. *ї́тти(жерти) очима (оком)* [кого, що] (*inescapably, attentively look at someone, showing a certain feeling*; V. Užčenko, D. Užčenko 1998: 120);

Lith. *Spausti širdį* (*to squeeze the heart, the soul(heart) hurts*; Galnaitytė et al. 1989: 290) : Ukr. *серце стисло* (Lith. *suspáusti* 'to squeeze', 'to press' : Ukr. *стиска́ти, сті́снути* 'the same');

⁶ Available at: <https://goroh.pp.ua> [accessed 23.08.2024].

Lith. *Širdis plyšta* (the heart (soul) is torn (into pieces); Galnaitytė et al. 1989: 306) : Ukr. *серце крається* (someone is suffering, tormented, worried), (роз)краяти (*pizatu*) *серце* (to experience/cause mental anguish; V. Užčenko, D. Užčenko 1998: 167) (*plyšti* ‘to crack’, ‘to split’, ‘to burst’, ‘to tear’: *крається* ‘is torn’, ‘splits’, ‘is cut’);

Lith. *Šuns akis turėti* (there is no shame in anyone’s eyes; neither shame nor conscience; Galnaitytė et al. 1989: 308) : Ukr. *очи у Сірка позичати, очей у Сірка* (*Рябка*) *позичати* (to lose the sense of shame, one’s dignity; V. Užčenko, D. Užčenko 1998: 122), where *Сірко/Рябка* are generalized names for a grey or motley yard dog, often used as nicknames. As a result, there is an almost complete coincidence of both the ideological content of the phraseme as a whole and the semantics of its components in Lithuanian and Ukrainian: lith. *šuō, šuñs* ‘dog’, ‘canine’ : Ukr. *Сірко/Рябка* = *dog, canine* & *akis* : *око* & *turėti* ‘to have’, ‘to possess’, ‘(to) hold’ : Ukr. *позичати* ‘to take (for oneself)’, ‘to borrow’;

Lith. *Varna nenešė kaulo* (= it was not at all; FŽe⁷) : Ukr. *куди ворон кісток не заносить* (V. Užčenko, D. Užčenko 2005: 56, 78). However, with the general mythopoetic image embodied, the Ukrainian analogue (Proto-Slavonic **vornъ, *vorna* : Lith. *vařnas, vārna*) still has a slightly different meaning: here, unlike in Lithuanian, it is not the **absence** of the results of the event (*visai nebuvo*) that is actualized, but the **uncertainty** of place and direction.

In conclusion, we should note one more textual correspondence, namely, Lith. *Perkūno qžuolu* : Old Russian (Galicia) *Пероуновъ дубъ* in the mythologem about the oak of the thunder god (the Supreme God of the Slavs and Balts), whose name is etymologically identical and structurally close among the Lithuanians and Slavs, cf.: Lith. “*Perkūno qžuolu* vadinamas Kupiškio v. Bėdos ganyklose. Didelio ažuolo kamienas išpuvusiū viduriu. Jis dėl to taip vadinamas, kad yra griausmo sudaužytas” (Balys 1937: 163, 197) along with Old Russian. “А ѿ той горы до *Пероунова Доуба* горѣ Скломѣ. а ѿтѣ Пероунова Доуба до Бѣлыхъ береговѣ” in the “Charter of Lev Danilovich, Prince of Galicia, to the Bishopric of Peremyska”, 1302 (Žalovannaja gramota 1854: 317; for more details on this mythologem, see Ivanov, Toporov 1974: 14–16). The charter was written in a language that later formed the basis of some of the South-Western dialects of Ukraine.

⁷ Available at: <https://www.lietuviuzodynas.lt/frazeologizmai/Varna> [accessed 23.08.2024].

4.4. Typological analogies at the text level

Typologically similar material is found in folklore texts of funeral rituals, healing (magic) spells and phraseology.

1. Lith. “*O mano motinėlei budavoja tėviškėlę baltų lentelių be stiklinių langelių, be durelių: nematysi saulelės užtekant nei saulelės nusileidžiant*” (LD 1882: 281) : Ukr. Chernihiv “*Яка твоя доріженька смутна та невесела! / Яка твоя хаточка темна та невидная, / Що ні дверичок, ні оконечка, ні праведного сонечка...*”, (Podolia) “*Якої ти хатки собі загадав – / Чи ти не мав у чім жити? / Маленької, новенької – Без дверець і віконець, / Щоби сонце не загірло і вітер не завів, / Без лавичок, без поличок*” (Svencickij 1912: 37, 65). One can cite a proverb with a more complete lexical set, outlining the pragmatic and symbolic contour of the text and conceptually equating it with Lithuanian, cf. Lviv (in the former Ravsky district) “*Мій господарейку. [...] Чи ти не мав свої хатинойки? / А там тобі збудували таку малейкую, що в ні нема ані дверойків, ані воконяйків, що там навіть вітер не завіє, ані сонце не загірє*” (Svencickij 1912: 63).

Thus, we have very similar text contours: Lith. [*budavoja*] & [*tėviškėlę baltų lentelių*] as a euphemistic name for a coffin (= *a paternal house made of white planks*) & [*be langelių*] & [*be durelių*] & [*saulelė*] VS Ukr. [*збудували*] & [*хатка, хаточка, хатинойка*] & [*Без дверець, дверичок, дверойків*] & [*Без віконець, оконечка, воконяйків*] & [*сонечко, сонце*]. Both text matrices are similar in some details: 1) the sun, which does not rise or set for the deceased (Lithuanian) and does not warm (Ukrainian); 2) the use of names of concepts supporting the lamentation exclusively in the diminutive form with suffixes *-el-* (Lithuanian) VS *-к-/-оч-к-/-еч-к-, -ьч-, -ой-к- (-яй-к-)* (Ukrainian).

2. Lith. *Ėjo Kristus per ciltį ir nulūžo lieptas ir inkrito Kristaus koja. Nuėjo Kristus sveikas, neskauda koja, taip tegu neskauda Jonui (ligonio vardas arba plaukų spalva). – Christ was walking on a bridge and the crossbar broke and Christ's leg got stuck. Christ went healthy, his leg didn't hurt, so let Jonas's (name or hair colour of the sick person) not hurt either* (Balys 1951: 72, no. 477) : Ukr.: *Ишов Христос, ступив на трость, трость уламалась, кров угамовалась, цвето цветається, кров угамовається* (Efimenko, ed., 1874: 14).

3. Lith. *Ugniauvystas kraujas, paparčio žiedas. Aprimo upė. Tegul šitas kraujas nustos tekėti. – Fiery blood, red fern flower. The river has calmed down. Let this blood stop flowing* (Balys 1951: 76, no. 503, Švenčionys) : укр. *Вогняна кров, червона папороть. Вгамовалась річка. Нехай буде клята кров, котра тече*, Kharkiv region (Hromko 2008: 42).

4. Let us pay attention to the Lithuanian and Ukrainian phraseological units with the phrase *рябий кінь* (“speckled horse”) : *margas arklys* – a rather

rare coat colour, therefore noticeable and ambiguous in terms of the people's attitude towards it, cf. the Lithuanian belief that “a girl will get married when a speckled horse crosses her path” (Nepokupnyj 1979: 135). Cf. Lith. *Nusišauksi kaip margas arklys* (you will call upon yourself, like a speckled horse) : Ukr. dial. Poltava *Побачив рябого коня – завтра празник буде* (ibid.: 135), *сон рябої кобили* – about nonsense.

5. Phrasemes that play on the mythopoetic image of trampling the grass as life: Lith. dial. *Dar ilgai žolę mins senis* (= the old man will trample the grass for a long time, i.e. ‘to live’) : Ukr. dial. Chernihiv *Йому довго трави не топтати* (i.e. he will not live long) (Nepokupnyj 1979: 158). Cf. also the dialectal expression *вже мен’ї с’віжойї дерн’ї не топтати* = “I won’t live to see spring” (Onyškevyč 1984: 209), (Eastern) *скоро не буде роси топтати* “there is not enough left for someone to live” (V. Užčenko, D. Užčenko 2013: 430), (Western) *мураву топтати* (V. Užčenko, D. Užčenko 2005: 142) = to live.

6. The image of the Moon as a horned shepherd of sheep in riddles: Lith. *Laukas nematuotas, avys neskaitytos, piemuo raguotas* – ‘The field is immense, the sheep are innumerable, the shepherd has horns’; *Pievos nematuotas, avys neskaičiuotos, piemuo raguotas* – ‘Meadows are not measured, sheep are not counted, the shepherd has horns’ (The sky, the stars and the Moon) (Laurinkienė 2019: 298) : Ukr. *Поле не зміряне, бидло не злічене, пастух рогатий* (The Moon, the sky and the stars) (Nomys 1993: 637), *Один пастух багато овець пасе* (The Moon and the stars); *Аж до раночку вночі / Дід-пастух овець лічив. / Вийшло сонечко з-за гаю... / Де вони тепер – не знає* (The Moon and the stars) (Zahadky⁸).

7. A zoomorphic image of the Moon as a bald bull/ox/horse looking through the gate (in riddles):

Lith. *Laukas jautis pro vartus žiūri* – ‘The bald bull is looking through the gate’ (The Moon) (Laurinkienė 2019: 298) : Ukr. *Лусий віл через ворота дивицця* (The Moon) (Nomys 1993: 637). Cf. Lith. *laūkas* ‘with a white bald spot (mark) on the forehead’;

Lith. *Laukas arklys pro vartus žiūri* – ‘The bald horse is looking through the gate’ (The Moon) (Laurinkienė 2019: 298) : Ukr. *Лусий кінь у ворота загляда* (Month) (Nomys 1993: 637).

8. A zoomorphic image of a thunderstorm/storm as a bull/ox roaring behind the mountains: Lith. *Už trijų kalnų jautis baubia* (Perkūnija) – ‘Behind three mountains, the bull roars’ (Thunderstorm) (Laurinkienė 2019: 299) : Ukr. *Ревнув віл за сто гір, за сто річок, за сто пічок...* (Thunder, and also a bell) (Nomys 1993: 638).

⁸ Available at: <https://dovidka.biz.ua/zagadki-pro-misyats/> [accessed 23.08.2024].

5. CONCLUSION

It seems to us that in the comparative grammar of the Baltic and Slavonic languages, the outlines of a section covering the ancient exclusive relations between the two dialect groups against the background of the others are quite clearly outlined. The above material is sure to be clarified in the future in terms of areal characteristics, and it is quite possible that the geography of some of the parallels will be expanded. However, even the remaining facts taken together will very likely prove to be a sufficient basis for developing a theory of lingual contacts of the type indicated. In any case, we have only outlined a program of work in a narrower direction of Balto-Slavonic linguistics, highlighting the most promising angles of research, the results of which depend entirely on the quantity and quality of the data collected. For example, the issue regarding the reason *why Ukrainian etymological parallels to Lithuanian units are noted not in the area of ancient interaction between the Eastern Slavs and the ancestors of the Lithuanians on the Upper Dnipro, but generally far beyond its borders*, is very interesting.

The task of identifying etymological correlates at the lexical level shows some thematic “blurring” of correspondences, their belonging to a large number of thematic groups. However, in this thematic diversity, several important points can be seen. Firstly, these are elements of general social terminology (Lith. *draūgalas* : Ukr. *дру́голик*; Lith. *pusbrolis* : Old Ukr. *Полб́ратъ*), secondly, it is worth emphasizing several technical terms (Old Lithuanian (?) **šovėj(a)s*/**sovėj(a)s* : Slavonic **savějъnikъ*; Lith. *kilpa* : Ukr. *[чойн]*; Lith. *virbū tvorà* : Ukr. *вербо́ва тварь*), which do not belong to the most important terminological vocabulary (the oldest corpus of basic craft and other terminology), being the names of secondary details, which indicates their late age. Thirdly, there is a significant number of common innovations in the field of geographical nomenclature, possibly partly arising as a result of loan translation (both Balto-Slavonic and Slavonic-Baltic) based on genetically common building material (roots, affixes).

A whole series of joint lexical neoformations are represented by prefixal derivatives constructed according to a single model (Lith. *bè-* : Ukr. *бе3-*; Lith. *iš-* : Ukr. *3-*, *с-*). This is rather a variegated material semantically, but it shows the unity of Baltic and Slavonic in the use of common methods of morphological derivation of nominals and verbs. The multiplicity (it can be discussed even with a far from complete sample from dictionaries) of parallels shows not the sporadic use of etymologically common prefixes, but its systematicity, which also testifies to the relatively late chronology of contacts, the results of which have not yet been erased by later processes or innovations in Lithuanian and Ukrainian.

Textual analogues that demonstrate the same etymological composition in Lithuanian and Ukrainian are mostly phraseological units, stable word combinations with similar or identical ideological load. It is noteworthy that even a limited selection of phraseological units with two nuclear lexemes involved in the system of cultural associations and meanings (Lith. *akis* : Ukr. *око*; Lith. *širdis* : Ukr. *серце*), reveals not just common elements of the late Balto-Slavonic text; the practically identical ideological content of phrases in both languages (cf. Lith. *akis į akį* : Ukr. *віч на віч*; Lith. *už akių* : Ukr. dial. *уз очі*; Lith. *imti į širdį* : Ukr. *їм'ати в серце*) shows the significant depth of cultural interaction, which turned out to be so significant that it has survived to the present days (cf. in particular examples of elementary legal regulations: Lith. *savo būdu* : Ukr. *своїм бодом*). Often such stability is also explained by the comparatively late age of contacts (on the scale of linguistic history, a thousand or slightly more years is a very relative antiquity). The same situation is confirmed by common elements of texts belonging to other genres.

Lithuanian-Ukrainian typological analogies are unlikely to be accidental, primarily due to their systematic nature, which is usually a consequence of the design of common (right up to the smallest semiotic nuances) cultural experiences using identical semantic models. Even plot- and image-centred similar texts of spells, in which characters of Christian doctrine appear, could have emerged early in both languages based on a common pagan spell tradition and then just as early experienced the influence of Christianity.

The planned prospects for the development of ancient Balto-Slavonic linguistic relations, reproduced in the Lithuanian-Ukrainian separate parallels, with due attention to the material, can provide abundant material for theoretical generalizations.

REFERENCES

- Ambrasas Saulius 1993: *Daiktavardžių darybos raida 1: Lietuvių kalbos veiksmažodiniai vediniai*, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla.
- Ambrasas Saulius 2000: *Daiktavardžių darybos raida 2: Lietuvių kalbos vardažodiniai vediniai*, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.
- Anikin Aleksandr E. 1998: Аникин, Александр Е. *Этимология и балто-славянское лексическое сравнение в праславянской лексикографии. Материалы для балто-славянского словаря* [Ètimologija i balto-slavjanskoe leksičeskoe sravnenie v praslavjanskoj leksikografii. Materialy dlja balto-slavjanskogo slovarja], вып. [выр.] 1 (*a- – *go-), Новосибирск: РАН. СО; Институт филологии [Novosibirsk: RAN. SO; Institut filologii].

Balys Jonas 1937: Perkūnas lietuvių liaudies tikėjimuose. – *Tautosakos darbai* 3, 149–238.

Balys Jonas 1951: *Liaudies magija ir medicina*, Bloomington, Indiana: Lietuvių tautosakos lobynas II.

Baronas Jonas 1967: *Rusų–lietuvių kalbų žodynas / Русско–литовский словарь* [Russko–litovskij slovar'] 1, sudarytas, panaudojant spausdintą ir rankraštinę medžiagą, kurią surinko J. Baronas, par. V. Baronas, V. Galinis, Vilnius: Mintis.

Bezlaĳ France 1966: Einige slovenische und baltische lexische parallelen. – *Linguistica* 8(1), 63–81.

Brods'ka Kateryna A. 1979: Бродська, Катерина А. Усталені вислови в мові народних промислів [Ustaleni vyslovy v movi narodnych promysliv]. – *Сборник материалов научной конференции студентов КГПИ им. А. С. Пушкина* [Sbornik materialov naučnoj konferencii studentov KGPI im. A. S. Puškina], Кировоград: КГПИ [Kirovograd: KGPI], 33–35.

Būga Kazimieras 1958: *Rinkiniai raštai* 1, Vilnius: Politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla.

Čekman Valerij N. 1972: Чекман, Валерий Н. К проблеме литовско–белорусских лексических связей [K probleme litovsko–belorusskich leksičeskich svjazej]. – *Baltistica* 8(2), 147–156.

Dialektolohična anketa 2015: *Діалектологічна анкета (відповіді)* [Dialektolohična anketa (vidpovidi)], укл. Т. В. Громко [ukl. T. V. Hromko], Кировоград: БВ [Kirovograd: BV].

Efimenko Petr S., ed. 1874: Ефименко, Петр С., ред. *Сборник малороссийских заклинаний* [Sbornik malorossijskich zaklinanij], Москва: Университетская типография [Moskva: Universitetskaja tipografija].

Endzelīns Jānis 1971: *Darbu izlase četros sējums* 1, Rīga: Zinātne.

ESSJ II – *Этимологический словарь славянских языков. Праславянский лексический фонд* [Ètimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskich jazykov. Praslavjanskij leksičeskij fond] 2 (*bez – *bratrъ), ред. О. Н. Трубачёв [red. O. N. Trubačiov], Москва: Наука [Moskva: Nauka], 1975.

ESSJ III – *Этимологический словарь славянских языков. Праславянский лексический фонд* [Ètimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskich jazykov. Praslavjanskij leksičeskij fond] 3 (*bratrъсь – *cъrky), ред. О. Н. Трубачёв [red. O. N. Trubačiov], Москва: Наука [Moskva: Nauka], 1976.

ESSJ IV – *Этимологический словарь славянских языков. Праславянский лексический фонд* [Ètimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskich jazykov. Praslavjanskij leksičeskij fond] 4 (*čaběniti – *děl'a), ред. О. Н. Трубачёв [red. O. N. Trubačiov], Москва: Наука [Moskva: Nauka], 1977.

ESSJ VI – *Этимологический словарь славянских языков. Праславянский лексический фонд* [Ètimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskich jazykov. Praslavjanskij leksičeskij fond] 6 (*e – *golva), ред. О. Н. Трубачёв [red. O. N. Trubačiov], Москва: Наука [Moskva: Nauka], 1979.

ESSJ IX – *Этимологический словарь славянских языков. Праславянский лексический фонд* [Ètimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskich jazykov. Praslavjanskij leksičeskij fond] 9 (*jbz – *klenbje), ред. О. Н. Трубачёв [red. O. N. Trubačiov], Москва: Наука [Moskva: Nauka], 1983.

ESSJ XIII – *Этимологический словарь славянских языков. Праславянский лексический фонд* [Ètimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskich jazykov. Praslavjanskij leksičeskij fond] 13 (*kroměžirь – *kyžiti), ред. О. Н. Трубачёв [red. O. N. Trubačiov], Москва: Наука [Moskva: Nauka], 1987.

ESSJ XV – *Этимологический словарь славянских языков. Праславянский лексический фонд* [Ètimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskich jazykov. Praslavjanskij leksičeskij fond] 15 (*lětina – *lokačь), ред. О. Н. Трубачёв [red. O. N. Trubačiov], Москва: Наука [Moskva: Nauka], 1988.

ESSJ XVI – *Этимологический словарь славянских языков. Праславянский лексический фонд* [Ètimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskich jazykov. Praslavjanskij leksičeskij fond] 16 (*lokadlo – *lživьсь), ред. О. Н. Трубачёв [red. O. N. Trubačiov], Москва: Наука [Moskva: Nauka], 1990.

ESSJ XIX – *Этимологический словарь славянских языков. Праславянский лексический фонд* [Ètimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskich jazykov. Praslavjanskij leksičeskij fond] 19 (*męs'arь – *morzakь), ред. О. Н. Трубачёв [red. O. N. Trubačiov], Москва: Наука [Moskva: Nauka], 1992.

ESSJ XXV – *Этимологический словарь славянских языков. Праславянский лексический фонд* [Ètimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskich jazykov. Praslavjanskij leksičeskij fond] 25 (*neroditi – *novotьnъ(jb)), ред. О. Н. Трубачёв [red. O. N. Trubačiov], Москва: Наука [Moskva: Nauka], 1999.

ESUM I – *Етимологічний словник української мови 1 (А–Г)* [Etymolohičnyj slovnyk ukrajinskoji movy 1 (A–G)], ред. О. С. Мельничук [red. O. S. Mel'nyčuk], Київ: Наукова думка [Kyjiv: Naukova dumka], 1982.

ESUM III – *Етимологічний словник української мови 3 (Кора–М)* [Etymolohičnyj slovnyk ukrajinskoji movy 3 (Kora–M)], ред. О. С. Мельничук [red. O. S. Mel'nyčuk], Київ: Наукова думка [Kyjiv: Naukova dumka], 1989.

ESUM IV – *Етимологічний словник української мови 4 (Н–П)* [Etymolohičnyj slovnyk ukrajinskoji movy 4 (N–P)], ред. О. С. Мельничук [red. O. S. Mel'nyčuk], Київ: Наукова думка [Kyjiv: Naukova dumka], 2003.

ESUM V – *Етимологічний словник української мови 5 (Р–Т)* [Etymolohičnyj slovnyk ukrajinskoji movy 5 (R–T)], ред. О. С. Мельничук [red. O. S. Mel'nyčuk], Київ: Наукова думка [Kyjiv: Naukova dumka], 2006.

ESUM VI – *Етимологічний словник української мови 6 (У–Я)* [Etymolohičnyj slovnyk ukrajinskoji movy 6 (U–Ja)], ред. О. С. Мельничук [red. O. S. Mel'nyčuk], Київ: Наукова думка [Kyjiv: Naukova dumka], 2012.

Fraenkel Ernst 1962: *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch 1*, Heidelberg, Göttingen: Carl Winter and Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Fraenkel Ernst 1965: *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch 2*, Heidelberg, Göttingen: Carl Winter and Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Fžė – *Frazeologizmy žodynas*, par. I. Ermanytė, O. Kažukauskaitė, G. Naktinienė, Z. Šimėnaitė, A. Vilotytė, ред. J. Paulauskas, Lietuvių kalbos institutas, 2001, e. variantas. Available at: <https://www.lietuviuzodynas.lt/frazeologizmai>.

Galnaitytė Elzė, Pikčilingis Juozas, Sivickienė Marija 1989: *Mokyklinis lietuvių–rusų kalbų frazeologijos žodynas*, Kaunas: Šviesa.

Horox – Горох. Фразеологія [Horoch. Frazelohija], available online. Available at: <https://goroh.pp.ua>.

Hrinčenko Borys D. 1958: Грінченко, Борис Д. *Словарь української мови 1 (А–Ж)* [Slovar' ukrajinskoji movy 1 (A–Ž)], Київ: Вид-во АН УРСР [Kyjiv: Vyd-vo AN URSR].

Hromko Tetjana V. 2008: Громко, Тетяна В. *Діалектологічно-фольклорні матеріали говірок Центральної України* [Dialektolohično-fol'klornі materialy hovirok Central'noji Ukrajinu], Кіровоград: БВ [Kirovograd: BV].

Hromko Tetjana V. 2017: Громко, Тетяна В. Матеріали до словника говірок української мови [Materialy do slovnyka hovirok ukrajinskoji movy]. – *Наукові записки* [Naukovi zapysky], вип. [vyp.] 160, сер. *Філологічні науки: Studia semasiological* [ser. Filolohični nauky: Studia semasiologica], Кропивницький: ПБВ ЦДПУ ім. В. Винниченка [Kropyvnytsky: RVV CDPU im. V. Vinničenska], 239–253.

Iliadi Oleksandr I. 2013: Іліаді, Олександр І. З ономастичного архіву Інституту української мови НАНУ [Z onomastyčnogo archivu Instytutu ukrajinskojı movy NANU]. – *Studia linguistica et juridica*. 2012–2013: зб. наук. праць / відп. ред. О. І. Іліаді [zb. nauk. prac' / vidp. red. O. I. Iliadi], Кіровоград: КІРоЛ [Kirovograd: KIRoL], 137–149.

Iliadi Aleksander I. 2023: Slavo-Iranica II: Compound Words with Slav. *slav-, *slux-; Iran. *šraua-, *šrauša-, *šrūta- (against Baltic and Germanic Background). – *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 89, 39–74.

Ivanov Vjačeslav V., Toporov Vladimir N. 1974: Иванов, Вячеслав В., Топоров, Владимир Н. *Исследования в области славянских древностей (Лексические и фразеологические вопросы реконструкции текстов)* [Issledovanija v oblasti slavjanskich drevnostej (Leksičeskie i frazeologičeskie voprosy rekonstrukcii tekstov)], Москва: Наука [Moskva: Nauka].

Kregždys Rolandas 2012: Крегждис, Роландас. Данные к реконструкции балто-славянского похоронного обряда: кашуб. *donota* ‘молоко’ (лексико-семантические параллели балто-славянского ареала) [Dannye k rekonstrukcii balto-slavjanskogo pochoronnogo obrjada: kašub. *donota* ‘moloko’ (leksiko-semantičeskie paralleli balto-slavjanskogo areala)]. – *Studia mythologica slavica* 15, 217–230.

Labuda Gerard 1974: Ze stosunków językowych kaszubsko-pruskich. – *Słowianie w dziejach Europy: studia historyczne ku uczczeniu 75 rocznicy urodzin i 50-lecia pracy naukowej profesora Henryka Łowmiańskiego: tom przygotowany przez Jerzego Ochmańskiego*, Poznań: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu im. A. Mickiewicza, 75–83.

Laurinkenė Nijolė 2019: Лауринкене, Нийоле. Мифологический образ неба в балтийской традиции [Mifologičeskij obraz neba v baltijskoj tradicii]. – *Балто-славянские исследования* [Balto-slavjanskie issledovanija] 20: сборник научных трудов– [sbornik naučnych trudov], Москва: ООО «Буки Веди» [Moskva: ООО “Buki Vedi”], 292–316.

LD 1882 – *Lietuviškos dainos užrašytos par Antaną Juškevičę Velūnos apigardoje iš žodžių Lietuvių dainininku ir daininikiu / Литовскія народныя песни, записанныя Антоном Юшкевичем в окрестностях Велёны со слов литовских певцев и певиц* [Litovskija narodnija pesni, zapisannyja Antonom Juškevičem v okresnostjach Veliony so slov litovskich pevcev i pevic] 3: *Daina 1024–1569*, Казань, тип. Имп. ун-та [Kazan', tip. Imp. un-ta].

Leksykonу 1973: Лексикони Є. Славинецького та А. Корецького–Сатановського (Пам'ятки української мови XVII ст. Серія наукової літератури), підготував до видання В. В. Німчук [Leksykony È. Slavyneč'koho ta A. Korec'koho–Satanovs'koho

(Pamjatky ukrajinskoji movy XVII st. Serija naukoivoi literatury), pidhotuvav do vydannja V. V. Nimčuk], Київ: Наукова думка [Kyjiv: Naukova dumka].

Lyberis Antanas 1971: *Lietuvių-rusų kalbų žodynas*, red. Ch. Lemchenas, Vilnius: Mintis.

LKže – *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas* 1–20 (1941–2002), red. kolegija G. Naktinienė, J. Paulauskas, R. Petrokienė, V. Vitkauskas, J. Zabarskaitė, vyr. red. G. Naktinienė, e. variantas, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, 2008 (atnaujinta versija, 2018). Available at: <https://ekalba.lt/lietuviu-kalbos-zodynas/>.

Morkūnas Kazys, atsak. red., 1977: *Lietuvių kalbos atlasas 1: Leksika*, Vilnius: Moksas.

Непокупный Анатолий П. 1976: Непокупный, Анатолий П. *Балто-севернославянские языковые связи* [Balto-severnoslavjanskije jazykovyje svjazi], Киев: Наукова думка [Kiev: Naukova dumka].

Непокупный Анатолий П. 1979: Непокупный, Анатолий П. *Балтійські родичі слов'ян* [Baltijski rodyči slovjan], Київ: Наукова думка [Kyjiv: Naukova dumka].

Непокупный Анатолий П. 1981: Непокупный, Анатолий П. *Балтійсько-українські взаємозв'язки і паралелі* [Baltijsko-ukrajinski vzaëmozv'jazky i paraleli]. – *Гідронімія України в її міжмовних і міждіалектних зв'язках* [Hidronimiija Ukrajinu v jiji mižmovnych i miždialektnych zvjazkach], відп. ред. О. С. Стрижак [vidp. red. O. S. Stryžak], Київ: Наукова думка [Kyjiv: Naukova dumka], 65–84.

Непокупный Анатолий П. 2002: Непокупный, Анатолий П. Куршско-прусский суффикс собирательности *-or-*: лит. (жем.) оз. *Béržoras* и прус. *paucoran* Е 6 'Плеяды' [Kurško-prusskij suffiks sobiratel'nosti *-or-*: lit. (žem.) oz. *Béržoras* i prus. *paucoran* Е 6 'Plejady']. – *Jono Kazlauskio diena: istorinės gramatikos dalykai. Tarptautinės konferencijos programa ir tezės*, Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla, 23–25.

Непокупный Анатолий П. 2013: Непокупный, Анатолий П. Балто-слов'янський суфікс збірності *-or-* / *-arь* [Balto-slovjanskij sufiks zbirnosti *-or-* / *-arь*]. – *Індоєвропейська спадщина в лексиці слов'янських, балтійських, германських і романських мов: семантичні та словотвірні зв'язки і процеси* [Indoevropska spadščyna v leksyici slovjanskich, baltijskich, hermanskich i romanskich mov: semantyčni ta slovotvirni zvjazky i procesy], відп. ред. В. П. Пономаренко [vidp. Red. V. P. Ponomarenko], Київ: Видавничий дім Дмитра Бураго [Kyjiv: Vydavnyčij dim Dmytra Buraho], 208–218.

Nevskaja Lidija G. 1977: Невская, Лидия Г. *Балтийская географическая терминология* (к семантической типологии) [Baltijskaja geografičeskaja terminologija (k semantičeskoj tipologii)], Москва: Наука [Moskva: Nauka].

Nevskaja Lidija G. 1982: Невская, Лидия Г. Семантика дома и смежных представлений в погребальном фольклоре [Semantika doma i smežnych predstavlenij v pogrebal'nom folklore]. – *Балто-славянские исследования – 1981* [Balto-slavianskie issledovanija – 1981], отв. ред. В. В. Иванов [otv. red. V. V. Ivanov], Москва: Наука [Moskva: Nauka], 106–121.

Nikovskij Andrij 1927: Ніковський, Андрій. *Словник українсько-російський* [Slovnýk ukrajinsko-rosijský], Київ: Горно [Kyjiv: Horno].

Nomys Matvij T. 1993: Номис, Матвій Т. *Українські приказки, прислів'я і таке інше* [Ukrajinski prykazky, pryslivja i take inše], упоряд., приміт. та вступна ст. М. М. Пазяка [uporjad., prymyt. ta vstupna st. M. M. Pazjaka], Київ: Либідь [Kyjiv: Lybid'].

Onyškevyč Mychajlo J. 1984: Онишкевич, Михайло Й. *Словник бойківських говірок 1 (А–Н)* [Slovnýk bojkivských hovirok 1 (A–N)], Київ: Наукова думка [Kyjiv: Naukova dumka].

Popowska-Taborska Hanna 1991: Z rozważań nad językowymi związkami prusko-pomorskimi. – *Rocznik Slawistyczny* 47(1), 59–67.

Sławski Franciszek 1974: Zarys słowotwórstwa prasłowiańskiego. – *Słownik prasłowiański 1 (A–B)*, pod red. F. Sławskiego, Wrocław, Warszawa etc.: Wydawnictwo Polskiej akademii nauk, 43–141.

Sławski Franciszek 1976: Zarys słowotwórstwa prasłowiańskiego (ciąg dalszy). – *Słownik prasłowiański 2 (C–DAVBNOTA)*, pod red. F. Sławskiego, Wrocław, Warszawa etc.: Wydawnictwo Polskiej akademii nauk, 13–60.

Sławski Franciszek, ed., 1979: *Słownik prasłowiański 3 (DAVBŃB–DOBŖRATI)*, pod red. F. Sławskiego, Wrocław, Warszawa etc.: Wydawnictwo Polskiej akademii nauk.

Slovar' 1966 – *Словарь русских народных говоров* [Slovar' russkich narodnych govorov] 2 (Ба–Блазниться) [(Ba–Blaznit'sja)], гл. ред. Ф. П. Филин [gl. red. F. P. Filin], Москва, Ленинград: Наука [Moskva, Leningrad: Nauka].

Slovnýk 1979: *Словник гідронімів України* [Slovnýk hidronimiv Ukrajinu], Київ: Наукова думка [Kyjiv: Naukova dumka].

Smoczyński Wojciech 2019: *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego*, współpraca redakcyjna M. Oślon, wydanie drugie, poprawione i znacznie rozszerzone, na prawach rękopisu. Available at: [www.rromanes.org/pub/alii/Smoczyński W. Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego.pdf](http://www.rromanes.org/pub/alii/Smoczyński%20W.%20Słownik%20etymologiczny%20języka%20litewskiego.pdf).

Subačius Giedrius, par., 1993: *Didysis lenkų–lietuvių kalbų žodynas 1*, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla.

Svencickij Ilarion 1912: Свенціцький, Іларіон. Похоронні голосіння [Pochoronni holosinnja]. – *Етнографічний збірник Наукового товариства імені Шевченка* [Etnografičnyj zbirnyk Naukovoho tovarystva imeni Ševčenko] 31–32, Львів: Друкарня НТШ [L'viv: Drukarnja NTŠ], 1–129.

Топоров Владимир Н. 1985: Топоров, Владимир Н. Мифологизированные описания обряда трупосожжения и его происхождение у балтов и славян [Mifologizirovannye opisanija obrjada truposožženija i ego proischoždenie u baltov i slavjan]. – *Конференция «Балто-славянские этнокультурные и археологические древности. Погребальный обряд»*: тезисы докладов [Konferencija “Balto-slavjanskije ètnokul'turnye i archeologičeskie drevnosti. Pogrebal'nyj obrjad”: tezisy dokladov], Москва: Институт славяноведения и балканистики АН СССР [Moskva: Institut slavjanovedenija i balkanistiki AN SSSR], 95–107.

Топоров Владимир Н. 2010a: Топоров, Владимир Н. Балтийские и славянские данные о бобре в мифологической перспективе (опыт реконструкции) [Baltijskie i slavjanskije dannye o bobre v mifologičeskoj perspektive (opyt rekonstrukcii)]. – *Исследования по этимологии и семантике 4: балтийские и славянские языки* [Issledovanija po ètimologii i semantike 4: baltijskije i slavjanskije jazyki] 1, Москва: Языки славянских культур [Moskva: Jazyki slavjanskich kul'tur], 185–240.

Топоров Владимир Н. 2010b: Топоров, Владимир Н. К реконструкции одного балтийского ритуального термина [K rekonstrukcii odnogo baltijskogo ritual'nogo termina]. – *Исследования по этимологии и семантике 4: балтийские и славянские языки* [Issledovanija po ètimologii i semantike baltijskie i slavjanskije jazyki] 2, сер. *Opera etymologica. Звук и смысл* [ser. Opera etymologica. Zvuk i smysl], Москва: Языки славянских культур [Moskva: Jazyki slavjanskich kul'tur], 386–397.

Trautmann Reinhold 1923: *Baltisch-Slawisches Wörterbuch*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Užčenko Viktor D., Užčenko Dmytro V. 1998: Ужченко, Віктор Д., Ужченко, Дмитро В. *Фразеологічний словник української мови* [Frazеolohičnyj slovnyk sučasnoji ukrajinskoji movy], Київ: Освіта [Kyjiv: Osvita].

Užčenko Viktor D., Užčenko Dmytro V. 2005: Ужченко, Віктор Д., Ужченко, Дмитро В. *Фразеологія сучасної української мови: посібник* [Frazеolohija sučasnoji ukrajinskoji movy: posibnyk], Луганськ: Альма-матер [Luhans'k: Al'ma-mater].

Užčenko Viktor D., Užčenko Dmytro V. 2013: Ужченко, Віктор Д., Ужченко, Дмитро В. *Фразеологічний словник східнослов'янських і степових говірок Донбасу* [Frazеolohičny slovnyk schidnoslobožanskyh i stepovyh hovirok Donbasu], вид. 6-е, доповн. й переробл. [vyd. 6-e, dopovn. j pererobl.], Луганськ: ЛНУ імені Тараса Шевченка [Luhans'k: LNU imeni Tarasa Ševčenko].

Zahadky – *Загадки про місяць* [Zahadki pro misjac’], available online. Available at: <https://dovidka.biz.ua/zagadki-pro-misyats/>.

Zinkevičius Zigmās 1966: *Lietuvių dialektologija: lyginamoji tarmių fonetika ir morfologija* (su 75 žemėlapiais), Vilnius: Mintis.

Žalovannaja gramota 1854: Жалованная грамота Льва Даниловича князя Галицкого епископии Перемыской (1302 года) [Žalovannaja gramota L’va Daniloviča knjazja Galickogo episkopii Peremyskoj (1302 goda)]. – *Хрестоматия церковнословенская и древнерусская в пользу учеников высшей гимназии* [Chrestomatija cerkovnoslovenskaja i drevnerusskaja v pol’zu učenikov vysšej gimnazii], сост. Я. Головацкий [sost. J. Golovackij], Виден: Накладом правительства [Viden: Nakladom pravitel’sstva], 316–317.

Želechivs’kij Jevhenij I. 1886: Желехівський, Євгеній І. *Малорусько-німецький словар 1 (А–О)* [Malorus’ko-nimec’kij slovar 1 (A–O)], Львів: Друкарня тов. ім. Шевченка [L’viv: Drukarnja tom. im. Ševčenka].

Želechivs’kij Jevhenij I., Nedil’skij Sofron G. 1886: Желехівський, Євгеній І., Недільський, Софрон Г. *Малорусько-німецький словар 2 (П–Я)* [Malorus’ko-nimec’kij slovar 2 (P–Ja)], Львів: Друкарня тов. ім. Шевченка [L’viv: Drukarnja tom. im. Ševčenka].

Lietuvių ir ukrainiečių kalbų paralelės: etimologinis ryšys ir tipologinis panašumas

SANTRAUKA

Straipsnis patvirtina svarbią atskirų paralelių egzistavimo lietuvių ir ukrainiečių kalbose hipotezę. Bendrų abiejų kalbų arealo ribų nebuvimas parodė, kad yra išlikę bendrų kalbos relikto iš senųjų baltų ir slavų tarmių kalbėtojų kontaktų epochos. Lietuvių-ukrainiečių izoglosų savitumas pasirodė esąs rytų slavų ir dabartinių lietuvių protėvių glaudžios kalbinės sąveikos rezultatas teritorijoje, kurią apibrėžia Dniepro aukštupio intakų tinklas. Autoriai pateikė keletą lietuvių ir ukrainiečių kalbų sistemų lygmenų pavyzdžių – leksinio, žodžių darybos ir teksto (genetiškai bendros struktūros frazių). Bandymas identifikuoti etimologines koreliacijas leksiniu lygmeniu rodo tam tikrą teminių atitikmenų „išplitimą“, jų priklausymą keletui teminių grupių. Bendrieji pastebėjimai yra šie: bendrosios socialinės terminijos elementai (liet. *draūgalas* : ukr. *дру́го́лук*; liet. *pusbrolis* : senoji ukrainiečių kalba *Полбрать*); techniniai terminai (sen. lietuvių (?) **šovėj(a)s*/**sovėj(a)s* : slavų **savějbnikv*;

liet. *kilpa* : ukr. [чойн]; liet. *virbų tvorà* : ukr. *вербова тварь*); bendros naujovės geografinės nomenklatūros srityje, pagrįstos genetiškai įprasta darybine medžiaga (šaknimis, afiksais), pvz., pagal vieną modelį sudaryti priešdėlio vediniai (liet. *bė-* : ukr. *бєз-*; liet. *iš-* : ukr. *з-*, *с-*).

Įrodyta, kad frazeologiniai vienetai, pastovieji žodžių junginiai, turintys panašų ar identišką ideologinį krūvį, reprezentuoja tą pačią lietuvių ir ukrainiečių kalbų etimologinę sudėtį (plg. liet. *akis į akį* : ukr. *віч на віч*; liet. *už akių* : ukr. dial. *уз очі*; liet. *imti į širdį* : ukr. *їм'яти в серце*).

Analogiškus kalbinius vienetus abiejose kalbose galima paaiškinti ir glaudžia kultūrine Lietuvos ir Ukrainos sąveika.

Įteikta 2024 m. rugpjūčio 27 d.

OLEKSANDRA V. POPOVA

*The State institution "South Ukrainian National
Pedagogical University named after K. D. Ushynsky"*
26, Staroportofrankivska Str.
65020, Ukraine, Odesa
alex-popova@ukr.net

OLGA A. KOPUS

*The State institution "South Ukrainian National
Pedagogical University named after K. D. Ushynsky"*
26, Staroportofrankivska Str.
65020, Ukraine, Odesa
kopus@pdp.edu.ua

OLEKSANDRA O. MORHUN

*The State institution "South Ukrainian National
Pedagogical University named after K. D. Ushynsky"*
26, Staroportofrankivska Str.
65020, Ukraine, Odesa
morhun.alekssa@gmail.com