

Different Slavic Languages

Sh. K. Majidova

Lecturer, Department of Philology and Language Teaching, International Innovation University

Abstract:

The article is devoted to the consideration of the lexical typology of Slavic languages. It is noted that a certain part of their vocabulary is of Proto-Slavic origin, thanks to which Slavs from different countries can understand each other to a certain extent. Over the centuries, the vocabulary of Slavic languages has developed and been enriched largely through borrowings. This process continues actively today, leading to new universals.

Keywords: vocabulary, typology, Slavic, universals, individualities, innovations, borrowings.

Vocabulary is the most dynamic level of language and fully reflects the state and nature of the historical development of peoples and their cultures. Moreover, unlike other levels of language, vocabulary quickly responds to all changes in the surrounding life. One of the ancient cultural codes reflected in the vocabulary is also the weekly calendar as part of the calendar vocabulary - the designation of the days of the week and the general name of the latter.

There is no complete unity in the designation of the concept “seven days” today in different Slavic languages, as evidenced by the data in its designation. Let’s compare week in the meaning of “seven days” and Sunday in the meaning of “day off” in Russian with the corresponding words of other Slavic languages: tizh-deni nedilya (Ukrainian) - tydzeni nyadziela (Belarusian) - tydzień and niedziela (Polish) - týdeni neděle (Czech) - tyždeňi nedel’a (Slovak) - week and week (Bulgarian) - tjedan nedjelja (Croatian).

As you can see, in Slavic languages the designation for seven days began to differ, but it is significant that all designations are also represented by Slavic roots. It is noteworthy that the word week as the only designation of seven days is used only in the Russian language, and it represents a typological feature of the Russian language. Note that in the Bulgarian language, along with sedmitsa, the word week is also used in a more peripheral status, but the main load in this nomination falls on the word sedmitsa. The fact that the word week previously in Russian meant and today in other Slavic languages means a day off, a non-working day, is reflected in its

morphemic composition: weekly, non-doing, i.e. idle. The word week is etymologically a calque of the Greek *απρα κτός*. The old meaning of the word week in Russian as the name of the day of rest was preserved only in church terminology in the stable phrase Fomina week in the meaning of the seventh day of the post-Easter seven-day week. Only in the Russian language is the name of the day of rest Sunday used, and this is a unique feature of the Russian language among other Slavic languages.

The names of the days of the week in other Slavic languages are represented by the same Slavic words, with the exception of the word Saturday, which at the dawn of Slavic writing penetrated into all Slavic languages.

The last day of the week, as noted above, is implemented differently in the Russian language, in which it is designated by the word Sunday, and in other Slavic languages, which have retained the old designation week with some phonetic vowels. The Russian designation for the day of rest, Sunday, appeared in the weekly calendar after the adoption of Christianity in Rus' and represents an interesting case of transferring the name from an event to the time when it took place: the name of the day of the church holiday Easter, free from work, switched to a day of rest within the framework of the seven-day week, the day, generally free from work throughout the year. This transfer was also facilitated by the use of the word week in Russian to designate a seven-day period, since the homonymy that arose in designating a day of the week free from work and at the same time a seven-day period was undesirable and had to be eliminated.

Thus, a comparative analysis of words from different lexical-semantic groups of modern Slavic languages makes it possible to see the commonality of many lexical units, the history of which dates back to the Proto-Slavic, and in some cases to the earlier, Indo-European period. In this case, attention should be paid to the commonality in most cases of both the meaning and the form of expression of lexical units.

In a number of cases, the following phenomenon is observed: the form of expression of a lexical unit in different Slavic languages is completely the same, but these words are not the same in meaning, for example, Russian chairs, Czech stůl meaning table.

Also interesting are the cases of the existence of the same words in different Slavic languages, the meanings of which are not only not equivalent, but also not at all correlative in meaning: for example, the Russian word arrogant, which in modern language has the meaning extremely impudent, impudently shameless [7. P. 341]. However, in modern Czech it means sudden, quick. In the Macedonian (South Slavic) language today there is an adverb meaning quickly, sharply. At the same time, we note that in the Old Russian language the adjective arrogant functioned in the meaning of fast, and it is found in ancient Russian monuments, in particular, in the "Tale of Igoev's Host". In this word in different Slavic languages it is possible to identify (sometimes with a stretch) a common seme "quick", which creates something common in meaning: impudence, as a rule, manifests itself with speed. Therefore, it is not surprising that in other Slavic languages today the functioning of this word in its old meaning is noted: cf. insolent in the meaning of sudden, sudden in the Ukrainian language, as well as in Czech, Slovak, Polish, in both Sorbian languages, in which it retains its old meaning of sudden, quick. At M.V. Lomonosov in the ode "On the day of Empress Elizabeth Petrovna's accession to the throne" (XVIII century) we read: "You impudent whirlwinds, do not dare...". In a number of Russian dialects, the old meaning of this word remains today.

In the dictionaries of modern Slavic languages, there are also words that sound the same or almost the same, but at the same time have completely opposite meanings. In other words, the Slavic word itself has been preserved, but a significant semantic shift in its meaning led to antonymy. Examples from the Czech language are especially illustrative: let us give such a textbook example as stale bread (Russian) meaning stale bread, dried out and čerstvýchléb (Czech) meaning fresh bread. In

various Slavic languages, the Russian word fruit is equivalent to the nouns ovocie (Slovak), ovoce (Czech), owoc (Polish), ovôčje (Slovenian), vegetable (Bulgar), vegetable (Maked). As for the word fruit in Russian, which means sweet fruits, it is a borrowing from Peter's time; the monuments even record the exact date of this borrowing - 1705. If the Russian word vegetables means unsweetened fruits, then the same word in various Slavic languages, unlike Russian, means fruits, i.e. sweet fruits. It is interesting to note that the Ukrainian vocabulary includes the word ovojch vegetable , denoting not only vegetables as unsweetened fruits, but also fruits in general, as well as fruits.

In the above Slavic languages, to denote the concept of unsweetened fruits, corresponding to the Russian vegetables, old Slavic words with the same root are used, but in some cases with different word-forming affixes: cf. zelenina in the western group and zelenchuk in the southern group. The above allows us to conclude that some Proto-Slavic words in different Slavic languages retained only their form, and the semantic shift made them in many ways different words, despite the same form. As noted in the literature, "...unlike grammar and phonetics that have been changing for centuries, lexical semantics changes very quickly: within the memory of one generation of native speakers, words appear and disappear, lose their meanings and acquire new ones" [8. P. 8].

The commonality of many lexical units in Slavic languages becomes more visible when turning to Russian dialect vocabulary. Thus, in the Northern Great Russian dialects there are many words that are not in the modern Russian literary language, but these lexical units can be found in the dictionaries of certain Slavic literary languages. In the Russian dialect language - in Arkhangelsk, Olonets and other dialects - the old Slavic word loni , which had a meaning last year, has been preserved. This word is comparable to Czech loni , Polish, also Upper and Lower Sorbian łoni , Slovenian lani , as well as Bulgarian, Macedonian, Serbian lani. It is significant that in all Slavic languages this word has the same meaning. Let us also compare such words as Czech houba , Slovak huba , Bulgarian гъба , Slovenian goba in the meaning of mushroom with the corresponding Russian dialect word gubas the same meaning in Arkhangelsk, Perm, Kostroma, Yaroslavl dialects. In Vologda dialects, the word gubina is also observed in a broader meaning, namely, not only mushrooms, but berries . Also interesting is the Bulgarian word gunya , guna , denoting a type of outer peasant clothing, usually white. This word has been preserved in the dialect Serbian language (гуња) already in the meaning of men's clothing, lined with leather or sewn from sheepskin; in the vocabulary of the Macedonian language the noun гуњав has also been preserved in the meaning of a peasant jacket (made of coarse cloth).

It is interesting to note that this word, despite its absence in the Russian literary language, functions in different Russian dialects, and the form of the word is preserved when expressing different meanings or shades of meaning: for example, gunka (Tula and Oryol) in the meaning of a woman's shirt, gunya (Zaonezhskoe) in the meaning clean clothes and even gunye (Arkhangelsk) - old junk, rags, cast-offs. The word gunka (tavern) also has this latter meaning in a 17th-century work. "The Tale of Misfortune , " which is a recording of a folklore work, and therefore characterized by closeness to the folk language. By the way, these correspondences very definitely confirm the old position put forward at one time by R.I. Avanesov: dialectology as a science helps to understand the structure of the national language [1. P. 226].

Lexical correspondences in the dictionaries of different Slavic languages, dating back to the Proto-Slavic lexical fund, are found among words of different parts of speech. The above lexical correspondences were represented mainly by nouns. No less lexical correspondences of Proto-Slavic origin are found in the circle of adjectives. Thus, the Russian adjective beautiful correlates with the word beautiful with the same meaning in the Bulgarian language, and in the South Slavic Macedonian language, which is closest to Bulgarian, it corresponds to the adjective krasen. Here the latter already correlates with the Czech (West Slavic) word krásný . In ancient times, the concept of

“beautiful” was conveyed by the adjective red in the Russian language; it is not without reason that it appears in folk tales, phraseological units, proverbs and sayings - the maiden is beautiful; The hut is red not in its corners, but in its pies, etc. And that’s why the old main square in Moscow is called Red Square.

Genetically related and to a certain extent coinciding in different Slavic languages, and perhaps not in all of them, are the words of all significant parts of speech, the relationship of which is not always visible due to centuries-old historical changes. However, service words are also quite comparable, for example, prepositions and prefixes (cf. Russian, Bulgarian and Macedonian *pod*, Czech *pod*), conjunctions (compare the Russian conjunction *if* and Czech *jestli*). Let us note that the conditional union *isli*, completely equivalent in form to the corresponding modern Czech *union*, is found in Russian monuments of the first quarter of the 18th century, for example, in the “Letters and Papers of Peter the Great”. Typologically comparable in the circle of function words and particles: cf. Russian *already*, *bolg* . *already*, Czech . *už* . Along with universal features, one can also see individualities here : let’s compare the Russian modal particle *zhe* and the same word in the Czech language *že*, which acts as a subordinating conjunction in an explanatory subordinate clause.

An interesting phenomenon is the typology of interjections in different Slavic languages: equivalence is also observed in the circle of interjections, but to a lesser extent, which is associated with the mentality of the native language people, with the emotional side of their life, which manifests itself differently even among closely related peoples. Let us present correlative interjections from different Slavic languages, both in the expressed meaning and in form: such interjections are *akh* (Russian), *akh* (Macedonian), *ach* (Czech), etc. However, there are also many cases of inconsistency in the form of interjections expressing the same thing and the same meaning: for example, the Russian interjection *eiso* is related in meaning and is completely incompatible in form with the interjection *bre* (Bul ., Macedonia) and *hola* (Czech).

An interesting typology is observed in the rich Slavic anthroponymy, which has a centuries-old history. From the 9th century The Eastern Slavs adopted Christianity and Christian names penetrated them, the overwhelming majority of which became firmly established in the anthroponymic vocabulary. At the same time, the Slavic languages did not accept these canonical names mechanically, but adapted them, as is natural, to their phonetic and grammatical systems. Thus, the Greek male name *George* in different Slavic languages acquired the following form: *Georgi* (Bulgarian) - *Georgi*, *Chorchi* (Serbian , Maked .) - *Jíří* (Czech) - *Jerzy* (Polish) - *George*, *Yuri*, *Egor* (three different names in Russian anthroponymy !).

Currently, starting from the end of the 20th and beginning of the 21st centuries, a new situation is emerging in the lexical systems of various Slavic languages due to the widespread entry into the life of society of new realities, in particular, computers and computer technologies, the Internet, new means of communication, for example, mobile, new media, television. All this leads to innovations in Slavic languages, which are reflected primarily in vocabulary. The vocabulary of Slavic languages includes foreign words, mainly Anglicisms, or rather Americanisms, which tend to be preserved in these languages. In this sense, new close parallels are already emerging in the lexical systems of different Slavic languages, since the source of borrowing is most often the same: cf. the Bulgarian and Macedonian verb *alarmra* (to sound the alarm) from the English *alarm* and the Czech verb *alarmovat* with the same meaning, but some phonetic differences arise between them.

Such borrowings are the result of the cultural factor. Most often these are nouns (84%), which, having entered a new language system, are mastered phonetically, acquire the status of semantically independent words and become the basis for the formation of new words. Such derivatives (Russianisms, Bohemianisms, Bulgarianisms, etc.) already become a fact of the vocabulary of a particular Slavic language, enriching it with new words. Thus, in the Bulgarian language in recent years, new words have appeared that are already to a certain extent Bulgarianisms, because they

arose on Bulgarian soil and according to the grammatical norms of the Bulgarian language, for example, *mobifoniz* mobile phone, etc. Among such new words is the noun *mobil*, which has entered the Czech vocabulary, meaning mobile phone. Phenomena of the same order are reflected in any Slavic language; as an example, we will give the latest borrowings into the Russian language of words related, for example, to computer terminology - *blog*, *blogger*, *site*, *file*, *cursor*, etc.

Summing up the results of our consideration, we note that the 21st century, the century of new technologies and communication systems, scientific discoveries, innovations in various areas of life, is just beginning, and time will show new universals and individuals in the lexical systems of Slavic languages, which appeared as a result of internationalization. However, it is clearer than anything that the Proto-Slavic words, preserved to this day in all Slavic languages, are destined for a long life.

LITERATURE

1. Аванесов Р.И. Вопросы фонетической системы русских говоров и литературного языка // Известия АН СССР, ОЛЯ. Т. VI. Вып. III, 1947.
2. Гудков Д.Б. Теория и практика межкультурной коммуникации. М.: Гнозис, 2003.
3. Лер-Сплавинский Т. Польский язык. М.: Иностранная литература, 1954.
4. Меркулова И.А. Проблемы сопоставительного изучения лексики славянских языков // Вестник ВГУ. Серия: лингвистика и межкультурная коммуникация. 2014. № 1.
5. Мечковская Н.Б. Общее языкознание. Структурная и социальная типология языков. М.: Флинта, 2001.
6. Мейе А. Общеславянский язык. М., 1951.
7. Ожегов С.И. Словарь русского языка. М.: Русский язык, 1978.
8. Рахилина Е.В., Резникова Т.С. О работе Московской лексико-типологической группы // Проблемы лексико-семантической типологии. Вып. 1. ВГУ, 2011.
9. Трубачев О.Н. Принципы построения этимологических словарей славянских языков // Вопросы языкознания. 1957. № 5.
10. Фасмер М. Этимологический словарь русского языка. М.: Прогресс, 1986.
11. Ходова К.И. Языковое родство славянских языков. М., 1960.
12. Цейтлин Р.М. Лексика славянских языков X—XI — XIV—XV вв. (результат сопоставительного исследования) // Славянское языкознание. X Межд. съезд славистов. М.: Наука, 1990.