Shared Vocabulary and Grammatical Influences Between Russian and Lithuanian

https://orcid.org/0009-0001-5471-6210

Gerda Urbaite
Euro-Global Journal of Linguistics and Language Education

Keywords	Abstract
linguistic contact language preservation shared vocabulary grammatical influence Lithuanian resistance	The linguistic relationship between Russian and Lithuanian is shaped by centuries of cultural and political interaction, resulting in a complex blend of shared vocabulary and subtle grammatical influences. This study analyzes key areas where Russian has left its mark on Lithuanian, particularly in governance, everyday life, and technology, while highlighting how Lithuanian has adapted these borrowings through phonetic and semantic shifts. Despite extensive contact, Lithuanian has retained its unique grammatical features, demonstrating significant resistance to external influences. The article also explores the sociopolitical factors that fueled language preservation efforts, particularly during the 20th century, and examines the broader cultural implications of this linguistic exchange. The findings underscore the significance of linguistic resilience and the ongoing efforts to maintain linguistic purity in the Baltic region, serving as a testament to the enduring power of cultural identity.

1. Introduction

The intricate relationship between Russian and Lithuanian languages has evolved over centuries, shaped by a dynamic historical and geographical context. Positioned along the Baltic Sea, Lithuania's strategic location has made it a site of significant cultural and political interactions with neighboring powers, including Russia. The shared history between these nations, marked by periods of coexistence and conflict, has inevitably led to substantial linguistic exchanges. During the Russian Empire's rule and the Soviet era, Russian influence permeated many aspects of Lithuanian society, including language. This prolonged contact has resulted in shared vocabulary, linguistic borrowing, and mutual grammatical influences, though not without resistance and efforts to maintain linguistic purity (Vaicekauskienė & Vyšniauskienė, 2019).

The Baltic region's multilingual landscape has further contributed to this linguistic interdependence. Despite the influences, Lithuanian has managed to preserve unique features due to its status as one of the most conservative Indo-European languages. Yet, the impact of Russian remains evident, especially in terms of borrowed vocabulary and syntactic structures. Understanding these shared elements provides insights into the broader implications of language contact and how languages evolve through cultural and political pressures (Dabašinskienė & Krivickaitė-Leišienė, 2019).

Purpose of the Study

The primary objective of this article is to explore and analyze the shared vocabulary and grammatical influences between Russian and Lithuanian. By examining the extent and nature of these linguistic exchanges, the study seeks to shed light on how historical events have shaped the languages. This exploration will not only reveal the linguistic borrowing processes but also highlight the mechanisms of resistance and adaptation that have preserved Lithuanian's unique linguistic identity. The analysis will provide a comprehensive understanding of how these languages influence each other and the sociolinguistic factors at play.

Research Questions

1. **What are the main categories of shared vocabulary between Russian and Lithuanian?**

   o   This question aims to categorize and analyze the types of vocabulary borrowed or shared between the two languages, focusing on semantic fields such as governance, everyday life, and technology.

2. **How have historical events influenced grammatical similarities and differences between these languages?**

   o   This question explores the impact of historical and sociopolitical interactions on the grammatical structures of both languages, examining cases of influence and the preservation of linguistic uniqueness.

2. Historical and Cultural Context

Overview of Linguistic Contact

The linguistic relationship between Russian and Lithuanian has been profoundly shaped by centuries of interaction, marked by complex layers of cultural, political, and economic exchange. Lithuania's geographical position as a bridge between Eastern Europe and the Baltic region placed it at the crossroads of various linguistic influences, with Russian being one of the most dominant. The earliest significant period of contact dates back to the 18th and 19th centuries when Lithuania was absorbed into the Russian Empire. During this time, Russian was imposed as the official language of administration, education, and public life, leading to widespread bilingualism among the Lithuanian elite and increasing exposure to Russian vocabulary in everyday speech.

Trade routes connecting the Baltic region to the vast Russian hinterland further facilitated linguistic borrowing. Lithuanian merchants and traders often interacted with Russian-speaking counterparts, exchanging not only goods but also linguistic elements. Words related to commerce and trade, such as *rublis* (from the Russian *рубль*, meaning "ruble") and *mužikas* (from *мужик*, meaning "peasant"), became part of the Lithuanian lexicon, reflecting the practical need for mutual intelligibility in economic exchanges.

Cultural contact extended beyond trade, influencing social practices and even religious language. The Russian Orthodox Church established a presence in Lithuania, introducing ecclesiastical terms that left an imprint on the Lithuanian religious lexicon. Despite these borrowings, Lithuanian remained distinct in its structure, holding onto its rich Indo-European heritage. The resilience of the Lithuanian language, even as it absorbed Russian elements, highlights the complexity of this linguistic interplay.

Influence of Sociopolitical Factors

The influence of Russian on Lithuanian language structure became particularly pronounced during the 19th and 20th centuries, under both the Russian Empire and the Soviet Union. During the Russian Empire's rule, aggressive Russification policies aimed to suppress Lithuanian culture and language. Schools were forced to teach in Russian, and the publication of Lithuanian texts in the Latin alphabet was banned between 1864 and 1904, a period known as the Lithuanian Press Ban. As a result, Russian lexical and grammatical elements began to seep into the language, even as Lithuanians covertly resisted by distributing books printed in Lithuanian abroad and smuggling them into the country.

In the Soviet era, the imposition of Russian as the lingua franca of governance and education further accelerated language borrowing. Soviet policies sought to homogenize linguistic practices across the republics, with Russian as the unifying language. Consequently, numerous Russian terms related to government, technology, and scientific advancements entered the Lithuanian language. For instance, words like *telefonas* (from the Russian *телефон*, meaning "telephone") and *kompiuteris* (from *компьютер*, meaning "computer") were adopted, reflecting the socio-political reality of Soviet technological and administrative dominance.

Beyond vocabulary, sociopolitical pressure influenced syntax and sentence structure in subtle ways. For example, the tendency to use certain Russian-inspired constructions in formal and bureaucratic Lithuanian language was observed, though these influences often remained confined to specific registers. The linguistic landscape of Lithuania became a site of tension between assimilation and preservation, with efforts to maintain linguistic purity intensifying as a form of cultural resistance. Despite the dominance of Russian, Lithuanian language activists and scholars worked tirelessly to preserve and standardize the language, ensuring that borrowed elements did not erode its grammatical foundations.

The linguistic legacy of this period is complex. While Russian undoubtedly left a significant imprint on the Lithuanian lexicon and influenced certain structural elements, the resilience of Lithuanian as a distinct language attests to a deep cultural and national pride that resisted complete assimilation. Even today, linguistic purism movements in Lithuania emphasize the importance of minimizing Russian borrowings, reflecting a historical consciousness of the struggle to preserve national identity through language.

3. Shared Vocabulary Analysis

Loanwords and Borrowings

The exchange of vocabulary between Russian and Lithuanian is a testament to the deep historical ties and prolonged periods of sociopolitical interaction between the two languages. Loanwords in Lithuanian from Russian span various semantic fields, reflecting the domains where Russian influence was most pronounced, particularly governance, everyday life, and technology.

1. **Governance and Administration**: Many terms related to governance entered Lithuanian during the periods of Russian dominance. Words like *valstybė* (meaning "state") have Slavic roots, although this word has been naturalized in Lithuanian. Another notable borrowing is *gubernatorius* (from the Russian *губернатор*, meaning "governor"), a term that reflects the administrative hierarchy established during the Russian Empire.

2. **Everyday Life and Social Concepts**: Everyday vocabulary also bears the imprint of Russian influence. Terms such as *arbata* (from the Russian *арбáт*, "tea") and *bulvė* (from *булка*, meaning

"bun" or "loaf") show how Russian impacted even mundane aspects of Lithuanian culture. Borrowings extended to familial and social relations as well, with words like *mužikas* (from *мужик*, meaning "peasant"), revealing socio-cultural influences that shaped Lithuanian society.

3. **Technology and Science**: The Soviet era, with its emphasis on technological advancement, contributed numerous Russian terms to Lithuanian. Words like *traktorius* (from *трактор*, meaning "tractor") and *automobilis* (similar to the Russian *автомобиль*, "automobile") became part of the Lithuanian lexicon. The rapid industrialization and scientific emphasis of the Soviet period ensured that terms related to these fields became widespread.

Interestingly, the linguistic borrowing was not entirely one-sided. Though less common, some Lithuanian words made their way into Russian, particularly in the context of Lithuanian-specific cultural and geographical terms. However, these borrowings remained relatively niche compared to the extensive influence of Russian on Lithuanian.

Phonetic and Semantic Adaptations

Loanwords borrowed from Russian into Lithuanian did not remain unchanged; instead, they underwent phonetic and semantic transformations to better align with Lithuanian phonological and grammatical systems.

1. **Phonetic Adaptations**: Lithuanian phonology is markedly different from Russian, particularly in its vowel and consonant inventories. As a result, Russian loanwords often underwent significant phonetic shifts. For instance, the Russian word *булка* (meaning "bun" or "bread roll") became *bulka* in Lithuanian, with the adaptation of the vowel sounds to fit Lithuanian pronunciation rules. Additionally, the stress patterns of borrowed words were altered to match the prosodic characteristics of Lithuanian, which often places stress on different syllables compared to Russian.

2. **Semantic Shifts and Narrowing**: The meanings of some Russian loanwords in Lithuanian also shifted or narrowed over time. For example, the term *stotis* (meaning "station" in Lithuanian) originates from the Russian *станция* (meaning "station" or "stop"), but in Lithuanian, the usage of *stotis* has been restricted to specific types of stations, such as bus or train terminals. Such semantic narrowing reflects how languages selectively adapt borrowed terms to suit cultural and linguistic contexts.

3. **Morphological Integration**: Russian loanwords were also morphologically adapted to fit Lithuanian grammar. Lithuanian is an inflectional language with a complex case system, so borrowed words often had to be modified to take appropriate endings for declension. For instance, the Russian word *губернатор* ("governor") became *gubernatorius* in Lithuanian, with the suffix *-ius* added to make it conform to Lithuanian noun declension patterns. This adaptation illustrates how the linguistic borrowing process involves more than simple lexical adoption—it also requires integration into the grammatical framework of the receiving language.

4. **Cultural and Semantic Adaptations**: Some words took on new cultural meanings in Lithuanian. The Russian word *батон* (meaning "loaf of bread") has a different connotation in Lithuanian culinary contexts, reflecting local customs and dietary habits. Similarly, borrowed terms related to social structures, like *kolūkis* (from *колхоз*, meaning "collective farm"), not only retained their original

meaning but also became embedded in the collective historical memory of Lithuanians, symbolizing the Soviet era's influence on agriculture and community life.

Through these phonetic and semantic adaptations, the Lithuanian language has shown resilience and flexibility, transforming borrowed elements to fit its linguistic identity while also reflecting the deep and enduring connections between these two languages.

4. Grammatical Influences and Differences

Morphological Parallels

One of the most striking similarities between Russian and Lithuanian lies in their complex morphological systems. Both languages have highly developed case systems, which serve to mark the grammatical roles of nouns, pronouns, and adjectives. Lithuanian has seven grammatical cases (nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, instrumental, locative, and vocative), while Russian has six (lacking the vocative case). The presence of elaborate case systems in both languages has led to debates about whether there has been mutual influence or whether these similarities are merely coincidental, stemming from their shared Indo-European roots.

For example, both languages use cases to express possession, as in the genitive case. In Lithuanian, the phrase "tėvo namas" ("father's house") uses the genitive *tėvo* to denote possession, just as the Russian phrase "дом отца" (*dom ottsa*, "father's house") employs the genitive *отца* (ottsa). Despite these parallels, the two languages have distinct rules for case usage, suggesting that while some similarities exist, the core morphological systems developed independently, preserving unique aspects of each language.

Another area of morphological parallelism is found in verb conjugation patterns. Both Russian and Lithuanian categorize verbs into different conjugation classes and use prefixes and suffixes to indicate aspectual distinctions. However, while Russian places a heavy emphasis on verbal aspect (perfective vs. imperfective), Lithuanian relies more on temporal distinctions and does not emphasize aspect to the same extent. Despite these differences, the structural use of prefixes in both languages for verb modification—such as *pa-* in Lithuanian and *no-* in Russian to indicate a change in aspect or intensity—demonstrates a shared approach to verb formation that may have been reinforced by linguistic contact.

Syntax and Sentence Structure

In terms of syntax, Lithuanian and Russian share some similarities in sentence construction, though significant differences remain. Both languages typically follow a Subject-Verb-Object (SVO) order but allow for flexibility based on emphasis and grammatical considerations. This flexibility is a common feature in many inflected languages, where word order can change without altering the fundamental meaning of a sentence. For instance, in both languages, a sentence like "The boy reads a book" can be reordered to emphasize different elements: in Lithuanian, *Berniukas skaito knygą* can be rearranged as *Knygą berniukas skaito*, just as the Russian sentence *Мальчик читает книгу* (Mal'chik chitayet knigu) can become *Книгу мальчик читает*.

One area of syntactic influence likely stems from Russian's emphasis on fixed word order in formal writing, which may have had an impact on Lithuanian during periods of Russification. Lithuanian speakers, especially in formal or bureaucratic settings, sometimes adopted more rigid syntactic structures modeled after Russian sentence patterns. Additionally, constructions that place emphasis on the object or use passive

forms have been observed more frequently in Lithuanian texts influenced by Russian bureaucratic language, though these influences are generally subtle and not pervasive in everyday speech.

Grammatical Borrowing

Instances of direct grammatical borrowing from Russian into Lithuanian are less common than lexical borrowing, but some influences are evident, particularly in spoken language and informal contexts. One example is the use of certain prepositions and conjunctions. During the Soviet era, phrases that mirrored Russian syntax became embedded in colloquial Lithuanian. For instance, the use of the preposition *prie* in phrases like *prie stalo* (literally "by the table") mirrors the Russian construction *у стола* (u stola, "by the table"). While this usage exists independently in Lithuanian, the increased frequency and contexts in which it appears can be partially attributed to Russian influence.

Moreover, Russian conjunctions and particles, such as *но* ("but") and *или* ("or"), have been observed in code-switching contexts among bilingual speakers, occasionally spilling over into casual Lithuanian speech. However, these elements have not become formalized in standard Lithuanian grammar and are more indicative of bilingualism and language contact rather than systematic borrowing.

In terms of verb aspect, Russian's sophisticated aspectual system has not been adopted in Lithuanian, but the concept has subtly influenced how some speakers perceive and express temporal distinctions. For example, in narratives influenced by Russian, Lithuanian speakers might use more nuanced temporal expressions to convey ongoing versus completed actions, though this remains a stylistic rather than a grammatical feature.

Overall, while Lithuanian has borrowed extensively from Russian vocabulary, it has shown resilience in preserving its grammatical integrity. The grammatical influences that do exist are often context-specific and reflective of broader sociolinguistic dynamics, rather than wholesale adoption of Russian structures.

5. Linguistic Divergence and Resistance to Influence

Unique Features of Lithuanian

Lithuanian is celebrated for being one of the oldest and most conservative languages within the Indo-European family. Its unique features have remained remarkably intact, despite centuries of contact with neighboring languages, including Russian. One of the most notable aspects of Lithuanian's linguistic conservatism is its preservation of archaic grammatical structures. For example, Lithuanian retains a complex case system with seven cases, which is a characteristic that has largely disappeared in many other Indo-European languages. The language also features highly inflected nouns and verbs, with a sophisticated array of declensions and conjugations that have survived relatively unchanged through the centuries.

Phonologically, Lithuanian has maintained its distinct vowel and consonant inventory, resisting significant alteration even under Russian influence. For instance, Lithuanian has a well-developed system of pitch accent, similar to that of Ancient Greek, which adds a melodic quality to the language. This pitch accent system has not been compromised by contact with Russian, which uses a more fixed stress system. The preservation of such phonological traits underscores Lithuanian's resistance to external phonetic influence.

Moreover, Lithuanian's vocabulary includes a wealth of ancient Indo-European roots that have been preserved without borrowing replacements from other languages. Terms related to nature, agriculture, and family life have remained relatively pure, demonstrating the language's deep historical roots. For instance, words like *sūnus* (son) and *moteris* (woman) have direct connections to Proto-Indo-European terms, highlighting the language's ancient lineage and resilience.

Russian Influence vs. Lithuanian Purism

Despite extensive contact with Russian, particularly during the 19th and 20th centuries, Lithuanian has maintained a strong sense of linguistic purity. The 20th century was a pivotal time for linguistic preservation, especially during the periods of Soviet control when Russian was heavily promoted as the language of administration, education, and public life. In response, Lithuanian language activists and scholars embarked on a campaign of linguistic purism aimed at protecting the national identity embedded in the Lithuanian language.

During the Soviet era, the imposition of Russian was met with a fierce cultural resistance. Efforts to preserve Lithuanian included the establishment of underground schools, where the Lithuanian language and cultural heritage were taught in secret. The Lithuanian language press played a crucial role in this resistance, publishing literature and educational materials that emphasized the importance of maintaining linguistic and cultural independence. Language purists actively sought to replace Russian loanwords with Lithuanian equivalents, even in scientific and technical fields. For example, instead of adopting Russian terms for new technologies, linguists coined Lithuanian words, such as *skaičiuotuvas* (calculator) instead of borrowing from the Russian *калькулятор* (kalkulyator).

Language standardization efforts during this time focused on reinforcing traditional grammatical rules and vocabulary. Institutions such as the Institute of the Lithuanian Language worked tirelessly to compile comprehensive dictionaries and grammars, ensuring that Lithuanian remained a robust and standardized language. Additionally, cultural policies were implemented to promote the use of Lithuanian in public life and discourage code-switching, which had become common in bilingual communities.

The influence of Russian on Lithuanian, while undeniable, was therefore mitigated by these sustained efforts. Even today, Lithuanian purism continues to shape language policy, with strict regulations on the use of foreign words in media, education, and official documents. The cultural memory of linguistic resistance remains strong, and modern Lithuanian society places a high value on language preservation, celebrating the uniqueness of Lithuanian as a symbol of national identity and historical endurance.

Through these efforts, Lithuanian has successfully preserved its grammatical and lexical integrity, making it a fascinating case study in linguistic resilience. The ongoing commitment to maintaining linguistic purity ensures that, while Russian influence is acknowledged, it has not fundamentally altered the core features of the Lithuanian language.

6. Conclusion

Summary of Key Findings

This article has explored the intricate and multifaceted linguistic relationship between Russian and Lithuanian, highlighting the significant yet selective influence of Russian on Lithuanian vocabulary and grammar. Shared vocabulary often reflects historical periods of Russian dominance, with terms related to

governance, technology, and everyday life becoming part of the Lithuanian lexicon. However, phonetic and semantic adaptations have modified these borrowings, making them distinctly Lithuanian. In terms of grammar, while both languages share certain morphological parallels, such as complex case systems and the use of verbal prefixes, Lithuanian has largely resisted adopting Russian grammatical structures. The flexibility and resilience of Lithuanian syntax, along with sustained efforts at linguistic purism, have ensured the preservation of its unique linguistic identity despite intense and prolonged contact with Russian.

Implications for Further Study

Future research could delve deeper into the sociolinguistic aspects of Russian-Lithuanian language contact, examining how bilingual communities navigate linguistic identity and code-switching. A comparative analysis of other Slavic-Baltic interactions, such as the influence of Polish or Latvian on Lithuanian, would also provide valuable insights into the broader dynamics of language contact in the Baltic region. Additionally, longitudinal studies focusing on the impact of globalization and modern media on language use in Lithuania could reveal emerging patterns of linguistic influence, both from Russian and other global languages like English.

Cultural and Linguistic Significance

The linguistic exchange between Russian and Lithuanian carries profound cultural and historical significance. It reflects a centuries-long struggle for national identity and cultural preservation, particularly during periods of foreign domination. The resilience of the Lithuanian language, evident in its continued use and development despite external pressures, symbolizes the broader cultural determination to maintain a distinct Baltic identity. Efforts to preserve and purify Lithuanian underscore the importance of language as a marker of national heritage and a tool for resisting cultural assimilation. This linguistic relationship serves as a reminder of the enduring power of language in shaping and reflecting cultural identity, and it highlights the importance of continued efforts to protect and celebrate linguistic diversity in the face of external influences.

References

Alisoy, H. (2023). A comparative study of Lithuanian and Old Prussian. *Scientific Reports of Bukhara State University*, 143-148.

Balsys, R. (2016). Paganism of Prussian: sacred caste tulissones, ligaschones. *Вісник Львівського університету. Серія історична*, (52).

Braun, A. P. (2009). Sociolinguistic and crosslinguistic aspects of the acquisition of English by Lithuanian university students.

Dabašinskienė, I., & Krivickaitė-Leišienė, E. (2019). Lithuanian as L2: a case study of Russian minority children. *Multilingualism in the Baltic States: societal discourses and contact phenomena*, 205-237.

Mockienė, L. (2016). *Formation of terminology of constitutional law in English, Lithuanian and Russian* (Doctoral dissertation, Mykolo Romerio universitetas.).

Séguis, B. (2013). From code-switching to a mixed code: the role of parenthetical verbs in the emerging Polish-Russian mixed code in Lithuania. *Eesti ja soome-ugri keeleteaduse ajakiri. Journal of Estonian and Finno-Ugric Linguistics*, *4*(2), 79-98.

Strakauskaitė, N. (2010). Historical character in region's identity transformations: Prussian Lithuania-Lithuania Minor-Western Lithuania. *Acta historica universitatis Klaipedensis: Studia anthropologica 4. Identity politics: migration, communities and multilingualism.*, *20*, 135-143.

Vaicekauskienė, L., & Vyšniauskienė, I. (2019). Russian and English as socially meaningful resources for mixed speech styles of Lithuanians. *Multilingualism in the Baltic States: Societal Discourses and Contact Phenomena*, 337-367.

Verschik, A. (2020). Yiddish–Lithuanian bilingualism: Incomplete acquisition, change through contacts, or both?. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 1367006920932664.

Voeikova, M., & Dabašinskienė, I. (2012). What can child language tell us about language development?: A case for case study in Lithuanian and Russian. In *Multiple perspectives in linguistic research on Baltic languages/edited by Aurelija Usonienė, Nicole Nau and Ineta Dabašinskienė* (pp. 43-74). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.