

MGIMO
UNIVERSITY



RUSSIAN JOURNAL OF CULTURAL STUDIES AND COMMUNICATION

Volume 2, number 4

2023

Russian Journal of Cultural Studies and Communication

Peer-Reviewed Journal

<https://www.cultures.mgimo.ru/>

Editor-in-Chief

Kizima, Marina P. – Dr. Sci. (Philology), Professor, Department of World Literature and Culture, MGIMO University (ORCID) (Scopus)

Editorial Board:

Iovenko, Valerii A. – Dr. Sci. (Philology), Head of the Spanish Language Department, MGIMO-University

Khramchenko, Dmitry S. – Dr. Sci. (Philology), Professor, English Language Department №4, MGIMO University (ORCID) (Scopus)

Kudryavtsev, Oleg F. – Dr. Sci. (History), Professor, Department of World and Russian History, MGIMO University (ORCID)

Simonov (Viazemsky), Yury P. – Cand. Sci. (History), Professor, Head of the Department of World Literature and Culture, MGIMO University

Silantyeva, Margarita V. – Dr. Sci. (Philosophy), Professor, Head of the A. F. Shishkin Department of Philosophy, MGIMO University (ORCID) (Scopus)

Evteev, Sergei V. – Cand. Sci. (Philology), Professor, German Language Department, Director of Language training and Bologna process Directorate, MGIMO-University, (ORCID)

Table of Contents • 2(4) • 2023

RESEARCH ARTICLES

Vol. 2, No. 4, 2023

National and International Discourses

- 4 Romanin E. V. 2022. The Xenology of the Powder Keg of Europe: The Reflection of the Peculiarities of the Friend or Foe Dichotomy in the Balkan Model of the World in the Xenopejorative Vocabulary of the Languages of the Balkan Sprachbund. Articulation of Issue.
- 24 Khlopotunov Y. Y. 2020. Hate Speech in American Political Discourse: A Functional-Linguistic Analysis.

Professional Discourses

- 35 Maidansky A. D. 2022. Spinoza's Doctrine of Affect in Cultural-Historical Psychology.
- 48 Saprykina O. A. 2022. Active Models in Modern Portuguese Neology: New Words and the Pandemic.
- 60 Ryabchenko-Shats V. D. 2022. Beardsley Movement in Russian Silver Age Culture.

Religious Discourses

- 75 Petrova G. V. 2022. Old Believers in Brazil: Preserving Linguistic Identity.

THE XENOLOGY OF THE POWDER KEG OF EUROPE: THE REFLECTION OF THE PECULIARITIES OF THE FRIEND OR FOE DICHOTOMY IN THE BALKAN MODEL OF THE WORLD IN THE XENOPEJORATIVE VOCABULARY OF THE LANGUAGES OF THE BALKAN SPRACHBUND. ARTICULATION OF ISSUE¹

Evghenii V. Romanin

Saint Petersburg State University

Abstract. This article discusses the reflection of the features of the “friend or foe” dichotomy in the Balkan model of the world in the xenologic pejorative vocabulary of the Balkan sprachbund languages: Albanian, Aromanian, Bulgarian, Modern Greek, Macedonian, Romanian and Serbo-Croatian. The author gives a brief review of the historical, cultural and geopolitical specifics of the Balkan-Carpathian region, which influenced the local peoples’ ideas about strangers; some traditional mythological beliefs of the Balkan peoples related to the conceptual field of otherness are also presented. Based on the analysis of the internal history of the word, an attempt is made to define the main models for constructing derogatory names for strangers in order to compare the data for various Balkan languages and, to the extent possible, build an integral image of the concept of alien in the Balkan conceptual worldview. According to the results of the study, the xenopejorative vocabulary of languages of the Balkan sprachbund shows significant similarities both in terms of form and content. Pejoratives with undifferentiated evaluativity predominate, which could account for the richness of the Balkan derivational morphology and a large number of lexical borrowings in each of the languages; pejoratives with an indication of appearance, features of language and peculiarities of behaviour are also widely represented; however, the first are referentially limited, while the second and the third are universal, from which it is concluded that the prototypical Balkan alien is someone who speaks differently and behaves different-

¹ Romanin E. V. 2022. The Xenology of the Powder Keg of Europe: The Reflection of the Peculiarities of the Friend or Foe Dichotomy in the Balkan Model of the World in the Xenopejorative Vocabulary of the Languages of the Balkan Sprachbund. Articulation of Issue. *Concept: Philosophy, Religion, Culture*. 6(3). P. 107–125. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24833/2541-8831-2022-3-23-107-125>

ly. At the same time, the most common target for pejorative vocabulary in the Balkan languages among all strangers is the Romani people, which is due both to a number of stereotypical ideas about the physical and behavioural features of this ethnic group, and to the historical isolation caused by the nomadic way of life and the closedness of the Romani community from outsiders.

Keywords: own, alien, the Balkans, Balkan sprachbund, xenologic pejorative, xenophobia

The “friend or foe” dichotomy is one of the fundamental oppositions in the worldview of cultural communities. The study of this opposition from the point of view of linguoculturology is of interest no matter which cultural group is being studied; however, some communities, due to their historical, geographical and ethno-cultural specificity, appear more promising in terms of the conclusions we may be able to draw. One such community is, without a doubt, the peoples inhabiting the Balkan Peninsula.

The Balkan-Carpathian area is one of the most culturally interesting regions of Europe, as well as one of the most problematic from the political point of view. Numerous Russian and foreign researchers have examined Balkan cultures from various perspectives, including the “friend or foe” dichotomy. Among the most noteworthy are the works of A. V. Desnitskaya, T. V. Tsivyan, A. N. Soboleva, N. G. Golant, M. Todorova, T. Stoyanovich. It is clear that, due to the cultural and historical specifics of the region, the image of “foe” in the Balkans will also be rather specific.

The subject of this paper is the pejorative vocabulary of the conceptual field of “foe” in the languages of the Balkan sprachbund. The main criterion for classifying a culture as Balkan in this paper is not its geographic location (Romania, for example, is located entirely outside of the Balkan Peninsula itself, if the Danube is seen as its northern border), but rather a linguistic characteristic – the belonging to the Balkan sprachbund. The most compelling argument for the validity of this approach is the fact that the object of study in our case is exclusively linguistic material – pejorative lexemes of the Balkan languages that are in one way or another related to the “friend or foe” dichotomy (and the patterns identified as a result of this study can be considered both cultural and linguistic – lexical and lexical-semantic Balkanisms). Istriot and Meglenitic have deliberately been excluded from this work, as they have been insufficiently studied by linguists, and because the number of speakers of these languages is extremely low.² Thus, in this article, we compare the xenologic pejoratives of seven languages: Albanian, Aromanian, Bulgarian, Macedonian, Modern Greek, Romanian, and Serbo-Croatian.³ This study aims to identify the general patterns of the “friend or

² In the Romanian linguistic tradition, these are called Istro-Romanian and Megleno-Romanian and are considered dialects of Romanian.

³ For more on the Balkan sprachbund (Lindstedt 2000, Friedman 2008).

foe” opposition in the Balkan languages. The working hypothesis is the assumption that the ideas about the “foe” or the “other” in the cultural consciousness are materially represented in the expressive nomination of strangers (“others”), and therefore, based on the data on vocabulary of this kind, we can attempt to build a model of the image of the “Balkan stranger.” The purpose of this paper is to conduct a comparative analysis of xenologic pejoratives (in this article, the term xenologic pejorative, or xeno-pejorative, means a pejorative lexeme that directly names someone or something as “other” or “alien,” or is related to the conceptual field of “foreignness” or “alienness”) in the languages of the Balkan sprachbund, and to further derive the general and specific features from this of the image of the “stranger” in the ethno-cultural picture of the world of the Balkan peoples.

The contribution of this paper to the field of study is the fact that it is the first (that we know of) comparative study of Balkan xenology based on xeno-pejorative vocabulary. From the theoretical point of view, this paper will be of interest to a wide range of scholars – ethnographers, ethnologists, culturologists, anthropologists, and linguists, not to mention, of course, experts in Balkan studies, as well as other researchers whose interests include the “friend or foe” or “us versus them” dichotomy. From a practical point of view, this study promises to contribute to a deeper understanding of the ethno-cultural and ethno-confessional conflicts in the Balkan-Carpathian area, as well as to the search for ways to resolve them.

The Historical, Cultural and Geopolitical Features of the Balkan-Carpathian Area

The Balkan Peninsula, which for many centuries was located at the junction of the borders of the great empires of the past, has a complex and contradictory history. It is no coincidence that the region has received the moniker of the “powder keg of Europe”: for hundreds of years, the peoples of the Balkans were under the rule of the Sublime Porte; throughout the twentieth century, the region was shaken (and continues to be shaken today, in the twenty-first century) by various ethnic, religious and other conflicts, the most troubling of which today are the so-called “Macedonian question,” the issue of Albanian nationalism, and the confrontation between Serbs and Albanians in Kosovo (Lamash 2021). In addition to disputes over various territories (for example, Kosovo or Transylvania), there are also conflicts regarding issues of identity. For example, the Bulgarian government refuses to acknowledge the existence of Macedonians as a separate ethnic group, and Macedonian as a separate language (Kirchanov 2021); for years, the Greek government officially denied Macedonia’s right to the name “Macedonia,” which resulted in it being officially changed to North Macedonia (Parastatov 2010; Koloskov 2011); nationalist Serbs do not recognize the existence of Croats and Bosnians, considering them Catholic and Muslim Serbs, respectively, while, interestingly, Croatian supremacists hold the same view regarding an independent Serbian nation and identity (Belyakov 2010). The frequent political upheavals have led to the

term “Balkanization” becoming a household word in international political discourse, in the sense of the fragmentation of a once monolithic territory into separate independent entities. The sheer number of unresolved issues and the constant ethnopolitical tension would suggest, at least in theory, that the people of the region need a psychological defence, a safety valve to protect their mental health, or at the very least a way to vocalize their resentments in the most basic way. In thus follows that there should be an abundance of xenopejorative terms in the languages of the Balkans that can be used as a basis to construct a model of the “other.”

This condition is a consequence of the specifics of the Balkan Peninsula, ranging from natural factors to the historical vicissitudes of the region. The peninsula, both geographically and culturally, is at the point where Europe and Asia converge, hence the common name of the territories to the east and west of the Bosphorus – Eurasia Minor. On the other hand, the ruggedness of the landscape is conducive to isolation, which has led to great cultural and linguistic fragmentation in the region (Sobolev 2013: 75). As A. Sobolev notes, “a feature of the geographical borders of the Balkans is that they are easy for humans to climb and cross.” The border there does not divide, but rather connects. Accordingly, the region is relatively accessible in terms of trade and cultural contacts.

As for the regional specifics of the “friend or foe” dichotomy, researchers typically point to “the characteristic openness of the Balkans to all things foreign, the ease of crossing the territory, and its inherent amenability, as it were, to language contacts, to communication in difficult conditions...” (Tsivyan 1999: 99) which emerged as a result of a variegated cultural and linguistic palette. In addition, according to T. Tsivyan, the concept of “friend or foe” in the Balkans is, to a certain extent, “included in the circle of spatiotemporal oppositions (Tsivyan 1999: 1), and the Balkan space itself is characterized by a “system of unstable opposites [...] from rigid binarism to its categorical denial.” For the land there is not completely dry – surrounded as it is by water on three sides – nor is the sea a sea in the truest sense of the word, as it is dotted with numerous islands. It can be said that this natural geographic “interpenetration” of opposing elements is also reflected in the peninsula’s culture: linguistically (there would, of course, be no point talking about a sprachbund if such interpenetration did not exist), as well as in everyday life, local customs, and even religion – for example, Albanian Muslim women carve the image of a cross onto bread dough, Christian icons are brought as offerings to the graves of Islamic dervish saints, and one monastery in Macedonia has a room specially designated for Muslims (Sobolev 2013: 135). All these properties, which highlight the fragility of the boundary between “us” and “them,” between “friend” and “foe” in the conditions of constant cultural exchange, must have left their mark on the model of the Balkan stranger.

At the same time, the image of the stranger, of a foreign land and a foreign language, occupy an important place in the folklore and the mythological picture of the world of the Balkan peoples, manifesting themselves in legends, fables and superstitions. Tsivyan, for example, points to Romanian beliefs associated with foreign peo-

ples: “*Armenian* [all italics used in quotations have been added by the author for emphasis] is used as a name for cursed people. In their land, cattle, and even people, are slaughtered and thrown into the abyss to the dragon. And the dragons give them precious stones in return [...] Written *in Russian* on the wings of the locust are its age and the number of years it will eat the crops” (Tsivyan 2006: 119). According to the beliefs of the people of the Oltenia province in Romania (which have parallels with the beliefs of Bulgarians and Serbs), the *Jews* (*jidovi*) – who were incredibly tall and strong – inhabited the Earth before the flood (Golant 2013). Widespread among the Romanian and Montenegrin people are aetiological legends about where the various food prohibitions of the Jews, Turks, and sometimes even Hungarians, came from: as the story goes, the Jews (Turks, Hungarians) do not eat pork because one their tribesmen was once turned into a pig, and they do not want to risk eating their relative (Golant 2012). People of “other” ethnicities are seen as part of a group of demonic creatures (typically three) who foretell the fate of children when they are born: for the Romanians, this creature is usually a *Hungarian*, a *Jew* or a *Gypsy* (although a Romanian may be included too) (Golant 2016); the Bulgarians of South Bulgaria and Dobrudzha believe that the demons into which the souls of dead mothers and pregnant women turn are called *armenki*, *armentsi*, *ermenki*, or *ermenliyki* (Plotnikova 2009), and the souls of unbaptized babies are called *evreiche* (*Jewish*), *pomache*, or *tsiganche* (*Gypsy*) (Trefilova 2020: 175). The opposition of “a person of my faith” versus “a person of another faith” is clearly and directly associated with the dichotomy “human versus inhuman.” Thus, in the Balkan folk consciousness, the line that “outsiders” are from the non-human realm can clearly be traced. First, “outsiders” are associated with the animal world (and typically to animals that cause harm, such as insects – destroyers of crops; it is also worth noting that the Romanian tradition names the locust specifically, a reference to the idea of heterotopia, as swarms of locusts typically come from the “outside”). Second, they are associated with the chthonic world and the monsters that inhabit it (and here would be a good place to mention the belief of some experts that the core concept of “other” is precisely the image of the monster (Foucault 2005; Romanova 2015). And third, they are associated with the spirit world and devilry, and the “outsider” is sometimes even endowed with supernatural abilities. It would thus make sense that these facts should also determine the specific features of Balkan xenology.

Research Methodology

The material used in this study was taken from explanatory and etymological dictionaries (both hardcopy and online), as well as, in the case of Serbo-Croat and Bulgarian, through interviews with native speakers. This likely explains the small number of lexemes found (125 in total): lexicographers are reluctant to use expressive vocabulary with an invective charge in dictionaries, and speakers may be ashamed or embarrassed to admit that they use such language, or want to present their native tongue in the most favourable light possible. The same reasoning can be used to explain the dispro-

portionality of data across languages: for example, only ten xenologic pejorative units were identified in Modern Greek, a very small sample compared to the 48 units found in Romanian.⁴

Having isolated the xenologic pejorative vocabulary from the lexicon of these languages, we analysed the meanings embedded in it based on the theory of internal form expounded by Alexander Potebnja – namely, that the structure of the word indicates the thought process of the person who uttered it, and therefore preserves the memory of the worldview of the ancestors of native speakers today (Potebnja 1989).

The next step in our methodology was to divide the xenopejoratives into semantic groups in terms of their internal form. The Russian linguist S. Yakushenkov proposed a three-part model of the image of the “stranger,” which was then developed in detail by O. Yakushenkova. According to the model, the three most important components, or facets, of the stranger’s reflection (the three markers of their “otherness” or “alienness”) in one’s picture of the world are: alimentary (their food habits); vestimentarity (how they dress), and sexuality (their sex life and marital behaviour).⁵ This model appears to be structurally incomplete: it is easy to see that the parameters listed by Yakushenkova can be described using a single word – behaviour – while it is clear, even from her work itself, that physicality and linguistic characteristics are no less important in the creation of the image of the stranger.

For this reason, we decided to supplement and expand upon this three-part model and, based on the marker that is the basis for motivating the xenopejorative, divide the material into the following models:

- corporeal (with the sub-models “appearance” and “dehumanization”);
- linguistic (with the sub-models “phonetics,” “lexicon” and “onomastics”);
- behavioural (with the sub-models “alimentary,” “vestimentarity,” “sexuality,” and “other,” which includes all other behavioural characteristics not related to sexuality, and so on).

At the practical stage of our research, however, it became clear that these models are insufficient for a full analysis. The following models were thus added:

- heterotopic (associated with the idea that the stranger belongs to another space, discussed in detail by V. G. Lysenko (Lysenko 2009));
- historical precedent (related to precedent phenomena of various kinds, in particular to the historical experience of interaction with representatives of a group of “others”);
- undifferentiated (the motivating marker cannot be identified due to the obscurity of the internal form, or its undifferentiated negative evaluation, expressed grammatically – most often with an expressive suffix).

⁴ It is worth noting here that my level of knowledge of these languages varies, and with respect to Albanian and Greek in particular, I had to rely on translations and my own linguistic intuition when assessing their accuracy.

⁵ Yakushenkova O. S. 2014. *The Image of the Stranger in Heterotopic Spaces of the Frontier*. Doctoral dissertation. Astrakhan.

We are also forced to draw the reader's attention to the fact that, for the purposes of the study, we deliberately ignored the specific expressive content of each xenopejorative – ironic, derogatory and directly offensive lexemes with negative connotations were used indiscriminately for analysis. If we had not, we would have had to conduct a discourse analysis in order to clarify our results – that is, we would have had to have studied each example in context – which would increase the size of the work several times over, without significantly affecting the results obtained.

Findings

Now that we have got the methodology clear, let us move directly to our findings and see which models are represented in each of the Balkan languages, and to what extent.

The largest number of xenopejoratives (48 units) was obtained for the Romanian language (which can be explained by the fact that more relevant material is available in Romanian-language publications, and that the topic receives greater attention). Of these xenopejoratives, the corporeal model contains such units as *balaoacheș* (a combination of *balai* [“fair-haired”] + *oacheș* [“dark-haired”], most likely ironic in meaning) – “gypsy”; *ciorânglav* – “gypsy” (from the Slavic *cernoglav* [“black head”], although it could have emerged independently on Romanian soil from *cioară* [“crow”] + *glavă* [“head”], the latter being borrowed previously from one of the South Slavic languages⁶); *încărbunat* (“charred”) – “gypsy” (from the Russian for “coal, smoked” – meaning “a black person” in this context) – gypsy; and the less obvious *bahniță* (“dirty person”), likely from *bahnă* (“swamp, marshy mud”) – gypsy, and *gașper* (“Casper,” one of the wise men who came to worship the baby Jesus and was, according to legend, distinguished by his dark skin⁷), which, again, means “gypsy.” Three pejoratives of this group that are not associated with gypsies are *șonț*, meaning “German” (“lame,” cf. Hung. *sánta*, *sántika* – “lame”;⁸ Serb./Croat., Bulg. *шантав* [*shantav*] – “lame, paralyzed,” although it is possible that they originated independently from the same source, or are not related to each other whatsoever); *parhă* – “scab” (with the variants *parhal*, *parhal*, *harhal* and *harhar*) to refer to Hebrews; and *ciutac* (“stump”) to refer to Turks (this xenopejorative evidently refers to the custom of circumcision, and should therefore be classified as behavioural).

A subset of the corporeal model is “dehumanization,” which includes *balaur* (“snake”) in reference to gypsies (apparently motivated by the phonetic similarity to *balaoacheș*); *cioară* (“crow”) – “gypsy,” sometimes a “black person”; *cioroi* (“crow,” “large crow,” “male crow” – but not a raven [Rom. *Corb*])⁹ – “gypsy”; *coțofană* (“mag-

⁶ Șăineanu L. 1929. Dicționar universal al limbei române, ediția a VI-a.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ The suffix -oi combines augmentative and masculine forms (it is used to form the names of male animals: *pisoi* – “tomcat”; *broscoi* – “male frog”; *lebedoi* – “cob”) and have a pejorative meaning.

pie”) – a female gypsy (the motivating marker here is more behavioural, although de-humanizing does take place); *gărvan* (< Bulg. *garvan* [“raven”]) – “gypsy” (cf. *cioară, cioroi*); *graur* (“starling”) – “gypsy” (*cioroi* + *arapină* [“negro”] + the magnifying suffix *-ină*, according to the etymology proposed by A. Scriban¹⁰) – “gypsy.” As we can see, the references are mainly to various birds with dark plumage, and primarily from the *Corvidae* family, based on the supposed similarity of the appearance and behaviour of gypsies to these animals.

The linguistic model is represented by xenopejoratives indicating stereotypical names: *honț* (from *Hans*) – “Transylvanian Saxon”; *ihman* – “Jew,” this evidently reproduces the stereotypical sound of Ashkenazi surnames (*-man*);¹¹ the use of the autoethnonym as a negatively coloured nomination: *poleac* – “Pole” (neutral – *poleac* or the obsolete *leah*); the focus on the sound features of the accent: *maldafan* – “Moldovan (person)” (Moldovans are considered “Russified Romanians,” hence the exaggerated reflection of the Russian accent, with the unstressed /o/ being replaced by /a/; the neutral ethnonym is written *moldovean*); imitation of the sound of the language through characteristic phrases: *danci* – “gypsy child” (< *Romani dan ci* – “give me something”); *parpalec* (most likely “person who stutters”: the internal form is obscured here, although Scriban suggests that it could be mocking the tongue-tied pronunciation of foreigners¹²) – “Greek person,” specifically a travelling merchant (cf. Russ. *офеня* [*ofenya*], which, according to one version, is derived from the name of the city of Athens). This possibly also includes *bozgor* – “Hungarian,” if the etymology from *boscorodi* (“to grumble, to mumble”) is correct (the Hungarian language is incomprehensible to Romanian speakers), or the version suggested by Hungarian historian S. Szilágyi that the word is a composite of the Hungarian swear word *baszd meg* (lit. “take [fuck] me”) and the Romanian neutral ethnonym denoting a Hungarian person (*ungur*), as well as numerous units with obscure etymologies: *ștronț* – “German, Hungarian”; *șoangher, șoanghină, boanghen* (unless this is a Slavism from *жзринъ* or *вазринъ* [both of which mean “Hungarian”) – “Hungarian.” All of these can be imitations of the sound of an incomprehensible language.

Behavioural xenopejoratives include alimentary: *broscar* (“frog eater”), *macaronar* (“pasta maker”) – “Italian”; *orezar* (“rice grower,” “rice eater”) – “Asian,” most often Chinese; *pilafgiu* (“fruit grower”) – “Turk” (these last two xenopejoratives combine alimentary and activity models). The only xenopejorative that can be unambiguously classified as vestimentarity is *șalvaragiu* (“baggy trousers”) – “Turk”; other words that can be placed in this category include, once again, *bozgor*, assuming that the most plausible version – that it comes from the dialect pronunciation of the Hung. *bocskor*,

¹⁰ Scriban A. 1939. *Dicționarul limbii românești*. Presa Bună.

¹¹ Scriban offers a version of the origin of this word from the German expletives *Jauchemann* – “gold digger”(?), although the connection to Jews is not immediately obvious here. Also, for this particular xenopejorative, it should be noted that the meaning “devil, vampire” probably appeared secondhand.

¹² Scriban.

which means a certain type of shoes without soles worn by Balkan shepherds (Brubaker 2006) – is correct, and another ethnonym we have already mentioned, *coțofană* – “gypsies,” an exaggerated take on the love of gypsies (much like magpies) for shiny jewellery, and their poor taste in general. Other features of behaviour and character are indicated again by the word *coțofană* (like magpies, gypsies are known to have a penchant for stealing things) and, possibly, *cioropină*, which, we assume, may be a distorted version of *cere-pâine* – “to ask for bread” (cf. *danci*, as well as the semantically and structurally similar version in the section of the Aromanian language). *Ciutac* mentioned above refers to customs and traditions.

Almost no purely heterotopic examples in Romanian were identified. The only one we could find was combined with a precedent, in the xenopejorative *faraon* – “gypsies” (which refers both to the common belief that the gypsies originated from Egypt, and to the episode in the Bible where the Egyptian soldiers drowned in the Red Sea in pursuit of the Jews – the suggestion here is that the gypsies are related to or descendants of the soldiers who died). Another, extremely tentative exception here could be the abovementioned ethno-pejorative *bozgor*, which many non-experts believe to be a translation from the Hungarian, meaning “a man without a homeland,” or “a man without a country.”¹³ Despite its clearly mythical nature (“a man without a homeland” in Hungarian is *hazátlan ember*, and “a man without a country” is *hontalan ember*), this version nevertheless warrants mention, since the idea is itself an important part of the picture of the world of those who actually use the word. It is worth noting that this mythology refers to the long-standing dispute between the Romanian and Hungarian historical and mythological narratives about which of the two peoples first settled in Transylvania, and thus who has the historical right to its ownership, in particular to the fact that the Hungarian people are supposedly nomads who originally came from the wild Asian steppes and thus do not have a native land (Luchkanin 2014). Another unscientific version claims that *bozgor* comes from the Turkish *bozkır* – “steppe.” Thus, both of these folk etymologies, although they have nothing to do with the actual origin of the word, nevertheless reflect the ideas that exist in the Romanian conceptual picture of the world that the Magyars (Hungarians) are aliens, “outsiders,” from somewhere in the endless plains of Central Asia.

Finally, many xenopejorative units in Romanian cannot be analysed synchronously, as they are borrowed from various third languages, for example, *pem* – “Czech,” borrowed from the German Böhme (Borisov, Pilipenko 2020); *șoacă* – “German” or “Hungarian,” is taken from the Serbo-Croat *uokau* (*shokats*, see below); *liftă* – “Catholic,” most likely a distortion of *Litva* (“Lithuania”); *hahol* – “Ukrainian person” (< Russ. *хохол*, *khokhol*), *cifut*, *jidov*, *jidan*, and *târtan* are all various pejorative designations for Jews, borrowed from Turkish, Old Church Slavonic, and German, respectively (*târtan* has an interesting etymological history itself, as it comes from the German

¹³ Dicționar explicativ al limbii române. URL: <https://dexonline.ro>

Untertan, meaning “subject”:¹⁴ originally, the word was evidently a euphemism for the Jews – subjects of the Austrian monarchy, to which Transylvania historically belonged, although it does not convey anything about the image of the stranger), or do not carry significant information for research, since the derogatory meaning is expressed in them undifferentiated, using a diminutive, augmentative, or simply general pejorative suffix (*bulgăroi* – “Bulgarian”; *grecoței*, *grecoșor* – “Greek”; *negrotei* – “negro, dark-skinned”; *nemțălău* – “German”; *rusnac* – “Russian”; *papistaș* – “Catholic”).

A total of 19 pejorative lexemes related to the field of “other” or “alien” were identified in the Bulgarian language.¹⁵ There were no xenopejoratives relating to appearance, nor did we observe examples of dehumanization. The only word we can, somewhat tentatively, place in this category is *mangal* – “gypsy,” along with its variants *mango* and *mangasar*. Most likely, this lexeme refers to the linguistic model, but native speakers associate this derogatory nickname with the word *mangal* in the meaning of a roaster or grill – after all, grills are smoky, and the stereotypical image of a gypsy implies blackness and dirt (cf. Rom. *încărbunat*).

The linguistic model includes *doichovets* – “German” (from the self-designation Deutsch), and also, potentially, *muzhik* – “Russian,” a borrowing from the Russian language.

The alimentary model clearly includes *zhabar* (“frog eater”) – Italian, and *mami-ligar* (“mămăligă eater”) – Romanian; while *fes* (“fez”) and *piskul* (“tassel”), meaning Turk, belong in the vestimentarity model (as they are characteristic elements of the traditional Turkish national attire). The sexuality model includes political pejoratives, of which there is just one example: *gerebrast*, the name used to refer to a member or supporter of the nationalist party GERB + *pederast* (“faggot, queer”). Behavioural xenopejoratives that refer to religious customs include *ryazan* (“circumcised”), *ryazan pishchov* (“sawn-off shotgun”) – “Turk”; *katunar* (“taborshchik”) – “gypsy,” referring to a nomadic lifestyle; *apash* (in the sense of “swindler”), which also refers to gypsies (Lesnichkova 2020), points to the stereotype that gypsies often steal.

The historical precedent model is based on ethnonyms and demonyms, which at some point in the past were completely neutral, but over time acquired a negative connotation: *vizantinets* (“Byzantine”) and *fanariot* (“Phanariot”) – “Greek” (these two xenopejoratives imply hypocrisy and deceit,¹⁶ although this does not follow from their internal form); *arnautin* means “Albanian” and *prusak* is used for “German.”

Undifferentiated xenopejoratives include the borrowings: *chifut/chifutin* – “Jew” (< Turk. *çifut*), *rash’n* (“Russian”) and *gypsy* (“gypsy”) (< Eng. Russian and Gypsy). At a stretch, these could be included in the linguistic model, but even if they can, then it is only in a very indirect manner, through the foreign sound of the lexeme itself.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Речник на българския език. URL: <https://ibl.bas.bg/rbe/lang/bg>

¹⁶ Ibid.

Twenty-one xenopejoratives were identified in the Serbo-Croatian language (which we did not divide into Serbian, Bosnian, Croatian and Montenegrin, since the set of pejorative vocabulary is the same), a considerable part of which is related to the religious conflicts on the peninsula.

The dehumanization sub-model of the corporeal model is represented by the xenopejorative *tovar* (“donkey”), used to refer to people from Dalmatia in Croatia, apparently with the connotation “draft cattle” (see *shkutur* below).

The linguistic model can be observed in the xenopejorative *shiptar* – “Albanian,” derived from the autoethnonym *shqiptar*; evidently, the lexeme *balija*, used to refer to Turks and Yugoslav Muslims (Bosniaks), and apparently originating from an Ottoman forename (Turk. *Bāli*), which, in turn, comes from the Arabic (*bālī*, “worn out, dilapidated”).¹⁷ Incidentally, the ethnonym *Boshnyak* is itself considered pejorative by some speakers, erroneously associated with the Turkish word *boş* – “nothing, a nonentity.”

Xenopejoratives that belong in the alimentary model are represented, again, by *zhabar* and also refer to “Italians.” Xenopejoratives of the sexuality model include the lexeme *kozojeb* (“goat fucker”), used to refer to Albanians, Bosnians, and apparently Muslims in general. The general behavioural model (in this case, xenopejoratives relating to activity) includes *konjushar* (“groom”) to refer to Croats or Slovenians (possibly with the implication of “servant,” as Slovenians and Croats are seen as having betrayed Orthodoxy and freedom by entering into the service of the Catholic Hapsburgs, those who, according to the Serbian proverb, traded their faith for a meal), *shkutor/shkutur* (a distorted form of the word *egzekutor* – “performer/executor [of some dirty work], an Austrian servant, a sycophant”),¹⁸ *dalmatinetz* (“Dalmatian”) and *chergar/chergash* – “tent dweller,” i.e. someone without a permanent shelter, a wanderer or vagabond; in other words, a gypsy.

Historical grievances of all kinds play an important role among the peoples of the former Yugoslavia, which makes the historical precedent model particularly important: Serbs, for example, refer to the Croats as *ustasha* (a reference to the far-right Croatian fascist organization Ustasha that was active between 1929 and 1945), while Croats and Bosnians call Serbs *chetnitsy* (“Chetniks,” a reference to the Chetnik Detachments of the Yugoslav Army, nationalist-monarchist Serbian militias that operated in the first half of the 20th century). Other xenopejorative units that arguably belong to the historical precedent model include *shvaba* (“Swabian,” used to refer to Germans and Austrians); *shokatz* (from the German dialect pronunciation of the ethnonym *Sachse* – “Saxon”) – “German,” and also “Catholic”; *vlakh* (meaning “foreigner, non-religious,” a word used by Catholic Croats to characterize Orthodox Christians), Bosnian Muslims, and all Christians in general).

¹⁷ Wiktionary. The free multilingual dictionary. URL: <https://wiktionary.org>

¹⁸ Српски дијалектолошки зборњик. Књига LXII. 2015. Расправе и грађа. Српска академија наука и уметности и институт за српски језик САНУ.

Finally, the undifferentiated group of xenopejoratives includes words formed from suffixes: *tsrnchuga* (from *tsrn* – “black,” meaning “negro”; while the xenopejorative does contain an indication of a bodily feature – skin colour, it is the suffix that should probably be considered the bearer of the evaluations, cf. *ljenchuga* – “lazybones”); and *srbenda* (a Serb in general, and a Serbian jingoist in particular).¹⁹ It also includes words borrowed from third languages: *bodul* – Dalmatian (< It. *bodolo*);²⁰ *gabel* – “gypsy” (< Alb. *Gabel*, see below); *čifutin/čivutin* – “Jew” (< Turk. *çifut*); and *kaur* – “infidel, non-Muslim,” cf. Rus. *гяур* (*gyuar*) (< Turk *gâvur*).²¹

Particularly worthy of note is the lexeme *poturica/poturcenik/poturčenjak*, which is used to refer to someone who has converted to Islam (and thus become a “Turk”). The word explicitly indicates the act of changing identity and, as such, it does not fit into any of the models we have established. However, a clearly negative attitude to that change is demonstrated in the word, and confessional identity is directly linked to ethnicity (we thus believe that this feature is extremely important for understanding the Serbian picture of the world).

The set of xenopejoratives is similar to the Bulgarian set, on the one hand, and the Serbo-Croatian, on the other, and contains a total of nine units. The same alimentary pattern is evident, represented by the lexeme *zhabar* (with the same referent, “Italian”). The linguistic model includes *shiptar* – “Albanian” (cf. Serb./Croat.) and its derivative *shipets*, as well as, most likely, *manga* (“gypsy,” cf. Bulgarian, which, depending on the etymology, can be classified as corporeal), and the ethnonym *tsintsar* (“Aromanian”), which is not always considered offensive and originates either from the Aromanian *tsintsi* (“five”) or from the general impression of the sound of the Aromanian languages, full of the combinations [tsi] and [tse] in positions where in other Balkan Romance languages it is usually pronounced [ʃi], [ʃe] or [ʃi] or [ʃe].²² The heterotopic model should probably include the xenopejorative *guptin* (“Egyptian,” i.e. “gypsy,” similar in origin to Eng. *gypsy* and Rom. *faraon*). The following suffix formations can be considered undifferentiated: *tsrnchuga*, which we saw in Serbo-Croatian and which carries the same meaning; and the political xenopejorative *komovar* – “communist”; as well as *jenki* (“American”), an obvious anglicism (from the word *Yankee*, which is also found in Russian).²³

Albanian (13 units) demonstrates xenopejoratives that fit into the corporeal model (*manga* – “gypsy”: cf. Bulg., Maced.), the alimentary model (*zhabar* – “Italian”; this has possibly been borrowed directly from one of the neighbouring Slavic languages,

¹⁹ It is appropriate to include this xenopejorative in the research material, as its referent belongs to the field of “alien, other, outsider,” both from the point of view of Croats and Bosnians (an ethnic xenopejorative), and from the point of view of Serbs who do not share jingoistic beliefs (a political and ideological xenopejorative).

²⁰ Hrvatski jezični portal. URL: <https://hjp.znanje.hr>

²¹ Речник српског језика. Измењено и поправљено издање. 2011. Матица Српска.

²² Capidan T. 1932. Aromânii. Dialectul aromân. Academia Română.

²³ Дигитален речник на македонскиот јазик. URL: <http://drmj.eu>

but the internal form is clearly felt by speakers due to the fact that the word *zhabe* exists in Albanian, and means “toad”), the general behavioural model (*cergar/cergatar* [“tent dweller,”], *strannik* – “gypsy”; *gabel* [“deceiver”] – “gypsy”²⁴), undifferentiated suffix formations (*grekoman* – “Greek”; *turkoshak* – “Greek”), and borrowings (*jenki* – “American”). Of the suffixal formations, however, the lexeme *shipuc* (literally “Albanian,” but in practice the word is used to denote an Albanaphobe, typically from among the Serbs or Macedonians) is also intriguing for the purposes of our study. This xenopejorative is a phonetically distorted version of the autoethnonym *shqip*, but the [c] (written q) is dropped, as in the South Slavic derogatory ethnonym *shiptar* (borrowed from the Albanian *shqiptar* and appearing in Serbo-Croatian as *uhunemap* [*shiptar*], although this form is now archaic; the form without the letter *h* is considered pejorative by Albanians themselves), with the diminutive suffix *-uc*. Another complex and ambiguous case is demonstrated by the xenopejorative *viç* (“calf”), used to refer to Serbians or Montenegrins. Based on the literal meaning of the internal form of the word, we should probably classify it as dehumanizing. However, *-viç* here serves as an allusion to the common ending of Serbian surnames – *vić* (Serb./Croat. *-vih*), and to Slobodan Milošević in particular – that is, this pejorative also contains signs of the linguistic and historical precedent models. *Viç* is also used with the derogatory meaning “fool, a stupid person,” that originated entirely independently, and perhaps evokes corresponding associations, although in this case they should obviously not be taken into account due to their secondary nature. As a term for gypsies, the lexeme *arixhi* (“bear leader”) can be singled out, belonging to the category of general behavioural xenopejoratives. Other xenopejoratives that refer to gypsies in Albania include *katal*, *kurbat* (both of Turkish origin), and *magjup/maxhup*, whose internal forms are somewhat uncertain: we cannot say anything unequivocally about the first example, but the second, according to Maria Koinova, is probably related to the idea of emigration (Tur. *gurbet* – “foreign land”),²⁵ and, therefore, belongs in the heterotopic category. *Magjup/maxhup*, meanwhile, appears to be connected in some manner either with the Egyptian origin attributed to the gypsies, or with their supposed magical abilities, which means, in terms of classification, it belongs in either the heterotopic of behavioural category, although it would perhaps be more prudent to leave it in the undifferentiated column. To sum up, it is worth noting that the word *çifut*, which is familiar to us from other Balkan languages, is also present in Albanian, although it does not carry a negative connotation.²⁶ As such, it is beyond the scope of our study.

²⁴ Maria Koinova offers an alternative explanation: the word literally means “stranger, foreigner” and goes back to some unnamed “Mediterranean root,” likely via Latin. The version we offer in this paper is more transparent, but we nevertheless consider it necessary to present this one as well. Koinova M. 2000. Minorities in Southeast Europe. Roma of Albania. Center for Documentation and Information on Minorities in Europe - Southeast Europe (CEDIME-SE). URL: https://cadmus.eui.eu/bitstream/handle/1814/46231/Koinova_RomaofAlbania.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (accessed 12.12.2023).

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Fjalor i gjuhës shqipe (ASHSH 2006). URL: <https://fjalorthi.com/>

With the Aromanian language (11 units), the physical model is evident (*subtsāri* [“thin, slim”], *limbā-subtsāri* [“thin tongue”] – “Greek”; *groshi* [“fat”] – “Bulgarian”; *lāvoshi* [“dirty”] – “Serbs”), as is the alimentary model (*macaronari* [“macaroni eaters”] – “Italians”), and the general behavioural xenopejorative *purintsā* (“pagans”) – “Pomaks.” The word *zdańgańi*, meaning “Bulgarians” and/or “Macedonians,” does not have an entirely clear internal form (the translation of this in the Romanian source text is *mojic* [“men”] in the sense of “yokel”). Speakers of Aromanian use the nickname *gricumani* to refer to Greek people, much like Albanians do. The epithets “thin” in relation to Greeks and “thick” in relation to Bulgarians curiously echo the lines of Mihai Eminescu (a Romanian Romantic poet, one of the pantheon of “fathers of the nation” and among the country’s most mythologized historical and literary figures (Kirchanov 2016): “Și apoi în sfatul țării se adun să se admire // Bulgăroi cu ceafa groasă, grecotei cu nas subțire...”²⁷ “In the Council then they gather and put on their shows / Dull Bulgarians with thick napes, and Greeks with their slender noses...” (this is a word-for-word translation, and this part is actually omitted from the translation into Russian by I. Mirimsky). It would seem that that the idea that Greek people have distinctive facial features, and Bulgarians are somewhat rotund is, if not a constant, then at least a stable stereotype among the Eastern Roman peoples. Pericle Papahagi offers several more ethnonyms used to refer to the Romani people.²⁸ While there is no *porecle* (“nickname”) for them, per se, the words used are undeniably xenopejoratives: *fusari* (“godwits”), *ursari* (“bear leader”), *tsirāpānj* (Papahagi spells the word in the Daco-Romanian style – *Țirāpîni*) – literally “sleeping,” i.e. “beggars”;²⁹ all these lexemes should be attributed to the general behavioural model.

Modern Greek (ten units) demonstrates examples of the general behavioural model in political xenopejoratives (*Κατσαπλιάς* [“thief, robber”] – an ELAS [Greek People’s Liberation Army] fighter³⁰), although the historical precedent model and undifferentiated models dominate. Historical precedents include the xenopejoratives *Αράπης* and its variant *αραπάκι*, complicated by the derogatory suffix *-arap* – “negro,” “arab” (Turk. *Arap*; note that, in addition to the real referent, this word also means a supernatural creature that is used to scare children),³¹ *Αγαρηνός* (“Hagarian”) – “Turk, Arab” (evidently, the word is used to refer to Muslims in general); *Φράγκος* (“frank”) – “Catholic,” and its derivative *Κουτόφραγκος* (“dumb frank”) – “Western European” (obviously primarily a tourist – cf. Span. *Guiri*). Xenopejoratives from the undifferentiated model include *Αμερικανάκι* – “American,” *Ελληναράς* – “Greek” (“Great Greek chauvinist”³²),

²⁷ Eminescu M. *Scrisoarea a III-a*. URL: https://www.mihaieminescu.eu/opere/poezii/scrisoarea_III.html#. YoPabIRBzIU (accessed 12.12.2023).

²⁸ Papahagi P. 1925. *Numiri etnice la Aromâni*.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ Wiktionary.

³¹ Dictionary of Standard Modern Greek. URL: https://www.greek-language.gr/greekLang/modern_greek/tools/lexica/triantafyllides/search.html?q=%CE%91%CF%81%CE%AC%CF%80%CE%B7%CF%82&dq=

³² The xenopejoratives *Κατσαπλιάς* and *Ελληναράς* are included here for the same reason that the xenopejorative *srabend* was included earlier: the referent is an outsider in relation to speakers of Greek who do not share his political beliefs.

and Τουρκαλάς – “Turk.” Καράγυφτος – “gypsies” stands apart here, with the pejorative connotation being conveyed by a prefix of Turkish origin that carries the meaning “black,” although in Greek it has acquired a general evaluative meaning, for example *καραπουτάννα* – “prostitutes,” that is, this xenopejorative should be classified as undifferentiated. Αράπης noted above can be supplemented by its derivative Σκυλάραπας – “arab bitch” (*σκύλα* means “bitch”), which could be attributed to the dehumanization model, but this appears to be a de-semanticized generalized pejorative prefix similar to *καρα-*. Looking at Greek pejoratives, the term Σκοπιανός – “Skopjan (a resident of Skopje),” (Koloskov 2011) which appears neutral at first glance, stands out, as it does not fall under any of the models and is used as a derogatory name for Macedonians, thereby emphasizing their lack of continuity with ancient Macedonia and the historical right to this name (much like the xenopejorative *Moskovit* [“Muscovite”] that nationalists in Ukraine often use to refer to Russians, the implication being that the right to the toponym “Rus” actually belongs to Ukraine).

When comparing the corpora of xenopejoratives in the languages in the Balkan sprachbund, the following features stand out:

- the presence of formally and semantically coinciding elements (both in closely related languages, for example Serb./Croat. and Maced. *Tsrnchuga* and *shiptar*, and in distantly related languages, cf. Alb. and Serb./Croat. *гaбeль/gabel*, *чepгap/cegar*, Maced., Bulg. and Alb. *мангал/манга/manga*, Serb./Croat., Maced., Bulg. and Alb. *жабap/zhabar*, and Serb./Croat., Maced., Bulg. and Rom. *чуфyт/cifut*);
- the presence of common areal beliefs about the origin of other peoples (Gr. Καράγυφτος, Maced. *guptin* and Rom. *faraon*) and stereotypes (Alb. *ar-ixhi* Arom. *Ursar*), including those that do not coincide with stereotypes that exist in other cultural regions (for example, Serb./Croat., Bulg., Maced. and Alb. *жабap/zhabar*, and Rom. *broscar* all suggest that it is the Italians, and not the French, who eat frogs);
- the sexuality model is poorly represented compared, for example, with Russian and English (which can be explained by the puritanism of lexicographers in these countries, as traditional thinking continues to dominate in Balkan cultures, and the relevant lexemes of a given semantic group, if any, must be particularly taboo).

We can thus observe (bear in mind that these figures are true right now, but will inevitably change as new data is collected) that the most frequently encountered models within the Balkan sprachbund are linguistic (6/7) and general behavioural (6/7), followed closely by alimentary (5/7); the undisputed leaders are the corporeal (7/7) and undifferentiated models (7/7, mainly various kinds of suffix formations with a generalized negative meaning, which is unsurprising, as all the Balkan languages have a rich word-formation morphology; and borrowings, which, again, is not particularly surprising, given the high degree of linguistic syncretism within the languages of the Balkan sprachbund). The sexuality (1/7), heterotopic (3/7), and historical precedent

(4/7) models are relatively poorly represented. However, there is an asymmetry in how these models are represented in the Balkan languages, as well as in the breadth of coverage of the nominated groups: the linguistic and general behavioural models are more universal than the corporeal model, for example, as they are applicable to a wide range of referents, while the corporeal model applies almost exclusively (with rare exceptions) to a given ethnic group.

Undifferentiated pejoratives nevertheless contain an interesting layer of Turkish borrowings (for example *чуфым/cifut*) that is present in one way or another in all Balkan languages (according to I. Sedakova, “the presence of Turkish words is an essential feature of the dictionaries of all languages that make up the Balkan sprachbund. Many scholars believe that the study of Turkishisms is one of the most important tasks of Balkan studies (Sedakova 2014). In and of itself, this layer does not indicate anything from the point of view of internal form, since borrowings in the recipient language can rarely be said to have an internal form at all. It does, however, fit into an existing trend, namely, that there are many words of Turkic origin among the pejoratives that exist in the Balkan languages; often, a neutral word of autochthonous origin will have a Turkic synonym with an expressive component (cf. Russian pair *голова* [*golova*] and *башка* [*bashka*], both of which mean “head”), and perhaps the Turkic origin itself can thus be interpreted as a marker of negative connotation. According to many experts, this is indeed the case. N. Stoyanova, for example, notes the following about the Bulgarian language: “for the most part, Turkish words are recognized by native speakers as foreign words and are not used in the literary languages. They are often used to express a special, pejorative attitude” or “to create a specific expression, a playful ironic tone,” for example, a Bulgarian might use the Turkic word *tapia* to mean “permission, certificate, ID papers” (Stoyanova 2007),³³ in the same way that a Russian speaker might use *ausweis*.

Rather surprisingly, dehumanization does not appear particularly frequently, even when talking about peoples with whom armed conflicts have taken place. Given the connection between the “other, stranger, outsider,” etc., and the concepts of the chthonic and otherworldly in the mythological picture of the world of the Balkan peoples, one would expect to encounter dehumanization of the demonic type, that is, likening people to supernatural beings. However, to our surprise, this is not observed either. The only exceptions here, as with the pejoratives associated with appearance, are a handful of nicknames for gypsies (Rom. *cioară, coțofană, balaur*) and the isolated Albanian ethnonym *-viç*, which has a multi-layered semantic structure. We believe that this apparent discrepancy can be explained by the fact that mythological ideas belong to the category of archaisms, the passive layer of the concept, to use Y. Stepanov’s terminology,³⁴ while the xenopejoratives used in the language, which do, in a sense, reflect mythological thinking, are based to a greater extent on synchronic representations, that is, on the active layer of the concept.

³³ Staynova M. 1964. За пейоризацията на турцизмите в българския език. Български език. 3. P. 183–186.

³⁴ Stepanov Y. S. 2004. *Dictionary of Russian Culture*. Akademicheskyy Proekt.

A significant problem for classifying one or another CP to one specific model turned out to be a kind of “lexical synthetosemy,” that is, the tendency to combine several interrelated motivating features in the same word (or even root). For example, the Romanian xenopejorative *coțofană* implies a likeness to an animal (dehumanization, that is, a manifestation of the corporeal model), a moral and behavioural characteristic, and an indication of a vestimentary pattern. This ethnophaulism thus falls into three categories at once, which complicates statistical calculations.

Another even more significant problem is the scarcity of relevant materials and records (and for some languages, such as Aromanian, this applies not only to xenopejoratives, but also to vocabulary in general), hence the limited data we had to work with. The data on Aromanian, for example, was extracted from a single source, a work by P. Papahagi, and the only conclusion we can thus draw from this is that further research is required, including (and even primarily) field work.

Similarly, the large number of corporeal pejoratives, but the narrow focus of the corporeal model itself in comparison with the alimentary and general behavioural models, may be explained by the fact that the lifestyle of the Balkan peoples is more or less the same (at one time, some were predominantly semi-nomadic shepherds, others were settled farmers, others were fishermen, traders and sailors, but over time, as these ethnic groups continued to mix, they began to adopt each other's ways of life), as is their appearance – a result of the large number of inter-ethnic marriages (the only exception here, in terms of both lifestyle and appearance, are gypsies, which would explain why they are the referents of the majority of bodily and behavioural pejoratives). It turns out that the key factors separating the peoples of the Balkans are language, religion (and the associated religious customs, although they do demonstrate a high degree of syncretism), cuisine, and various kinds of historical grievances (the historical precedent model is typically associated with these aspects, cf. the *Ustasha–chetnitsy* pair). The prototypical Balkan stranger is thus someone who looks different, behaves differently, lives, prays and eats differently, and, above all, speaks differently.

Conclusions

Our study of the image of the “other” (“stranger,” “alien”) in the worldview of the Balkan peoples, based on a comparative analysis of the internal forms of xenopejoratives used in the respective languages, revealed that the most frequently used models are (in ascending order): general behavioural, alimentary, linguistic, corporeal, and undifferentiated. From this, we can conclude that the prototypical stranger in the Balkan picture of the word is someone who looks, speaks and acts differently, with the latter two being far more prevalent in terms of the number of referents. This is likely due to the fact that in a region where peoples have frequently, and over an extended period of time, intermingled, intermarried, and borrowed elements of each other's national dress, customs, cuisine, and lifestyle, language continued to be one of the most powerful identifying factors by which one community could oppose itself to another

(the only exception here is the peoples of the former Yugoslavia, who speak virtually the same language – here, the historical precedent model would be the primary identifying factor).

Judging by the number of pejoratives, it is Gypsies who appear to be the most important referent, the “significant other,” as it were (and not the Turks, as we initially assumed). The Romani lived for centuries in the Balkan-Carpathian region without mixing with other peoples, maintaining an identity that was distinct from their neighbours, a unique (nomadic) lifestyle, and a manner of living that was condemned by those whose culture did not involve moving from place to place. The traditional closeness of the gypsy community to outsiders undoubtedly played a role here, and real ideas about their way of life were largely replaced by myths.

The conclusions we offer here should be considered preliminary. New material and a clearer classification system would likely change these conclusions in one way or another. That said, we nevertheless hope that this study, while doing nothing to mitigate the ethno-political tension in the Balkans (it would be naïve and presumptuous to assume that it would), will at least make the roots of this tension more understandable, and the further development of the ethno-political situation in the region more predictable, and thus more manageable.

Abbreviations used in this paper:

Alb. – Albanian; Arom. – Aromanian; Bulg. – Bulgarian; Eng. – English; Ger. – German; Greek – modern Greek; Gyp. – Romany; Hung. – Hungarian; It. – Italian; Maced. – Macedonian; Rom. – Romanian; Rus. – Russian; Serb./Croat. – Serbo-Croatian; Turk. – Turkish.

About the Author:

Evghenii Romanin – a Ph.D. student at the Institute of Philosophy, Saint Petersburg State University. 199034, Russia, Saint Petersburg, Universitetskaya embankment 7/9. Email: st027419@student.spbu.ru

Conflicts of interest:

The author declares the absence of any conflicts of interest.

Acknowledgements:

the author wishes to express his gratitude to Vuk Opančina and Daria Mecicari for their guidance on Serbo-Croatian and Bulgarian linguistic and cultural peculiarities.

Article submitted on June, 2022; approved after review on July 23, 2022; and accepted for publication on September 12, 2022.

References:

- Belyakov S. S. 2010. Serby – “Chuzhak” №1 [Serbs Are the No. 1 Alien]. *Voprosy nacionalizma*. (3). P. 128–140. (In Russian)
- Borisov S. A., Pilipenko G. P. 2020. Czech-Serbian-Romanian Language Contacts in Romanian Banat Based on Field Research. *Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*. 459. P. 15–26. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17223/15617793/459/2>. (In Russian)
- Foucault M. 1999. *Les anormaux*. Gallimard.
- Friedman V. 2008. Balkan Slavic Dialectology and Balkan Linguistics: Periphery as Center. In *American contributions to the 14th International Congress of Slavists, Ohrid, September 2008. Vol. 1. Linguistics*. Slavica. P. 131–148.
- Golant N. 2012. Obychai, obrjady i obraz zhizni evreev v zerkale rumynskih mifologicheskikh predstavlenij [The Customs, Rituals and Way of Life of the Jews as Reflected in Romanian Mythological Ideas]. In *“The Old” and “The New” in Slavic and Jewish Cultural Tradition*. Probel-2000. P. 314–323. (In Russian)
- Golant N. 2013. Biblejskie sjuzhety v rumynskom foljklore i mifologicheskie predstavlenija rumyn o evrejah [Biblical Plots in the Romanian Folklore and Mythological Ideas of the Romanians about the Jews]. In *Oral and Written in Slavic and Jewish Cultural Tradition*. Probel-2000. P. 220–226. (In Russian)
- Golant N. 2016. Mifologicheskie predstavlenija rumyn Oltenii i Muntenii (po materialam ekspedicii v vylchu, Gorzh, Mehedinc’ i Buzeu [Mythological Ideas of the Romanians of Oltenia and Muntenia (A Case Study of the Expedition to Vâlcea, Gorj, Mehedinți and Buzău)]. *Acta linguistica petropolitana*. 12(3). P. 27–40. (In Russian)
- Kirchanov M. V. 2016. Imagining Romania Spatially and Bodily: “National Locus” and “National Body” as Inventing Traditions of Romanian Identity in the Second Half of the 19th Century. *Studia Slavica et Balcanica Petropolitana*. 20(2). P. 169–192. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21638/11701/spbu19.2016.211>. (In Russian)
- Kirchanov M. V. 2021. “Culture of Unknowledge” as a Form of Historical Imagination and Political Culture of Russian and Bulgarian Nationalism. *Bulletin of Udmurt University. Sociology. Political Science. International Relations*. 5(3). P. 357–366. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.35634/2587-9030-2021-5-3-357-366>. (In Russian)
- Koloskov E. A. 2010. Macedonian-Greek Polemics on The Name: Aspects, Stages and the Search for a Solution. *Slavânskij al'manah* (Moskva). P. 186–203. (In Russian)
- Lamash M. V. 2021. *The Balkan Peninsula: Features of Geopolitical and Interethnic Processes*. Russian Political Science. 1. P. 90–99. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51180/RPS.2021.18.1.007>. (In Russian)
- Lesnichkova L. 2017. The Notion of the Foreign in Hungarian and Bulgarian Phraseologisms. *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Philologica*. 9(2). P. 27–36. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.1515/ausp-2017-0015>. (In Russian)
- Lindstedt J. 2000. Linguistic Balkanization: Contact-Induced Change by Mutual Reinforcement. In *Languages in Contact. Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics*. Rodopi. P. 231–246. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.2307/40997168>
- Luchkanyan S. 2014. Historico-Linguistic Disputes about the Latin Danube and the Continuity of the Roman Element in Ethno- and glottogenesis of Romania. *Scientific Notes of Taurida V. I. Vernadsky National University. Series: Philology. Social Communications*. 27(1–1). P. 20–24. (In Russian)
- Lysenko V. G. 2009. Knowledge the Other as the Way to Self-Knowledge. *Voprosy Filosofii*. (11). P. 61–77. (In Russian)
- Parastatov S. V. 2010. “The Macedonian Question” in the Context of Modern Geopolitical Process in Balkans. *Pravovaâ politika i pravovaâ žizn'*. 1. P. 128–133. (In Russian)
- Plotnikova A. A. 2009. Materialy dlja etnolingvisticheskogo izuchenija balkanoslavjanskogo areala [Materials for the Ethnolinguistic Study of Balkanoslavic Area]. Institut slavyanovedenija. (In Russian)

- Potebnja A. A. 1989. *Slovo i mif* [Word and Myth]. Pravda. (In Russian)
- Romanova A. P. 2015. The Ambivalence of the Image of the Monster in Modern Culture: The “Own–Alien” dichotomy. *Eurasian Union of Scientists*. (10–3). P. 52–54. (In Russian)
- Sedakova I. A. 2013. Balkanisms and Turkisms: New Approaches to the Problem. *Slavânskij al'manah* (Moskva). P. 553–562. (In Russian)
- Sobolev A. N. 2013. *Osnovy lingvokulturnoj antropogeografii Balkanskogo poluostrova* [The Foundations of Linguocultural Anthropogeography of the Balkan Peninsula]. Nauka; Verlag Otto Sagner. (In Russian)
- Stoyanova N. I. 2007. Turcizmy vo frazeologizmah bolgarskogo jazyka [Turkisms in the Phraseological Units of the Bulgarian Language]. *Herald of Daghestan State University*. 6. P. 102–107. (In Russian)
- Trefilova O. V. 2020. Bulgarian Folk Demonology: A Brief Overview. *Slavic World in the Third Millennium*. 15(3–4). P. 160–181. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31168/2412-6446.2020.15.3-4.11>. (In Russian)
- Tsivyan T. V. 1999. *Movement and Path in the Balkan World Model*. Indrik Publ. (In Russian)
- Tsivyan T. V. 2006. *Modelj mira i ego lingvisticheskie osnovy* [Model of the World and its Linguistic Foundations]. URSS. (In Russian)

HATE SPEECH IN AMERICAN POLITICAL DISCOURSE: A FUNCTIONAL-LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS¹

Yaroslav Y. Khlopotunov

Tula State Lev Tolstoy Pedagogical University

Abstract. The aim of this paper is to analyse how the concept of hatred is represented in American political discourse. The problem of intensified hate speech requires thorough linguistic investigation as political discourse is becoming more openly conflictual. The empirical material of this study comprises public speeches by American politicians, politically themed analytical articles in the press, and posts and statements of politicians in social networks. The main method used in the analysis is the functional-linguistic analysis of discourse. The author analyses confrontational communicative tactics, e.g. discrediting, scorn, insult, accusation, mockery, etc. The objects (or victims) of such rhetoric are political opponents of the subject of speech, who may have different points of view, religious beliefs, cultural backgrounds and social status. Hate speech, which is an extreme form of how the concept of hatred can be verbalized, may be directed against confessional and ethnical groups. The paper places a special emphasis on the communicative goals and intentions of discourse participants who resort to hate speech. Usually it is the desire of the subject of speech to publicly demonstrate disrespect, mock, belittle the authority of opponents and favourably represent oneself in the eyes of the audience. The rhetoric of hatred comprises such typical means as negative and offensive epithets and metaphors; hyperbolic, comparative, rhetorical and lexical constructions with the pragmatical meaning of irony. In situations when the subjects of speech emphasize the difference between them and their opponents (national, religious, social etc.), the functional fields of the concept of hatred and the “in-group/out-group” concept may overlap. In these cases, the communicative goal of the speaker is to alienate political opponents and emphasize their dissidence in a negative way.

Keywords: political discourse, communicative tactic, functional linguistics, verbal aggression, professional communication, hatred, speech manipulation, pragmalinguistics

¹ Khlopotunov Y. Y. 2020. Hate Speech in American Political Discourse: A Functional-Linguistic Analysis. *Professional Discourse & Communication*. 2(2). P. 20–30. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24833/2687-0126-2020-2-2-20-30>

Modern American political discourse is antagonistic in nature, thanks in large part to its institutional and national features (democratic, public, media-oriented, dialogical, and bipartisan). This leads to a constant struggle among candidates for various public positions for power. This often leads to conflict situations, the linguistic marker of which is the use of words from the semantic field “hate,” or words “of various parts of speech whose meanings have a common semantic feature” (Kulikova, Salmina 2013), in this case an expression of hatred towards the object of the statement. In the context of the ongoing functional and pragmatic evolution of modern English-language discourse and the transformation of the linguo-pragmatic norms of speech interaction in the political sphere as observed by many researchers, the deliberate deviation from the rules of verbal behaviour, as well the deregulation of discourse and the violation of the prescriptions for correct non-conflict interaction, can be seen as an effective rhetorical technique for exerting pragmatic influence on opponents² (Khranchenko 2017). Undoubtedly, hate speech, as a discursive phenomenon, can be attributed to such persuasive means.

Features of the implementation of the concept “hate” typically include the verbalization of such pragmatic meanings as disgust, enmity, hostility, loathing, ill will, malicious intent, dislike, etc. (Epifanova 2019). The American Merriam-Webster Dictionary defines the word “hate” as follows: “*HATE: to feel strong aversion or intense dislike for [...] HATE implies an emotional aversion often coupled with enmity or malice*”³. Thus, the semantic field “hate” may include those linguistic units whose lexical meaning includes a deliberate and extremely negative attitude on the part of the subject of the statement towards a certain object or person.

An extreme way of expressing the concept of “hate” in political communication is the use of so-called “hate speech.” Hate speech can be understood as various statements of the communicator that deliberately convey or express hatred towards a specific population group, such as an ethnic, religious or national minority (Smits 2016). Hate speech, as E. V. Koval notes, is based on the differentiation of people into “us” and “them,” and is at the same time designed to arouse the sympathy and understanding among those who agree with the person talking, while at the same time discrediting “them” (Koval 2019). Accordingly, hate speech primarily targets the listener’s emotions, appealing to their insecurities, fear of danger, and their sense of inequity in relation to those social groups that are the object of their hatred.

The communicative act of hatred is made up of the following semantic components: the subject of the statement, an emotion, a process, and the object of hatred. We will include any statements by politicians aimed at demonstrating hostility towards and disrespect for their opponent among such acts.

² Khranchenko D. S. 2014. *Funktsionalno-pragmaticheskaja evoliutsia anglijskogo delovogo diskursa* [Functional-Pragmatic Evolution of English Business Discourse]. Abstract of doctoral dissertation. Moscow. MGIMO University.

³ Dictionary by Merriam-Webster Online. 2020. URL: <https://www.merriamwebster.com> (accessed 10.05.2020).

The purpose of this article is to study the implementation of the pragmatic meaning of “hate” in American political discourse based on the functional-linguistic approach. Accordingly, we aim to solve the following tasks:

- to highlight, based on the speeches of American political figures, the most frequently used methods of expressing a hateful attitude among the subjects of statements;
- to analyse the speech tactics typically used in conflict situations;
- to determine the goals of the subjects, the functions of their speech acts, and the features of the images of the objects of hate that they build.

Research Methodology

This article examines the functional and pragmatic features of speech acts that imply hatred in American political discourse. By analysing linguistic methods for achieving the semantic component “hate” in institutional discourse, we are able to identify the communicant’s target preferences and clarify the manipulative tactics that influence the addressee’s picture of the world.

As the empirical material for our study, we used the speeches of high-ranking American politicians, as well as their posts on social networks. A functional-pragmatic analysis reveals key tactical ways in which the participants in American political discourse actualize the meaning of hatred in their words.

Research Results

The concept of HATE is most often expressed in the speeches of politicians through pejorative and discrediting means of expression. Take the following expressions by U.S. President Donald Trump:

(1) *They’re going to put him into a home, and other people are going to be running the country, and **they’re** going to be **super-left, radical crazies**. And Joe’s going to be in a home and he’ll be watching television⁴.*

(2) *She said she was Indian. And I said that **I have more Indian blood than she does, and I have none**. I’m sorry, and we drove her crazy and that’s a good thing, not a bad thing⁵.*

(3) *Looks to me like it’s going to be **SleepyCreepy Joe over Crazy Bernie**. Everyone else is fading fast!⁶.*

⁴ Sargent G. 2020. Trump’s new attack on Biden exposes his own unfitness. *The Washington Post*. 03.03.2020. URL: <https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2020/03/03/trumps-new-attack-biden-exposes-his-own-unfitness/> (accessed 10.05.2020).

⁵ Seipel B. 2019. Trump swipes at Warren: “I have more Indian blood than she does, and I have none”. *The Hill*. 08.01.2019. URL: <https://thehill.com/homenews/campaign/455875-trump-swipes-at-warren-i-have-more-indian-blood-than-she-does-and-i-have/> (accessed 10.05.2020).

⁶ Donald J. Trump. 2019. “Looks to me like it’s going to be SleepyCreepy Joe over Crazy Bernie. Everyone else is fading fast!”. Twitter. 10.05.2019. URL: <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/1126839450330382346> (accessed 10.05.2020).

(4) *Disgraced and discredited Bob Mueller and his whole group of Angry Democrat Thugs spent over 30 hours with the White House Council, only with my approval, for purposes of transparency*⁷.

(5) So interesting to see *“Progressive” Democrat Congresswomen*, who originally *came from countries whose governments are a complete and total catastrophe, the worst, most corrupt and inept anywhere* in the world (if they even have a functioning government at all), *now loudly and viciously telling the people of the United States*, the greatest and most powerful Nation on earth, *how our government is to be run*⁸.

In Statement (1), Trump uses the negative definitions of “super-left” and “radical crazies” to characterize the team of his rival in the presidential race from the Democratic Party, Joe Biden. The prefix *super-* and the adjective *radical* underscore the differences between the political views of the two rivals, and the medical assessment of crazies suggests that Biden’s supporters are reckless. With the hyperbole *Joe’s going to be in a home and he’ll be watching television*, Trump is clearly mocking his opponent’s age and health, creating in the minds of the audience the image of an ordinary man living out his retirement, suggesting that his team will be running the country instead of him. Accordingly, in this speech act, Trump resorts to verbalizing a pragmatic meaning of hatred in order to show voters that Biden is helplessness and lacks independence, and that his team is excessively radical.

Discursive fragment (2) is an attack by Trump on Senator Elizabeth Warren, built around Trump’s ridiculing the senator’s claims about her ethnicity as a member of racial minorities. The ironic phrase *I have more Indian blood than she does, and I have none*, allows us to indirectly accuse Warren of hypocrisy, of an inappropriate attempt to build her political career on a sensitive issue that has been a sore point for the United States for years. Trump uses the colloquial idiomatic expression *we drove her crazy* and the lexical repetition *that’s a good thing, not a bad thing* to actualize the concept of “hate,” thus approving the mass condemnation of his opponent and any attempts to rattle Ms. Warren.

In statement (3), the U.S. President uses verbal labels in relation to his opponents, based on the comical combination of their names and caricatures of them (*Sleepy-Creepy Joe over Crazy Bernie*). The dismissive and hateful tone represents Trump’s flip-pant attitude towards his opponents in the presidential race, and points to a lack of concern that he could lose his post as leader of the country. The metaphor *fading fast* emphasizes the lack of a serious political struggle among the Democrats and other worthy presidential hopefuls. This creates an image of Donald Trump in the minds of voters as a shoe-in at the upcoming presidential elections.

⁷ Donald J. Trump. 2018. “Disgraced and discredited Bob Mueller...” Twitter. 20.08.2018. URL: <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/1031503298967363586> (accessed 10.05.2020).

⁸ Donald J. Trump. 2019. “So interesting to see “Progressive” Democrat Congresswomen...” Twitter. 14.07.2019. URL: <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/1150381394234941448> (accessed 10.05.2020).

Statement (4) contains the negative epithets *disgraced* and *discredited* with regard to prosecutor Robert Mueller, who led the investigation into Russian meddling in the 2016 U.S. presidential elections. The story was a blow to Trump's reputation, as he was suspected of collaborating with the Russian intelligence services. The negative prefix *dis-* emphasizes the fact that the president was able to overcome the Mueller ordeal, and the invective phrase *his group of Angry Democrat Thugs* points both to the political affiliation of those involved in the investigation, and to its lack of grounds. Trump thus presents himself as a victim of political persecution, which is pointless and takes up a lot of his time (*spent over 30 hours with the White House Council, only with my approval, for purposes of transparency*).

In statement (5), Trump uses indirect insults as a tactic against a congresswoman from the Democratic Party. The deliberate use of quotation marks and a capital letter when writing the epithet "*Progressive*" is a graphic demonstration of the president's mocking tone towards his rivals, and the discursive element *originally came* emphasizes their origins as immigrants and implicitly allows his opponents to be categorized as "them," that is "aliens," or "foreigners." Trump also uses hate speech when talking about the countries of origin of these politicians. The metaphorical constructions *complete and total catastrophe, the worst, most corrupt and inept anywhere in the world*, contrasted with the antithesis *the greatest and most powerful Nation on earth*, paints these countries as undeveloped and backward compared to the United States, and connecting his opponents with their historical country of origin indirectly emphasizes their affiliation with a foreign culture, as well as their hypocrisy and disrespect for the American people (*now loudly and viciously telling the people of the United States how our government is to be run*).

The concept of "hate" can appear through the very use of the communicative tactics of discredit, accusation, insult, reproach, and positive representation in speech:

(1) *I think **this president is a coward** when it comes to helping our kids who are afraid of gun violence. I think that **he is cruel** when he **doesn't deal with helping our Dreamers**, of which we are very proud of. I think **he is in denial about the climate crisis**. However, that's about the election⁹.*

(2) *I think the president is making clear that the Democrats have been parroting Iranian talking points and **almost taking the side of terrorists and those who were out to kill the Americans**. I think the president was making the point that the Democrats seem to **hate him so much that they're willing to be on the side of countries and leadership of countries who want to kill Americans**¹⁰.*

⁹ "I Pray for the President All the Time". Nancy Pelosi Had an Angry Response When Asked If She Hates Trump. 2019. *Time*. 05.12.2019. URL: <https://time.com/5744706/nancy-pelosi-trump-impeachment-hate/> (accessed 10.05.2020).

¹⁰ Trump amplifies incendiary tweets about Nancy Pelosi after her comments on Iran protests. 2020. *The Washington Post*. 13.01.2020. URL: <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2020/01/13/trump-pelosi-iran-retweets/> (accessed 05.12.2023).

(3) So I'd like to talk about who we're running against, **a billionaire who calls women "fat broads" and "horse-faced lesbians."** And, no, I'm not talking about Donald Trump. I'm talking about Mayor Bloomberg¹¹.

(4) I'm a New Yorker. I know how **to take on an arrogant conman like Donald Trump**, that comes from New York. **I'm a mayor** or was a mayor. **I know how to run a complicated city**, the biggest, most diverse city in this country¹².

(5) What a wonderful country we have. The **best known socialist** in the country **happens to be a millionaire with three houses**. What did I miss here?¹³

(6) You know, when we talk about **a corrupt political system, bought by billionaires like Mr. Bloomberg**, it manifests itself in a tax code in which not only is Amazon and many other major corporations, some owned by **the wealthiest people in this country not paying a nickel in taxes**, we have the **insane situation that billionaires today, if you can believe it, have an effective tax rate lower than the middle class**¹⁴.

In fragment (1), speaker of the United States House of Representatives Nancy Pelosi ascribes numerous negative characteristics to President Donald Trump (*a coward, cruel*) and emphasizes, through the use of the negative constructions *doesn't deal* and *denial about*, his backward views on immigration policy and the problem of global warming. The possessive pronoun *our* (*our kids, our Dreamers*), the demonstrative *this* (*this president*), and the personal pronouns *I* (the words *I think* appear three times in the fragment) and *we* (*we are very proud*) actualize the concept of "us against them," which the communicant uses to implicitly place the country's leader in contrast to the American people, thereby indicating that Trump's actions are contrary to the interests of his own citizens and the values of the United States. Pelosi uses the remark *that's about the election* to point the attention of listeners to the fact that they are the ones who elect their presidents. Accordingly, the concept of "hate" is implemented here in relation to the personality of Donald Trump, and not the status of the President of the United States as a whole.

In fragment (2), White House press secretary Stephanie Ann Grisham is speaking out against the U.S. Democratic Party, which had criticized Trump's anti-Iranian foreign policy. By substituting concepts (*Iranian – terrorists, those who were out to kill the Americans, countries who want to kill Americans*) that create a negative image of the people of Iran as criminals and enemies of the United States, she paints Trump's opponents as traitors and accomplices of terrorists. At the same time, the use of constructions indicating probability (*I think, almost, making the point, seem to*) creates a certain distance that allows the speaker to avoid directly accusing the Democratic Party of

¹¹ Elizabeth Warren, Criticizing Bloomberg, Sent a Message: She Won't Be Ignored. 2020. *The New York Times*. 19.02.2020. URL: <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/02/19/us/politics/elizabeth-warren-debate.html> (accessed 10.05.2020).

¹² Full transcript: Ninth Democratic debate in Las Vegas. 2020. *NBC News*. 20.02.2020. URL: <https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/2020-election/full-transcript-ninth-democratic-debate-las-vegas-n1139546> (accessed 10.05.2020).

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Ibid.

supporting criminals. Grisham also stresses the Democrats' hatred of Donald Trump (*hate him so much that they're willing to be on the side of countries and leadership of countries who want to kill Americans*), indicating that their opinion is conditioned not by the interests of the United States, but by personal political ambitions and selfish motives.

In statement (3), Senator Elizabeth Warren accuses her rival in the election, Michael Bloomberg, of being a chauvinist and a homophobe. Deliberately comparing Bloomberg to Trump emphasizes the similarities between the two politicians (*a billionaire who calls women*), even though Bloomberg is no Trump supporter himself. The deictic construction *who we're running against* allows the speaker to actualize the "us against them" concept, thus highlighting Bloomberg's belonging to the "out-group" – the people Warren and her supporters vote against. In this way, Warren paints her opponent as an opponent with different views and priorities, despite the fact that they represent the same political party.

In turn, Michael Bloomberg uses the tactic of positive representation in statement (4) and stresses that the only thing he and Donald Trump have in common is the fact that they are both from New York (*I'm a New Yorker – Donald Trump, that comes from New York*). The pejorative phrase *an arrogant conman* in this context allows Bloomberg to express his contempt for the president and indirectly indicates that Trump, unlike him, acquired his fortune through fraudulent means, and that this is also an important difference between the two billionaires. The syntactic parallelism and lexical repetitions in the last two sentences highlight the managerial and political experience of the speaker, and the epithets expressed by superlative adjectives (*the biggest, most diverse*), form an implicit comparison of New York and the United States, since this city is the most accurate representation of the country in terms of its ethnic composition. Consequently, Bloomberg's track record of success in governing the nation's largest city makes him the Democratic candidate's best candidate for president.

In statement (5), Bloomberg uses the tactic of reproaching Bernie Sanders for his hypocritical stance towards millionaires. The rhetorical constructions *what a wonderful country we have* and *what did I miss here?* are clearly ironic in tone and point to the absurdity of the situation in which the participants in the election find themselves. *The nominations the best known socialist and a millionaire with three houses* are contextual antonyms in this fragment, emphasizing the discrepancy between the political views of the opponent and his real way of life. Accordingly, Bloomberg is attempting to create a negative image of Bernie Sanders in order to neutralize his social agenda and devalue his image as a fighter for social justice among working-class voters.

In statement (6), Bernie Sanders himself describes the American political system using the negative adjective *corrupt* and the participial construction *bought by billionaires like Mr. Bloomberg*, indirectly accusing his rival of bribing other politicians and the shadow management of the country's public institutions. The hyperbole *the wealthiest people in this country not paying a nickel in taxes*, the nomination *the insane situation*, and the conditional construction *if you can believe it*, point to the absurd-

ity of the U.S. tax reforms, and the comparative clause (*that billionaires today have an effective tax rate lower than the middle class*) is used to confirm the thesis that the country is corrupt. Thus, the communicator creates a negative image of American billionaires, representing them as greedy people who use the U.S. tax system for their own purposes in order to increase their own wealth.

In addition to the desire to blame the opponent and belittle his authority, the speaker's goal when employing the "hate" concept may be rattle the opponent, to elicit a response from them, and to openly demonstrate ignorance, neglect and hostility in the dialogue. In such cases, the tactics of ridicule and mockery are actively used:

(1) ***Let's dumb this down for me, because I don't know what a class 1 is, and I don't have the Book of Mormon over there like you've got to read from... I tried...***¹⁵.

(2) ***As you are speaking as the oracle of science, tell us, what exactly is a Y chromosome?***¹⁶.

(3) ***Sen. Cruz, while I understand you judge people's intelligence by the lowest income they've had, I hold awards from MIT Lincoln Lab & others for accomplishments in microbiology. Secondly, I'm surprised you're asking about chromosomes given that you don't even believe in evolution***¹⁷.

(4) - ***Romney's in isolation? Gee, that's too bad.***

- ***Do I detect sarcasm there?***

- ***No, no, none whatsoever***¹⁸.

(5) - ***My family has served this nation in uniform, going back to the Revolution. I'm a daughter of the American Revolution. I've bled for this nation ... Families like mine are the ones that bleed first.***

- ***I had forgotten that your parents came all the way from Thailand to serve George Washington***¹⁹.

(6) ***In three short years, President Trump has doubled the growth of the greatest economy in all of human history. And you know what our Democratic friends have done for him? Speaker Nancy Pelosi is trying to impeach him! I don't mean any disrespect, but it must suck to be that dumb!***²⁰.

¹⁵ Caffeinated Thoughts. 2017. Matt McCoy Mocks Jake Chapman's Faith During Debate on Fireworks Bill. 22.03.2017. URL: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uNEY-ubqj9I> (accessed 07.12.2023).

¹⁶ Ted Cruz. 2020. "As you are speaking as the oracle of science, tell us, what exactly is a Y chromosome?" Twitter. 27.02.2020. URL: <https://twitter.com/tedcruz/status/1233130604436369409> (accessed 10.05.2020).

¹⁷ Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez. 2020. "Sen. Cruz, while I understand you judge people's intelligence by..." Twitter. 28.02.2020. URL: <https://twitter.com/AOC/status/1233409167085449216> (accessed 10.05.2020).

¹⁸ The Hill. 2020. President Trump: "Romney's in isolation? Gee, that's too bad". 23.03.2020. URL: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=p37XPqHH7eU> (accessed 05.10.2023).

¹⁹ Illinois Senator Draws Fire for Racially Charged Attack on Opponent's Family. 2016. *NBC News*. 28.10.2016. URL: <https://www.nbcnews.com/news/asian-america/mark-kirk-questions-tammy-duckworth-s-family-s-service-heritage-n674331> (accessed 05.12.2023).

²⁰ "It must suck to be that dumb!" Louisiana senator mocks Nancy Pelosi for welcoming public impeachment war with Donald Trump as president grins during raucous rally. 2019. *The Daily Mail*. 07.11.2019. URL: <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-7660671/It-suck-dumb-Louisiana-senator-mocks-Nancy-Pelosi-welcoming-impeachment-war.html> (accessed 07.12.2023).

Statement (1) is from Iowa Senator Matt McCoy, a Democrat. Here, he is ridiculing Republican Jack Chapman, who, while promoting legislation in the Senate to allow the sale of fireworks in the state, tried to explain the different classes of fireworks. The use of substandard vocabulary in the imperative construction *let's dumb this down for me* demonstrates Mr. McCoy's disdain towards his opponents address, and the comparative construction and parcellation (I don't have the Book of Mormon over there like you've got to read from... I tried ...) allow him to employ the tactics of mockery with regard to Chapman's religion. Accordingly, the speaker turns to the conceptual areas of "hate" and "us against them" to demonstrate hostility towards Mormonism in general, and to indirectly diagnose his opponent as being insane, which thus devalues his bill.

Statement (2) was spoken by Republican Senator Ted Cruz, who was attempting to ridicule Republican Member of the U.S. House of Representatives Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez for criticizing the appointment of Vice President Mike Pence, a politician with no medical, as head of the White House coronavirus task force. The nomination *the oracle of science* is a thinly veiled jab at the authority of the opponent's statements, since she is a politician, and not a scientist. Cruz then uses the interrogative construction (*what exactly is a Y chromosome?*) to indirectly accuse Ocasio-Cortez of hypocrisy, since, according to him, she too lacks the necessary knowledge of medicine and biology (the very thing for which she criticizes Pence) to make such a judgement.

Statement (3) is Ocasio-Cortez's retort, in which she criticizes Cruz for disdaining people based on their financial status (*you judge people's intelligence by the lowest income*) and positively represents herself as a person with certain achievements in the field of biology (*I hold awards from MIT Lincoln Lab & others for accomplishments in microbiology*). Ocasio-Cortez uses intensifying constructions (*I'm surprised, you don't even believe*) to ridicule her opponent's religious beliefs, which contradict scientific principles. Consequently, both communicants attempt to belittle the other's authority in their statements.

In statement (4), Donald Trump ridicules the fact that his Republican colleague Mitt Romney, a frequent critic of the president who voted in favour of his impeachment, had decided to self-isolate. The exclamation *gee* is mocking in tone and allows Trump to express open disrespect for his fellow party member, and the intensifying constructions *too bad* and *none whatsoever* point to a certain sarcasm, although officially he expresses regret about the restriction of Romney's freedom. In this way, the president openly demonstrates hostility towards his colleague, gloating over the fact that he is isolating.

Fragment (5) is a dialogue between Democratic Senator Tammy Duckworth and Republican Mark Kirk. In it, Duckworth appeals to the past and paints herself as an heir to the American Revolution (*I'm a daughter of the American Revolution*). In response, Kirk uses irony (*I had forgotten*) and hyperbole (*your parents came all the way from Thailand to serve George Washington*) to make fun of Duckworth's Asian appearance (her mother was Thai), thus actualizing the concept of "us against them" by point-

ing out the hypocrisy of his opponent, who is trying to earn political points on a topic that is important to all Americans. What we thus see is Kirk's attempt to neutralize Duckworth's tactic of appealing to the past and belittle her authority.

Statement (6) was uttered by Republican Senator John Neely Kennedy. Here, he is ridiculing Democratic politicians who called for the impeachment of Donald Trump. The rhetorical question and the ironic *our Democratic friends* point to the non-cooperative behaviour of democratic senators and members of Congress with respect to the president, and the invective vocabulary in the rhetorical exclamation (it must suck to be that dumb!) is employed in order to express the speaker's dissatisfaction with and indignation at this behaviour. The remark *I don't mean any disrespect* is used to soften the offensiveness of the statement and give it a more conventional character. The goal of this communicative act is thus to ridicule and express indignation at what Kennedy believes to be the hypocritical and illogical behaviour of his opponents, and not to insult members of the Democratic Party.

Conclusion

The concept of "hate" is employed in numerous ways in American political discourse. These include various communication tactics: discrediting, accusation, insults, scorn, ridicule, mockery, etc. The goal of the communicant when resorting to hate speech may be the desire to express hostility towards or disrespect for the opponent, to belittle their authority and positively represent themselves as a more worthy candidate. Our analysis of the material in this article revealed that the reason for expressing hatred is often tied to certain characteristics of the object of criticism: the person's nationality, religion, beliefs, political views, age, and so on. Often the speaker actualizes the concept of "us against them" in order to draw attention to the "alienness" of the political opponent. Invective and pejorative epithets and metaphors are commonly used as speech markers for expressing hatred and hostility towards opponents, as are hyperbole, lexical repetition, and rhetorical and comparative constructions with an ironic meaning. The specific features of the functioning of different linguistic tools depending on the communicative situation are, in our opinion, of particular interest and deserve further study.

About the Author:

Yaroslav Y. Khlopotunov – PhD student in philology of Tula State Lev Tolstoy Pedagogical University, Department of foreign languages. 300026, Russia, Tula, Prospect Lenina 125. Email: yktula17@gmail.com

Conflicts of interest:

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

References:

Epifanova V. V. 2019. Leksiko-grammaticheskie komplekсы russkogo i nemeckogo yazykov dlya realizacii semanticheskogo polya “Nenavist” [Lexico-Grammatical Groups of the Russian and German Languages Actualizing the Semantic Field “Hate”]. *Filologičeskije nauki. Voprosy teorii i praktiki* [Philology. Issues of Theory and Practice]. 12(9). P. 394–400. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30853/filnauki.2019.9.80> (In Russian)

Khramchenko D. S. 2017. *Confrontation in Modern American Political Discourse: Linguistic Aspects & Teaching Practice*. ICERI2017 Proceedings. IATED Academy. P. 2917–2920.

Koval E. A. 2019. Ritorika doveriya kak kommunikativnaya strategiya bor’by s ritorikoj nenavisti [Trust as a Communicative Strategy to Combat Hate Speech]. *Rossiiskij horoshij zhurnal* [Russian Good Journal]. 2(2). P. 65–81. (In Russian)

Kulikova I. S., Salmina D. V. 2003. *Vvedenie v yazykoznanie* [Introduction to Linguistics]. Urait. (In Russian)

Smits K. 2016. *Applying Political Theory: Issues and Debates*. Macmillan International Higher Education.

SPINOZA'S DOCTRINE OF AFFECT IN CULTURAL-HISTORICAL PSYCHOLOGY¹

Andrey D. Maidansky

Belgorod National Research University
Institute of Philosophy, Russian Academy of Sciences

Abstract. Spinoza regarded life as an active play of affects, and human freedom as the taming of passions by means of the concepts of reason. Following him, Lev Vygotsky treats affect as the *alpha* and *omega* of mental development. The key theme of Vygotsky's last manuscripts is the same as in Spinoza's *The Ethics*: man's path to freedom via the reasonable mastery of his affects. Vygotsky defines freedom as the affect in the concept; in the last years of his life, he investigated the processes of synthesis of emotional and intellectual forms in the child's psychical development. Following Spinoza, Vygotsky defines affect as a dynamogenic state of the body, increasing or decreasing its capacity for action. Thus, affect acts as the intrinsic driving force behind the behaviour of all living beings. In the Spinozist view, psychology is the science about production of affects in the process of object-oriented activity and about exchange of affects in the process of communication of living beings. Vygotsky did not have time to carry out his project of the new psychology of man, and his successors refused or failed to continue this work. Aleksey Leontiev, Vygotsky's closest disciple and associate, denounced his turn to Spinoza and returned to the phenomenological treatment of affect as a form of experiencing activity. As a consequence, Vygotsky's problem of the relation between affect and intellect proved to be unsolvable. The philosopher Evald Ilyenkov, who adhered to the Vygotsky school, linked the beginning of psychical activity to the formation of images of the external world, losing sight of affect and, thus, of the problem of freedom as understood by Spinoza. Resuming Vygotsky's apex psychological project and studying the evolution of the psyche, based on the concept of freedom as the active mastery of human affects and communication relationships, form two growth points of cultural-historical psychology.

Keywords: affect, concept, activity, psyche, freedom, Spinozism, Marxism

¹ Maidansky A. D. 2022. Spinoza's Doctrine of Affect in Cultural-Historical Psychology. *Concept: Philosophy, Religion, Culture*. 6(2). P. 7–19. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24833/2541-8831-2022-2-22-7-19>

Spinoza succeeded in creating an idea of man, etc. This idea can be leading for the psychology of man as a science [...] it shows man – in Shakespeare’s words – in the full meaning of the word.
L. S. Vygotsky

Lev Vygotsky, the man who founded the cultural-historical activity theory in psychology, connected the future of the discipline of psychology with the ideas of Benedictus de Spinoza. However, following Vygotsky’s passing, the thread of “Spinozist” thought in psychology was torn. Spinoza’s name is almost entirely absent from the works of his students, although, of course, it is not his name that is the important here. None of Vygotsky’s students wanted – or were able – to use the lenses of categories and axioms that Spinoza refined in his seminal work, *The Ethics*.

Half a century after Vygotsky’s death, his biographer, M. G. Yaroshevsky, would make the claim that Spinoza’s views were hopelessly outdated and useless for modern psychological science.² This is at least an honest assessment of the Spinoza’s importance for the “Vygotsky school” of thought. But perhaps Vygotsky found something in Spinoza’s works that his extremely gifted students and colleagues, not to mention his narrow-minded biographer, did not notice.

In an earlier work, I traced Spinoza’s motifs in Vygotsky’s works (Maidansky 2008). Here, I will talk about the unfinished “Spinozist” project of “apex” or “Acmeist” psychology outlined in Vygotsky’s recently published *Notebooks*, as well as about why none of his students followed the path he laid out.

In the Beginning there Was “Affect”

In his final years, Vygotsky was absorbed in Spinoza’s doctrine on the concept of “affect” (meaning passions or emotions in this context). “*Implicite* contains the whole Acmeist psychology, the whole theory of concepts, affects and volition, the semantic and systemic structure of consciousness, which we *explicite* developed. Spinoza has the idea of man, which can serve as a model for human nature: This makes his theory of the passions the prolegomena for a psychology of man” (Vygotsky 2018: 436).

Vygotsky set about developing a new, modern theory of affect, comparing Spinoza’s definitions and lines of thinking with the latest discoveries in the field of psychology and the physiology of emotions. In his notebooks, he called his latest manuscript

² “Spinoza’s philosophy belonged to a different century – the century of the triumph of mechanistic determinism and uncompromising rationalism – and, contrary to what Vygotsky (who had been a passionate admirer of Spinoza since his college days) may have hoped, it could not resolve problems that required a new methodology (Yaroshevsky 1993: 97).

“the book I have wanted to write my entire life” and planned on dedicating it to the memory of his father. But death cut short his work, just as Spinoza’s psychology was about to enjoy a renaissance

Even before he became acquainted with Vygotsky, Alexander Luria had started to develop his own theory of affects at the Moscow State Institute of Experimental Psychology. He started studying affective reactions using the “conjugate motor technique” built on the principle of “simple free association” and the Jungian concept of “complex.” Luria interpreted affects in a purely negative way – as reactions that disorganize and temporarily destroy the “normal balance of behaviour.”

Luria attended the Ninth International Congress of Psychology in New Haven, Connecticut, arriving with the manuscript of his book *The Nature of Human Conflicts* in hand.³ Part One the book is devoted to the “Psychophysiology of the Affective Processes,” while Part Three, entitled “The Genesis of the Reactive Processes and the Psychophysiology of the Control of Behaviour,” was produced as a collective work under the leadership of Vygotsky. Luria mentioned joint experiments conducted with Vygotsky and Aleksei Leontiev, as well as conversations with the two men, and refers to works they had published.

Leontiev was also engaged in the study of affective processes as an undergraduate in 1923 before later joining Luria’s research team. His personal archive contains two manuscripts written in 1925. One is called “An Essay on the Theory of Affectivity,” and the other is dedicated personally to Spinoza. It was that year that Vygotsky introduced Leontiev and Luria to his cultural-historical activity theory. When he first broached the issue of emotions, Vygotsky decided to discuss the topic with his “inner circle” of fellow researchers. Luria notes the internal conferences that took place in the department: “The Problem of Emotions in Modern Psychology” (October 21, 1930), and “Modern Studies on Emotions” (January 3, 1931). As he delved deeper into the issue, Vygotsky was led directly to Spinoza: a good half of his *The Ethics* is devoted to the theme of affects.

So, why did Vygotsky elevate Spinoza’s teaching on affects to the position of “the prolegomena for a psychology of man”?

Such a bold claim carries weight if the following statements are true: (1) Spinoza was the first to offer the correct concept of “affect”; and (2) affect forms the fundamental basis of the psyche, its genetic root. But what if it does not form the fundamental basis of the psyche? How can Spinoza’s doctrine of affects serve as a gateway to human psychology then?

³ The English translation appeared three years later: (Luria 1932). The original Russian version would not see the light of day until the next century: (Luria 2002).

When he was first developing his cultural-historical activity theory, Vygotsky paid great attention to the determination of psychological activity from the outside – the formation of higher functions with the help of signs. In the 1930s, however, he became occupied with the processes of determination of the psyche from the inside, through “affect.”

He argued that a sign acquires significance for a person when it evokes some kind of affective response, and its significance is proportional to the strength of that response. The same applies to sensory perceptions, ideas, and any external factors of mental activity. The more powerful the effect, the more significant the object that causes it.

“The affective and volitional tendency stands behind thought. Only here do we find the answer to the final ‘why’ in the analysis of thinking,” we read in the final paragraph of Vygotsky’s *Thinking and Speech* (Vygotsky 1982: 357). Spinoza defined “will (volition)” as an active “affect” arising from comprehension (*ex ratione*) and giving peace to the soul (*acquiescentia*), and not as a fictitious “free choice.”

Vygotsky was well aware that Spinoza saw life as the play of effects, but he was in no hurry to agree with him on the issue. The turning point, it would seem, came when he read a rather loose translation into Russian of Walter Cannon’s *Bodily Changes in Pain, Hunger, Fear and Rage* (1927). Vygotsky saw Cannon’s experiments as empirical proof the Spinoza was right. In 1930, Vygotsky published an article entitled “The Biological Basis of Affect” in which he agrees with Cannon’s assertion that elemental affects – fear, rage, pain, hunger pangs, etc. – are the most powerful factors determining the behaviour of people and animals. The purpose of affective reactions is to prepare the body for activity.

This pragmatic – or, as Vygotsky, using the terminology offered by Cannon’s translators, puts it, “dynamogenic” – understanding of the nature of “affect” was perfectly in line with Spinoza’s definition of “affect.” And this did not escape Vygotsky’s notice:

“We cannot help but use this first factual statement, obtained by us from the first experimental study of emotions, to our advantage in order to connect it with the corresponding idea of Spinoza, which forms the starting point of his entire doctrine of the passions [...] Experimental proof of the dynamogenic influence of emotions, which elevates the individual to a higher level of activity, is at the same time empirical proof of Spinoza’s thought, which by ‘affects’ refers to such states of the body that increase or decrease its ability to act, help or hinder it, and at the same time to ideas about these states” (Vygotsky 1984c: 102).

Spinoza believed desire (*appetitus*) – the striving for self-preservation – to be the essence of all living things, including humans. Desire is expressed in special states of body and soul, called “affects” that increase or decrease the ability of living beings to act (*agendi potentia*). The primary affect of the soul is “want,” or conscious desire. Satisfying one’s desire produces the “affect” of pleasure; an unsatisfied desire causes the “affect” of pain or sorrow. All other “affects,” Spinoza argues, stem from these three basic ones.

Vygotsky eventually came to agree with Spinoza: “Affect is alpha and omega, the initial and final link, the prologue and the epilogue of all mental development” (Vygotsky 1984a: 297).

While Vygotsky cannot be called a consistent Spinozist, he nevertheless strove to think in the same vein, and set about deepening his understanding of Spinoza’s philosophy in his final years, when he turned to the core issue of *The Ethics* – the study of the relationship between concept and affect. Herein lies the key to human freedom.

Affects and the Problem of Freedom

Vygotsky’s thought always revolved around the problem of freedom. He considered freedom to be a far more significant difference between a “cultured person” and higher animals than intelligence (Vygotsky 1983: 120; 1984b: 201). In his notebooks, freedom is defined as an understood “affect.”

“To understand the affect is an active condition and is freedom:

Freedom: the affect in the concept.

The central problem of all psychology: Freedom [...]

The grandiose picture of personality development: the path to freedom. To revive Spinozism in Marxist Psychology” (Vygotsky 2018: 255–256).

In his last works, Vygotsky was preoccupied with the contradictory unity of concept and affect, reason and passions, and thinking and communication/speech. In the animal world, rational behaviour is wholly incompatible with communication (communication between them is an exchange of affects), and with affective reactions in general. Humans have managed to synthesize and harmoniously combine these mutually exclusive forms of activity, which is what allowed us to become free.

Even during Vygotsky’s lifetime, the neo-Spinozist turn that took place in psychological research was actively resisted by Leontiev. This much is clear from the internal Vygotsky group conferences held in 1931. Leontiev opposes the “logocentrism” of Vygotsky’s position, and Vygotsky, for his part, reproaches Leontiev for underestimating the “power of socialization” and “exaggerating the importance of practice.”

On February 5, 1932 (the day Leontiev turned 29 years old), Leontiev wrote Vygotsky a long and rather emotional letter, in which he notes, “Now we, as a group of ideologically connected people, are experiencing a colossal crisis [...] Our work, our joint work, has been crushed, undermined, shattered” (Leontiev 2003: 231).

The letter says nothing about the nature of this disagreement. In his declining years, in his 1976 oral autobiography, Leontiev would shed some light on the matter: “[It was] a confrontation of two lines of thought about how to move forward. My line was to return to the original theses and develop them in a new direction. The study of practical intellect (= objective action) [...] Vygotsky’s line was: affective tendencies, emotions, feelings. This is what is behind consciousness. The life of effects – hence the turn to Spinoza. I am all about practical research” (Leontiev 2005: 375–376).

Earlier, presumably in the early 1940s, Leontiev noted that Vygotsky's latest research had enriched the theory with factual content and opened up new research opportunities, but he regarded this step as movement away from the original plan, which was "to connect life with consciousness." Instead of tracing the origins of consciousness in the objective world, in human affairs, Vygotsky turned to internal mental states and "affects," attempting to explain consciousness in this way. "Affect? But affect is not a driving force," Leontiev objects (Leontiev 1994: 40).

Spinoza did consider affect to be a driving force – the determinant, the "proximate cause" of the behaviour of all living beings. "*Unusquisque ex suo affectu omnia moderatur*" – "Everyone shapes his actions according to his emotion" (Spinoza 1993: 91). People are often slaves to their passions. Human freedom consists in nothing more than the ability to master one's emotions and thereby increase the "ability to act."

"The affect motivates to act and think in a certain direction," writes Vygotsky, echoing Spinoza (Vygotsky 2018: 473). It is here where Leontiev diverges in his thinking from his teacher. He refuses to accept the concept of "affect," and thus rejects Spinoza's "idea of man" outright. In his opinion, the turn to "affect" was a mistake.

Leontiev sees a connection between affects and activity, but interprets this connection phenomenologically: in his opinion, affect is a "form of experiencing activity" that arises when the outcome of a given activity does not coincide with its motive. This interpretation of affects, in which they are reduced to experiences, directly opposes Spinoza's "dynamogenic" concept of affect as a state of the body that influences its ability to act.

Vygotsky cites the psychophysiological experiments of Charles Sherrington and Walter Cannon, as well as the "new psychology of emotions," that is Kurt Lewin and Morton Prince's studies of the "dynamic nature of affect." "The dynamic, active, energetic aspect of emotion is put forward as the only way to understand affect, thus allowing for a real scientific, deterministic and truly causal explanation of the entire system of mental processes (Vygotsky 1984c: 214).

Affect is not limited to experiences. Rather, it is a "holistic psychophysiological reaction that includes experiences and behaviours of a certain kind and which represents the unity of the phenomenal and the objective [...] It follows that emotion cannot play the passive role of epiphenomenon. It has to do something of note" (Vygotsky 1984c: 214).

The concept of affect thus became a bone of contention that caused a split in the Vygotsky school of thought, and even those who stuck with him to the end would ignore the theme of affects altogether. The confrontation reached its peak in early 1933. "Vygotsky was left with everything, I had to start over," Leontiev wrote in his diary (Leontiev 2005: 376).

He is absolutely right when he says that objective actions, practical experience, and "industrial history" should be an "open book" (Marx) for the scientific discipline of psychology. But the next step is to determine the features of the psychological study of objective activity. This is where Leontiev had difficulty – even his closest ally, Piotr

Galperin, could not be convinced. In 1969, Galperin asked bitterly: “What is left of the problem of activity in psychology? It is a verbal shadow [...] The nature of mental activity itself was still an unknown [...] The concept of activity has been completely hollowed out. It does not oblige anyone to anything” (Galperin 2004: 329–330). According to Galperin, while Vygotsky returned to acts of consciousness after briefly dabbling with external activity, Leontiev started to explain psychological processes as physiological processes, and his students did the same.

Thus ended Leontiev’s return to practical work.

Vygotsky suggested that they return to Spinoza. In *The Ethics*, the life of the soul is depicted as a flow of affects. And if that is the case, then the first thing that psychology must do is clarify the nature of affect. Of course, the cultural-historical activity theory can and should go beyond Spinoza, who did not fully understand the specifics of ideal human effects,⁴ such as awe at the starry sky above, or one’s sense of duty – “my internal moral code.” However, Spinoza did give us a simple concept of affect as a regulator of the “ability to act.” Vygotsky intended to make this concept the “alpha and omega” of theoretical psychology, but he never got the chance.

Farewell, Spinoza...

After Vygotsky’s death, the topic of affects moved to the far periphery of research. The relationship between affects and concepts disappeared almost completely from the scientific discourse, and the “central concept of the whole of psychology” – freedom – went with it.

Leontiev, as the archival records clearly show, considered the problem posed by Vygotsky to be “fundamentally unsolvable,” leading his school of thought to a dead end. “He [Vygotsky] tried to solve it through his study of Spinoza; and I am quite familiar with these attempts. I know that it was not resolved in this sense of the reverse of affect – intellect. It could not be resolved” (Leontiev 1994: 39).

If you read Luria’s or Galperin’s lectures on general psychology, you will notice that there is no mention of the topic of affects, and the term itself almost never appears. Leontiev does talk about affects, but his understanding of affect, as a “label” for things and situations, has absolutely nothing in common with that proposed by Spinoza in *The Ethics*. Spinoza’s name does not even appear in the conversation about affects (or anywhere else in Leontiev’s lectures). Stranger still is the absence in these works of traces of the thought of his teacher, Vygotsky...

The reason lies in his changing views on the subject of psychology – in a narrower and one-sided understanding of the nature of the psyche. For Leontiev (and even more so for Galperin and Ilyenkov), the most important thing was the orienting function

⁴ By way of an illustration, suffice it to cite his judgements about the beautiful and the hideous as “movement perceived by the nerves,” which can be beneficial or harmful to health (Spinoza 1993: 41).

of activity, the cognitive processes and images of the external world. The functioning of the psyche was essentially reduced to cognitive activity. The affects remained in the deepest, darkest shadows, on the other side of the Moon, as it were. There was no place for affects in Leontiev's picture of the evolution of the psyche: sensory – perceptual – intellect – consciousness. And this is quite natural, given that Leontiev's concept of affect makes it impossible to solve the problem of freedom (if it is posed at all).

In the early 1960s, Evald Ilyenkov would mark a return to the topic of Spinoza. However, his work on Spinoza – including on the problem of freedom – sidesteps the topic of affects completely, and not a word is said about the relationship between concept and affect, which forms the active nerve of the last three parts of Spinoza's *The Ethics*. Ilyenkov also ignores the issue of affects in his works on psychology. At the same time, he carries the interpretation of the psyche to its logical conclusion – more persistently and consistently than Leontiev – as a form of orienting activity in the surrounding, external world.

According to Ilyenkov, the elementary unit of the psyche is a sensory image. From the point of view of the subject, an image is an “individually adjusted scheme of external action”; from the point of view of the object, it is a spatial “contour” of the world, of things involved in the process of activity. “The direct sensing of these *external* contours of things as the goal as well as of the means – obstacles on the path to its attainment, *is the image*, and is the cellular form of psychic activity, its simple abstract schema” (Ilyenkov 2009: 98).

Ilyenkov does not attach importance to the simple fact that all mental images are emotionally coloured, whether positively or negatively. Objects that do not evoke even the slightest affect, remaining affectively neutral, leave no psychological trace, no image. We simply do not notice such objects. A mental image is a reflection (representation) of an external object of activity in the affective state of the functioning body. “Further, to retain the usual phraseology, the modifications (affectiones) of the human body, of which the ideas represent external bodies as present to us, we will call the images of things, though they do not recall the figure of things” (Spinoza 1993: 60). In other words, a mental image is nothing more than an affect that represents some external thing. Moreover, this representation is not necessarily similar to the thing itself (say, the painful sensation of a prick “does not recall the figure” of a thorn or a needle, yet at the same time it is a full-fledged image of feelings).

From the psychological point of view, life is the flow of emerging and fading affects, replacing each other in the process of objective activity and regulating its intensity. In the Spinozist understanding, psychology is the science of the production (in the process of objective activity) and exchange (in the process of communication) of affects.

Leontiev painted a grandiose picture of the phylogenesis of the psyche. Ilyenkov created an equally impressive concept of the formation of the individual psyche using the example of raising deafblind children. There was no place for affect in either.

According to Leontiev, the psyche begins with a sensation – an orientation response to a non-biological stimulus. As the starting point for the history of the psyche, Ilyenkov creates an “organized system of sensations – an image.” In his opinion, “the first form of psychically shaped actions” appears when the child is just six months old, when he or she begins to reach for the mother’s breast (Ilyenkov 2009: 96).

Animals know how to move from birth; therefore, the psyche is innate to them. Human babies do not know how to move, meaning that they are inanimate objects. Is it appropriate to talk about the psyche of a creature that does not have any images of the external world and does not know how to navigate it?

The only thing we get from nature is purely physiological functions that ensure the working of the metabolism. The “soul” appears later, at the same time as the first image of an external thing. Once this image appears, the brain begins to carry out mental functions, turning into an organ that orders and controls the objective activity of the body in the external environment.

This is what the ontogeny of the human psyche looks like in Ilyenkov’s depiction. And, for some reason, he believed that this concept had come from Spinoza.⁵ For Spinoza, however, images of feelings are nothing more than a special kind of affect present in the living body, reflecting the states of external bodies interacting with it.

“Images of things, as we have said, are the very states of the human body (*humani corporis affectiones*), in other words, the affects to which the human body is exposed (*afficitur*) from external causes and by which it is disposed to this or that action” (Spinoza 1993: 109).

Ilyenkov’s definition of the psyche, which reduces it to the formation of images of external things, puts an end to the problem of freedom from passive affects, “passions,” that occupied the author of *The Ethics*.

If affects are not part of the sphere of mental activity, then they automatically fall into the category of physiological processes. It turns out that Spinoza, reflecting “on the origin and nature of the emotions” (the title of Part III of *The Ethics*), encroached on the field of physiology, and Vygotsky, following him, also went on to retrain as a physiologist...

The foundations of the physiological interpretation of affects were laid in the late nineteenth century by William James and Carl Lange, and the latter, much like Ilyenkov, considered himself the heir to Spinoza’s thoughts. Vygotsky’s unfinished manuscript provides a powerful critique of the “organic” theory of affects (unfortunately, the manuscript was not published during Ilyenkov’s lifetime).

⁵ A. V. Surmava even tried to characterize this imaginary Spinozism of Ilyenkov as a “revolution in psychology” (Surmava 2009).

Do human infants experience affects? Spinoza would say without a shadow of a doubt that they do. Vygotsky provided an unequivocal answer in his work: “Affect opens up the process of the child’s mental development, and the building of his personality closes it. Thus is completed and crowned the development of the personality as a whole” (Vygotsky 1984a: 296).

As far as Ilyenkov was concerned, there is nothing in primary affects except bare physiology. “The newborn baby is here still wholly like the plant. He lives for so long as the ‘external’ conditions of the exchange of substances ‘come to him themselves’ – the mother. He is not yet an animal – and there is no need here for the psyche [...] The baby possesses neither image nor psyche for the simple reason that while he possesses an organic need (for his mother’s milk) he does not possess a *requirement* for it – just like a plant. He is not a *subject* but only an *object* of feeding” (Ilyenkov 2009: 94–95).

The baby is given food, yes, but he only eats when he is hungry, and if he is full or sick, he turns away from the food, spits it out and whines – he does not actively eat. Try feeding him again, this “object” ... The plant does not curl its leaves away from water and does not spit it out, no matter how much you water it. Thus, the definition of the psyche adopted by Ilyenkov turns into theoretical blindness to the most ordinary facts.

The child screams and cries as soon as he breathes his first breath of air, smiles when he is only a few weeks old, and soon starts to respond to the emotions of adults, maintain eye contact, play with rattles, etc. Are these really the actions of an inanimate objects? Plants in human form?

The moment we recognize affect, and not image, as the much sought-after “cellular form of psychic activity,” the chimera of human-plant (*L’Homme Plante*, as the sensualist Julien Offray de La Mettrie named his treatise) will evaporate immediately. The trio of desire affects forms the most primitive, yet the most full-fledged subjectivity – the “self,” *das Selbst*. By refusing to recognize mental as well as physical phenomena in these natural affects (“I want – I don’t want,” “pleasant – disgusting”), the psychologist cuts off one of the paths for understanding the genesis of this psyche, its original source, not to mention the “apex” problem of personal freedom – freedom understood as the active mastery of one’s affects and communications.

The Ghost of Spinozism

At the dawn of the Enlightenment, “Spinozists” were unceremoniously dubbed freethinkers and atheists. Pierre Bayle, who engaged in a heated polemic with the Spinozists in his famous *Dictionnaire Historique et Critique* (1697), noticed that few of them were serious scholars of Spinoza’s works. And that is true. Who has not referred to himself as a Spinozist at some point...

Not too long ago, E. E. Sokolova, researching Leontiev’s personal archive, revealed that he too had been a Spinozist. Avoiding unnecessary references to Spinoza, Leontiev, it turns out, was able to “revive Spinozism in Marxist psychology,” something that went completely unnoticed by his colleagues (Sokolova 2019: 654–673). Following her

mentor's example, Sokolova did not delve into Spinoza's works either, limiting herself to the odd quote here and there, "to illustrate" her point. This has been the *modus operandi* of the typical Spinozist since the "radical Enlightenment."

But even a Spinozist of this ilk can, of course, learn something valuable and important from Spinoza. Sokolova rightly points to the principles of monism and determinism, as well as to Spinoza's understanding of objective reality as a substance of the psyche. All this really is contained in Spinoza's writings, and not in passing, as it actually forms the basis of his teaching – as well as the basis of Marx's teaching.

So, why would Leontiev invoke Spinoza if the very same principles are better developed and stand out more clearly in the works of Marx? An obvious question that, for some reason, Sokolova chose to ignore. Little wonder, then, that she did not grapple with the far more difficult question of the differences between Spinoza and Marx in their understanding of both activity and the psyche. For her, the Spinoza that had been brought back to life was the same "Marx without a beard" that he had been during Leontiev's youth among the "priests of the Marxist parish" led by Abram Deborin.

Marx, by the way, would never have considered himself a Spinozist. He praised the French materialists who "smashed" Spinoza, along with other metaphysicians of the seventeenth century. Bayle, Marx wrote in *The Holy Family*, had already "refuted Spinoza" and, having written the history of metaphysics, was then witness to its death (Marx, Engels 1955: 139–141). Marx saw no need to resurrect the "drunken speculation" of the metaphysicians. Just look at the way he mocked David Strauss' attempts to revive Spinozism as being "stuck in the myriads of substances."

Spinozism as presented by Sokolova is essentially just Marxism clumsily disguised as Spinoza. There is absolutely nothing that is specific to Spinoza here. Instead of psychology, there are bits and bats of the theory of knowledge. Just like Leontiev before her, Sokolova ignored the last three parts of *The Ethics*, in which Spinoza expounds his theory of psychology, and she does not say a single word about affects... It is unclear what this new Spinozism had to offer Marxist psychology: monism, determinism and the principle of activity had long been known to it. There is no need to revive Spinoza for this purpose.

It would be more accurate to say that Aleksei Leontiev revived Marxism in psychology. For it is true that Marxism was more dead than alive in the human sciences of the Stalin era. It had deteriorated into a dead phrase, suitable only for hitting people of science over the head with – including true Marxists like Vygotsky.

Vygotsky was the only one who turned to the theory of affects developed in *The Ethics*, seeing in it a "beacon lighting the way for new research [...] not only the method, but also the *content of Spinoza's teaching of passions* is put forward as a guiding principle for the development of research in a new area – in the understanding of man" (Vygotsky 1984c: 297–298; italics added by the author for emphasis).

This is what the real, living Spinozism of the psychologist looks like – not some spectre of Spinozism made up of a few philosophical principles. The specific "content of Spinoza's teaching on passions" is completely absent from the works of all of Vygot-

sky's students, without exception. Not a single one of them responded to this call, nor did they even look to the "beacon of Spinoza" for at least some guidance.

The Ethics reconciles the issue of the relationship between affects and concepts, which provides the key to "freedom, or the bliss of the soul." Leontiev does not mention affects in his lectures on concepts, thinking and rational behaviour, just like his lectures on emotions and effects contain nothing about the concepts of reason and human freedom. His discussions on the nature of emotions reference "Freudian literature," as well as Fresse and Jean Piaget, as if Spinoza's *The Ethics* and Leontiev's "The Teaching of Emotions" had never existed.

Ilyenkov managed to write about Spinoza's understanding of the nature of thinking, and even about the subject of freedom (!), without mentioning affects even once. In the second essay of his "Dialectical Logic," Spinoza's man, absorbed in all the passions of life like "waves of the sea driven by contrary [...] unwitting of the issue and of [his] fate (Spinoza 1993: 129) – turns into a "thinking body" scanning the geometric contours of external bodies. All that remains of the "man in the full meaning of the word,"⁶ is a logical skeleton, a "poor Yorick"...

The development of the branch of Russian psychology that is associated with the names of Aleksei Leontiev and Evald Ilyenkov produced many remarkable discoveries; however, we have to admit that it strayed far from the "affect – concept" path carved by Spinoza, and which Lev Vygotsky actively pursued. And while Vygotsky would move close to Spinoza in terms of the evolution of his thought, the Vygotsky *school* moved so far away from Spinoza that, through the mouth of M. G. Yaroshevsky, it said goodbye to him altogether.

Vygotsky left the discipline of psychology a modern theory of effects that continued the work of Spinoza. But that was not enough. Psychology, Vygotsky argued, needs its own version of *Das Kapital*. Work needs to be done to derive the essential forms of mental life from the concept of affect, just like Marx in *Das Kapital* derives the forms of commodity exchange from the simple concept of commodity. Theoretically speaking, psychology needs to plot an evolutionary tree of the psyche from the "cellular form" of psychic activity, just like Mother Nature herself once did. This is the only way we can be sure that this "cell" is truly primary and universal – a "stem" cell, so to speak.

About the Author:

Andrey D. Maidansky – a Doctor of Philosophy, Professor at the Department of Philosophy, Belgorod National Research University. 308015, Russia, Belgorod, 85 Pobedy str.; a Research Associate at the Institute of Philosophy, Russian Academy of Sciences. 109240. Russia, Moscow, 12/1 Goncharnaya str. ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2061-3878>. Email: caute@yandex.ru

⁶ Vygotsky loved to quote this line from *Hamlet*. Like Goethe, he argued that Spinoza's *The Ethics* provides a translation of Shakespeare into the language of concepts.

Conflicts of interest:

The author declares the absence of any conflicts of interest.

Acknowledgements: This work was supported by Russian Science Foundation grant number 20-18-00028 Cultural-Historical Psychology in the Archives of Its Creators.

The article was submitted on April 2, 2022, approved after review on May 3, 2022, and accepted for publication on May 22, 2022.

References:

- Galperin P. Y. 2004. Vystuplenie na diskussii o problemakh deiatel'nosti [Speech at the Discussion on the Problems of Activity]. In *Deiatel'nost'. Soznanie. Lichnost'* [Activity. Consciousness. Personality]. Smysl Publ., Akademiia Publ. P. 324–335. (In Russian)
- Ilyenkov E. V. 2009. Psychology. *Voprosy filosofii*. 6. P. 92–105. (In Russian)
- Leontiev A. N. 1994. K kritike teorii L.S. [Vygotskogo] [Towards a critique of L.S. Vygotsky's Theory]. In *Filosofia psikhologii* [Philosophy of Psychology]. Moscow State University Publ. P. 38–42. (In Russian)
- Leontiev A. N. 2003. *Stanovlenie psikhologii deiatel'nosti: Rannie raboty* [The Formation of the Psychology of Activity: Early Works]. Moscow: Smysl Publ. (In Russian)
- Leontiev. A. N. 2005. Ustnaia avtobiografiia A.N. Leontieva [Oral autobiography by A.N. Leontiev]. In Aleksei Nikolaevich Leontiev. *Deiatel'nost', soznanie, lichnost'* [Aleksei Leontiev. Activity, Consciousness, Personality] Smysl Publ. P. 367–385. (In Russian)
- Luria A. R. 1932. *The Nature of Human Conflicts, or Emotion, Conflict and Will*. Liveright.
- Maidansky A. D. 2008. Vygotsky — Spinoza: Dialogue through Centuries. *Voprosy filosofii*. 10. P. 116–127. (In Russian)
- Marx K., Engels F. 1845. *Die heilige Familie, oder Kritik der kritischen Kritik. Gegen Bruno Bauer & Consorten*. Literarische Anstalt.
- Sokolova E. E. 2019. How A.N. Leontiev Revived Spinozism in Marxist Psychology, or On the Implicit Philosophical Basis of the Theory of Activity. *Psychology, Journal of the Higher School of Economics*. 16(4). P. 654–673. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17323/1813-8918-2019-4-654-673>. (In Russian)
- Spinoza B. 1677. *Ethics: ethica ordine geometrico demonstrata*. [Place of publication not identified].
- Surmava A. V. 2009. Ilyenkov and the Revolution in Psychology. *Logos. Philosophical and Literary Journal*. 1. P. 112–132. (In Russian)
- Vygotsky L. S. 1982. Myshlenie i rech [Thinking and Speech]. In *Sobranie sochinenii v 6 t. T. 2* [Collected Works in 6 Vols. Vol. 2]. Pedagogika Publ. P. 5–361. (In Russian)
- Vygotsky L. S. 1983. Istoriia razvitiia vysshikh psikhicheskikh funktsii [The History of the Development of Higher Mental Functions]. in *In Sobranie sochinenii v 6 t. T. 3* [Collected Works in 6 Vols. Vol. 3]. Pedagogika Publ. P. 5–337. (In Russian)
- Vygotsky, L. S. 1984a. Mladencheskii vozrast [Infancy]. In *Sobranie sochinenii v 6 t. T. 4* [Collected Works in 6 Vols. Vol. 4]. Pedagogika Publ. P. 269–317. (In Russian)
- Vygotsky L. S. 1984b. Pedologiya podrostka [Pedology of the Adolescent]. In *Sobranie sochinenii v 6 t. T. 4*. [Collected Works in 6 Vols. Vol. 4.]. Pedagogika Publ. P. 5–242. (In Russian)
- Vygotsky L. S. 1984c. 'Uchenie ob emotsiakh. Istoriko-psikhologicheskoe issledovanie' [The Teaching about Emotions. Historical-Psychological Studies]. In *Sobranie sochinenii v 6 t. T. 6* [Collected Works in 6 Vols. Vol. 6]. Pedagogika Publ. P. 91–328. (In Russian)
- Vygotsky L. S. 2018. Zapisnye knizhki L.S. Vygotskogo: Izbrannoe [Vygotsky's Notebooks. A Selection]. Kanon+ Publ. (In Russian)
- Yaroshevsky M. G. 1993. L.S. Vygotsky: v poiskakh novoi psikhologii [Vygotsky: In Search of a New Psychology]. Mezhdunarodnyi fond istorii nauki Publ. (In Russian)

ACTIVE MODELS IN MODERN PORTUGUESE NEOLOGY: NEW WORDS AND THE PANDEMIC¹

Olga A. Saprykina

Lomonosov Moscow State University

Abstract. In this paper, neology is considered as a heuristic activity that is carried out with the help of language. The article uses materials from modern Portuguese-language media discourse, specifically from the internet versions of the leading media resources in Portugal and Brazil. The combination of structural, psycholinguistic, functional-stylistic, denotative, cognitive-discursive and lexicographic approaches helps to identify the main active models in the field of Portuguese neology. During the coronavirus pandemic, Portuguese neology developed in the classical way, although some new phenomena are observed at the same time. Processes that traditionally occur include word formation (affixation, abbreviation and word composition), semantic reinterpretations of lexical units, and borrowings. There is a large proportion of initial abbreviations in word formation, both alphabetic (sigla) and phonetic (acronyms). Many initial abbreviations are of an international origin. Compound words function alongside scientific symbols. In affixation, prefix word-formation prevails. To enrich the dictionary, borrowings are mostly taken from English. New neological models are associated with the determinologization of medical vocabulary, which migrates into everyday discourse. Proper names are interpreted in a new way. Some anthroponyms, mythonyms and toponyms acquire associative connotations or become part of complex words. Derivation in the field of phraseology, in which the number of fixed combinations increases, has become more common. Paremiology is renewed with antiproverbs. Linguocreative activity is represented by expressive memes and hashtags. In the pandemic period, along with neologisms, potential words with great expressiveness appear. Portuguese neology actively conceptualizes the events of the coronavirus pandemic. In the field of conceptualization, the subdomains of medicine, media and everyday discourse, in the focus of which lies the concept of “disease,” are distinguished. The latter is understood with the help of conventional lexical means and lexical resources from different styles. During the pandemic, the neological field “coronavirus pandemic” appears as part of the constantly expanding neologosphere of the language.

Keywords: neologisms, word production, affixation, abbreviation, word composition, paremiological derivation, determinologization

¹ Saprykina O. A. 2022. Active Models in Modern Portuguese Neology: New Words and the Pandemic. *Linguistics & Polyglot Studies*. 8(2). P. 29–39. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24833/2410-2423-2022-2-31-29-39>

Neology can be seen as heuristic activity that is carried out through language. Heuristic activity in speech is understood as techniques of creative cognitive work during which new lexical units in the language may arise (new words, new meanings, and new combinations of words). Neology is the sphere of active word creation (linguistic creativity). Lexical innovations show new forms of life, new objects, and new concepts. A large group of lexical innovations is made up of neonyms, or terminological neologisms.

Active processes in Portuguese neology are taking place in numerous areas. The focus of the intensification of neological activity is on word formation, within which abbreviation, compounding and merging (blending) occur. Innovations also take place in the process of the semantic rethinking of existing lexical units, sometimes on the basis of phraseological derivation. The newest layers of vocabulary are rapidly being replenished with borrowings from other languages (foreign neologisms). Active processes that take place in neology include determinologization – the transformation of neonyms into new common words on the basis of the properties acquired by them, such as the spontaneity of their appearance, their form and distribution, the presence of synonyms, and the origin of the words. In variantology, the differentiation of the neological vocabulary of the European and Brazilian varieties of Portuguese is manifested in the field of potential vocabulary exclusively.

The intensification of neological processes that started in 2019 came about as a result of the coronavirus pandemic – a kind of “black swan” of world civilization and culture (Taleb 2009). Signs of the impending global crisis were the anomalous nature of the events, which no one could have seen coming, their immense impact, and the fact that they were open to analysis. The Brazilian linguist Evanildo Bechara notes that language reflects what happens in history, that any event inevitably produces new vocabulary, and the pandemic is a vivid example of this².

O. S. Akhmanova defines a *neologism* as “a word or phrase created (or which has appeared) to designate a new (previously unknown) object or to express a new concept” (Akhmanova 2004: 261–262). A word belongs to the category of neologisms from the moment it first appears in a dictionary of the respective language. Or if it is considered to be new by the generation now using it (Kotelova 1983; Togoëva 2000; Kozlovskaja 2020). Russian neography has latched onto the theory presented by N. Z. Kotelova, who developed a typology of dictionaries of new words – annuals, ten-year dictionaries, and thirty-year dictionaries, with each recording words that appear in the corresponding timeframes (Popova 2005). The composition of neologisms is in constant flux: some replenish the active vocabulary; while those that do not lose their novelty and freshness remain in the passive vocabulary (Bragina 1973). Along

² Capobianco M. 2020. Está em carentena? Como surgiram as gírias nascidas durante a pandemia. 17.07.2020. URL: <https://vejario.abril.com.br/cidade/girias-pandemia/> (accessed 30.01.2022).

with the term *neologism*, experts in the field also use similar terms *innovation* and *nonce-formation*. Innovations can arise at different levels of language, while nonce-formations (Vinogradov 1977: 3) are typically word-forming neologisms.

The study of neology in Portugal and Brazil takes much from the French linguistic tradition, which, back in 1750, raised the issue of creating new words to enrich the language (Kosovitch 2014: 55). Following the Canadian linguist J.-C. Boulanger, the Portuguese-speaking researchers I. Alves, M. Barbosa, M. Botta, J. Ganança, and others³ see neologisms as “recently created lexical units, new meanings of an existing word, or a word recently borrowed from a foreign language and adopted in another”⁴.

According to the Dicionário eletrônico Houaiss da Língua Portuguesa, the term *neology* carries the following meanings: “the process of creating, describing and using new lexical units”; “the registration of these units”; and “a set of neologisms”⁵. Researchers note that while *neology* is the process of creating new units, *neologism* is the result of this process⁶. Centres for the study of neologisms appeared in various Romance countries – Obneo (the Neology Observatory) in Spain and Onli in Italy – copying the model of the Institute of Neology set up in France by Bernard Quemada (1926–2018). In Portugal, the Observatório de Neologia do Português, do Instituto de Linguística Teórica Computacional, and Iltec appeared in Lisbon, while the Observatório de Neologismos do Português Brasileiro Contemporâneo (Projeto TermNeo) opened at the University of São Paulo in Brazil.

Object of Study and Research Methods

Lexical innovations created during the pandemic appeared with great frequency in the Portuguese media, in the medical (scientific and practical) discourse and in everyday communication. The coronavirus pandemic became one of the main topics of media speech. COVID-related news has been afforded its very own section in the Portuguese media, alongside politics, culture, and sports⁷.

³ Alves I. M. 2001. O conceito da neologia da descrição lexical a planificação linguística. *ALFA: Revista de Linguística*, 40. URL: <https://periodicos.fclar.unesp.br/alfa/article/view/3992> (accessed 30.01.2022); Barbosa M. A. 1978. Aspectos da dinâmica do neologismo. URL: <https://www.revistas.usp.br/linguaeliteratura/article/view/138126> (accessed 20.01.2022); Botta M. J. 2020. Os usos do neologismo spoiler no português brasileiro. 20.05.2020. URL: <https://seer.ufu.br/index.php/GTLex/article/view/54463> (accessed 30.01.2022); Dicionário eletrônico Houaiss da Língua Portuguesa. URL: https://houaiss.uol.com.br/corporativo/apps/uol_www/v6-0/html/index.php#0 (accessed 11.01.2022).

⁴ Alves I. M. 2001. O conceito da neologia da descrição lexical a planificação linguística. *ALFA: Revista de Linguística*, 40. URL: <https://periodicos.fclar.unesp.br/alfa/article/view/3992>. (accessed 30.01.2022). P. 101.

⁵ Dicionário eletrônico Houaiss da Língua Portuguesa. URL: https://houaiss.uol.com.br/corporativo/apps/uol_www/v6-0/html/index.php#0 (accessed 11.01.2022).

⁶ Fraga Patrícia da Silva. 2020. Provérbios em quarentena. 07.04.2020. URL: <https://coletiva.net/colunas/proverbios-em-quarentena,354579.jhtml> (accessed 27.01.2022). P. 35.

⁷ A covid-19 na língua. 2020. URL: <https://ciberduvidas.iscte-iul.pt/artigos/rubricas/idioma/covid-19-na-lingua/4059/> (accessed 25.01.2022); Moreno da Silva F., Sobral da Silva Maia J. 2021. Neologismos na mídia em meio a pandemia da covid-19. URL: <https://periodicos.ufsc.br/index.php/forum/article/view/73727/47286> (accessed 25.01.2022); Mutchnik L. 2021. Coronavirus Pandemia infla entrada de novas palavras no dicionário. 17.10.2021. URL: <https://educacao.uol.com.br/noticias/2021/10/17/pandemia-coronavirus-novas-palavras-dicionario.htm> (accessed 21.10.2021).

The print and electronic versions of the leading publications in Portugal (*Diário de Notícias*, *Público*, and *Expresso*) and Brazil (*Folha de São Paulo* and *Veja*) regularly update the relevant information: *Avanço da Omicron obriga governo a novas restrições* (“Spread of Omicron Forces Government to Take New Restrictive Measures”);⁸ *Incidência na Alemanha baixa ligeiramente, governo desaconselha viagens* (“COVID-19 Incidence Shows Slight Decline, Government Advises against Travelling”).⁹

This paper focuses on lexical innovation in the Portuguese media, and in medical and everyday discourse.

Our concern is with the formation of neologisms, which can take place in a number of ways: the use of various models of word formation, including semantic rethinking, transformations of phraseological units, and borrowings from other languages.

Several approaches are used in the theory of neologisms – functional-stylistic, psycholinguistic, denotative, structural, and lexicographical (Popova 2005: 4–16). The combination of these approaches gives a more or less complete “neological field” in the language, a fragment of the *neologosphere*. The period of the spread of COVID-19 gave rise to the “coronavirus pandemic” neological field, which contains nonce-formations of various types.

As a heuristic activity, neology is active in the field of conceptualization and categorization, that is, in the design of classes of words and concepts. An approach to the study of such units is being developed in cognitive neology (Zabotkina 1990). Communication during the coronavirus pandemic brought such concepts (including mythological concepts) as “disease,” “catastrophe,” “apocalypse” into the focus of verbal communication. The words and expressions used most commonly to denote these concepts were *pandemia* – pandemic; *doença (contagiosa, severa)* – disease (contagious, serious); and *Apocalypse* – apocalypse.

Analysis and Results

In Portuguese neology, intensive processes were set in motion during the pandemic in the field of word formation, new phenomena emerged in phraseology and paremiology, and the lexical migration of words from different languages and different functional styles took place.

⁸ *Avanço da Omicron obriga governo a novas restrições* [Spread of Omicron Forces Government to Take New Restrictive Measures]. 23.12.2021. URL: <https://www.dn.pt/sociedade/avanco-da-variante-omicron-obriga-governos-europeus-a-novas-restricoes-14434638.html> (accessed 11.12.2023).

⁹ *Incidência na Alemanha baixa ligeiramente, governo desaconselha viagens* [COVID-19 Incidence Shows Slight Decline, Government Advises against Travelling]. 05.12.2021. URL: <https://www.dn.pt/internacional/covid-19-incidencia-na-alemanha-baixa-ligeiramente-governo-desaconselha-viagens-14381200.html> (accessed 11.12.2023).

Derivational Neologisms

The most productive way to form neologisms in Portuguese is to shorten words. The Portuguese words *truncção* or *abreviação* refer to the process of word-formation by eliminating part of the original word. Words can be contracted by means of *truncation*, *contraction*, or a *combined method* (*contamination*).

The class of contracted words in Portuguese includes initialisms and compound words. In Portuguese linguistics, the class of initialisms covers *sigla* (sigla), *acrônimos* (acronyms), *abreviaturas* (abbreviations), and *símbolos* (symbols).

The majority of initialisms used during the pandemic were international in nature. Sigla differ in that you need to pronounce each initial letter in accordance with the rules of the alphabet. The sigla OMS (o-emi-esi) was widely used during the pandemic. It refers to the Organização Mundial da Saude (the World Health Organization, WHO), as the international organization that plays the leading role in the UN system in tackling health problems that arise in emergency situations. Determinologized sigla such as ADN (a-de-eni) for ácido desoxirribonucleico (DNA, deoxyribonucleic acid), IG (i- gue) for imunoglobulina (immunoglobins), and Ac for anticorpos (antibodies) were used to explain the mechanisms of the disease, and Teste RT-PCR (erre-te, pe-ce-erre) was used for reação em cadeia de polimerase (polymerase chain reaction, or PCR, test). These sigla, which existed before the pandemic, were a part of medical terminology, but were almost never used in everyday speech.

Acronyms also consist of initial letters, but they are read as a single word. Popular acronyms popular during the pandemic include covid (coronavirus disease) and Sars-CoV-2 coronavirus da síndrome respiratória aguda grave-2 (Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2). Strictly speaking, these two lexical units in Portuguese are formed by a threefold process of borrowing, acronym-creation, and compounding. Another example of a borrowed acronym is ECMO Oxigenação por Membrana Extracorpórea (extracorporeal membrane oxygenation, which is an invasive method of saturating the blood with oxygen): *O doente foi posto em ecmo*. The widespread use of masks and other protective equipment during the pandemic brought the acronym EPI equipamento de proteção (PPE, personal protective equipment) into regular usage. The severe cases required intensive medical care, which, in Portuguese saw the word UNI unidade de cuidados (ICU, intensive care unit) appear with increasing frequency.

Abbreviations are typically made up of shortened initial elements of a phrase. Abbreviations (blends) such as *covidiota* (covid + idiota, a “covidiot”) – a person who reacts in a less-than-adequate manner to the pandemic or neglects precautionary prescriptions; *imunodeprimido* – a person with reduced immunity; *imunodepressão* – decreased immunity; and *infectocontagioso* – a contagious infected (patient) appeared during the pandemic,

Generally accepted graphic abbreviations that received widespread use during the coronavirus pandemic can be considered symbols: *Molécula de imunoglobulina tipicamente com a sua forma em Y. Em azul observam-se as cadeias pesadas com quatro domínios Ig, enquanto que em verde mostram-se as cadeias leves. Entre o pé do Y (fracção constante, Fc) e os braços (Fab) existe uma parte mais fina conhecida como a “região de dobradiça.”*¹⁰ The Portuguese researcher Maria de Sousa, who died from coronavirus, was one of the first in medical science to identify the T cell area – *the zone of the lymph node in which lymphocytes accumulate*. **B.1.1.7** is the alpha strain of coronavirus, and **B.1.526** is its lota variant.

Among the most significant word-building patterns are affixal structural formations, which are based on suffixation, prefixation or compounding.

With suffixation, traditional suffixed are used with the meanings of “theory,” “concept,” “location,” or “quality.” For instance, in neological vocabulary, the words *negacionismo*, *covidário*, and *covidico* became popular during the pandemic. *Negacionismo* < *negações* + *ismo* – negationism as a revision of established concepts in the medical (or another) field, ignoring accepted facts: *Luciano Huck diz que negacionismo no combate a coronavirus é inaceitável*¹¹. *Covidário* – covidarium, a place set aside for the treatment of covid patients (originally a medical term). *Covidico* – covid (as an adjective), used to refer to the period of the covid pandemic. A person in quarantine is called a *quarentener*, while *chloroquiner* is used to describe a person who takes hydroxychloroquine, an antimalarial drug, to treat coronavirus.

The universal prefixes *pós-*, *anti-*, *tele-*, *sub-*, *super-*, and *co-* were used with great frequency in neologisms: *pós-covid 19*, *o mundo pós-covid* (“post-covid world”); *pós-coronavirus* (post-coronavirus): *é possível imaginar um legado pós-coronavirus* (“is it possible to imagine a post-coronavirus will?”); *pós-pandemia* (post-pandemic): *o mundo pós-pandemia exigirá novo papel do estado* (“the post-pandemic world will require the state to play a new role”); *anticoronavirus* (“anti-coronavirus”): *vacina anticoronavirus* (“anti-coronavirus vaccine”); *anticorpos* (“antibodies”): *presença de anticorpos em pessoas já infetadas* (“the presence of antibodies in infected people”); *antivírico* (“antiviral”); *teleescola* (remote learning), *teletrabalho* (remote working, professional activity carried out away from the workplace using special communication tools for data transfer). The word *notificação* (“data”) is used to assess coronavirus cases. Understating the increase in cases is known as *subnotificação*, while the deliberate exaggeration is called *supernotificação*: *Doria rebate suposta supernotificação de mortes em SP5* (“Doria [the mayor of São Paulo] disputes alleged increase in covid fatalities in São Paulo”).¹² The word *comorbidade* has become common to denote concomitant diseases that complicate the illness.

¹⁰ Imunoglobulina. URL: <https://pt.wikipedia.org/wiki/Imunoglobulina>

¹¹ Luciano Huck diz que negacionismo no combate ao coronavirus é ‘inaceitável’. 22.04.2020. URL: <https://jovempan.com.br/programas/panico/luciano-huck-negacionismo-coronavirus.html> (accessed 11.12.2023).

¹² Ibid.

New lexical units have emerged in the practice of compounding: *cobre-sapatos* (“shoe covers”); *coronabonds* – bonds issued during the coronavirus crisis; *coronavirus* (“coronavirus” or *coronaviridae* in Latin) as the general name of the viruses in the family.

Potential Words in Media Discourse

Not all words created in speech are immediately adopted into the general vocabulary. Neologisms enter into circulation and are reproduced in speech, both oral and written. Potential words belong to the category of non-common nonce-formations. During the pandemic, expressive potential words appeared in Portuguese media speech, particularly in Brazil. Lexical units such as *bolsonaristão* and *bolsonique* to refer to President of Brazil Jair Bolsonaro, who was vehemently opposed to implementing tough restriction measures in response to the coronavirus pandemic, have become common. Brazil received the nickname *Bolsonoristan*, a reference to Turkmenistan, whose president was also against prohibitive restrictive measures. *Bolsonique* is a supporter of Bolsonaro, someone’s whose views align with those of the president. A common sight in Brazil during the pandemic, especially in the early stages of the spread of the diseases, were protests on cars in support of restrictive measures, which became known as *carreata* (*passeata* means “demonstration” in Portuguese).

Potential words that emerged during the pandemic also include compound words *carentena*.

Borrowed Neologisms

Many nonce-formations consisted of borrowings from foreign languages, primarily English. On the whole, these words have not gone through assimilation into modern Portuguese usage and remain barbarisms: *shutdown*; *lockdown*; *burnout*; *live* (as in face-to face); *home office* (as in working from home); contact tracing, and so on.

International words adopted into the language include the names of coronavirus strains borrowed from Greek, as well as accepted medical terminology as corresponding *nomen*: *delta*, *ómicron*, *flurona*.

Determinologization and Functioning of New Words

Determinologization is the opposite of creating new terms. Its purpose, as is well known, is to designate new concepts and objects. While terms are typically part of a certain functional style and are included in scientific discourse, determinologized units are common in colloquial everyday speech. Words that were previously used as terms become innovations in everyday speech, thus acquiring a new stylistic status. Determinologized units are used to achieve the effect of speech intellectualization, which could very well be what the speaker is looking for. Common properties in

Portuguese usage include: *portador assintomático* (“asymptomatic carrier”); *período de incubação* (“incubation period”); *pandemia* (“pandemic”); *teste PCR para Covid-19* (“PCR test”); *presença de anticorpos* (“presence of antibodies”); *vacina* (“vaccine”); *ventilador* (ventilator).

Neologisms in the Field of Proper Names

Proper names make up a special layer of “pandemic” neologisms, in particular anthroponyms. Anthroponyms are used both to indicate specific people who achieved fame or infamy during a tragic period in history, but also point to events that turned out to be unpleasant milestones in the chain of movement of the disease. For example, in Lusophone countries, the name Adriano Maranhão from Nazaré became known as the first Portuguese national to contract Covid. Adriano was isolated on the *Diamond Princess* ship off the coast of Japan and spent 146 days in quarantine. As he put in, “we’re just here for a while, then they’ll let us all go.”

António Sarmiento was the first Portuguese citizen to be vaccinated against Covid; as a doctor, he administered the vaccine himself as an experiment. He is practically a national hero now.

Butantan is the name of a biomedical research centre in São Paulo, Brazil, that develops and produces vaccines, including against coronavirus. During the pandemic, it became famous for producing the vaccine butanvac, on which great hopes were pinned. It is a truncated proper name that has become part of a compound abbreviated word to designate the newest vaccine – an innovation in the neological field of the pandemic.

Abdala is an effective vaccine for the prevention of coronavirus infection developed in Cuba at the Center for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology. *Abdala* is the name of the hero of the poem “Abdala” by the Cuban poet and philosopher José Martí about the struggle for liberation of the fictional country of Nubia. The developers of the vaccine chose the name of the liberator Abdala to express their pride and faith in their homeland, which, despite all the difficulties it has experienced, is still at the cutting edge of scientific achievement.

In the “coronavirus pandemic” neological field, individual proper names acquire new signifiers and, based on metonymic transfer, extend their designations to new facts of historical figures that appear in the field of view. Some proper names start to function as mythonyms, acquiring the associative connotation of a “historical hero.”

Neologisms in Phraseology and Paremiology

During the pandemic, new fixed expressions arose or became commonplace, the semantics of which reflect the new reality: *distanciamento social* (“social distancing”); *ensino à distância* (“remote learning”); *fatores de risco* (“risk factors”); *hospital de campanha* (“field hospital” – a health facility set up like on the battlefield).

A number of paremiological units relating to coronavirus topics became widespread during the pandemic. These are primarily proverbs that retain an element of comic rethinking of the world, as well as cautionary teaching. The Covid topic is introduced using vocabulary that represents the reality of the pandemic.¹³

A corda sempre arrebenta do lado mais fraco ou com a imunidade mais baixa (“The rope always breaks on the side that is weakest, or has the lowest immunity”).

Água mole em pedra dura, tanto bate até que transmite algo (“Water erodes the stone until it transmits something”).

Amigos, amigos, negócios e espirros à parte (“Friends are all well and good, but sneezing is another matter”).

A pressa é inimiga da perfeição, espera até passar a pandemia (“Haste is the enemy of perfection, wait for the pandemic to pass”).

As aparências enganam, melhor fazer um exame (“Appearances can be deceiving, you better get checked”).

Antes só do que mal acompanhado por algum infectado (“It’s better to be alone than accompanied by an infected person”).

Cada macaco no seu galho, se possível em outra árvore (“Each monkey on its own branch, preferably on a different tree”).

All of these innovative units can be considered anti-proverbs. Anti-proverbs are a manifestation of paremiological variation. They are formed on the basis of well-known proverbs (Kozlovskaja 2020). H. Walter and V. M. Mokienko note that anti-proverbs are based on “their own paremiological fund, marked by special linguo-cultural characteristics. At the same time, their axiological portrait is generally universal, since it is dictated by the negative attitude towards the coronavirus pandemic shared by everyone” (Kozlovskaja 2020: 38). The logic of the anti-proverb is a continuation and development of the picture of the world created in the original proverb.

Along with proverbs and sayings, the conditions of new social communication have produced all manner of memes, communicatively significant units (ideas and images), and lexicalized hashtags that contain culturally important information: #BolsonaroTemRazão (“Bolsonaro is right”); #EstudoEmCasa (“study from home”); #UseMascara (“wear a mask”). Despite the linguistic origin of these units, their content is often of a universal nature, as it is associated with the global reality that is the pandemic.

Expressive-Stylistic Colouring of Nonce-Formations

Expressive-Stylistic Colouring of Portuguese neologisms in relation to the coronavirus pandemic is motivated by the semantics of the means of forming new words, and is associated with unusual ways of creating new units of speech.

¹³ Fraga Patrícia da Silva. 2020. Provérbios em quarentena. 07.04.2020. URL: <https://coletiva.net/colunas/proverbios-em-quarentena,354579.jhtml> (accessed 27.01.2022).

For example, the nonce-formation *quarentite* (*quarentena* + *-ite*) appeared in the Portuguese language to denote a state of irritation, anxiety and alienation caused by self-isolation (voluntary or mandatory). *Covinado* < *covinar* (to fall ill with Covid; self-isolating does not only refer to falling ill with Covid, but also to isolating oneself due to the pandemic). *Covidices* (pl.) (household chores that people carry out because they are self-isolating and which they would probably not do otherwise): *Hoje dei-me ao trabalho de fazer uma grande covidice – fiz pão* (“I did a big ‘Covid’ thing today – I baked some bread”)¹⁴.

Coronado < *coronar* (“to fall ill with coronavirus”). The evaluative connotation of this word arises in connection with its internal form: *corona* (“crown”) is a symbol of monarchical power. And while the Portuguese word for “crown” is *coroa*, the Latin origin of the word manifests itself in the form of a signifier.

Conceptualization in Pandemic Neology

Conceptualization during the pandemic primarily took place in the medical field, in the media, and in everyday speech. The notion of *doença* took on increasing importance as a basic concept, meaning a disease, a health disorder, a disruption of the body’s functioning, a change in the individual’s health that manifests itself through the appearance of various symptoms.

The word *pandemia* has become socially significant in the concept of “disease.” Medical representations of the matrical concept appear: *infecção* (“infection”); *contágio* (“contagion”); *contagioso* (“contagious,” “infectious”). In media discourse, designations often appear that name the phases of the course of the disease: *surto* (“outbreak,” “rise”); *incidência* (“incidence”). Treatment of coronavirus requires solid scientific knowledge: *genoma* (“genome”); *imunidade* (“immunity”); *letalidade* (“lethality”).

The concept of *quarentena* (“quarantine”) became part of everyday life and people’s cognitive activity during the pandemic. The concept is associated with the measures put in place to limit the spread of the disease. The word *quarentena* had previously been used to refer to the 40-day period of isolation prescribed to prevent the spread of infectious diseases (originally smallpox and the plague). At the same time, this word (alongside *Quaresma*) was also used to refer to the period of Lent before Palm Sunday. In public life, *generosidade* and *caridade* (various types of social behaviour in the new coronavirus conditions, typically benefit events for hospitals and the most vulnerable, or for representatives of specific age or socioeconomic groups) have become more widespread in public life.

¹⁴ Caça ao neologismo nos tempos da pandemia. 25.03.2020. URL: <https://www.trespontos.pt/post/caça-ao-neologismo-nos-tempos-da-pandemia-quem-alinha>

Other words that have increased in popularity in Portuguese speech in addition to *quarentena* include *confinamento* (going into isolation, restriction of freedom for health reasons): *Não se justificam novas medidas de confinamento*;¹⁵ *isolamento* (“isolation”); *autorreclusão* (“self-isolation”); *clausura* (“a solitary, reclusive life,” previously used to refer to life in a monastery).

In Portugal and Brazil (like in other countries), the coronavirus pandemic caused a kind of infodemic, an overabundance of information primarily related to the coronavirus. *Infodemia* < Infodemic < info+demic (information + epidemic). The infodemic spread through various media channels – in traditional media and on social networks. A significant part of the infodemic consists of unreliable information in the form of fake news, rumours, and alarmist warnings. In Portugal, the infodemic uses new scientific terms, which often gives messages an authoritative (albeit pseudoscientific) quality.

Conclusions

Word-formation processes in modern Portuguese neology are flexible, dynamic and diverse. Neologisms are created according to various word-formation models – abbreviation, affixation, compounding and blending. The pool of neologisms is constant replenished with borrowings from other languages. Neology manifests itself in phraseology and paremiology. In cognitive neology, new concepts – events, situations, and facts – are formed in the fields of medicine, media and everyday discourse. Active processes of determinologization and stylistic neologization have pragmatic relevance. A lexical-semantic field has emerged in modern Portuguese as a result of the pandemic that has the special linguistic status of a neologistic field, the vocabulary of which is weakly differentiated in the variants of the language.

About the Author:

Olga Saprykina – Ph.D. (Philology), a Professor at the Department of Ibero-Romance Linguistics in the Faculty of Philology at Moscow State University. 119991, Russia, Moscow, Leninskie Gory, 1, str. 51.
E-mail: olgasaprykina@mail.ru

Conflicts of interest:

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

¹⁵ Medidas gerais de confinamento "já não se justificam", defendem médicos, farmacêuticos e enfermeiros em carta aberta. 16.07.2021. URL: https://www.rtp.pt/noticias/pais/medidas-gerais-de-confinamento-ja-nao-se-justificam-defendem-medicos-farmacuticos-e-enfermeiros-emcarta-aberta_a1335888 (accessed 11.12.2023)

References:

- Akhmanova O. S. 2004. *Slovar' lingvisticheskikh terminov* [Dictionary of Linguistic Terms]. Editorial URSS.
- Bragina A. A. 1973. *Neologizmy v russkom iazyke* [Neologisms in the Russian Language]. Nauka.
- Kosovitch O. V. 2014. K probleme novizny neologizmov [On the Problem of the Novelty of Neologisms]. *iHerald of Tver State University*. 3. P. 184–189.
- Kotelova N. Z. 1983. *Pervy opyt leksicograficheskogo opisania russkikh neologizmov* [First Experience of the Lexicographic Description of Russian neologisms]. Nauka.
- Kozlovskaya N. V. (ed.). 2020. *Novye slova i slovari novykh slov 2020* [New Words and Vocabularies of New Words]: Sbornik nauchnykh statei. Institut lingvisticheskikh issledovaniy RAN. ILI RAN.
- Popova T. V. 2005. *Russkaya neologiya i neografia* [Russian Neology and Neography]. GOU VPO UGTU-UPI.
- Taleb N. N. 2009. Cherny lebed'. Pod znakom nepredskazuemosti [The Black Swan. A Sign of Unpredictability]. Kolibri.
- Togoeva S. I. 2000. *Sovremennaya leksicografiya i novye edinit'sy nominatsii* [Modern Lexicography and New Unities of Nomination]. Tver State University.
- Vinogradov V. V. 1977. Ob osnovnom slovarnom fonde i ego slovoobrazovatel'skoy roli v istorii iazyka [On the Basic Word Fund and Its Word-Formation Role in the History of Language]. In V. V. Vinogradov. *Izbranye Trudy. Leksikologiya i leksikografiya*.
- Zabotkina V. I. 1990. *Novaya leksika sovremenogo angliiskogo iazyka* [New Lexis of the Modern English Language]. Vysshaya shkola.

BEARDSLEY MOVEMENT IN RUSSIAN SILVER AGE CULTURE¹

Valeria D. Ryabchenko-Shats

Moscow State Institute of International Relations (University)

Abstract. This article dwells on the phenomenon of Russian *Beardsleism*, which was formed by the influence of the works and personality of the English graphic artist Aubrey Beardsley on the Russian intelligentsia at the turn of the twentieth century. As the brightest representative of English aestheticism and Art Nouveau, Aubrey Beardsley became a champion of the ideas of new art for Russia. In his homeland, Aubrey Beardsley managed to usher in a real revolution in the field of illustration and book graphics, turning them into independent elements of creativity and raising the art of graphics to a completely new, unprecedentedly high level. No less revolutionary was the artist's behaviour – Aubrey Beardsley turned his life into art, postulating innovative aesthetic and philosophical aspirations by his very appearance. The worth of his personality was undoubtedly comparable to the worth of his works, and one became inseparable from the other. Thus, the very image of Aubrey Beardsley became a symbol of the Art Nouveau era, containing numerous complex concepts. No wonder, therefore, that the sphere of his influence in Russia was extremely wide – not limited to the field of graphic art, it extended from new artistic methods to lifestyle and demeanor. The significance of Beardsleism in the Russian artistic life of the turn of the twentieth century is also indicated by its scope – the most prominent figures of the Silver Age, such as Sergei Diaghilev, Léon Bakst, Nikolai Feofilaktov, and the rather obscure Aleksandr Silin, Anatoly Arapov and Modest Durnov – both these and others experienced the significant influence of Aubrey Beardsley on their works and life.

Keywords: Silver Age, decadence, Aubrey Beardsley, Russian journals, graphics, illustration, symbolism, Anglomania, dandyism

Anglomania first appeared in Russia in the late eighteenth century, as a response to the obsession with all things French in the country. English-style parks were all the rage in Russia after Catherine the Great, who was known to be a “great admirer” of English garden art,² entrusted her gardens to James Meader, the

¹ Ryabchenko-Shats V. D. 2022. Beardsley Movement in Russian Silver Age Culture. *Concept: Philosophy, Religion, Culture*. 6(3). P. 141–155. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24833/2541-8831-2022-3-23-141-155>

² Cross A. 1997. British Gardeners and the Fashion for English Parks in Russia in the Late 18th Century. In *From the Banks of the Thames to the Banks of the Neva. The Masterpieces of British Art in the Hermitage: Catalogue*. State Hermitage Museum. P. 80.

head gardener of the Duke of Northumberland, and the design of her Tsarskoye Selo and Pavlovsk residences to Charles Cameron, who would become one of her favourite architects (Bott 2004: 19). And later, everyone just had to have furniture in the style Thomas Chippendale and interiors à la William Morris (in 1894–1895, Morris & Co. even started to supply fabrics for decorating the personal apartments of Nicholas II and Alexandra Feodorovna).³ What is more, a manner of behaviour for the gentlemen of the “English fold” was developed – a special *modus operandi* known as the “dandy.” But it was not until the turn of the twentieth century that “British fever” truly swept Russian society, when the English illustrator and poet Aubrey Beardsley, one of the most prominent representatives of the English aesthetic movement (which ushered in the Art Nouveau era), entered the cultural arena in Russia and, in the words of Kuzma Petrov-Vodkin, immediately acquired “full citizen rights” (Petrov-Vodkin 1982: 428).

Beardsley’s outrageous works caused quite the stir from the very beginning. No wonder that his contemporaries wanted to study his graphics, highly impressed by his innovative artistic decisions. For example, the Scottish painter and art critic Dugald Sutherland MacColl, who was a friend of Beardsley, wrote one of the first articles in Russian on English graphic art, published in 1900 in the journal *Mir iskusstva* (*World of Art*).⁴ In 1905, Vittorio Pica published a short essay on Beardsley’s work,⁵ and later that year, the English symbolist poet, essayist and literary critic Arthur Symonds, produced a study of Beardsley’s art.⁶ A more in-depth study of Beardsley’s legacy by the art critic, publisher and poet Sergey Makovsky was published in 1906, which focused on the origins of the artist’s work and his creative world.⁷ Three years after that, Robert Ross published the seminal biography *Aubrey Beardsley*.⁸ In 1912, the Russian art critic and playwright Nikolai Evreinov wrote an essay entitled Beardsley, in which he analyses the significance of Aubrey Beardsley’s contribution to art and carefully plots his creative path.⁹ In 1913, the artist and critic Nicolas Radlov published an article entitled “Modern Russian Graphics and Drawing” in the journal *Apollo*, in which he mentions the significance of Aubrey Beardsley’s art in the development of world graphics and illustration.¹⁰ And, finally, the last pre-revolutionary study on the English artist – Aleksei Sidorov’s biography *Aubrey Beardsley: Life and Work* – came out in 1917.¹¹

It is important to note here that the artistic legacy of the controversial English illustrator is of no less interest to modern researchers. The artistic world of Aubrey Beardsley and his influence on the Russian art of the turn of the twentieth century have

³ Russian State Historical Archive. Fund 475. Series 1. File 605. Sheet 95.

⁴ MacColl D. 1900. Aubrey Beardsley. *Mir Iskusstva*, 7/8, 73–84; 9/10, 97–98, 100–101, 104, 106–110, 112–120.

⁵ *Aubrey Beardsley: Illustrations. Prose, Poetry, Aphorisms, Letters. Reminiscences and Articles about Beardsley.* (1992). Introductory Article in the Album. Edited, compiled and annotated by A. Basmanov. Igra-Tekhnika. P. 240–241.

⁶ *Ibid.* P. 242–248.

⁷ *Ibid.* P. 248–256

⁸ *Ibid.* P. 227–238.

⁹ Evreinov N. 1912 *Beardsley: A Sketch*. N. I. Butkovskaya.

¹⁰ Radlov N. 1913. Modern Russian Graphics and Drawing. *Apollo*. 6. P. 5–23.

¹¹ Sidorov A. A. 1917. *Aubrey Beardsley: Life and Work*. Doctoral dissertation. Moscow University. Venok.

been examined by G. Y. Sternin (Sternin 1984), E. S. Vyazova (Vyazova 2004; 2009), Y. Y. Gerchuk (Gerchuk 2004), A. E. Zavyalova (Zavyalova 2008), S. Chapkina-Rugi,¹² D. L. Lebedev (Lebedev 2021), A. K. Dovzhyk (Dovzhyk 2021), M. Sturgis (Sturgis 2014), and others. We should point out here that while all these works are of undoubted scientific value and content, they still leave room for further work into the influence of Aubrey Beardsley's work, and especially of Aubrey Beardsley the man, on the culture of the Silver Age of Russian Poetry.

The research methodology employed in this article is based on a comprehensive and systematic cultural approach, combining the historico-cultural method, textual analysis, scientific classification (the analysis of primary sources and secondary data), and the philosophical-aesthetic method. Sources used include archival materials of the Russian State Historical Archive, as well as documents kept in storage in the manuscript section of the State Russian Museum. Also important to our work are the pre-revolutionary art magazines *World of Art*, *Zolotoye runo* (*Golden Fleece*), *Vesy* (*Libra*) and *Apollon* (*Apollo*), as these were the journals that most clearly reflected the dynamics of the development of Russian thought and art at the turn of the century. A corpus of scientific and art-critique works also used, as were the memoirs of prominent figures of the Silver Age of Russian Poetry, including: Andrei Bely, Alexander Benois, Georgy Chulkov, Mstislav Dobuzhinsky, Igor Grabar, Vladislav Khodasevich, Nikolai Kuzmin, Pyotr Pertsov, Nina Petrovskaya, Kuzma Petrov-Vodkin, Sergei Shcherbatov, Konstantin Somov, and Sergei Vinogradov.

Beardsleism in the Culture of the Silver Age of Russian Poetry

Aubrey Beardsley played the role of messiah of new aesthetics in world culture and, undoubtedly, became an era-defining figure at the turn of the twentieth century. In his seemingly absurd work, the transcendental truth of the enchanting and frightening *fin de siècle* is clear to see. The works of numerous creators at the time contained a tacit and painful premonition of the fall of the old world. "*Incipit vita nova*" reads the dwarf in one of Beardsley's drawings – and he would become the living embodiment of this new life.

As a follower of decadence, the English illustrator recognized beauty as the only possible religion and managed to bring about a real revolution in the field of graphics and illustration. The colours of life that captivated his Impressionist contemporaries left Beardsley indifferent – for him, only black, white, ink, pen and paper existed. Beardsley's graphic works are simple yet pretentious at the same time: it is a game of contrasts, minimalism combined with unbridled imagination. "With fragile flourishes of ornamental design, a dust of small dots, patterned alternation of thick shadows and

¹² Chapkina-Rugi S. A. 2014. Russian Beardsleists. In *Oscar Wilde. Aubrey Beardsley. A View from Russia*. ABCdesign. P. 142–198.

white blots, this brilliant young man has created a graphic style that surpasses everything we have known to this point in its exquisite boldness and sharp contrasts” writes Sergey Makovsky, editor and publisher of the *Apollo* magazine.¹³

Despite the fact that Beardsley’s art is an amazing synthesis of eras (“there is nothing more charming than Beardsley’s anachronisms,” notes Makovsky¹⁴), and Beardsley himself always demonstrated a certain escapism, he was undoubtedly an artist of his time, for whom everything clean, simple and healthy was alien. “Graphics is a new and thoroughly model artform; Aubrey Beardsley will go down in art history not only as a perfect graphic artist, but also as a representative of his era, a man who felt and expressed more clearly than anyone else the creative problem facing art,” stresses art critic and bibliophile Aleksei Sidorov, who in 1917 published a large album of Beardsley’s drawings with detailed comments and analyses of his works.¹⁵ Beardsley also considered himself a graphic artist of modern life. As a true child of his time, he only saw beauty in the unnatural: he marvelled at oddly shaped flowers, disproportionate figures, and whimsical silhouettes. And, without a doubt, one of Beardsley’s most enduring masterpieces was Aubrey Beardsley himself – a real dandy, elegant and original in everything he did. Affectation was natural for him

It is truly amazing just how closely Beardsley’s frame of mind matched the spirit of the turn of the century. Not only was he able to express through his work the artistic aspirations of his contemporaries, their penchant for and pursuit of the ornamental, but he also set the tone, cultivating an elegant and sophisticated aesthetics. “Gaunt, dandified, racked by disease” (Sturgis 2014: 11), he mirrored the images he created. “It was a striking connection, promoted by the press and embraced by the public” (Sturgis 2014: 11). In the late 1890s, “Beardsley seemed to embody the very spirit of the *fin de siècle* (Sturgis 2014: 12). The image of Beardsley, coupled with the style of Oscar Wilde, would later become the tuning fork of Russian dandyism.

It was through illustration that Beardsley carved out for himself one of the most spectacular careers of the nineteenth century. Beardsley’s fame came thanks to books and magazines – he never produced a single painting, nor was a single exhibition of his works held during his lifetime. The artist and critic Nicolas Radlov noted that it was thanks to Beardsley’s work that book illustration became a genre of its own: “We only recently caught on to what is the central idea of his art – the separation of book graphics from the art of drawing.”¹⁶ During the short period of his creative output, covering the last seven years of his life, Beardsley managed to create a truly unique artistic language. Working on his drawings, the artist was provocative, mocking, treating the frivolous seriously and the serious frivolously. Beardsley was incredibly prolific: he was the illustrator and graphic designer for such works as *Le Morte d'Arthur* by

¹³ Beardsley: *Illustrations. Prose, Poetry...* P. 249

¹⁴ Makovsky S. 1908. On Beardsley’s Illustrations. In O. Wilde. *Salome*. Op. cit.

¹⁵ Sidorov. P. 61.

¹⁶ Radlov. P. 15.

Thomas Malory, *Salome* by Oscar Wilde, and *The Rape of the Lock* by Alexander Pope, among others; he also worked on his own poetry and prose, including the unfinished novel *Under the Hill* (his take on the Tannhäuser legend); he produced drawings and caricatures; and actively collaborated with the journals *The Savoy*, *The Studio*, *Pall Mall Budget*, *Pall Mall Magazin* and *The Yellow Book*. This, Aubrey Beardsley was a light that shone bright, albeit briefly, illuminating the *fin de siècle* era and serving as a powerful impetus for a new aesthetic and new ideological crusades in art.

One year after the 25-year-old Beardsley succumbed to tuberculosis, his “resurrection” began in Russia. This aesthetic spirit of this truly unique man became a symbol of freedom and individualism for the Russian culture of the Silver Age. The thirst in Russian societies for the ideas of aestheticism and pure form, which Oscar Wilde had demonstrated years before, was also a significant factor in Beardsley’s popularity. The translator and art critic Abram Efros noted that “Beardsley did not experience the brief resistance we offered to Wilde. He entered triumphantly in a country he had already conquered and had become prisoner to him.”¹⁷

The incredibly powerful wave of Art Nouveau that swept the Russian Empire gave rise to a cult of Beardsley’s work among the so-called *Miriskusniki* – contributors to the *Mir iskusstva* (*World of Art*) literary and arts magazine published monthly in St. Petersburg from 1898 to 1904, as well as members of the association of the same name. The creative core of the *World of Art* journal, the first periodical devoted entirely to promoting “new art,” was made up of Alexander Benois, Léon Bakst, Sergei Diaghilev, Dmitry Filosofov, Eugene Lansere, Walter Nouvel, Andrei Nurok, and Konstantin Somov. We cannot stress enough here that the *World of Art* was an entirely new phenomenon in the history of Russian culture, and changed its image forever. The group opposed the ideals of populism, which by that time had run its course, and opened the way to the search for new aesthetics and meanings in Russian art, and this, in turn, was contributed significantly to the emergence of Russian impressionism, modernism and symbolism. Thus, the periodical and the association of the same turned into a real phenomenon, reflecting the trends that emerged in Russian society in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, resonating most profoundly with the wants and needs of the new generation.

Interestingly, the *World of Art* magazine was directly influenced by the English journal *The Studio*, where Beardsley got his start. As Alexander Benois recalls, *World of Art* embodied the aspirations of the members of the group to ensure that “something similar to the *The Studio* would emerge in Russia” (Benois 1980b: 194). It is hardly surprising, therefore, that it was the students of the World of Art movement who were the first in Russia to be captivated by the work of Aubrey Beardsley, their ideology and aesthetics being remarkably close to his. And it is natural that they were the ones who introduced the Russian audience to Beardsley’s art, which was then cultivated in the Moscow-based journals *Libra* and *Golden Fleece*.

¹⁷ Rosstsii (Abram Efros). 1912. The Religious Crisis in the Life of Aubrey Beardsley. *Russkie vedemosti* (October 5). 3.

One figure who played a particularly important role in popularizing English graphic art was the music and art critic Andrei Nurok, who was known for being infatuated with all things English (having spent part of his childhood and adolescence in Great Britain) (Benois 1980b: 2490. Benois mentions Nurok in his memoirs: "... he is the one we have to thank for introducing us to the work of Aubrey Beardsley, which dominated our thoughts for five or six years (Benois 1980a: 685). Nurok was, according to Benois, a "typical decadent," fascinated by the "taste of decay," the "vicious sensuality dressed in all sorts of lace" in the English artist's work (Benois 1980a: 685). It was largely thanks to Nurok's obsession with English aestheticism that Sergei Diaghilev made Beardsley's acquaintance – having read Nurok's writings, Diaghilev considered it his duty during his trips to France in 1897–1898 to visit Oscar Wilde in Dieppe, where he also met Aubrey Beardsley and Charles Conder (Benois 1980a: 685). Moreover, it is generally accepted that Nurok was the first person to publish an article in Russian about Aubrey Beardsley, which was published in *World of Art* in 1899.¹⁸ Other articles on Beardsley came in 1900, the most notable of which was a translation commissioned by Diaghilev of an article by *The Studio* contributor, art critic and personal friend of Beardsley Dugald MacColl.¹⁹

It did not take long for the *World of Art*'s active promotion of Beardsley's work to bear fruit – the Russian public of the Silver Age was immediately taken with the English illustrator's unique work. He opened the door to his deliberate, pretentious and unimaginably attractive world, where defects are elegant, irony kills feelings, and beauty gifts us sweet oblivion. Beardsley turned out to be incredibly in sync with the ideas of the World of Art movement, and the mood of the Silver Age in general, with its eschatological crusades, a sprinkling of spiritualism and symbolism, and intoxicating decadence and aestheticism. And this explains why the followers of the World of Art movement were so passionately committed to his style. His precise technique – the thin, clean, perfect lines outlining the impure, the small nuances and detail of his illustrations – left a profound impression on their worldview. This is where their desire to produce a journal that was sophisticated, aesthetic, obsessed with artistic detail, and filled with all kinds of vignettes, borders, backdrops, letter frames, and so on, came from. As a matter of fact, it was the design of the *World of Art* magazine that would serve as a model for future apologists of symbolist journalism: for example, Nikolay Ryabushinsky, editor of the *Golden Fleece* art magazine, saw his publication to be a successor to the work of Sergei Diaghilev (Benois 1980b: 439).

The Moscow-based journals *Libra* and *Apollo* also clearly inherited the style of *World of Art* and demonstrate a passion for Beardsley's genius: in 1905, the graphic artist Nikolai Feofilaktov created a mock-up for the cover of the fifth edition of *Libra* that featured a depiction of Beardsley. The mock-up would eventually turn into a full-fledged cover for the eleventh issue of the magazine, which was dedicated entirely

¹⁸ A. N. (Nurok A.). 1899. Aubrey Beardsley. *Mir iskusstva*. 3/4. P. 16–17.

¹⁹ MacColl.

to Beardsley's work, containing numerous drawings and sketches, as well as some of his prose and a translation of an article by Vittorio Pica about him. Thus, Beardsley's aesthetics became a tuning fork for an entirely new area of Russian journalism and publishing. When discussing the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, one cannot but agree with Kuzma Petrov-Vodkin when he writes that it really was "the time of Beardsley, when all the books, journals and almanacs of the leading publishing houses were dotted and garlanded with circles" (Petrov-Vodkin 1982: 428).

The speed with which the new English aesthetics took root in Russia and the degree to which it influenced Russian culture are clear from the writings of prominent figures of the Silver Age of Russian Poetry. Nina Petrovskaya, femme fatale of the bohemian world at the turn of the century and heroine of Valery Bryusov's debut novel *The Fiery Angel*, describes the prevailing mood of the era thus: "Ladies, who only yesterday were heavy, like dolls in their nests, started to dream about Balmont's 'serpent-like nature' and 'moon streams'; dressed in the tunics of Pre-Raphaelite maidens and, as if on command, combed their hair à la Monna Vanna. Gentlemen and husbands became dignified and ironed à la Oscar Wilde. Languidly powdered young men with shadows under their eyes appeared. The 'tiger orchid' became everyone's favourite flower, even though it had been immortalized even before Balmont by the most piquant Maupassant as a 'sinful flower'" (Garetto 1989: 42).

"All" of Moscow, the vast Moscow of merchants, sworn attorneys, merchant sons, the sophisticated people – i.e. the same "old Moscow" that over the course of two or three years repainted their villas in "stylish nouveau" colours – swapped their suit jackets for tuxedos, à la Wilde, and their dresses for chitons, 'à la Botticelli,'" Andrei Bely commented sardonically (Bely 1990a: 125). To be sure, the philosophy and style of the English aesthetic movement, embodied in the figure and art of Aubrey Beardsley, instantly captured literally all spheres of life of Russian society, especially bohemian circles.

As these new trends extended to both the spiritual and material aspects of the lives of the Russian people at the turn of the century, they would also be reflected in the fashion of the time. The dandyism that was a distinctive feature of the representatives of the English Art Nouveau movement was all the rage in the artistic circles of Moscow and St. Petersburg in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Formulated by Charles Baudelaire as a "new aristocracy" that sought to achieve rebellion and combat vulgarity, and which adhered to the "doctrine of elegance and originality" and the "cult of one's own personality" (Baudelaire 1986: 283–315), dandyism was a cultural role that was adopted by many, if not all, of the most prominent figures of the Russian Silver Age. What made the image of the dandy so attractive was the fact that the dandy was, in a way, the last hero of a bygone era, the only worthy reference point against the backdrop of world that was crumbling. Baudelaire subtly noted that dandyism arises precisely in unstable periods of social change, when "democracy has not yet achieved true power, and the aristocracy has only partly lost its dignity and the ground under its feet," and that it is like "a sunset: like a dying star, magnificent, lacking warmth

and filled with melancholy” (Baudelaire 1986: 283–315). Thus, the image of the dandy became an homage to the noble habits of the disappearing aristocracy, creating a new “caste,” uniting individuals who were idle, uncompromising in the face of vulgarity, spiritually gifted, and original.

One such original individual was the architect, artist, poet and *arbitrum elegantum* of the Moscow bohemia of the turn of the century, Modest Durnov, who, thanks to his emphatically impeccable manners, wit and immaculate appearance, rightfully earned the title of Moscow’s first dandy. It is worth noting here that his deliberately elegant image was intended not only to shock, but also to challenge the ideology of the populists, who called, among other things, for people to dress unpretentiously. Modest Durnov was an ardent apologist for “new art” and was known for spreading the latest ideas and trends, which, of course, made him a passionate admirer of Oscar Wilde. In 1903, he created a watercolour portrait of this idol, and later illustrated Wilde’s poem “The Ballad of Reading Gaol,” as well as his novel *The Picture of Dorian Gray* and his play *Salome*. Durnov’s unique style and refined taste, which he manifested in both his life and his art, made him a kind of focal point for the most brilliant creators of his time. Valentin Serov, Mikhail Vrubel, Vasily Vereshchagin, Aleksandr Golovin, Serge Soudeikine, Valery Bryusov, Konstantin Balmont – they all fell into the orbit of this “gloomy devil,” (Bely 1990a: 188). “Bryusov and Balmont considered him one of their own, and Balmont dedicated his book *Let Us Be Like the Sun*, among others, to ‘Modest Durnov, [who was] hard as steel,’ recalls Sergei Vinogradov (Vinogradov 1993: 431). Balmont also wrote in the dedication: “To Modest Durnov, an artist who created a poem out of his own personality.”²⁰ And, according to Vladislav Khodasevich, “legends” truly “were created” about the Modest Durnov and his fate.²¹ Much like that of Beau Brummell, the most famous of all the British dandies, his “whole life was an influence” (Barbey d’Aurevilly 2000: 77). Durnov was especially influential in shaping the worldview of the masters of the World Art movement. Following him, all the members of the association, in addition to Alexander Benois, sought not only to adhere to the dandy style in their manner of dress, but also to reproduce the most characteristic features of this *modus operandi*. Aubrey Beardsley served as an unconditional point of reference here too. For example, Nikolai Feofilaktov, who equally imitated Beardsley in his appearance and his artistic style – and thus received the nickname the “Moscow Beardsley” (Bely 1990b: 212) – according to Sergei Vinogradov’s memoirs, even “had his hair styled like Aubrey Beardsley” and “tried all the time to keep his profile in people’s view, because his profile resembled that of Oscar Wilde” (Vinogradov 1993: 431). Bely, meanwhile, contests that Feofilaktov had a “profile like Beardsley’s” (Bely 1990a: 422).

²⁰ Cit. ex Khodasevich, V. 1928. The End of Renata. *Vozrozhdenie*. 3. P. 1045–1047.

²¹ Ibid.

Léon Bakst was also known for his dandyism: the artist loved to wear formal suits with spectacular bright colours, and had a “trademark” manner of speaking and gesticulating. Igor Grabar recalls: “... he was a dandy, dressed to the nines, in patent leather boots, with a magnificent necktie and a bright purple handkerchief coquettishly tucked into the cuff of his shirt. He was a coquette: his movements were soft, his gestures elegant, and his speech quiet – his entire manner of behaving was fashioned after that of the ‘secular’ dandies, with their deliberate disengagement and a feigned ‘English’ licentiousness” (Grabar 1937: 158). In his oft-cited memoirs, Mstislav Dobuzhinsky also pointed to the fact that Bakst “dressed extremely smartly” (Dobuzhinsky 1987: 201). The pianist and amateur composer Walter Nouvel, an “acknowledged *Magister elegantiarum*” among his World of Art colleagues (Dobuzhinsky 1987: 203), was elegant in both appearance and his rare wit. As was his friend, the “melancholy sceptic” (Chulkov 1999: 210) and “St. Petersburg Parisian” (Pertsov 2002: 206) Andrei Nurok, who was also known for his cynicism, subtle sarcasm and excellent panache.

However, the dandyism of the English aesthetes was most fully embodied in the life and work of Sergei Diaghilev. “Diaghilev was a dandy,” wrote Makovsky, “the people of St. Petersburg commented, not without mocking envy, on his top hat, his immaculate business cards and his *vestons*. “He had a foppish swagger, loved to show off his dandyism, and wore a scented silk scarf in the cuff of his shirt. Whenever he had the chance, he would, in order to spite the bigots of virtue, ignore, much like Oscar Wilde, the ‘prejudice’ of good morals, refusing to hide the unusualness of his tastes” (Makovsky 1955: 201). Paradoxically, even Diaghilev’s friends in the art world, themselves dandies to varying degrees, often accused him of excessive aplomb. Benois recalls: “We often called him on his ‘prancing,’ his obvious dandyism, and not without reason, I have to say” (Vyazova 2004: 68). Konstantin Somov, for one, could not stand the way Diaghilev carried himself, and often complained in his letters that he was “impudent to the point of disgusting,” or “such a grand sir that it’s sickening” (Somov 1979: 62). However, some were able to see behind the image of a brilliant dandy a man of lofty ideas and bold aspirations. In his homage to Diaghilev, Nicholas Roerich wrote: “He was not your run-of-the-mill ‘bearer of a green carnation,’ but was rather a sincere knight of evolution and beauty.”²² To be sure, Diaghilev’s affected and defiantly impeccable style was nothing more than the externalization of the ideas he put into practice, and a manifestation of his nonconformism, something he would admit in a letter to Alexander Benois in April 1897: “Everything I have done in my life... I have done in defiance of everyone – just remember how long I seemed to you to be your inner hussar. Then society started to attack my appearance, my pomposity and dandyism. I know this for sure, yet I walk into the Assembly of the Nobility dressed just like this.”²³

²² Roerich N. K. 1930. A Wreath for Diaghilev. *The League of Composers’ Review*. URL: <https://rerih.org/library/3008/50>

²³ Manuscript Section of the Russian State Museum. Fund 137. File 939. Sheets 20–25.

It is important to note that dandyism did not only take over the World of Art movement, as the employees at the *Apollo* art magazine were equally enamoured, following the lead of its editor, art critic and the “living embodiment of dandyism,” Sergey Makovsky.²⁴ According to the illustrator Nikolai Kuzmin, “this was the most gentlemanly editorial office in the capital” – Makovsky even proposed making it obligatory for all employees to come to work wearing tuxedos.²⁵ The writer and author of the theory of “mystical anarchism” Georgy Chulkov recalled the atmosphere that reigned in the editorial office: “There was a cult of dandyism at *Apollo*. The employees flaunted a special kind of aristocracy, almost ludicrous at times, causing one to wonder about its authenticity. The magazine put on parties, attended by ladies in striking dresses, low-cut, like at balls. And many of the men would be wearing tailcoats” (Chulkov 1999: 201).

One of *Apollo's* employees in particular was often compared to the English aesthetes and dandies, and that was the poet Mikhail Kuzmin. The “lean and elegant” (Bely 1990a: 356) Kuzmin was alternately compared with Beau Brummell, Dorian Gray, and even Oscar Wilde himself. “It was the picture of Dorian Gray” – this is how Dobuzhinsky described meeting the poet (Dobuzhinsky 1987: 279). It is no coincidence that it was Mikhail Kuzmin who wrote the preface to a short treatise on Brummell and dandyism by the French author Jules Barbey d'Aureville, where he defined dandyism as a “true property of art” (Barbey d'Aureville 2000: 46).

In the same preface, Kuzmin very accurately noted that d'Aureville's book is devoted to dandyism as an “inner fashion” first and foremost, rather than an outward one, as a “psychological way of ‘knotting a tie’” (Barbey d'Aureville 2000: 46). This line of thinking is followed by the author himself, who notes that dandyism must be understood much more broadly than just “the art of dressing”: dandyism, according to d'Aureville, “is a manner of living [...] consisting of subtle shades” (Barbey d'Aureville 2000: 72). This fundamental aspect of the understanding of dandyism was also emphasized by Charles Baudelaire, who wrote that “it is also unreasonable to reduce dandyism to an exaggerated passion for dress and external elegance. For the true dandy, all of these material attributes are merely a symbol of the aristocratic superiority of his spirit” (Baudelaire 1986: 283–315). Thus, the most important reason why dandyism took root on Russian soil was that, in addition to the external trappings of the phenomenon, Russian bohemia also adopted the internal content of dandyism, which presupposes a special behavioural code that cultivates individuality. We can therefore assume that the style and behaviour of Aubrey Beardsley and Oscar Wilde, transformed into true art and becoming a facet of the expression of their aesthetic and philosophical aspirations, had a significant impact on the formation of the concept of the creative life,

²⁴ Kuzmin N. V. 1982. *The Recent and the Distant*. Sovetsky khudoazhnik. P. 245.

²⁵ Ibid. P. 244.

which was of paramount importance for the culture of the Russian Silver Age, involving, as it did, the postulation of artistic ideas through life itself. It was during the Silver Age of Russian Poetry that behaviour, fused with style, emerged as an artistic task in itself. In addition, the exaggerated aloofness that supposedly elevated the dandy above all those around him, his effeminacy, his aversion to the brutal aspects of life, and his standoffishness in pursuit of his aesthetic and hedonistic needs, probably contributed to the Art Nouveau apologists separating themselves from the social and utilitarian functions of creativity.

This new style of behaviour at the turn of the twentieth century was accompanied by the deliberate stylization of interiors and an abundance of unusual and whimsical decorative elements. From this moment on, the interior of one's home had to match the aesthetic principles of the owner, it had to be a perfect reflection of his personality. Prince Mikhailo Shcherbatov, the ideologue and financier of the "Modern Art" salon, wrote: "... a home, a room – could it not be a 'symphony' in its forms, colours, and overall harmony?" (Shcherbatov 2016: 118). Shcherbatov wanted "Modern Art" to become a platform around which "creativity would be concentrated, that it, it would show through in the applied arts, which is closely connected to pure art [...] The applied arts should not be represented, as they typically are, by selected works, but should reveal a kind of holistic plan of artists who are gradually involved in arranging the interiors of rooms as a kind of organic and harmonious whole, where, starting with the walls and furniture and ending with all the small details, the principle of unity, which I indicated as an unshakable law, would be realized" (Shcherbatov 2016: 179–180).

Participants had to present their own interior design projects, which they worked on just as reverently and diligently as they would on their own artworks: according to Dobuzhinsky, interior design was a "parallel sprout" of the creativity of the World of Art artists (Dobuzhinsky 1987: 192). "Modern Art" pursued the goal of "creating a series of 'model' interiors with all the furnishings into which our artists from the World of Art circle could invest their taste for grace and sense of style" (Dobuzhinsky 1987: 192). The best artists of the period were involved in the enterprise, including Eugene Lansere, Alexander Benois, Igor Grabar, Konstantin Korovin, Léon Bakst, and Aleksandr Golovin. Each room was decorated by the artists, using the general concept and sketches as guidelines, without the involvement of architects. The project's curator, Igor Grabar, explained his vision: "the truly extraordinarily beautiful decoration of the rooms will be a wonderful surprise and will stun the St. Petersburg public. It will give an impetus to taste, practically ushering in a new era..." (Dobuzhinsky 1987: 193). And we have to say that the interiors were indeed splendid and caused quite the stir among the public: they were impractical and unusable, which was essentially the point, and people either marvelled at them or were somewhat bemused.

The commitment of the World of Art members to English aestheticism is also worthy of note here. For example, Léon Bakst created a boudoir-rotunda in the spirit of the Suite en Blanc brought to life by the architect and decorator Edward William Godwin at Oscar Wilde's house on Tite Street in Chelsea. The interior was supposed to

leave an impression of incredible fragility and weightlessness: ivory walls, white fabrics with ornaments on the floor and the finest, most delicate furniture, which is intended to exude “the aroma of perfume and power,” as Bakst himself said (Shcherbatov 2016: 152). The influence of English culture can also be seen in the dark blue dining room of Alexander Benois and Eugene Lansere: the furniture made by the in-demand Nikolai Svirsky according to sketches produced by Benois was partly stylized as Chippendale furniture, which was typical of the palace furnishings of the Peter the Great era and served as inspiration for the craftsmen who managed to organically and successfully combine it with Modern Art. Reproductions of all the interiors were published in the fifth issue of *World of Art* in 1903, dedicated entirely to the activities of the Modern Art salon.

The influence of Aubrey Beardsley can also be seen in the work of the *World of Art* masters. Almost every single one of them, from Alexander Benois to Dmitry Mitrohin, became fascinated with Beardsley’s artistic style and they set about mastering and creatively reworking his methods, techniques and images. In his memoirs, Benois pointed out that Aubrey Beardsley “strongly influenced the art (and the overall attitude towards art) of the subtlest artist among us, Konstantin Somov” (Benois 1980a: 685). Indeed, Somov’s own unique style is a direct result of his dallying with Beardsley’s graphic inventions. “An impression that is truly special (a kind of spiritual connection with our cult of Hoffmann and Dostoevsky,” wrote Benois, “is being made on both of us, but on Somov in particular, by Aubrey Beardsley and Thomas Heine. His passion for the former (and partly for his friend Conder) helps even Somov to develop his own ‘graphic style,’ his own ‘artistic mark’” (Somov 1979: 482). Inspired by the eroticism of Beardsley’s drawings, Somov created a genre that was completely new for Russia, “nude art,” which he combined with the capricious sensuality and affectation of the “courtly age” he loved so much. What is more, Somov compiled the first ever album of Beardsley’s work to be released in Russia, in which he expressed his love for the illustrator’s showiness.²⁶ The small volume was extremely professionally made. Benois, in turn, incorporated broken silhouettes and the play of dotted lines and grotesque images into his work. Bakst managed to assimilate the sophistication of Beardsley’s work, but was far from him in terms of the obscene nature of his pictures. Lansere successfully imitated Beardsley’s style in intricate and whimsical patterns. The Oriental style and pomp organically became a part of the graphic work of Mitrokhin, as just like the mystical images and exquisite decorativeness became part of Sergey Chekhonin’s drawings. What is more, in their illustrative work, *World of Art* artists, like Beardsley, practiced “co-authorship” – the free interpretation by the artist of the writer’s ideas. In this case, the illustration would serve as both a visual reproduction of a literary work, and an independent work capable of radically changing the meaning

²⁶ Beardsley A. 1906. Beardsley: [album / works selected under the direction of the artist Konstantin Somov; engravings by Frismuth and Marx]. Shipovnik.

of the text, or adding something significant to it. In addition, one of Beardsley's most impressive qualities was his ability to combine motifs from different eras. Artists from the World of Art movement also strove to reconcile mysticism with reality: they drew from everything that they considered to be the best aesthetically, paying no attention to chronology or verisimilitude, creating images that astound in terms of their modernity and honesty.

World of Art was not the only magazine whose illustrations bear the unmistakable mark of Beardsley's genius, as his influence can also be seen in the Moscow periodicals *Libra* and *Golden Fleece*. Beardsley scholars claim that this influence extended to almost all the graphic artists who worked for these publications (Gerchuk 2004:121). One of the most glaring examples of this is the work of Nikolai Feofilaktov, who we talked about above. Feofilaktov was the lead designer of *Libra* and the creator of a cover to one of its issues that paid tribute to Beardsley (*Libra*, no. 11, 1905), whose style he was able to imitate both in his art and in his life. Along with his planar ornament-style patterns, the "Moscow Beardsley" was also captivated by the understated plot, full of meaning, and the unabashed eroticism of the works of his English colleague. As a result, his own drawings often acquired an "almost pornographic" character (Pertsov 2002: 193). Despite this, the ideologue and *de facto* leader of *Libra*, Valery Bryusov, had a soft spot for Feofilaktov, decorating his apartment on Tsvetnoy Boulevard with his works (Pertsov 2002: 193); he also sent an album of Feofilaktov's drawings published in 1909 entitled *Scorpio*, along with an album of Somov's paintings, to Émile Verhaeren.²⁷ The editor and publisher of *Libra*, Sergei Polyakov, was also partial to graphic art. While he gave Bryusov free rein to print what he wanted in the journal in terms of its ideological and literary content, he was extremely finicky when it came to the graphic style of the publication. According to Andrei Bely, Polyakov loved nothing more to "pour over a page of *Libra*," rustling one of Feofilaktov's "squiggles" and exclaim: "it's finer than Beardsley" – extremely carefully engraved, giving *Libra* a beautiful aesthetic (Bely 1990a: 415). The towering influence of Aubrey Beardsley's artistic style on the overall tone of *Libra* can be felt beyond Feofilaktov's work, too, as Anatoly Arapov's elegant and whimsical style was very close to that of Feofilaktov, and Alexander Yakimchenko, whose eclectic drawings were also likely more akin to Feofilaktov's work than to Beardsley's, and the ethereal and fragile graphics produced by Nikolai Sapunov, and many others. Vassili Milliotti, who worked as a layout artist for both *Libra* and *Golden Fleece*, endowed the style of his fabulous, "moving" drawings with a unique sophistication – his work was a kind of synthesis of the artistic methods of Mikhail Vrubel and Aubrey Beardsley. The artist and art critic Nicolas Radlov points to another man as the most direct and "subtle" imitator of Aubrey Beardsley, namely Aleksandr Silin.²⁸ Thus, *Libra*, which differed from the World of Art in that it was a literary journal only,

²⁷ Valery Bryusov to Émile Verhaeren (Jan. 22 / 4 Feb. 1900). In Valery Bryusov. *Literary Heritage*. V. 85. Nauka. P. 583.

²⁸ Radlov. P. 15.

became a centre of Russian *Beardsleism*. With regard to the Moscow artists of the *Libra* and *Golden Fleece* circle, we can say that it was their unique take on Beardsley that allows us to single out Russian *Beardsleism* as the most striking manifestation of camp stylistics on Russian soil.

Conclusion

There is no doubt that Aubrey Beardsley was a guiding light of Russian decadence. Beardsley, incredibly sensitive as he was to everything subtle, fragile and ephemeral, managed to create a world all of his own, woven from the terrible realities of the turn of the twentieth century, like rays reflected in the black diamond of his work. Building exquisite castles from lace, creating images that are terrifying in their brokenness and demonism, all he was doing was translating life into the language of decorative patterns. This ghostly metaphysical layer of reality, woven from vague experiences, inevitable and fatal, from images of purity and devilry, reflected the antinomy of the culture of the Russian Silver Age, and was fully understood and embraced by Russian society at the turn of the twentieth century, which became enveloped by the influence of the work and personality of the scandalous English graphic artist. Aubrey Beardsley, like no other artist before him, managed to express the presentiments and aspirations of the Russian creative intelligentsia, and, as such, he made a significant contribution to the creation of the myth of the Russian Silver Age.

About the Author:

Valeria D. Ryabchenko-Shats – a Ph.D. student and Lecturer in the Department of International Journalism at the Department of World Literature and Culture. 119454, Russia, Moscow, MGIMO University, Prospect Vernadskogo 76. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4940-6207>. Email: ryabchenko.v@inno.mgimo.ru

Conflicts of interest:

The author declares the absence of any conflicts of interest.

The article was submitted on July 11, 2022, approved after review on August 18, 2022, and accepted for publication on September 5, 2022.

References:

- Barbey D'Aurevilly J. 1879. *Du dandysme et de George Brummell*. Alphonse Lemerre.
- Baudelaire C. 1868. *L'Art Romantique*. Michel Levy Freres.
- Bely A. 1990a. *Mezhdu dvukh revolyutsii [Between Two Revolutions]*. Khudozhestvennaia Literatura Publishers. (In Russian)
- Bely A. 1990b. *Nachalo veka [The Beginning of the Century]*. Khudozhestvennaia Literatura Publishers. (In Russian)
- Benois A. 1980a. *Moi vospominaniya: v 5 kn. Kn. 1–3 [My Recollections: In Five Books. Books 1–3]*. Nauka. (In Russian)
- Benois A. 1980b. *Moi vospominaniya: v 5 kn. Kn. 4–5 [My Recollections: In Five Books. Books 4–5]*. Nauka. (In Russian)

- Bott I. 2004. 'Mebel' Charl'za Kamerona [Charles Cameron's Furniture]. *Pinacoteca*, 18/19, 18–25. (In Russian)
- Chulkov G. I. 1999. *Gody stranstvii* [Years of Wandering]. Ellis Lak. (In Russian)
- Dobuzhinsky M. V. 1987. *Vospominaniya* [Recollections]. Nauka. (In Russian)
- Dovzhyk S. 2021. Beardsley Men in Early Twentieth-Century Russia: Modernising Decadent Masculinity. *Modernist Cultures*. 16(2). P. 191–215. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3366/mod.2021.0328>. (In Russian)
- Garetto E. 1989. Zhizn' i smert' Niny Petrovskoy [The Life and Death of Nina Petrovskaya]. In *Minuvsheye: Istoricheskiy Al'manakh* [The Past: Historical Almanac]. 8. Atheneum. P. 7–139. (In Russian)
- Gerchuk Y. 2004. Pod znakom Berdsli [Under the Banner of Beardsley]. *Pinacoteca*, 18/19. P. 119–125. (In Russian)
- Grabar I. E. 1937. *Moya zhizn': avtomonografiya* [My Life]. Iskusstvo. (In Russian)
- Lebedev D. L. 2021. Aubrey Beardsley and Arthur Rackham: Subtleties of Impact. *Arts, Education and Science*. 1(1). P. 97–107. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36871/hon.202101011>. (In Russian)
- Makovsky S. 1955. *Portrety sovremennikov* [Portraits of Contemporaries]. Chekhova Publishers. (In Russian)
- Pertsov P. P. 2002. *Literaturnye vospominaniya 1890–1902* [Literary Memoirs]. Novoe Literaturnoe Obozrenie. (In Russian)
- Petrov-Vodkin K. S. 1982. *Khlynovsk: Prostranstvo Evklida: Samarkandiya* [Khlynovsk: Euclidian Space: Samarkand]. Iskusstvo. (In Russian)
- Shcherbatov S. 2016. *Khudozhnik ushedshei Rossii* [The Artist of Bygone Russia]. DirectMedia Publishers. (In Russian)
- Sternin G. Y. 1984. *Russkaia khudozhestvennaia kul'tura vtoroi poloviny XIX – nachala KhKh veka* [Russian Culture of the Second Half of the 19th to the Early 20th Centuries]. Sovetskii khudozhnik. (In Russian)
- Sturgis M. 1998. *Aubrey Beardsley: A Biography*. London: HarperCollins.
- Vinogradov S. 1993. O strannom zhurnale, ego talantlivykh sotrudnikakh i moskovskikh pi-rakh [On a Strange Magazine, Its Talented Employees and Moscow Feasts]. In *Vospominaniya o Ser-ebryanom veke* [Memories of the Silver Age]. Respublika. P. 430–440. (In Russian)
- Vyazova E. S. 2004. Bogema i dendizm: "shtany s bakhromoi" ili buton'erka v petlitse? [Bo-hemia and Dandyism: "Fringed Trousers" or a Boutonniere in a Buttonhole?]. *Pinacoteca*, 18/19. P. 63–69. (In Russian)
- Vyazova E. S. 2009. Gipnoz anglomanii. Angliya i "angliyskoye" v russkoy kul'ture rubezha XIX–XX vekov [Anglomania Hypnosis. England and "English" in Russian Culture at the Turn of the 20th Century]. Novoe Literaturnoe Obozrenie. (In Russian)
- Zavyalova A. E. 2008. Somov i Berdsli. Liubopytnye sovpadeniia. Novye fakty [Somov and Beardsley. Curious Coincidences. New Facts]. *Russkoe iskusstvo*. 4. P. 94–98. (In Russian)

OLD BELIEVERS IN BRAZIL: PRESERVING LINGUISTIC IDENTITY¹

Galina Petrova

Moscow State Institute of International Relations (University)

Abstract. This article presents a study of the history of Russian Old Believers' emigration to Brazil. As such, it analyses the reasons that allowed them to maintain their linguistic identity, and identifies the features of the dialect of *of the Russian language of the Old Believers living in Latin America and in Brazil in particular*. Old Believers moved to Brazil after centuries of oppression, first leaving Central Russia for the East of the country, Siberia and Primorye, and then, after the 1917 Revolution, many of them moved to Harbin (China). After the 1949 Revolution in China, they turned to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, who sent them to the United States, Canada, Australia and Brazil. Brazil was the first country to grant them visas. The main wave of migration of Old Believers to Brazil took place in 1957–1958, that is, after the policy of nationalization of the New State carried out in 1937–1945 by President Getúlio Vargas, whose goal was to turn all immigrants into Brazilian citizens by banning their native language in both official and everyday communication. Thus, the Old Believers managed to fully preserve their religious, cultural and linguistic identity due to the hermetic nature of their communities and the preservation of their traditional way of life. The dialect of the Old Believers of Brazil retains the typical features of the Nizhny Novgorod dialect of the nineteenth century, in which archaic linguistic features and semantic shifts in the meaning of words were preserved. However, it also contains lexical innovations denoting new concepts of modern life, Spanish and Portuguese borrowings and their adaptation. At the beginning of the twenty-first century, several Old Believer families decided to return to Russia under the State Programme to Assist the Voluntary Resettlement to Russia of Compatriots Living Abroad. Specifically, they returned to Primorye, thus completing their round-the-world trip.

Keywords: Old Believers, emigration, immigration, Russian language abroad, dialect of Old Believers in Latin America, repatriation programme

¹ Petrova G. V. 2022. Old Believers in Brazil: Preserving Linguistic Identity. *Linguistics & Polyglot Studies*. 8(3). P. 109–121. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24833/2410-2423-2022-3-32-109-121>

This purpose of this article is to study the history of the emigration of Russian Old Believers to Brazil, analyse the reasons that allowed them to preserve their linguistic identity, and identify the features of the Russian dialect of Old Believers living in Latin America, and in Brazil in particular.

Our investigation into the history and customs of Old Believers relies heavily on the work of Y. M. Yukhimenko (Yukhimenko 2012) and D. V. Semikopov (Semikopov 2021).

The history of the emigration of Old Believers to Brazil, the integration of immigrants into Brazilian society and the preservation of the Russian language in their new homeland have been the subject of studies by descendants of Russians who emigrated to Brazil, including M. E. Iachinski Mendes (Iachinski Mendes 2019), S. A. Ruseishvili (Ruseishvili 2018, 2020), D. C. Fatuch Rabinowitz (Fatuch Rabinowitz 2008), A. Bytsenko (Bytsenko 2006), and A. Vorobieff (Vorobieff 2006).

Numerous research articles, chapters in books, and films have been produced on the unique phenomenon of preserving the emigration traditions, faith and language of Old Believers in Latin America, which dates back four generations, specifically the works of O. A. Matveichev², M. Bachmakova³, D. Antonelli⁴, V. V. Kobko and N. B. Kertchelaieva (Kobko, Kertchelaieva 2012), as well as the film directed by A. V. Pivovarov⁵.

Interest in the phenomenon of Old Believers has increased as a direct consequence of the Old Believers resettlement programme and their return to the Russian Far East. Numerous documents and articles appeared in the media, and documentary films were made on the subject⁶.

Our analysis of the features of the dialect of Old Believers in Latin America owes much to the text of Danila Zaitsev's *The Life and Times of Danila Terentievich Zaitsev* (Zaitsev 2015), as well as to the research of dialectologist O. G. Rovnova⁷.

² Matveichev O. 2019. Chto stalo s russkimi staroverami, kotorye poselilis' v Braziliu [What Happened to the Russian Old Believers Who Settled in Brazil]. *Cyrillitsa*. 26.10.2019. URL: cyrillitsa.ru/actual/122926-chto-stalo-s-russkimi-staroverami-koto.html (accessed 9.01.2022).

³ Bachmakova M. 2014. Como os Velhos Crentes mantêm suas tradições no mundo moderno. *Gazeta Russa*. 22.11.2014. URL: br.rbth.com/sociedade/2014/11/22/como_os_velhos_crentes_mantem_suas_tradicoes_no_mundo_moderno_28363 (accessed 9.01.2022).

⁴ Antonelli D. 2018. Russos na terra dos pinheiros. *Revista Ideias*. 07.06.2018. URL: revistaideias.com.br/2018/06/07/russos-na-terra-dos-pinheiros/ (accessed 09.01.2022).

⁵ Pivovarov A. 2020. Kak zhivut russkie starobriadtzy v Yuzhnoy Amerike [How Russian Old Believers Live in South America]. URL: youtube.com/watch?v=17-3EGQ1aAw (accessed 09.01.2022).

⁶ Makarova E. 2017. Pereekhavshim na Dal'niy Vostok staroveram pomogut adaptirovat'sya [Old Believers Who Have Moved to the Far East Will Receive Help to Adapt]. *Ministry for the Development of the Russian Far East and Arctic*. 26.04.2017. URL: minvr.gov.ru/presscenter/news/pereekhavshim-na-dalniy-vostok-staroveram-pomogut-adaptirovatsya-4923/ (accessed 09.01.2022); Reassentamento dos compatriotas – velhos ritualistas no Extremo Oriente. Portal de informações sobre as possibilidades de reassentamento dos fiéis Velhos Ritualistas no Extremo Oriente. URL: navostok.info/por/ (accessed 09.01.2022); Chesnokova E. 2017. Extremo Oriente russo gera interesse na América Latina. *Sputnik Brasil*. 02.04.2017. URL: sputniknewsbrasil.com.br/20170402/latino-americanos-extremo-oriente-russo-8049919.html (accessed 09.01.2022).

⁷ Rovnova O. 2014. Zdes, v Bolivii, starovery prekrasno sokhraniayut russkiy iazyk [Here, in Bolivia, Old Believers Perfectly Preserve the Russian language]. *Perunica*. 24.12.2014. URL: perunica.ru/kultura/8958-zdes-v-bolivii-starovery-prekrasno-sokhranyayut-russkiy-yazyk.html (accessed 09.01.2022); Rovnova O. 2018. Kak govoriat russkie starobriadtzy Latinskoy Ameriki [How Russian Old Believers in Latin America Speak]. *Radio Rossii*. 21.11.2018. URL: youtu.be/Gsdwbt4-Cto (accessed 09.01.2022); Makeev A. 2018. Povest' i zhitie "rusos barbudos" [The Life and Times of "Rusos Barbudos"]. *Russkiy Mir*. 05.05.2018. URL: rusmir.media/2018/05/05/rovnova/ (accessed 09.01.2022).

Who Are Old Believers?

The Russia of the seventeenth century was in dire need of reforms to modernize the state, and the Orthodox Church yearned for a moral renewal. The goal of the church reforms of Patriarch Nikon of Moscow was to unify the sacred texts. The Old Church Slavonic translations of the Holy Scriptures and liturgical books, which were copied by hand, contained numerous discrepancies and distortions, and thus had to be brought into line with the Greek versions. The return to Greek rites and texts was rejected outright by supporters of the old faith, who believed that the Church had been reformed to match a dubious Greek model, since the Greeks had initially been allied with the Catholics, before finding themselves under the rule of the Muslim Turks. The role of the leader of the “schismatics” was given to Protopope Avvakum⁸.

Old Believers, therefore, are supporters of the rituals that were universally practiced before the church reform of 1654, which was carried out during the reign of Tsar Alexis. The ruler sided with Patriarch Nikon in the latter’s standoff with Protopope Avvakum. Old Believers were subsequently subjected to centuries of persecution, until 1905, when Tsar Nicholas II signed the “Decree on Strengthening the Principles of Religious Tolerance.” The Council Code of 1649 had imposed the death penalty for crimes against the Orthodox Church and faith, and this article was extended to Old Believers after 1654. The most prominent preachers among the Old Believers were the monk Abraham (1672), the noblewomen Feodosia Morozova, Evdokia Urusova and Maria Danilova (1675). Other leaders of the Old Believer movement – the protopopes Avvakum and Lazarus, the deacon Feodor, and the monk Epiphanius – were exiled to the remote town of Pustozersk beyond the Arctic Circle, where they suffered terrible torture and died by immolation (Yukhimenko 2012).

These acts of persecution, torture and execution were justified not only by the tough position adopted by the tsarist authorities to the Old Believer movement, but also by the stance of the Old Believers themselves, which bordered on fanaticism. As is known, some Old Believers preferred to be burned alive rather than be forced to convert to a new faith, since they believed that self-immolation was a direct path to the salvation of the soul.

The History of Emigration

The Russian Far East and Primorye

In an effort to preserve everyday Orthodox life and escape pressure from the state and the church, the Old Believers started to move to the edges of Russia, to the forests and “deserts,” where the power of the state was weaker (Ibid.: 22–23). In their flight

⁸ Semikopov D. 2021. 11 voprosov o staroobriadtsakh [11 Questions about Old Believers]. Arzamas. 23.08.2021. URL: youtu.be/Gsdwb4-Cto (accessed 09.01.2022).

from the “world of the Antichrist,” the Old Believers went further and further east, to Siberia and the Far East, to Primorye and the most sparsely populated areas of the country.

Manchuria and Harbin

However, when Soviet power, with its collectivization and collective farms, made its way to the Russian Far East, the Old Believers started to move *en masse* to Manchuria. Two routes brought them to China: one group crossed the border from Altai to Xinjiang province, while the second fled from Primorye, crossing the Amur River, to settle in Harbin. These groups remain distinct to this day (called Xinjiang Russians and Harbin Russians, respectively) in terms of their language and customs, which sometimes leads to disagreements between the two. In fact, as O. G. Rovnova, a researcher of Old Believer dialects, notes, they are all descendants of the Nizhny Novgorod *Kerzhaks* (Old Believers). Rovnova established the proximity of their dialects to the modern dialects of the northeast of Nizhny Novgorod, the southwest of Kirov, and the east of Kostroma Oblast⁹.

In the late nineteenth century, the tsarist government decided to build the China-East Road, part of the Trans-Siberian Railway, or the Siberian Route, which would cut the distance to Vladivostok.

To this end, the government entered into an agreement with China that would see the railway lines pass through Manchuria. Harbin would serve as the main hub city of the Chinese Eastern Railway. Built in 1898 on Chinese territory, the city would remain a typical Russian provincial town for some twenty-five years after the revolution, a place where representatives of different religions coexisted without any restrictions. Pockets of Russian émigrés emerged in Harbin, Shanghai and certain other Chinese cities, and the Russian people there published their own newspapers, built schools, and were active in public life¹⁰ (Vorobieff 2006: 161). By 1920, the Russian-speaking population in Harbin had reached 100,000 (out of 430,261 total residents), far greater than in any other city outside Russia (Fatuch Rabinowitz 2008: 24).

The Old Believers lived in Manchuria for around twenty-five years, preserving their centuries-old traditions. However, the situation changed dramatically following the Chinese Revolution in 1949, when the Communist government demanded that foreigners leave the country. The Old Believers were thus faced with a choice: to either go back to Russia (by this point, the Soviet Union) or to emigrate to yet another coun-

⁹ Rovnova O. 2014. Zdes, v Bolivii, starovery prekrasno sokhraniaiut russkiy iazyk [Here, in Bolivia, Old Believers Perfectly Preserve the Russian language]. *Perunica*. 24.12.2014. URL: perunica.ru/kultura/8958-zdes-v-bolivii-starovery-prekrasno-sokhranyayut-russkiy-yazyk.html (accessed 09.01.2022).

¹⁰ Matveichev O. 2019. Chto stalo s russkimi staroverami, kotorye poselilis' v Braziliu [What Happened to the Russian Old Believers Who Settled in Brazil]. *Cyrillitsa*. 26.10.2019. URL: cyrillitsa.ru/actual/122926-chto-stalo-s-russkimi-staroverami-koto.html (accessed 09.01.2022).

try. They ended up turning to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees for help, who in 1953 promptly sent them to Hong Kong, where the headquarters of the UN Refugee Agency were located. From there, having received the necessary documents, they travelled through the Philippines to Argentina, Israel, Canada, the United States, and Brazil (Kobko, Kertchelaieva 2012). S. A. Ruseishvili, who has published written extensively about the emigration of Old Believers to Brazil, notes the following about this period:

“One of the few ways out of this situation was the resettlement programmes in other countries, such as Australia, Argentina, Israel, Canada, the United States and Brazil. Throughout the 1950s, thanks to the efforts of the Far East Office of the International Refugee Organization, and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) that replaced it in 1952, as well as the Intergovernmental Committee for the Movement of Migrants from Europe, Russians were able to obtain travel documents for stateless persons and apply for visas one of the receiving countries. The UNHCR and the Brazilian consulate were located in Hong Kong, and it is from there that the Russian refugees were transported by ship to Santos and Rio de Janeiro” (Ruseishvili 2020: 68).

Brazil

The main wave of emigration of Old Believers to Brazil took place in 1957–1958, thus completing the stages of resettlement of Russians to this country. According to the National Institute of Immigration and Colonization, a total of 3416 Russian refugees came to Brazil from 1950 to 1958.¹¹

Because they arrived in the 1950s, the Old Believers managed to avoid the nationalization campaign carried out in Brazil by the Getúlio Vargas administration in 1937–1945, which aimed to turn all emigrants into Brazilian citizens by outlawing their native language – not only in official communication, but in everyday life too (Iachinski Mendes 2019: 276), (Petrova 2020: 116). This is what allowed the Old Believers to preserve their national, cultural and linguistic identity.

The Old Believers who had arrived in Brazil made their way to the states of Paraná, Santa Catarina and Rio Grande do Sul, as well as to the southeast of the country. The Brazilian government provided immigrants with significant benefits. They were offered free travel to Brazil by sea, free rail travel to their final destination within the country, a plot of land and a relocation allowance (Vorobieff 2006: 36). The rules for

¹¹ Campos G. B. 2015. Dois séculos de imigração no Brasil. A construção da imagem e papel social dos estrangeiros pela imprensa entre 1808 e 2015. Tese de Doutorado. Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ). Rio de Janeiro. Cit. ex. (Ruseishvili 2018).

engaging in gainful employment, acquiring land, obtaining loans, and so on, are described in detail by A. Bytsenko's in her master's dissertation¹².

Ideological and eugenic considerations meant that the Emigration Service would not accept Jews, as well as people suspected of harbouring communist beliefs, single women, the elderly and the infirm. To quote Ruseishvili once again:

“It should be noted that the Brazilian government accepted World War II refugees, not because of humanitarian principles, but because it wanted to fill the shortage of workers in skilled labourer positions in the growing industrial sectors and in mechanized agriculture. Those who applied to move to Brazil were selected by a government commission created specifically for this purpose in camps set up in Europe for displaced persons. Selection criteria included nationality, the ability to work, and political views. The Brazilian government, still influenced by the anti-communist and nationalist sentiments of the 1930s, preferred to take skilled industrial workers or farmers who were potentially willing to assimilate into the country's cultural mainstream and openly declared their anti-communist views” (Ruseishvili 2020: 68).

But the Old Believers were ideal “migration material” (a term used in the official documentation of those times): they were known to be exceptionally hardworking and responsible. The was just one obstacle: family communities did not want to be separated, and they would only move as a single group (Ruseishvili 2018: 121–128).

The initial years were not easy: the settlers were first sent to cut wood, a profession that caused growing dissatisfaction among them, as it was not one of the skills they had typically mastered as farmers. The situation was saved by A. Muravyov-Apostol, who supervised the settlers on behalf of the World Council of Churches. He was instrumental in the acquisition of 6000 acres of land with forest and a river in the municipality of Ponta Grossa in the state of Paraná. The landscape reminded them of central Russia, only the vegetation was tropical. These were the beginnings of the hacienda of Santa Cruz in Paraná. The Old Believers went about their usual business: they ploughed virgin lands, planted vegetable gardens, built houses of worship, and wooden huts to live in. The buildings were constructed in the Russian style, from logs, with saunas and Russian stoves.

The lands were unsuitable for farming, and farmers bought potassium fertilizer by the tonne¹³. The Old Believers themselves would later recall that they did not quite understand at first how to work on the new land, what fertilizers to use, and how to care

¹² Bytsenko A. 2006. *Imigração da Rússia para o Brasil no Início do Século XX. Visões do Paraíso e do Inferno*. University of São Paulo.

¹³ Pivovarov A. 2020. *Kak zhivut russkii staroobriadtsy v Yuzhnoy Amerike* [How Russian Old Believers Live in South America]. URL: youtube.com/watch?v=17-3EGQ1aAw (accessed 09.01.2022).

for crops they had never encountered before. They also worked for German settlers who had come from the Volga Region and understood Russian; thus, communication was not an issue. They learned how to plant rice from their German Volga neighbours.

Four years after settling, the colony started to turn a profit, even managing to get their buckwheat, rice, potatoes and sunflowers sold in Rio de Janeiro. Their apiaries produced up to 10,000 tonnes of honey per year, and the dairy products sold by Old Believers were sold throughout the region. Over the next 50 years, they purchased new lands, including another ranch in the state of Mato Grosso. There are currently around three thousand Old Believers living in Brazil. They have communities in the states of Paraná, Mato Grosso, Goiás and Tocantins, where they grow soybeans, beans, rice, cotton and sunflowers¹⁴. An exchange of sorts of culinary traditions took part between the Old Believers and their Brazilian neighbours: the Brazilians developed a taste for *tvorog* and sour cream and learned how to make *pierogi*, while the Old Believers learned how to make *feijoada* and rice bread¹⁵.

Traditions and Customs

Ideally, Old Believer communities should be isolated completely from civilization: in order to protect their children from the vices of the modern world, they choose the most inaccessible and remote places to settle. Whenever alcoholics, drug addicts and nonbelievers appear nearby, the Old Believers will up sticks, leaving the buildings and ploughed lands, and move on to an even remoter location, ploughing and fertilizing virgin soil, planting vegetable gardens and orchards, and engaging in fishing. They are not interested in the trappings of civilization and are not afraid of hardship or harsh climates.

Old Believers wear traditional nineteenth century garb. Men wear multi-coloured shirts and a belt that separates their “two bodies,” and they must always wear a beard. Women, meanwhile, wear a *sarafan* type of dress and a scarf (called a *shashmura*)¹⁶. The man of the house goes out and earns a living, while the woman stays at home, takes care of the children, cooks, weaves and sews traditional clothes, embroiders belts, does the household chores, and takes care of the livestock. She is the custodian of the hearth and the Russian language, which she passes on to her children¹⁷.

¹⁴ Matveichev O. 2019. Chto stalo s russkimi staroverami, kotorye poselilis' v Brazili [What Happened to the Russian Old Believers Who Settled in Brazil]. *Cyrillitsa*. 26.10.2019. URL: cyrillitsa.ru/actual/122926-chto-stalo-s-russkimi-staroverami-koto.html (accessed 09.01.2022).

¹⁵ Antonelli D. 2018. Russos na terra dos pinheirais. *Revista Ideias*. 07.06.2018. URL: revistaideias.com.br/2018/06/07/russos-na-terra-dos-pinheirais/ (accessed 09.01.2022).

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Makeev A. 2018. Povest' i zhitie “rusos barbudos” [The Life and Times of “Rusos Barbudos”]. *Russkiy Mir*. 05.05.2018. URL: rusmir.media/2018/05/05/rovnova/ (accessed 09.01.2022).

The woman preserves the purity of the Russian language, something that the man, who is engaged in his business in the new homeland, often cannot do. Old Believers do not share food or kitchenware with people of other faiths, and they do not buy food in shops (except for salt, tea and coffee), growing everything themselves on their farms. Smoking and eating at restaurants are strictly forbidden. The only alcohol (*brazhka*) that may be consumed must be homemade, by the community, and only on Sundays¹⁸.

Life in the community is closed: Old Believers do not take out loans from banks, preferring to borrow money from fellow believers, and they conduct business among their own¹⁹. If a “brother” finds himself in a difficult situation, his fellow believers are obliged to come to his aid, even if they do not know him personally. Old Believers are reluctant to communicate with the outside world, although they have no qualms about buying the equipment they need – both agricultural and household – wherever they can. Many families even have their own aeroplanes, as it would be impossible to get to neighbouring villages otherwise. By Brazilian standards, Old Believers are extremely well off.

Technically, television is prohibited (except when it serves educational purposes – for example, children may be allowed to watch Russian cartoons to help them with their Russian studies). However, all homes have internet access, which allows the family to talk to relatives from different countries or continents.

Consanguine marriage is prohibited up to the seventh generation: the genealogy of each clan is perfectly traced, and Old Believers typically arrange the marriages of their children with colonies located in Uruguay, Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, the United States or Australia. Thus, Old Believer communities in different countries are connected by kinship ties (Vorobieff 2006: 48). Marriages are usually strong, although they are not registered in the chapels and *bespopovtsy*.²⁰ Divorce does happen, although there are certain moral obstacles to it. Girls tend to marry early, at 14–16 years of age. A typical family has between ten and fourteen children.

The abundance of “schools of thought” in different communities of Old Believers means that their customs and beliefs often differ from each other.

¹⁸ Matveichev O. 2019. Chto stalo s russkimi staroverami, kotorye poselilis' v Braziliu [What Happened to the Russian Old Believers Who Settled in Brazil]. *Cyrillitsa*. 26.10.2019. URL: cyrillitsa.ru/actual/122926-chto-stalo-s-russkimi-staroverami-koto.html (accessed 09.01.2022).

¹⁹ Bachmakova M. 2014. Como os Velhos Crentes mantêm suas tradições no mundo moderno. *Gazeta Russa*. 22.11.2014. URL: br.rbth.com/sociedade/2014/11/22/como_os_velhos_crentes_mantem_suas_tradicoes_no_mundo_moderno_28363 (accessed 09.01.2022).

²⁰ As Old Believers are not recognized by the Russian state or church, they cannot comply with the rules of the church hierarchy and have their own priest. The fact that there were no bishops or priests of the ancient, pre-Nikon order in the Old Believers was painfully obvious by the 1670s–1680s. Hence the variety of “schools” of Old Believers, from *beglopovovtsy* (priests ordained in the official church but who had later broken away from it – so-called “fugitive priests” – and then accepted into Old Believer communities) to chapels and *bespopovtsy*. The latter, upon the decision of a meeting of the community, choose a mentor from among the worthy laymen, who receives a blessing to carry out the service. Everyone in the community observes fasts and takes part in all the services. The person chosen as priest performs the service.

In some colonies, children go to public schools, where they learn to read and write, and also study Portuguese or Spanish. However, it is not uncommon in villages that practice a stricter form of the religion to excommunicate members of the community for sending their children to a mainstream school. Each colony must have its own school, where an Old Believer teacher is brought in, for a fee, to teach the children Old Church Slavonic and liturgical singing from the first grade. In most cases, children only complete primary school, as it is believed that four years are sufficient to toil the land. Thus, children grow up in villages where they speak Russian exclusively, thereby preserving the purity of their native language.

Features of the Dialect of Russian Spoken by Old Believers in Latin America

The Russian spoken by Old Believers is not a literary language, but a living dialect that was spoken in Russia in the nineteenth century.

It is often the case that émigrés lose their native language by the third generation, meaning that the grandchildren of emigrants are typically unable to communicate in the language of their grandparents.

This is not the case in Old Believer settlements, where the Russian language remains intact, spoken fluently by the fourth generation of settlers. Researchers note that while Russian continues to thrive among Old Believers living in Latin America, the same cannot be said for those in the United States and Australia, where the children of settlers (the second generation) start to lose their native tongue. This can be explained by the fact that emigrants in these countries are often actively involved in business and economic activities there. This leads to situations in which a grandmother living in Bolivia, say, and her grandson in Alaska or Oregon natively speak completely different languages and do not understand each other²¹.

Our analysis of the language of Old Believers is based on the memoirs of the Old Believer Danila Zaitsev, *The Life and Times of Danila Terentievich Zaitsev* (Zaitsev 2015).

The book is a unique document, a record, as it were, of the spoken language of Old Believers in Latin America. As we know, dialects exist in oral form only, but this book is an exception. Zaitsev completed just four years of schooling. The book, which is 700 pages long, is written in block letters, with no spacing between words, which are transcribed phonetically. The dialectologist O. G. Rovnova, who studies the language of Old Believers, spent three years rewriting Zaitsev's book in accordance with exist-

²¹ Rovnova O. 2014. Zdes, v Bolivii, starovery prekrasno sokhraniaiut russkiy iazyk [Here, in Bolivia, Old Believers Perfectly Preserve the Russian language]. *Perunica*. 24.12.2014. URL: perunica.ru/kultura/8958-zdes-v-bolivii-starovery-prekrasno-sohranyayut-russkiy-yazyk.html (accessed 09.01.2022).

ing spelling rules, and compiled an annotated dictionary to make the work easier to read. She has published numerous works on the pronunciation and vocabulary of Old Believers, not only those in Latin America, but all over the world.

The dialect maps plotted by Rovnova on the basis of her research show that the native dialect of the Old Believers originated from the Nizhny Novgorod Governorate, and from there, the Kerzhaks spread it throughout the world²².

Rovnova notes that the Old Believers are unwilling polyglots: they easily learn the language of the country to which fate has brought them, yet they speak Russian exclusively at home. For example, the elders who were forced to leave China towards the end of the 1950s claim that they can speak Mandarin. In Brazil, Old Believers speak “Brazilian” (not Portuguese) in their dealings with the outside world, and in Bolivia and Argentina, they speak “Colina” (not Spanish), which is taken from the word *colla*, the name of a native tribe²³.

Old Believers are true nomads. As we mentioned above, they have no problem moving from country to country, leaving their belongings behind and starting anew. According to Zaitsev, his family, which included 11 children, moved 60 times in search of the “promised land.”

The language of the Old Believers was not mummified: it is a living and breathing language. But distance and isolation have meant that it has developed differently to the Russian spoken in the motherland.

Phonetics

Phonetic differences are a consequence not only of the place where a given community of Old Believers currently resides, but also of the part of China from which they emigrated. Harbin Russians are convinced that their speech is more correct and closer to standard Russian, and they look down on Xinjian Russians because of this. Even though the oldest living Old Believers were born in China and have never known Russia, they consider themselves Russian (Fatuch Rabinowitz 2008: 47), and their connection to the motherland is very important for them.

Xinjian Old Believers pronounce *s* instead of *ts*: *syplyonok* (and not *tsyplyonok* – “chicken”); *s Marfoy sapalis* (not *tsapalis* – “Martha and I quarreled”); *seluyu rybu* (not *tseluyu rybu* – “a whole fish”); *za amerikansom* (not *za amerikantsom* – “for the American”); *usadba v sentre* (not *usadba v tsentre* – “the farmstead is in the town centre”); *dva nemsy* (not *dva nemtsy* – two Germans) *ushla k paragvaysu* (not *ushla k paragvaytsu* – “left for a Paraguayan”); *argentins* (not *argentinets* – “Argentinian”); *v konse*

²² Makeev A. 2018. Povest' i zhitie "rusos barbudos" [The Life and Times of "Rusos Barbudos"]. *Russkiy Mir*. 05.05.2018. URL: rusmir.media/2018/05/05/rovnova/ (accessed 09.01.2022).

²³ Rovnova O. 2018. Kak govoriat russkie starobriadtsy Latinskoy Ameriki [How Russian Old Believers in Latin America Speak]. *Radio Rossii*. 21.11.2018. URL: youtu.be/GsdwbT4-Cto (accessed 09.01.2022).

konsov (not *v kontse kontsov* – “at the end of the day”); *zolotsa* (“gold”); *migrasionnaya sluzhba* (not *migratsionnaya sluzhba* – “migration service”); *vkones* (not *vkonets* – “in the end”) [5].

Phonetic phenomena that are common to people from Xinjian and Harbin include:

- the sounds *ch* and *shch* (or *sh*) are interchanged: *synoshchek* (*synochek* – “son”); *shchaynik* (*chaynik* – “kettle”); *lavoshka* (*lavochka* – “bench”); *rasshitatsya* (*rasschitat-sya* – “to settle accounts”); *skushno* (*skuchno* – “boring”); *perevodshik* (*perevodchik* – “translator”); *boroda gusta, rusa, poshti bela* (*boroda gusta, rusa, pochti bela* – “[his] beard is thick, blonde, almost white”). For example, in Zaitsev’s book, written in the Xinjian dialect, we encounter: *zhenchiny* (*zhenshchiny*), *soobchil* (*soobshchil* – “[he] informed/told”); *obchatsya* (*obchatsya* – “to talk/chat”), *voobche* (*voobshche* – “whatsoever”); *proshshayutsya* (*proshchayutsya* – “they are saying goodbye”), *isho* (*ishchu* – “I am looking”), *ishshut* (*ishchut* – “they are looking”); *proshshe* (*proshche* – “easier:”); *pomorshilis* (*pomorshchilis* – “winked”); *yashsherki* (*yashcherki* – “lizards”); *okreshshu syna* (*okreshchu syna* – “I will baptize my son”); *chichas* (*seychas* – “now”); *chizhalo* (*difficult*); *skupushsha* (*skupushcha* – “stingy”); *voobche* (*voobshche* – “whatsoever”), *zaroshshe* (*zarosshe* – “overgrown”); *pushshe* (*pusshe* – “more”); *tashshila* (*tashchila* – “[she/it] dragged”);

- the consonants *k* and *kh* are interchanged: *khryosna* (*kryostnaya* – “godmother”); *nekrest* (*nekhrist* – “unbeliever”); *nikhto* (*nikto* – “no one”); *bakcha* (*bakhcha* – “melon field”);

- when vocalizing, the vowels *u*, *a*, and *e* are replaced by *yu* and *ya*: *pachkyu deneg* (*pachku deneg* – “a wad of money”); *kartochkyu* (*kartochku* – “card”); *kopeykyu* (*kopeyku* – “Kopeck”); *v rechkyu* (*v rechku* – “into the river”); *na tu zhe tochkyu* (*na tu zhe tochku* – “to the same point”); *tolkya* (*tolko* – “only”); *aviyakompaniya* (*avia-kompaniya* – “airline”); *charodeykya* (*charodeyka* – “sorceress”); *Zaykya* (*Zayka* – a term of endearment); *s tyatyay* (*s tyetyoy* – “with [my] aunt”); *poprosil denyag* (*poprosil deneg* – “[he] asked for money”); *bolshoya spasibo* (*bolshoye spasibo* – “many thanks”); *s Maryay* (*s Maryoy* – “with Mary”); *i tak daleya* (*i tak dalee* – “and so on”); *v glubokiya lesa* (*v glubokiye lesa* – “deep into the woods”); *Marfonkya* (*Marfonka*); *bystrenkya* (*by-strenko* – “quickly”); *dengyami vyruchil* (*dengami vyruchil* – “he helped me out with money”); *nas troya* (*nas troye* – “three are three of us”); *bolshoya sozhaleniye* (*bolshoye sozhaleniye* – “a big regret”); *vosem bratyav* (*vosem bratyev* – “eight brothers”); *rodnoya* (*rodnoy* – “native”); *charodeykya* (*charodeyka* – “sorceress”); *Froskya* (*Froska*); *khristiyane* (*khristiane* – “Christian”); *zhili by derevnyay* (*zhili by derevnaya*); *privychkya* (*privychka* – “habit”); *malyya gruppy* (*malaye gruppа* – “a small group”); *s Kharitinyay* (*s Kharitinyo*); *Vankya* (*Vanka*); *natrenkyalsya* (*natrenkalsa*); *vesyolenkyay* (*veselen-kiy* – “jolly”); *syali na traktor* (*seli na traktor* – “they got into the tractor”); *khozyaykya* (*khozyayka* – “woman of the house”); *s dyadyay* (*s dyadey* – “with [my] uncle”); *po-prezhnyamu* (*po-prezhnemu* – “as before”); *bolshoya spasibo* (*bolshoye spasibo* – “many thanks”); *privychkya* (*privychka* – “habit”); *svechkya* (*svechka* – “candle”); *spetsiyalnoye*

mesto (*spetsialnoye mesto* – “special place”); *ya syal i gorko zaplakal* (*ya sel i gorko zaplakal* – “I sat down and wept”); *rechky* (*rechka* – “river”); *teyetry* (*teatry* – “theatres”); *sushit boby soyavy* (*sushit boby soya* – “to dry soya beans”).

Some vowels and consonants undergo elision: *mnya* (*menya* – “me, of me”); *pouzhnat* (*pouzhinat* – “to have dinner”); *strechayutsya* (*vstrechayutsya* – “they are dating”); *spominayu* (*vspominayu* – “I recall”). There are also cases where additional consonants are inserted between vowels: *idivot* (*idiot* – “idiot”); *idivotnichala nad nimi* (*idiotnichala nad nimi* – “she made them laugh”).

Morphological Features

In terms of morphology, the full forms of adjectives are often replaced with short forms: *vtoru doch* (*vtoruyu doch* – “the second daughter”); *no pervo* (*no pervoye* – “but first”); *v staru derevnyu* (*v staruyu derevnyu* – “to the old village”); *tako rasstoyanie* (*takoye rasstoyanie* – “such a distance”); *nekotory* (*nekotorye* – “some, a certain”); *slaba* (*slabaya* – “weak”); *khoroshi* (*khoroshie* – “good”); *skore* (*skoreye* – “quick”); *bela* (*belaya* – “white”); *kholodna* (*kholodnaya* – “cold”); *dobry lyudi* (*dobrye lyudi* – “kind people”); *mnogi* (*mnogie* – “many, lots”); *kitaysko gosudarstvo* (*kitayskoye gosudarstvo* – “the Chinese government”); *bankovski rekvizity* (*bankovskiy rekvizity* – “bank details”); *zhenchina vysoka, stroyna i krasiva, no vredna, zavidliva, leniva* (*zhenshchina vysokaya, stroynaya i krasivaya, no vrednaya, lenivaya* – “the lady is tall, slim and beautiful, but she’s spiteful, lazy and the jealous type”); *kotoru nevzlyubit* (*kotoru nevzlyubit* – “to whom he will take a disliking”); *bolye i bolye* (*bolyeye i bolyeye* – “more and more”); *zarplata nizka* (*zarplata nizkaya* – “low wage”); *argentinska* (*argentinskaya* – “Argentinian”); *materinny slyozy* (*materinnye slyozy* – “mother’s tears”); *rechki svetly rybny, no vse zarosshe* (*rechki svetlye rybnye, no vse zarossheye* – “the rivers are clear and full of fish, but everything is overgrown”); *lyubu otdam za tebya* (*lyubuyu otdam za tebya* – “I will give any of them for you”); *kaka roskosh* (*kakaya roskosh* – “what luxury”); *kazhdu nedelyu* (*kazhduyu nedelyu* – “every week”); *ikhno staranie* (*ikhnoye staranie* – “their efforts”); *videli eyo uplakannu* (*videli eyo uplakannuyu* – “we saw her crying”); *bolshi podryady* (*bolshiye podryady* – “big contracts”); *ni v kaki* (*ni v kakie* – “in no way”); *vremennoyu molennu* (*vremennuyu molennuyu* – “temporary prayer room”); *znakomstvo bylo khoroshe* (*znakomstvo bylo khoroshee* – “it was nice to get to know [them/him/her/you]”); *dokhshi myshi* (*dokhshiye myshi* – “dead mice”); *kazhdo viskresenye* (*kazhdoye viskresenye* – “every Sunday”); *kaki-to pridirki* (*kakiye-to pridirki* – “some nitpicks”); *mnogi* (*mnogie* – “many, several”).

Neologisms

Old Believers typically do not accept many of the lexemes that appear in the normative language, choosing instead to replace new concepts that have appeared in our reality with ancient words that then acquire a new meaning: *ukhazhorka* means

“girlfriend”; *na besovskikh kopytchikav* means “in high heels” (lit. “in devil’s hooves”). Cartoons are called *poskakushki* (lit. “skits”); teachers are called *klassnitsa*; fairy lights are called *pomigushki* (lit. “winkers”); headbands are *odevashka*; and instead of saying “loan” or “credit,” which exist in the Old Believer dialect, they prefer to say *vzyat na vyplatku* (“take for repayment”).

Word Formation

Foreign words are transformed according to Russian word-formation models: *poshel potelefonil Filatu* (“I went and phoned Filat”); *meksinanin* (“Mexican”); *masonin* (“freemason”); *zarabotayu i abilitiruyu svoyu lodku* (“I’ll earn some money and get my boat up and moving”); *gazolinka* (from the Spanish *gasolinera* – “petrol station”); *nizky klass konfliktivny* (“non-conflict”); *ushel k baptistam* (“he converted to Baptism”); *proiskhodit korrupsyya* (“there’s corruption”). Old Believers say *brazilyanyets* (not *brazilyets* – “a Brazilian man”) and *bolivianyets* (not *boliviets* – “a Bolivian man”). Women are called, respectively, *brazilyukha* (“a Brazilian woman”), *boliviyukha* (“a Bolivian woman”), *ispanukha* (“a Spanish woman”), *kitayukha* (“a Chinese woman”), *harbinukha* (“a woman from Harbin”) and *xinjiangukha* (“a woman from Xinjiang”). While the suffix *-ukh(a)* can carry negative connotations in standard Russian, this is not the case with the variant spoken by Old Believers. They also use the words *colya* and *colyukha* to refer to people from the Indian Colla tribe in Bolivia. “I was once mistaken for a ‘colyukha,’” Rovnova commented in an interview [5].

Archaisms

It is common knowledge that dialects are characterized by an abundance of archaic words. This is also true of the Old Believer’s dialect: *lednik* for *kholodilnik* (“refrigerator”); *pytat* for *sprashivat* (“to ask”); *vydyuzhit* for *vyterpet* (“to endure, suffer”); *oprostau nash dom* for *uidi iz nashego doma* (“leave our house”); *khudoj* for *plokhoj* (“bad”); and the obsolete Russian word *kufayka* is used to mean “sweater” or “jumper.”

Foreign Words

Foreign words that are not typically inflected in literary Russian do undergo inflection in the Old Believer’s dialect: *khodili v kinakh* (“they went to the cinema”); *30,000 cruzeirov v mesyats* (“30,000 cruzeiros per month”); *gringi zabili ves rynok* (“there were gringos all over the market”); *khodili po kazinam* (“they visited some casinos”). The process of adapting foreign nouns involves:

- a change of gender: *vovnutr zhungli* (“inside the jungle”), *khoroishuyu filmu propuskayut* (“they’re missing a good film”); *privezli produktu* (“they’ve brought the goods”);

- a change of number: *v biznesakh* (lit. “in businesses” to mean “in business”); *dolara pokoyu ne dayut* (lit. “the dollar do not bring peace”); *prazdnik pomidory* (lit. “a feast of tomato”);
- a change of the morphological form of the noun: *banok* (not *bank*) *stal pritesnyat* (“the bank started hassling us”).

Semantic Shifts

Words found in standard Russian take on a different meaning: *prazdnovat* (which means “to celebrate” in standard Russian) – to spend free time on Sundays and holidays; *proshshatsya* (“to say goodbye”) – to ask for forgiveness; *rovnya* (“equal, peer”) – a group of teenagers of the same age; *dokazyvat* (“to prove”) – to express dissatisfaction [with something or someone]; *rebyatyoshki* (“kids,” “guys”) – boys; *krutoi* (“strong,” “cool”) – fast; *skhvatyvat* (“to catch, capture”) – to vomit; *zapredstavlyatsya* (“to introduce oneself”) – to be cocky; *bazar* (“market, bazaar”) – shop; *poganyi* (“foul, unclean”) – a third-class citizen; *prostoi* (“simple”) – empty; *zloslovit kogo-l.* (“to slander”) – to call someone a name, to contradict oneself; *teryatsya* (“to be at a loss”) – to disappear without a trace; *rabocha* (“working”) – eager, zealous, diligent; *nelyzya nam slavitsya* (*slavitsya* – “to be known for sth.”) – we can’t become famous, public figures; *steklyannyi* (“glazed,” “glassy”) – brilliant, shiny; *snaryazhat svadbu* – to decorate the bride’s trousseau with embroidery; *velichat* (“to glorify,” “to dignify”) – to use a person’s patronymic when addressing or talking about them; *vypusk* (“issue”) – cattle shed; *rytsya* (“to delve, dig, burrow”) – to choose carefully; *kochevat* (“to wander, roam”) – to leave; *ves kapital provalila* – she spent all their money; *poklony* (“bows, curtsies”) – gifts for newlyweds; *poluchil blagoslovenie* (lit. “he received blessings”) – holy water; *vse chudyatsya* (lit. “everyone is imagining things”) – they are shocked, amazed; *predlog* (“pretext,” “preposition”) – offer, proposal; *tyanut* (“to pull, drag”) – to feel nauseated; *rodstvo* (“kinship”) – relatives; *vam ne nuzhno* (lit. “you don’t need...”) – it’s none of your business; *stegat* (“to quilt, lace, stitch”) – to experience cramps; *razna* (“various”) – different; *pererodok* (“degenerate”) – a child from an interracial marriage; *ne zabot’tes* – don’t worry about it; *tabor* (“a band of gypsies”) – campsite; *stroit* (“to build”) – to do; *proslavil menya masonom* (lit. “he made me a freemason”) – he declared; *prizhat* (“to grip, squeeze”) – to hug, embrace; *otvet* (“answer, reply”) – responsibility.

Foreign Loan Words

Interference of the Dominant Language

During Danila’s time in Brazil, borrowings from Brazilian Portuguese and the languages of the indigenous population started to appear in his Russian speech. Most of these denote concepts specific to the region: *raznosvetny arary*, *pirikity* (“multi-coloured *arary*, *pirikity*”; Port. *arara*, *piriquito* – parrot species); *tukany*, *vsyaki-razni*

makaki (“toucans, all kinds of *macaci*”; Port. *macaco* – “monkey”) *i onsy* (“and onça”; Port. onça – “jaguar”); *podkhodit krupnaya ryba: pintado, surubi, zhau, piri-putanga, pirarara, korvina, piyava, kurimba* (“big fish will do: pintado, surubim, jaú, piri-putanga, pirarara, corvina, piava, curimba”). “An insect of some sort crawled into the *mato*” (Port. *mato* – “woods, forest”); “he poured some *yerba mate*” (Port. *erva mate* – “maté tea”); “there was a *tumor* and he got cancer” (Port. *tumor* – “tumour”); “the Primavera do Leste *posto*” (Port. *posto de gasolina* – “petrol station”); “we went to the *telefónica brasileira*” (Port. *posto telefónico* – “telephone station”), *artificialmente* (“artificially”) *helped with the fish*; “they have an annual *agenda*”; “to show *bodegas* of all kinds” (Port. *bodega* – “pub”); “two *lots*, and they’re building a house” (Port. *lote* – “land plot”); “*comitiva* are coming” (Port. *comitiva* – “accompanying persons”).

A number of words and expressions of Spanish origin appear in Zaitsev’s language following his time in Bolivia, Argentina and Peru: “we bought a *chacra* with *fruta*” (Sp. *chacra* – “farm, farmyard”; *fruta* – fruit-bearing trees); “we went into the *inmobiliaria*” (Sp. *agencia inmobiliaria* – “real estate agency”); “on a *transbordador* boat” (Sp. *transbordador* – “ferryboat”); “the Spanish *virrey*” (Sp. *virrey* – “viceroys”); “Chilean men are considered *machisto*” (Sp. *macho* – “manly”); “the *stancer* declared” (Sp. *estancero* – “ranch owner”); “we met a Russian *científico*” (Sp. *científico* – “scientist”); “it’s good *experience*” (Sp. *experiencia* – “experience”); “there a lots of *depredators*” (Sp. *depredador* – “predator”); “a famous *vidente*” (Sp. *vidente* – “clairvoyant”).

Zaitsev’s time in the United States brought numerous Americanisms into his lexicon: “we went to the *casinos*”; “the *policeman* is right there”; “have them use *siding*”; “music, *barbecue*, and dancing.” He also started to write the time in the English manner: “until 14:00 p.m.”

In Russia, Danila uses Latin American terms to denote phenomena for which he does not know the Russian equivalent: “this is a forward-thinking *executiv*” (Sp. *executivo* – here “official”); “there are *pancartas* in Belgorod” (Sp. *pancartas* – “posters”); “I would like to add a deity and a *privat*” (Sp. *privado* – here “private property”).

The syntax demonstrates a clear influence of constructions that are typical of Romance languages: *I’ll take the bus; I thought you know how to fish; can you take this answer* [responsibility]; *low class, caught malaria*.

False Friends

Zaitsev’s book contained numerous so-called “false friends” of the translator, that is, words that are found in the Russian languages, but which have a different meaning: *your conpromiso* [responsibility] *is significant*, *professór* [teacher]; *there is a different book for each materia* [subject]; *we took a projector* [lamp] *with us; are the numeros* [numbers] *acceptable?*

Folk Etymology and Other Phenomena Characteristic of Colloquial Speech

Phenomena of folk etymology and other cases that are characteristic of colloquial speech are observed in the forms of nouns and verbs Zaitsev uses: *nadsmeshki* (“jokes, taunts”); *zagan passport* (“travel passport”); *symlenye* (“doubt”); *ne klansya* (“don’t bow”); *syodin* (“today”); *samodelashna lodka* (“homemade boat”); *oboi derevni* (“both villages”); *ya i otvetyu* (“I will reply”); *yaysty* (“eggs”); *s nyom ne rybachu* (“I don’t go fishing with him”); *ya yeyo spolyubil* (“I fell for her”); *one vzamuzhem* (“she is married”); *rossiets* (a Russian emigrant); *dolozhny svenchatsya* (“they should get married”); *sadyat v tyurmy* (“to throw in jail”); *chto khochut tvoryat* (“they do as they please”); *ya byl ne nuzhon* (“I wasn’t needed”); *v chyom vam pomogchi* (“how can I help you”)?

The pronunciation of specialized scientific terms is simplified: *isplotiryvaet devchonok* (“he exploits girls”); *ekspertiza* (“expert review”); *nastala epokha demokratov radikalnykh* (“the era of radical democrats is upon us”); *evkalipty* (“eucalyptus”); *ministr po energetike* (“energy minister”); *kandidat presidenta* (“candidate for president”); *eletriku proveli* (“they did electrical work”); *eksportiruie* (“export”).

We can thus conclude that the characteristic features of the dialect of the Old Believers are: the conservation of archaic linguistic features; word-formation models that are not characteristic of standard Russian; the emergence of lexical innovations; active borrowing and adaptation of Spanish and Portuguese vocabulary.

Old Believers Resettlement Programme

As of January 1, 2020, the population of the Russian Federation was 146.74 million people. This marks the second year in a row that a population decline has been observed: by almost 100,000 people in 2018, and by 35,600 people in 2019, according to the Federal State Statistics Service (Rosstat). The most realistic forecasts suggest that the population will decrease to 143 million people by 2036; under the worst-case scenario, this figure could be as low as 134.38 million people²⁴.

The State Programme to Assist the Voluntary Resettlement of Compatriots Living Abroad has designated four locations for resettling Old Believers in Primorye and Amur Oblast. As we noted above, this is where the Old Believers lived before they moved to China. They appear to be the best candidates for settling in Primorye – while none of them were actually born in Russia, they nevertheless retain close emotional ties with their motherland and dream of “coming home.”

²⁴ Riazanova, O. 2020. Pochemu Rossiia gotova priniat' novykh zhtelej bez otkaza ot prezhnego grazhdanstva [Why Russia is Ready to Accept New Residents without Giving Up their Former Citizenship]. *Profil*. URL: profil.ru/politics/pochemu-rossiya-gotova-prinyat-novykh-zhtelej-bez-otkaza-ot-prezhnego-grazhdanstva-230384/ (accessed 09.01.2022).

In the same way that representatives of the Brazilian government promoted a programme of emigration to Brazil in Europe in the nineteenth century, officials from the Far East and Arctic Human Capital Development Agency visited Old Believer communities in Brazil, Bolivia, Uruguay and Argentina to propose the idea of resettlement to the eastern part of their historical homeland²⁵. Participants in the resettlement programme would be offered a fast-track to Russian citizenship, a relocation subsidy of 240,000 roubles, plus 120,000 roubles for each family member, and all travel and transport expenses to their new place of residence would be reimbursed. The land would be provided on a rental basis, and unemployment benefits would be offered to those who cannot find work. They would also be provided with free medical care, free education, and other social services²⁶.

In addition to this, the government has been running the so-called “Hectare in the Far East” since 2016, whereby citizens can receive a hectare of land in the region for free²⁷. Considering that the typical Old Believer family consists of between 11 and 15 people, this is significant help. However, we should note that, in Latin America, Old Believers owned hundreds of hectares of land, harvesting two crops per year.

The process of resettling Old Believers has received much scrutiny from the media, which noted that it has slowed down in recent years as a result of the pandemic, and because certain negative reports have reached the communities in Latin America about it. The resettlement programme needs serious improvement: it does not account for the features of the Old Believers’ way of life, their traditions, education level, or professional skills, and it ignores the fact that they prefer to settle in secluded places. Old Believers coming to Russia know nothing about the law and run into red tape at almost every step in Russia²⁸.

Despite all this, they do not complain and continue to work and improve their lives. In Primorye, Old Believers mainly farm in the villages of Dersu in Krasnoarmeisky District and Lyubitskova in Dalnerechensky District, as well as in a community near

²⁵ Krilov V. 2018. Velhos Crentes radicados no Brasil, Uruguai e Bolívia viajarão ao Extremo Oriente russo. *Russia Beyond*. URL: br.rbth.com/estilo-de-vida/80488-velhos-crentes-no-brasil-voltarao-russia (accessed 09.01.2022).

²⁶ “Vozvrashchenie staroverov”: kak predlagaiut izmenit’ programmu pereseleniia sootchestvennikov [“Return of the Old Believers”: How it is Proposed to Change the Resettlement Programme for Compatriots]. 2017. TASS. 27.04.2017. URL: tass.ru/v-strane/4212858/ (accessed 09.01.2022); Reassentamento dos compatriotas – velhos ritualistas no Extremo Oriente. Portal de informações sobre as possibilidades de reassentamento dos fiéis Velhos Ritualistas no Extremo Oriente. URL: navostok.info/por/ (accessed 09.01.2022).

²⁷ Chesnokova E. 2017. Extremo Oriente russo gera interesse na América Latina. *Sputnik Brasil*. 02.03.2017 URL: sputniknews-brasil.com.br/20170402/latino-americanos-extremo-oriente-russo-8049919.html (accessed 09.01.2022).

²⁸ “Vozvrashchenie staroverov”: kak predlagaiut izmenit’ programmu pereseleniia sootchestvennikov [“Return of the Old Believers”: How it is Proposed to Change the Resettlement Programme for Compatriots]. 2017. TASS. 27.04.2017. URL: tass.ru/v-strane/4212858/ (accessed 09.01.2022); Makarova E. 2017. Pereekhavshim na Dal’nii Vostok staroveram pomogut adaptirovat’sia [Old Believers Who Have Moved to the Far East Will Receive Help to Adapt]. Ministry for the Development of the Russian Far East and Arctic. 26.04.2017. URL: minvr.gov.ru/presscenter/news/pereekhavshim-na-dalnyi-vostok-staroveram-pomogut-adaptirovatsya-4923/ (accessed 09.01.2022).

the city of Sovobodny in Amur Oblast. In total, they work over 7000 hectares of land. More than thirty children have been born in the returning communities, and ten new families have been forged²⁹.

And this is how the Old Believers completed their journey around the world, returning to the region they left following the 1917 Revolution.

Conclusion

As we can see, the Old Believers, who moved from Central Russia to Primorye, then from Primorye to China, then, in the 1950s, from China to Latin America, retained their linguistic identity for four generations, largely due to their hermetic lifestyle, the fact that each community had its own school, and the special role of women within the community, who, while staying at home and running the household, preserve the purity of the Russian language, passing it on to their children. The Old Believer dialect preserves numerous archaic linguistic features and semantic shifts in the meaning of words. At the same time, however, it is characterized by lexical innovations to denote new concepts of modern life, borrowings from Spanish and Portuguese, the adaptation of these words, and word formation devices that follow specific models of Old Believer Russian.

There is no way of telling whether the originality of the Old Believers' dialect will be preserved after repatriation to Primorye under the State Resettlement Programme. Despite the voluntary isolation in which the Old Believers live, standard Russian will likely seep into their dialect, and subsequent generations of Old Believers born in Russia will obviously lose the features of the dialect that were the subject of this paper.

About the Author:

Galina Petrova – PhD, an Associate Professor in Department of Romance Languages at MGIMO University. 119454, Russia, Moscow, Prospekt Vernadskogo 76. E-mail: g.vik.petrova@my.mgimo.ru

Conflicts of interest:

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

References:

- Bytsenko A. 2006. *Imigração da Rússia para o Brasil no Início do Século XX. Visões do Paraíso e do Inferno*. University of São Paulo.
- Fatuch Rabinowitz D. 2008. *Um Olhar sobre a Vida de Imigrantes Russos Idosos*. Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo.

²⁹ Ekspert: pandemiia oslozhnila pereseleniie staroobriadtsev na Dal'nii Vostok. 2020. TASS. 22.09.2020. URL: tass.ru/obschestvo/9515679/ (accessed 09.01.2022).

Iachinski Mendes M. 2019. A pesquisa das línguas eslavas no cenário da diversidade linguística na região sul Brasil. *Cadernos do IL*. 1(59). P. 271–290. DOI: 10.22456/2236-6385.92658

Kobko V., Kertchelaieva N. 2012. Vozvrashcheniie v Rossiiu [Return to Russia]. In *Dni v Romanovke* [Days in Romanovka]. Izdatelskaya Programma Interrosa. P. 298–302. (In Russian)

Petrova G. 2020. Braziliia: ot monolingvizma k mnogoiazychiiu [Brazil: From Monolingualism to Multilingualism]. *Linguistics & Polyglot Studies*. 1(21). P. 114–120. DOI: 10.24833/2410-2423-2020-1-21-114-120. (In Russian)

Ruseishvili S. 2020. Russkaia immigratsiia v Braziliu v pervoi polovine XX veka: migratsionnye puti i modeli adaptatsii [Russian Immigration to Brazil in the First Half of the 20th Century: Migration Routes and Adaptation Models]. *Cuadernos Iberoamericanos*. 8(3). P. 54–73. DOI: 10.46272/2409-3416-2020-8-3-54-73. (In Russian)

Ruseishvili S. 2018. Perfil sociodemográfico e distribuição territorial dos russos em São Paulo: deslocados de guerra da Europa e refugiados da China após a Segunda Guerra Mundial. *Revista Brasileira de Estudos de População*. 35(3). P. 1–20. DOI: 10.20947/S0102-3098a0036

Vorobieff A. 2006. *Identidade e memória da comunidade russa na cidade de São Paulo*. University of São Paulo.

Yukhimenko E. 2012. Istoriia staroobriadchestva i puti migratsii storonnikov staroy very [The History of Old Believers and the Migration Routes of Those Who Followed the Old Faiths]. In *Dni v Romanovke* [Days in Romanovka]. Izdatelskaya Programma Interrosa. P. 14–41. (In Russian)

Zaitsev D. 2015. *Povest' i Zhitiie Danily Terent'evicha Zaitseva* [The Life and Times of Danila Terentevitch Zaitsev]. Alpina Non-Fiction. (In Russian)