

***Leszek Bednarczuk***

*Kraków*

## LANGUAGES IN CONTACT AND CONFLICT ON THE TERRITORY OF THE GRAND DUCHY OF LITHUANIA (GDL)<sup>1</sup>

### 1. Introduction

Professor Uriel Weinreich (1926–1967), born and raised in Wilno / Vilnius, in his exploratory work *Languages in contact* (1953/1970) in fact does not mention the linguistic contacts in Wilno, which were known to him from personal experience, but while discussing the sources of language loyalty he notes:

“Occasionally, language loyalty can even be made subservient to aggressive purposes [...]. The Russians have toyed with the idea of changing certain forms of Slavic languages in Soviet-occupied countries. For example, after invading Poland in 1939

---

<sup>1</sup> A preliminary draft of this paper was published in ABS XXII (1994). Then it was presented at the Second International Symposium of Eurolinguistics (Pushkin 1999 / Berlin 2003), and in enlarged version as *Językowy obraz Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego* (Kraków 2010) – Linguistic Picture of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania [GDL]. Contents: I. The ethnolinguistic relationships in the GDL, II. The ways of Christianization of Lithuania, III. The origin of the Belarusian ethnos and language, IV. The Polish language on the territory of the GDL, V. The Republic of Two Nations (Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth), VI. The names of Wilno / Vilnius and its inhabitants in documents of the GDL, VII. The families of ethnical origin of the inhabitants of the GDL, VIII. The innovations in toponymy on the territory of the GDL, IX. The hydronymic differentiation of the territory of the GDL, X. Why over Niemien?, XI. The vocabulary of the raftmen in the Wilia / Neris river, XII. The linguistic situation on the Berezyna river, XIII. The language of the town chronicles of Mohylev and Vitebsk, XIV. The Polish influence in ancient texts and dialects of Smolensk area, XV. Linguistic heritage of the GDL in Adam Mickiewicz's literary works.

they found the fact that 'Jew' was called in Polish *Żyd* distasteful, since *žid* in Russian is a term of contempt. Consequently, they ordered Polish newspapers to write *Jewrej*, coined on the model of the non-pejorative Russian *Jevrej*. [...] After World War II, the Russian occupation authorities in Poland again felt misgiving about the use of *pan* as a pronoun of polite address, since *pan* also means (in Russian as well as in Polish) 'squire', and was found to be an inappropriate remnant of feudalism in a People's Democracy" [Weinreich 1970: 99].

In his other papers Weinreich dealt with the North-East variety of Yiddish used in the territories of the GDL, pointing, among others, to its peculiarities (1952, 1958). It is only natural that it was in Wilno that an international publication "Balticoslavica" (I–III, 1933–1938) appeared, in which scholars from many countries collaborated in friendly manner (Russians, Belarusians, Latvians, Estonians; political conflicts made the participation of Lithuanians impossible). Its editor, professor of archaeology, Włodzimierz Antoniewicz renewed the publication in 1964 in Białystok under a new name "Acta Baltico-Slavica", but since volume IX (1976) it was published by the Instytut Słowianoznawstwa (now Instytut Sławistyki) PAN, first under the editorship of professor Jan Safarewicz, and since volume XXII (1994) under the of editorship professor Iryda Grek-Pabisowa, under whose successful editorship it remains until today.

## 2. The ethnolinguistic situation of the GDL

The Grand Duchy of Lithuania was a multiethnic and multinational state. Thanks to the tolerant policy of its rulers, it provided a haven for various religious and ethnic minorities persecuted by the neighbours of the Polish-Lithuanian State, which its elites called *Rzeczpospolita Obojga Narodów* (Republic of Two Nations).

Apart from Lithuanians, who had built the State and given it its name, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was populated by ethnic groups of Baltic provenance. The Latgalians, who spoke a Latvian dialect, inhabited Livonia, politically linked with the GDL since the mid-16<sup>th</sup> century. The Prussians and Jatvingians sought refuge from the Teutonic Knights on the territory of the Grand Duchy, and traces of yet another pagan Baltic tribe have been found in the Białowieża Forest. A glossary has been discovered that contains elements of its language alongside their Polish equivalents.

Within the political boundaries of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, the East Slavic tribes of Kriviči, Dregoviči and Radimiči gave rise to the Belarusian nation and language. After the Union of Lublin (1569), the Grand Duchy saw the spread of Polish language and culture. Local varieties soon evolved. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the Grand Duchy found its way into Polish literature thanks to Adam Mickiewicz.

In the 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> centuries, Moslem Tartars and the Mosaic sect of Karaites came to the Grand Duchy from the Crimea. There was also an influx of Jews from

the West. As a result, a local language variety was formed called “Eastern Yiddish”, which became the main vehicle of communication as well as the medium of Jewish lay literature in this part of Europe. There is evidence that Romanies had lived in the Grand Duchy since the 15<sup>th</sup> century (a charter from 1501). Russian Old Believers (mostly peasants from the region of Pskov) fled from religious persecution and began to take refuge in Lithuania in the late 17<sup>th</sup> century. Lutheran and Calvinist communities widely used a German dialect called “Baltendeutsch” in towns, especially in the western part of the State, and in Livonia.

Thus the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was a conglomeration of languages, ethnic groups and religions, and its most mobile and politically mature segments of society (administration, nobility, soldiers, merchants, and craftsmen) were by necessity multilingual. This led to interactions between languages (interference) and to the emergence of shared innovations, particularly in the fields of vocabulary and onomastics. Interestingly, the boundaries between particular languages and dialects coincided with the administrative divisions of the GDL.

All the inhabitants of the Grand Duchy were referred to as “Lithuanians”, regardless of ethnicity, language and religion. Even today inhabitants of the Mazowsze (Mazovia) region apply these terms to Poles and Belarusians living in Podlasie (Podlachia). This is also true of Belarusians: those living in Polesie (Pripet Marshes) use the same denotations speaking about their compatriots from the north-eastern part of the country [Klimčuk 1985]. In Muscovite Ruthenia, the Belarusian and Polish inhabitants of the Grand Duchy were called *Litovcy* or *Litwini* ‘Lithuanians’, while the name *Litwak* signified a Jew living therein. Finally, Lithuanian Tartars were known in the Crimea as *Lipka* < *Litwa* ‘Lithuania’ [Łapicz 1986].

The Grand Duchy of Lithuania ceased to exist as a political entity toward the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century in the aftermath of the partitions of Poland. However, the awareness of common cultural roots and psychological community survived (in spite of national conflicts since the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century) in certain sense even to this day.

Literary works are written in various vernacular languages of those lands, and ethnic stereotypes are ascribed to Lithuanians: inertia and attachment to the native land, reticent and distrustful disposition, unforgiving nature, sensitivity and sentimentality, piety and immunity to foreign influence. Such features supposedly have allowed the nation to survive the vicissitudes of the last centuries and to retain the memory of a glorious past. As regards linguistic aspects, certain structural similarities have long been observed between Lithuanian and Belarusian [Wiemer 2003]. These structural similarities are also shared by the dialect of Polish spoken in Wilno / Vilnius and, to a lesser degree, by the other varieties of the Grand Duchy. Borrowings pertaining to nature, material and spiritual culture, and geographical names are numerous and reflect multidirectional influences. This allows us to speak about the Grand Duchy of Lithuania as a multilingual system of communication – not unlike the Balkan “Sprachbund” and other linguistic communities in some respect.

### 3. Languages and dialects of the GDL

#### 3.1. Lithuanian

The Christianization of Lithuania began in 1009 with St. Bruno's mission and formally ended in 1386 with Jagiełło / Jogaila's baptism in Roman-Catholic rite, but the oldest layer of the Lithuanian Christian terminology is of the Church Russian origin. The Christianization of the tribal Lithuanian territories was determined by continuous immigration – from the East and South – of the Old Belarusian population, which is documented by the ethnic toponomastics (*Krywicze, Połoczany, Rusaki*). The Lithuanian conquest of the Ruthenian territories which had started in the 13<sup>th</sup> century led to consecutive attempts toward Orthodox Christianization of Lithuania during the reign of Mendog / Mindaugas, his son Wojsiełk / \*Vaišvilkas and in the next century, of Giedymin / Gediminas and his successors. Apart from the basic Christian terms of Church Russian origin, one finds the Orthodox personal names of the Lithuanian princes installed in the Ruthenian lands, as well as the West Ruthenian (Old Belarusian) language used in documents of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. It indicates that the Christianization of Lithuania was initiated by Orthodox Russia during the 13<sup>th</sup>–14<sup>th</sup> centuries, and the direct source of the borrowings was Old Belarusian, which is documented by the form of certain terms and names.

As far as the direct contacts of Lithuania with Poland are concerned, they take place in Mazovia in the 13<sup>th</sup> century. These are Lithuanian military raids, as well as dynastic marriages, and conflicts alternated with political alliances, which culminated in the union and Christianization of ethnic Lithuania. The two nations first united in 1385 as a result of the personal union in Krewo / Krevas. This was formalized in 1569 by the Union of Lublin. Then, the Constitution of 3 May 1791 confirmed their status as a single state. This Commonwealth was broken up by the partitions of Poland, but the cultural unity it created lasted well into the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

In reality, contacts between the two nations date back to at least the 13<sup>th</sup> century, when the first marriages between the Mazovian line of the Piast dynasty and the Lithuanian dukes (*kunigaikščiai*) took place. These contacts are reflected in onomastics. Princess Gaudemunda (?) [\*Gaudi-manta] / Zofia, the daughter of the Lithuanian duke Traidenis, married Prince Bolesław II of Płock in 1279. Their son, the Prince of Czersk and Sochaczew Trojden I (1284 or 1286–1341), was named after his grandfather Traidenis. In 1325, King Kazimierz Wielki (Casimir the Great) married Aldona / Anna, the daughter of Duke Gediminas. Danuta / Anna, the daughter of Duke Kiejstut / Kęstutis married Prince Janusz of Mazovia before 1377. The ducal names Witold / Vytautas, Algierd / Algirdas, Kiejstut / Kęstutis became popular in Poland in the 19<sup>th</sup> century thanks to Mickiewicz, Krasiński, Sienkiewicz and other authors. It is a well-known fact that the mutual influence of the two languages was not limited to onomastics. Indeed, besides the considerable influence of the Polish language on Lithuanian, certain Lithuanian borrowings can be found in Polish from

the time of the oldest contacts between the two nations. In the Diplomatic Code of the Cathedral and Diocese of Wilno (KDW, 1387–1507) and other documents of the GDL [Jablonskis 1941] one finds numerous Lithuanian terms pertaining especially to husbandry, for example: *cywun* ‘administrator’, *dziakło* ‘a form of tribute in the GDL paid in grain and hay’, *gryka* ‘buckwheat’, *punia* ‘shed, barn’, *rykunia* ‘housewife’, *sterta* ‘pile, hayrick’, *świren* ‘granary’, *wicina* ‘barge’, etc.

Nearly the whole area where the Lithuanian language evolved lay within the boundaries of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, whose administrative divisions gave rise to the main dialectal isoglosses. Contacts with the neighbouring Slavic lands enriched the vocabulary and remodelled the grammatical structure. The historical boundary of Samogitia / Žemudž / Žemaitija on the Szuszwā / Šušvė and Niewiaża / Nevėžis rivers delimits the West Aukštaitian dialect. Together with the West Dzukian dialect (both preserve *e/aN*), West Aukštaitian is spoken in the former domain of Duke Kiejstut / Kęstutis (1297–1382) that became the province of Troki / Trakai. It is located to the West of the line defined by Kiernów / Kernavas, Muśniki / Musninkai and Olkienniki / Valkininkai, or Lithuania proper. The part of ethnic Lithuania within the domain of Duke Olgierd / Algirdas (1300–1377) included Dziawołtwa / Deltuvė (at later times the Zawilejski district) and Wiłkomierz / Ukmergė – Brasław, where the East “Dzukian” dialect was spoken (shift of *e/aN* to *uN*).

The eastern boundary of the Lithuanian ethnic element is a problem that has been addressed by scholars representing various disciplines. It is inseparable from questions concerning the ancestral homeland of the Balts. According to K. Būga [1924–1961, III: 728–742], the early eastern Balts lived in the upper part of the Dnieper Valley. Retreating under the pressure of the East Slavs (the Kriviči, Dregoviči and Radimiči tribes), the Proto-East-Baltic language must have survived longer to the west of the Berezyna and to the north of the Pripet. This survival rate is based on the abundance of hydronyms and the occurrence of toponyms of Baltic origin. Subsequently, the Lithuanian–Ruthenian border (until the Christianization of Lithuania towards the end of the 14<sup>th</sup> century) followed a line defined by the Brasław Lakes, the Miadziołka River, Lake Narocz, and then along the rivers Naroczanka, Wilia and Berezynka to Niemen. Toponyms in *-iszki* [Safarewicz 1956], as well as Lithuanian names of land features, become widespread to the West of that line. At the same time, it is the East border of Catholicism which in the 14<sup>th</sup> and the 15<sup>th</sup> centuries became the religion of the Lithuanians who lived there. It is only in historical times that the East Slavic elements reached the present-day status. The same line later became the boundary of the Wilno / Vilnius province, which marked the outer limit of borderland Polish dialects. The current geographic extent of the Lithuanian language occurred between the 16<sup>th</sup> and mid-19<sup>th</sup> centuries as a result of depopulation in the wake of wars and disasters. Polonization of the Lithuanian ethnic element took place in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century as a reaction against forcible russification which entailed a religious conversion (for a different opinion cf. [Zinkevičius 1993/1995; 1996: 286–332]). In the old Lithuanian language area, a series of “Dzukian” dialect islands has been

preserved in hard-to-reach places: Gierwiaty / Gervėčiai, Łazduny / Lazunai, Dziewieniszki / Deveniškės. In addition, a West Aukštaitian dialect with certain features of suspected Jatvingian origin (č, ž, š > c, z, s) is used in the vicinity of Zdzięcioł / Zietela / Džatlovo [Vidugiris 1998].

### 3.2. Belarusian

The oldest linguistic stratum, which may be observed in the territory of Belarusia, is the Finno-Ugric hydronymy in Latgalia, Estonia, the Pskov lake district. Some of them bear the seal of the Baltic mediation (e.g. formant *-el-* in *Nev-el*, cf. Lith. *Nevel-lis* – Finnish *Neva*). The numerous Baltic hydronyms constitute the successive stratum of Belarusia and the adjacent territories (Niemen, Dvina, Volga, Dnieper, Pripet, Narew interfluvium). The areal differentiation of the Baltic hydronymy of Belarusia speaks for the hypothesis according to which it is just here that (under the influence of geographical conditions) the differences between the Baltic tribes started to be formed: West Baltic (South-West part), East Baltic (northern Lakeland) and the Dnieper Balts (South-East), who were the earliest to be assimilated by the Slavs. The original territory of the East Balts became populated with Slavic Kriviči, that of the West Balts – Dregoviči, whereas the territory of the Dnieper Balts was peopled by Radimiči. Thus the division between historical White and Black Russia, where North-East and South-West Belarusian dialects were formed, seems to reflect the difference between Eastern and Western Baltic tribes. The consecutive stages of slavization can be indirectly observed thanks to the progressive condensation in the North-West of Baltic elements in onomastics, vocabulary and folklore of Belarusia. As it seems, these ethnolinguistic changes, were not caused by great migrations, but rather the outcome of progressive assimilation with the range of a long time: since the arrival of Ugro-Finnic people in the 3rd millennium B.C., through the formation and disintegration of the Proto-Baltic community in the 2nd millennium B.C., up to the East Slavic expansion, lasting from the middle of the 1st millennium A.D. The cause of the assimilation of the Balts was not only the quantitative preponderance of the Slavic elements, but also most probably cultural factors, and since the 11<sup>th</sup> century political and religious ones (cf. more exhaustively [EB 1973]).

The name *Bełaruś* (White Ruthenia) has yet to be explained satisfactorily [Łatyszzonek 2006: 17–70]. Until the 19<sup>th</sup> century, it encompassed the territory of the former provinces of Witebsk, Połock and Smolensk, which roughly corresponds to the extension of the north-eastern Belarusian dialect. The provinces of Nowogródek and Minsk, as well as the region of Grodno, were called Czarna Ruś (Black Ruthenia). The South-Western Belarusian dialect was spoken in Czarna Ruś, which abutted on the Ukrainian dialects of Polesie in Ruś Litewska (Lithuanian Ruthenia) covered the entire area of present-day Belarusia, approximately defined by the political border of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the 16<sup>th</sup> to 18<sup>th</sup> centuries.

The western variety of the Old Ruthenian legal language was the language of official documents in the Grand Duchy until the 17<sup>th</sup> century [Stang 1935]. Referred to as



“Old Belarusian” it is full of local, dialectal features, especially in the phonetic and lexical systems. Another variety of that language served as the language of religious literature and abounded in Church Slavic features. After the establishment of the Mohylan Academy in Kiev, it also was marked by Ukrainisms. Polish increasingly influenced both varieties, especially after the Union of Lublin [Martel 1938]. On the other hand, the Belarusian language was probably spoken by the Lithuanians who came to Poland. Thus no wonder that the words used by king Jagiełło / Jogaila before his baptism, were uttered in Belarusian: *ha ssto* [a što] ‘what’s the matter?’ [Łoś 1922: 17].

Polonisms penetrated the spoken language and dialects, particularly in the western area, reaching the line defined by Dryssa – Dokszyce – Łohojsk – Wołożyn – Prużana [SPNZ I–V, 1979–1986]. Numerous Lithuanian borrowings have been identified in the Belarusian language [Anikin 2005]. These are mainly the names of land features, plants, as well as terms pertaining to animal breeding, fishing, building, utensils, etc.

On the other hand, Lithuanian dialects abound in manifestation of early Slavic influence [Brückner 1877; P. Skardžius 1931]. These are mostly East Slavic and, since the 16<sup>th</sup> century, Polish. The Belarusian influence on Lithuanian dialects is defined by the range of the change of *t'(v)*, *d'(v)* into *c'(v)*, *ž'(v)*, which occurred under the direct influence of Belarusian, not Polish. This Belarusian influence is comparable to the previously mentioned “Dzukian” dialect, which extends up to the line defined by Jeziorosy / Zarasai, Łabonary / Labanoras, Jewie / Vievis, Olita / Alytus, Simno / Simnas, Puńsk / Punckas. This is an area where Slavic derivational affixes and other grammatical phenomena can be encountered.

The national self-consciousness of Belarusian is weakly developed. Part of them, especially in the Polesie region, considered themselves as locals (*tutejsi*). In Polish-Belarusian borderland self-identification was associated with religion: Catholics = Pole (“Polish faith”), Orthodox = Belarusian (“Rusian faith”). The national conflicts on the territory of the GDL were incited by Soviet-Russian and Nazi-German authorities, but did not succeed in Belarusia. Its inhabitants have remained until today bound by moral and cultural community inherited from the GDL times, cf. [Smułkowa, Budźko, Guščeva, Kazanceva, 2009–2011].

At the end we should answer the following question: how was it possible that in spite of such remarkable geographical, cultural and linguistic differentiation of Belarusian territory, in spite of the lack of an integrating center and of natural boundaries the Belarusian language and national separateness of Belarusians were nevertheless formed. The East Slavic origin and the transitional position between Ukrainian and Russian designate the position of Belarusian in Slavic family, but do not account for the linguistic problems connected with the issue of the ethnogenesis of Belarusians. This cannot be explained without taking into consideration original ethno-linguistic-cultural relations prevailing on their territories. These were determined (to a considerable extent) by the geographical position of Belarusia, which has neither natural boundaries nor a distinct center. The three main regions, which go to the making of the country – Pojezierze [Lake Region], Polesie [Pripet Marshes] and Podnieprze

[Dnieper Upland] – situated in the confluents of the rivers flowing in different directions, go beyond its limits and gravitate towards neighbouring territories. At the same time, bigger concentrations of settlement, are situated mainly on the peripheries. As a result of this, the most important anthropo-geographic confines (as well as the linguistic ones), do not unite but partition the territory of Belarusia, making out of it a conglomerate of transitional zones.

It seems that a separate Belarusian ethnos and language were formed thanks to the affiliation to the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, whose political boundaries almost exactly encompass the ethnographic Belarusia. Due to this, the Belarusian language did not become a transitional zone of East Slavic dialects, but an independent language, which has become the official language of Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

### 3.3. North-Eastern borderland Polish

Scientific investigations of the Polish languages in the territory of historical Lithuania were started by scholars who were natives of this part of the former Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth – J. Karłowicz [SGP, 1900–1911: *ustnie z Litwy* ‘oral information from Lithuania’], H. Turska [1930; 1939/1982], O. Chomiński [1928–1933/2010] and J. Trypućko [1955–1957]. After the World War II, the speech of the expatriates from various parts of the Wilno and Nowogródek regions was documented by A. A. Zdaniukiewicz [1999: 337–359], who published the monograph of a dialect of his native village Łopatowszczyzna near Wilno (1972). At the same time V. Verenič with a group of collaborators in Minsk started the local investigations of Polish dialects in the Soviet Union (I–II, 1973), which were published since 1982 with the co-authorship of J. Rieger in “*Studia nad Polszczyzną Kresową*”. Simultaneously, researchers from the Instytut Sławistyki PAN in Warsaw (I. Grek-Pabisowa, I. Maryniakowa, E. Smułkowa) with collaborators (H. Karaś, A. Zielińska, M. Ostrówka and others) started documenting the contemporary linguistic situation in Belarusia, Lithuania and Latvia. Apart from Warsaw, a research center investigation Polish language of Wilno region was formed in Bydgoszcz (J. Mędelska, Z. Sawaniewska-Mochowa, M. Marszałek). Worth mentioning are the papers of the youngest generation of scholars born in Lithuania (M. Dawlewicz, B. Dwilewicz, K. Geben, K. Rutkowska, I. Masojć, H. Sokołowska, K. Syrnicka) and Belarusia (J. Gurskaja, Ź. Jeroma, K. Konczewska, A. Pawlukiewicz). We should also mention the discovery of the “Polish language islands” in Lithuania by the team of V. Čekmonas from Vilnius and socio-linguistic studies of K. Morita from Japan. The Polish language from the GDL epoch (16<sup>th</sup>–17<sup>th</sup> c.) was investigated by Z. Kurzowa (1993), M. Liziśowa (2000), A. Pihan-Kijasowa (1999) and others (cf. bibliography: [Sawaniewska-Mochowa 1991, 1995]).

Cultural polonization of the Lithuanian and Belarusian nobility, burghers and clergy after the Union of Lublin (1569), and a population influx from Poland, resulted in the rise of a local variety of the Polish language, attested also in administrative texts and literature production. The local Polish language are used today in Lithuania,



Belarusia and Podlasie, this vernacular is permeated with Belarusian features and lexical borrowings from Lithuanian. An enormous body of writings exists in the territorial variety of Polish. We can distinguish the following Polish regiolects in the territory of the GDL, where one finds common features attributable to the influence of the Lithuanian Belarusian substratum and considerable regional variations marked the Polish languages of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

**1. Wilno / Vilnius and its region.** Wilno as the capital of the GDL and now Republic of Lithuania was still a multilingual town. In the Wilno region the Polish language (in spite of 19<sup>th</sup>–20<sup>th</sup> c. russification and contemporary lithuanization) has been best preserved till now, also in literary from the 16<sup>th</sup> century.

**2. Kowno / Kaunas and Lauda region.** Polish languages is used till now also in Wiłkomierz / Ukmergė and the Jeziorosy / Zarasai subregion, strongly influenced by Lithuanian environment.

**3. Suwałki / Suvalkai** on Jatvingian substrate, influenced in North-East by Lithuanian, in the West from the Mazurian Polish dialect and German.

**4. Podlasie–Grodno.** Baltic and Belarusian adstrate, traces of German and Yiddish influence (Tykocin, Białystok). Grodno and Bohatyrowicze features were attested in Eliza Orzeszkowa's literary works.

**5. Polesie.** Polish Mazurian dialect influenced by East Slavic idioms with Belarusian and Ukrainian features without national consciousness (*tutejsi*).

**6. Nowogródek.** Local Polish dialect, formed on Belarusian substratum, introduced to Polish literature by Adam Mickiewicz (Zaosie), Władysław Syrokomla (near Nieśwież) and Jan Czeczot (Maleszyce), who produced poems and described the Belarusian language in Latin letters in *Piosnki wieśniacze znad Niemna i Dźwiny* (1846).

**7. Minsk–Bobrujsk (central Belarusian),** where at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century the Polish dialect could be heard, recorded by Florian Czarnyszewicz in *Nadbereżyńcy* (1942). The slang of Minsk thieves and smugglers introduced to literature by Sergiusz Piasecki in *Kochanek Wielkiej Niedźwiedzicy* (1937) and his other novels.

**8. Mohylew–Witebsk (East Belarusian),** where in the 17<sup>th</sup> and the 18<sup>th</sup> c. Polish language was used. In Mohylew it was *Kroynika* of Trofim Sutra and Jerzy Trubnicki and his son Aleksander (till 1841), where many regional features of pronunciation with a Belarusian substrate and some Ukrainian characteristics as well as colloquial expressions. Similar is the case in *Dzieje miasta Witebska* of Michał Pancerny and Gabriel Awierka (till 1768), whereas in Połock it was the Polish borrowings in commercial correspondence with Riga in the 16<sup>th</sup> c. [Stang 1939].

**9. Smolensk,** originally inhabited by the Eastern Slavic tribe Kriviči, which in the West of the region was the forerunner of the Belarusian ethnos and its dialects. Between 1611 and 1654 Smolensk and its region was a part of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and then it returned to Moscow. In the Russian texts (16<sup>th</sup>–18<sup>th</sup> c. [RIS 2000]) and in dialects (19<sup>th</sup>–20<sup>th</sup> c. [SG 1974–2005]) we find the numerous Polish borrowings.

**10. Inflants (Latgalia).** Polish dialects in the Dyneburg / Daugavpils, Krasław, Indryca, Waraklany area with Latvian and Belarusian features can still be encountered also in the Latvian capital Riga. We can find Polish borrowings in Old Latvian religious texts and contemporary dialects.

### 3.4. Lithuanian Tartars

Three closely related languages from the Turkic family existed in the eastern parts of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth: (1) Armenian-Kipčak, used in Red Ruthenia since the 14<sup>th</sup> century by the majority of Polish Armenians; (2) West Karaite, the northern dialect which will be discussed below; (3) the language of Lithuanian Tartars, who had been migrating to the Grand Duchy from the Golden Horde and the Crimea since the 14<sup>th</sup> century, as recorded in the entry for 1324 in the *Franciscan Annals* by Waddingo. The influx of Tartars into the Grand Duchy of Lithuania reached its largest proportions during the reign of Grand Duke Witold / Vytautas. Some seventy Tartar villages still existed there in the 20<sup>th</sup> century [Talko-Hryniewicz 1924: 37]. Military service became the main Tartar occupation. They retained their old tribal organization in units, which were named after their former settlements (called *ulus*) in the Horde. One of the units was commanded by the Assanczuk princes from the *Ulan ulus* (cf. the Turkish-Oguzian *oghlan* ‘a youth of noble birth; a princely title’) – a name which came to be used in the 18<sup>th</sup> century to denote a type of military formation. The language of the Lithuanian Tartars was of Kipčak origin. Over the centuries, it incorporated a large number of Turkish (Ottoman) and Arabic lexical borrowings, which reached it from Crimea. The language fell into disuse in the 16<sup>th</sup> century. Sacred writings and prayer-books (*kitab*s, and *khamail*s) from the 17<sup>th</sup> to 19<sup>th</sup> centuries written in Belarusian and Polish, using the Arabic alphabet, have been preserved [Antonović 1968]. The Arabic alphabet was used for wills, notes and tomb inscriptions as well as the Koranic texts that were incomprehensible to most of the population. It performed the double role of a holy and secret script. Religious and lay texts written in Belarusian and Polish are so full of Turkish and Arabic terms that their language can be described as a remodelled Belarusian (or Polish) ethnolect, in which Slavic endings are affixed to Oriental lexemes. Its phonemic and word-building characteristics resemble other ethnolects of the Grand Duchy. Palatal consonants occur in the context of front vowels, as in the following examples:

Oriental (Tartar) lexemes in Belarusian / Polish: *biesz* ‘five’, *fierej* (name of a demon), *iślam* ‘Islam’, *mieczeć* ‘mosque’, *resiul* (Turkish *resul*) ‘envoy, prophet’, *sielam* (Arabic *salem*), *szerbiet* (Turkish *şerbet*) ‘sherbet, beverage’, *ziereć* ‘cemetery’, etc. Slavic suffixes are also in frequent use, e.g. *ahreć-ka* ‘kinswoman’, *moll-ina* ‘mullah’s wife’, *chodz-ina* ‘teacher’s wife’, *mekkiej-skij* ‘Meccan’, *ramazan-wyj* ‘of Ramadan’. Verbs distinguish perfective forms: *za-haremić* ‘to cover the bride’s face at the wedding ceremony’ (from harem), *po-guślić* ‘perform ablutions’, etc. There also exist participial forms, as in the other dialects of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, e.g. *Nu tak spiewszy ajety, treba dusjaka pieć* ‘after singing the Koran verse, it is time to sing the hymns’

[Borawski, Dubiński 1986: 255–264]. Family names of Tartar origin, based on Oriental stems, but adapted to the Polish / Belarusian system, include the following ones and many others [Dziadulewicz 1929]: *Abakanowicz, Ablańowicz, Aksak, Birbasz, Bohatyrowicz, Bułhak, Eliaszewicz, Kajdasz, Kryczyński, Kudasiewicz, Mordasewicz, Nurkiewicz, Safarewicz, Sułkiewicz, Szabunia, Szyryński, Tuhanowicz*, etc.

It has yet to be determined which was the contribution that the Lithuanian Tartars, who often functioned as interpreters in contacts with the Crimea and the Ottoman Porte, made to the transfer of Oriental borrowings into the languages of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. A Turkish-Tartar origin is plausible for the diminutive-patronymic suffix *-(cz)uk* (also *-(cz)uk-o/ewicz* in family names), widespread in Belarusian, West Ukrainian and borderland Polish areas ([Lindert 1972], cf. *Assan-czuk-owicz, Plan-ciuk-iewicz*). As this suffix was not recorded prior to the 15<sup>th</sup> century, and does not occur in other Slavic languages, it most probably owes its wide range of occurrence to the ethno-onomastic processes that went on in the Grand Duchy.

### 3.5. Karaites of Troki / Trakai

Another ethnolect in the territory of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania is the northern dialect of the West Karaite language, the speakers of which call themselves *Karajtych* [Musajev 1964]. It is still used by a small group of inhabitants of the former Karaim-szczyzna borough of Troki / Trakai. Until recently, Karaites lived also in Poniewież / Panevežys and Birže / Biržai. The first group of Karaites was brought to Lithuania by Grand Duke Witold / Vytautas from the Crimea around 1397. Probably in the 15<sup>th</sup> century, Karaites using the south-western dialect came to Halicz and Łuck [Grzegorzewski 1916–1918]. In the central Crimea (Yevpatoriya, Bakhchisarai, Feodosiya), remnants of the East Karaite language have been preserved that allow one to distinguish Slavic influence from native innovations. The origin of the Karaites has not been explained conclusively as yet [Musajev 1964; Németh 2011]. Links with the Kipčaks, Kumans, and Polovtsy tribes have been suggested, but they also may have been descendants of the Khazares, whose religion was based on the pre-Talmudic Bible as the only source of revelation. The liturgical language of the Karaites is Hebrew, but a number of Biblical books have been translated into Karaite. The Karaite literature comprises prayers, songs, folklore (divination formulae, proverbs, even epic literature), travelogues, historical writings, theological and scientific treatises, and translations (for example the *Crimean Sonnets* by Adam Mickiewicz). In contrast to everyday language, the written language has fewer Slavisms and Lithuanisms. The influence of Lithuanian and the Slavic languages is seen in the existence of palatal consonants. These are particularly widespread in the dialect of Troki / Trakai [Csató 1997: 68–83; Németh 2011: 13–18], where they occur throughout the phonemic system (in the dialect of Łuck and Halicz, only dental and velar consonants exist; the Crimean dialect has no palatalized consonants at all). In the dialect of Troki / Trakai, various processes have increased the frequency of occurrence for the vowel *a* which is similar to the phenomenon of

“(j)akanie” and the shift [e] > [ä] in Lithuanian. Since Turkish languages have no grammatical gender, feminine forms are built with borrowed word formation affixes (e.g. *Karai-ka* ‘Karaite woman’, *adjuv-ka* ‘she-bear’; diminutives: *at-ulju!* ‘daddy!’) and inflectional suffixes (as in adjectives: *karaj-ski* ‘Karaite (adj.)’; superlatives: *naj-burun* ‘the very first’). The family-name forming suffixes *-ski*, *-e/owicz*, *-uk* are added to Turkish stems: *Azar-ewicz*, *Soł-tań-ski*, *Ur-czuk*, as well as to Slavic ones. In present-day spoken language, code-switching is a frequent phenomenon, e.g. *Eto nevažno, bart kahyt* ‘It doesn’t matter, we’ve got paper’ [Musajev 1964: 10].

### 3.6. “Litwak” Yiddish

Three territorial varieties of Yiddish existed within the boundaries of the former Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth: central, south-eastern and north-eastern. The north-eastern dialect was called “Litwak” from the name denoting the Jewish population of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania within its borders (prior to the Union of Lublin in 1569). Apart from Lithuania and Belarus, Litwak extended into Podlasie (behind Brześć and Białystok in the West), Volhynian Polesie (reaching Kiev and Poltava) up to Vitebsk and Riga. All three dialects are sometimes called “East Yiddish” [Weinreich 1958; Jacobs 2001; Krogh 2002]. Slavic influence is seen in the loss of rounded front vowels and in the palatalization of consonants. The phenomena of “ciakanie” and “dziakanie” appear occasionally in the Litwak dialect [Weinreich 1958: 6]. The dialect’s greatest peculiarity is the so-called *sábesdiker losn* ‘Sabbath language, solemn pronunciation’, not unlike Polish “mazurzenie” [Weinreich 1952]. Also the morphosyntactic system of East Yiddish was remodelled under the Slavic influence as shown by word-building morphemes and patterns (diminutives of the type *žuk-ele* ‘little beetle’, *łośad-ka-lja* ‘little horse’), the aspect opposition (*iber-gelejen* ‘has read [perfective]’), and syntactic constructions. This is also the case with vocabulary and anthroponyms (diminutive first names, family names in *-ko*, *-owicz*, *-owski*). The neuter gender was probably lost in the Litwak dialect under the influence of Lithuanian.

The earliest evidence of the Jewish presence in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania is the privilege granted by Grand Duke Witold / Vytautas to the Jewish commune of Troki / Trakai [Heller 1930: 262]. In the centuries to follow, Wilno / Vilnius and other towns of the GDL became the centers of Jewish culture. At the beginning of the last century, A. Wasilewski (1905) observed that Yiddish was in use even among Slavic workers in factories owned by the Jews in Białystok.

### 3.7. A Baltic idiom from Narew

A hitherto unknown Baltic language was identified from a small dictionary entitled *Pogańskie gwary z Narewu* [The pagan dialects from Narew] compiled in the late 16<sup>th</sup> or early 17<sup>th</sup> century and consisting of some 200 translated Polish words. V. Zinov discovered the dictionary in 1978 at the eastern perimeter of Białowieża Forest. Z. Zinkevičius (1992) has interpreted its copy (the original had disappeared in

the meantime!) as a Jatvingian document. The Polish elements in the dictionary show features of the north-eastern borderland variety. The Baltic elements reveal a certain affinity with Latvian (palatalization of *k*, *g* + *E*, voicing of word final consonants as in Livonian dialects; Finno-Ugric borrowings, including some unknown in Latvian). The dictionary also contains Germanic borrowings (but no Slavic ones) and indicates some Lithuanian influence. Moreover, the existence of some archaic forms shows links with Old Prussian. All this suggests that the speakers of the ethnolect arrived on the Narew from Courland, perhaps to avoid Christianization by the Livonian Order. Thus it could not have been a Jatvingian document contrary to what Z. Zinkevičius suggests. According to all that is known about Jatvingian, it was related closely to Prussian, and it is unlikely that it would show signs of Germanic and Finno-Ugric (but not Slavic) borrowings, as well as Latvian influence. The dictionary is now an object of intensive investigation and, sometimes, far-fetched speculations. Regardless of particular interpretations, the phonetic structure of both parts of the dictionary fits the patterns of the language community of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, and it is an established fact that paganism existed in the borderlands between Lithuania and Latvia as late as the first half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century [Jablonskis 1941: 309].

### 3.8. Russian Old Believers

Latest of all, at the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, but mainly in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries the Russian Old Believers (*raskol'niki* 'schismatics') arrive from the regions of Velikie Łuki, Tropec and Opočka, bordering upon the GDL, similarly to the *strigol'nici* from Novgorod, who escaped from Ivan the Third's persecutions at the end of the 15<sup>th</sup> [EP, 1862, XXII: 289]. Probably, they first reached Latgalia, and from here they moved to the neighbouring Braślav, Święciany, Jeziorosy / Zarasai, Kowno / Kaunas and in the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, to the Suwałki–Augustów regions. According to O. Chomiński's meticulous calculations (1927–1934/2010) in the Braślav and Święciany regions Old Believers constituted 6–8 % of the population, most of them in Widze and Melegiany (10%), whereas to the south of Wilno there was practically no trace of them.

According to investigations of I. Grek-Pabisowa (1968, 1983, 1999), I. Maryniakowa (1976), A. Zielińska (1996), M. Głuszkowski (2011), the language of the Polish Old Believers belongs to the Middle West Russian dialect of the Pskov type, influenced by Belarusian language "ciakanie" / "dziakanie", "(j)akanie", prothetic *v-*) and Polish (numerous borrowings, also in territory of Lithuania and Latgalia). Among these lexemes even Catholic religious terms appear, e.g. *birmovat* 'to confirm', *kaplica* 'chapel', *parafia* 'parish', *pateri* 'prayers', *rożancy* 'rosary', *skapleri* 'scapular', *śljub* 'wedding', *żegnati'sja* 'to bless' [Nemčenko 1968: 57–58].

The Old Believers from the former Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth were resettled by the tsarist authorities to Siberia, where they were called *poljaki* or *raskol'niki* [Dal 1955, III: 268]. It is probably from them that Polish vocabulary was borrowed to the local Russian dialects [Doroszkievicz 1991: 137, 151].

## 4. Inter-lingual transpositions on the territory of the GDL

Multilingualism common on the territory of the GDL was the cause of mutual borrowings, which were taken over according to habits of articulation and phonotactic rules of particular languages and dialects in common nouns (appellativa) as well as in proper names.

### 4.1. Transpositions in appellativa

Ample Old Lithuanian material can be found in P. Skardžius' study (1931), whereas J. Otrębski (1932) provided a subtle analysis of phonetic, morphemic and phraseological Slavic-Lithuanian transpositions in East Lithuania dialect of Twerecz / Tverečius. The absence of certain phonemes and consonantal groups in Lithuanian led to the following transpositions:

*f* > *p*: Pol. *oficer* 'officer', *felczer* 'assistant surgeon' > Lith. dial. *apićėrus*, *pelćėrus*;

*x, f* > *k*: Pol. *grzech* 'sin' > Lith. *griekas*; Brus. *funt* 'pound' > Lith. dial. *kuntas*;

*h* > zero, dial. <sup>h</sup>-, *v*:- Pol. *herbata* 'tee' > Lith. *arbata*; Pol. *honor* 'honour' > Lith. dial. *vonaras*; Brus. *hadina* 'hour', *ahurka* 'cucumber', *bahaty* 'rich' > Lith. dial. (Zietela) <sup>h</sup>*adina*, *ahurka*, *bahotas* [Rozwadowski, Gregorski 1995: 113–115];

*c* > *č* hydronyms: Lith. *Avier-nyčia*, *Rat-nyčia* = Pol. *Rot-nica*, *Awier-nica*;

*-z-* > *-zd-*: Pol. *obraz* 'picture', *rozum* 'mind' > Lith. *abroz(d)as*, *raz(d)umas*;

*-šk-* > *-čk-*: Pol. *flaszka* 'bottle' > Brus. *plaška* > Lith. *pleška* / *plečka*; Pol. *puszka* 'cannon' > O. Lith. *pučka* 'cannon, musket'; Pol. *podkowa* 'horse-shoe' > Lith. dial. *pačkava*;

*-st-*, *-št-* > *-kšt-*: Pol. *baszta* 'tower' > Lith. *bokštas*, O. Brus. *xrest* 'baptism' > *krikštas*;

*-šč-*, *-č-* > *-kšt-*: hydronyms: Lith. = *Dysna* > *Dysn-ykštis* = Pol. Brus. *Dzisna* > *Dzisz-iszcze*; Lith. *Salčia* > *Salč-ykščia* = Pol. *Solcza* > *Solcz-ycza*;

*-nsk-* > *-nck-*: toponym Lith. *Puncikas* = Pol. *Puńsk*;

*-mn-* > *-min-*, *-vn-* > *-vin-*, *-vd-* > *-vid-*: Pol. *mnich* 'monk', *grzywna* 'fine', *krzywda* 'wrong' > Lith. *minykas*, O. Lith. *griv(i)na*, *kriv(i)da*.

On the other hand, in Slavic transpositions of certain Lithuanian proper names voiceless obstruent consonants may be softened (*-jt-* > *-jd-*, *-tr-* > *-dr-*, *nt-* > *-nd-*, *-lk-* > *-lg-*, *-sk-* > *-zg-*, *-čv-* > *-džv-*), e.g. ethnonym: *Žemaitija*, *Žemaitis* > Pol. *Żmu(j)dź*, *Żmudzin*, Brus. family name *Že/amojda*; name of prince *Svitrigaila* > *Świdrygiełło*; toponyms: *Lentvaris* > *Landwarów*, *Linkmenis* > *Łyngmiany*, family name *Švolka* / *Svolka*, *Svolkenis* > *Swolkień* [Svolg'ień]; *Druskininkai* > Brus. and Pol. regional (Grodno) *Druzgieniki*; Baltic ethnonym *\*Jotvingas* > Brus. *Jačvjaha*, Pol. (ancient and dialectal) > *Jadźwing(a)*, etc.



In some Lithuanian and Belarusian dialects before certain initial consonant groups a prothetic vowel may appear, e.g. Pol. *szkoła* ‘school’, *szkoda* ‘damage, harm’, *zbroja* ‘armour’, *dzban* ‘jug, pither’ > Lith. dial. *i-škala*, *i-škada*, O. Lith. *i-zbraja*, *i-zbanas*, dial. *u-zbanas*; Brus. *i-ržyšča* ‘staubble-field’, *i-mšar* ‘morass’, *i-mhla* ‘mist, fog’ *i-hruška* ‘pear’, *i-štuka* ‘piece’. Similarly to Lithuanian in Belarusian, Polish and Russian *f* is replaced by *p*, *xf*, *x*, e.g. Pol. *kartofle* ‘potato(es)’, *oficer* ‘officer’, *pantofle* ‘slippers’ > Brus. *kartoplja*, *katoxlja*, *kartoxfel*, *ałficer*, *pantopli*; also personal names, e.g. Russian *Afanasij*, *Filip*, *Josif*, *Sofronij* > Brus. *Apanas*, *Pilip*, (*V*)*osip*, *Supron*, etc. [Karskij 1955: 342].

#### 4.2. Transpositions in proper names

Particularly ample material is provided by transpositions of the early documented name of the capital town of the GDL and the rivers, which flow here. The name of Wilno / Vilnius appears in 1323 in the form *Vilna* in Latin documents of the Grand Duke Gedymin / Gediminas, among others in the letters to Franciscans of the German province, whom he asks to send to Wilno and Nowogródek priests who know Lithuanian, Ruthenian and Polish:

„Volumus enim episcopos, sacerdotes, religiosos ordinis cuiuscunque colligere, praecipue de vestris, quibus iam ereximus duas ecclesias in civitate nostra regia, dicta *Vilna*, et aliam *Novgardia*, ad quasi nobis hoc anno quatuor fratrem scientes polonicum, semigallicum [i. e. Lithuanian] ac ruthenicum ordinetis, tales ut nunc sunt et fuerant” (26 V 1323 GL, nr 19). Later on, the form *Wilno* appears in a letter to the bishop and the inhabitants of Riga: „Datum *Wilno* in die sancti trinitatis” (2 VI 1325 GL, nr 60).

*Vilna*. As the name of the town predominates in Latin documents and it entered West European languages. On the other hand, the form *Wilno* was recorded several times in the 14<sup>th</sup> century and is used until today in Polish. Both have a direct source in the Old-West-Ruthenian (i. e. Old Belarusian) town name *Vilna*, which is testified in GDL documents, where it later appears in the form *Vilnja* (still present in Belarusian). It is the name of small river (Lith. dial. *Vilnia*, *Vilnė*, now *Vilnelė*, Pol. *Wilejka*, now *Wilenka*), which flows here into the *Wilia*. Its Belarusian name *Vilnia*, *Vilna* was transferred as the name of the town and appears in Latin documents, whereas the form *Wilno* represents the Polish transposition. The contemporary Lithuanian form *Vilnius* is documented from the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century (1600 M. Dauksza *Postilla*; 1653 D. Klein *Grammatika*), but it became common in the period of the Lithuanian national rebirth at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

*Wilija*. The Lithuanian name of the lower riverside *Neris* [Njaris] was recorded in the Teutonic Order sources as *Nerge* [Nerje] (1294) as well as in the name of suburban settlement *Ponary* (1390). The form *Vilija* is the Lithuanian name of the upper riverside, from where the Belarusian and Polish names of the river are recorded in KDW since the end of the 14<sup>th</sup> century as *Wigilia* [Wilija] (1390, 1397), *Wilia* (1434).

In Old Russian sources the name *Velja* was formed probably under the influence of adjective *velbja* ‘big, great, vast’. Both names of the river are of Lithuanian origin [Vanagas 1981: 382–384; 2004: 254–262].

*Wilejka*, *Wilenka*, the main confluent of Wilia in the area of the town Wilno. Form *Wilejka* (16<sup>th</sup>–19<sup>th</sup> c.) was derived from *Vilija* with help of Lithuanian formant *-ejka*. Form *Wilenka* (1592 till now) was derived from Lithuanian dialectal and Belarusian form *Vilnia* (1430 – half of the 18<sup>th</sup> c.), which is identical with Lith. appellativum *vilnia* ‘wave’. In documents of the GDL one finds yet two derivatives: *Viln(j)ovka* (1663: do rzeki *Wilniowki*; przy rzece *Wilnowce*) and *Wilnejka* (1715: do rzeczki *Wilneyki*).

## 5. The linguistic community of the GDL

The above review demonstrates that the languages and dialects used in the territory of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania belong to various branches (Baltic, Slavic, Germanic and Turkic) and represent different structural types, but prolonged contacts led to their mutual assimilation through lexical borrowings and grammatical interference. This interference has resulted in common structural innovations and loan translations. The following features can be mentioned in this context.

### A. PHONOLOGY

**1. Correlation of palatalization.** This phenomenon concerns the entire consonant system, occasionally leading to a modified manner of articulation: in Belarusian and in the “Dzukian” dialect of Lithuanian, *t'(v')*, *d'(v')* changed into *c'(v')*, *ʒ'(v')*, presumably under the influence of the general change of *t'*, *d'* into *ć*, *ź* in Polish. Palatal consonants also appear with varying intensity in the remaining languages and dialects of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (Karaite, North-East Yiddish, and Tartar).

**2. Symmetry of vocalism.** It is a feature of all the Baltic languages (Lithuanian lacks a short *o* and a long *a*). In Belarusian vocalism, symmetry of vocalism occurs in unstressed syllables, where it takes the form of so-called “akanie” (*o* > *a*) and “jakanie” (*e* > *ja*). This phenomenon is also found in north-eastern Polish borderland dialects (*o* > *a*, *u*; *e* > *á*, *i*), although with less consistency. In the remaining languages and dialects it occurs only sporadically.

**3. Tendency towards diphthongization.** Lithuanian has phonological diphthongs: *ui*, *ei*, *ai*, *au*; *ie*, *uo*. In Belarusian we observe phonotactic repartition: *υ*, *j* (in pre- and intervocalic position) *υ*, *i* (in post-vocalic and final position). In the remaining languages diphthongal combinations occur occasionally.

### B. MORPHOLOGY

**1. Tendency towards a two-gender system (masculine / feminine).** The neuter has disappeared in Lithuanian, and it is rare in North Belarusian dialects and in

north-eastern borderland Polish. On the other hand, the feminine has emerged (creating an opposition to the masculine) in the genderless Turkic languages: Karaite and Tartar in their “Lithuanian” varieties.

**2. Perfective / imperfective aspect opposition.** This derivational opposition constitutes a regular (grammatical) phenomenon in Slavic languages; its grammatical status in Lithuanian is far from clear. It does not exist in Eastern Yiddish and in Karaite and Tartar; only some prefixal derivatives from simplex stems exist. The prefixation patterns however certainly appeared under Slavic influence.

**3. Derivational affixes and their transpositions.** These are particularly widespread in onomastics.

Anthroponyms: Lith. *-aitis, -utis, -etis* > Slav. *-ojć, -uć, -eć*; Lith. *-eika* > Slav. *-ejko*; Lith. *-aila, -elis, -ila(s)* > Slav. *-ajlo/-ełło, -eł, -iłł(o)*; complex suffixes: *-uć-ko; -a/e/usz-ko, -(cz)uk-e/ow-icz*.

Toponyms: Lith. *-iskės* > Slav. *-iszki*; contamination: Lith. *-onis* ↔ Slav. > *-(an)-ec* > *-ańce*; Pol. *-(ow)izna* ↔ Brus. *-(ov)ščina* > *-(ow)szczyzna*; Pol. *-ęta* ↔ Brus. *-enjata* > *-enięta*.

Hydronyms: Lith. *-a/ekys* > Slav. *-o/eč*; Lith. *-ančia, -intas* > Slav. *-ača, -ato*; Brus. *-iše* > Lith. *-ykštis*; Pol. *-(n)ica* > Lith. *-(n)yčia*.

On the other hand, the extraordinary abundance of diminutives in Lithuanian, Belarusian and north-eastern borderland Polish is an ethno-psychological trait of the inhabitants, which is attested to by the local literary tradition. Certain of them constitute the multiaffixal formants, cf. regional Polish: *-ucz-ek, -icz-ka, -ut-ka, -eń-ut-ek, -ul-acz-ek*, etc.

### C. SYNTAX

**1. Use of cases.** Semantic functions, use of prepositions, lack of a vocative.

**2. Finite verb.** Tendency to zero-copula (in the present tense) and lack of number distinction in the 3rd person of finite verbs.

**3. Widespread use of participial constructions.** The use of the active past participle in the formation of a perfect in Lithuanian, North Belarusian, north-eastern borderland Polish and, occasionally, Tartar and Karaite is a case in point.

**4. Possessive construction with the verb ‘be’.** This way of forming possessives is regular in East Slavic languages, frequent in Lithuanian and attested in north-eastern borderland Polish (local Polish *u mnie jest*), where it replaces the construction with the word *mieć* ‘have’.

Added to this, the numerous common innovations and mutual lexical borrowings and loan translations (on the lexical and phraseological and text levels) provide extra evidence in support of the claim for a linguistic, cultural and ethno-psychological community of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania – a “Sprachbund”, a linguistic community which has survived to some degree to this day.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adamovičiūtė-Čekmonienė I., Čekomonas V., 1999, *Polskojęzyczna wysepka pod Oniksztaimi, której dziś już nie ma*, [in:] SPK IX, 33–55.
- Anikin A., 2005, *Opyt slovarja leksičeskikh baltizmov v ruskom jazyke*, Novosibirsk.
- Antonovič A., 1968, *Belorusskie teksty, pisannye arabskim pis'mom* [...], Vilnius.
- “Balticoslavica”. Biuletyn Instytutu Naukowo-Badawczego Europy Wschodniej w Wilnie, 1933–1938, I–III, Wilno.
- Bednarczuk L., 1994, *Stosunki etnolingwistyczne na obszarze Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, ABS 22, 109–124.
- Bednarczuk L., 2003, *The ethnolinguistic relationships in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania*, “Studies in Eurolinguistics”. II International Symposium of Eurolinguistics, Pushkin, September 10–16, 1999, Berlin, 305–319.
- Bednarczuk L., 2010, *Językowy obraz Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*, Kraków.
- Borawski P., Dubiński A., 1986, *Tatarzy polscy*, Warszawa.
- Brückner A., 1877, *Litu-slavishe Studien*, I, *Die slavischen Fremdwörter im Litauischen*, Weimar.
- Būga K., 1958–1962, *Rinkiniai raštai*, I 1958, II 1959, III 1961, *Rodyklės* 1962, Vilnius.
- Chomiński O., 1928–1934/2010, *Obszar językowy litewski w państwie polskim*, ed. L. Bednarczuk, ABS XXXIV, 197–261.
- Csató E. A., 1997, *Some typological properties of North-Western Karaim in areal perspective*, [in:] *Areale, Kontakte, Dialekte, Sprache und ihre Dynamik in mehrsprachigen Situationen*, Bochum, 68–83.
- Dal V., 1880–1882/1955, *Tolkovyy slovar' živogo velikoruskogo jazyka*, I–IV, Moskva.
- Doroszkiewicz M., 1991, *Studia nad wpływami polskimi na rosyjską leksykę gwarową*, Wrocław.
- Dziadulewicz S., 1929, *Herbarz rodzin tatarskich w Polsce*, Wilno.
- Głuszkowski M., 2011, *Socjologiczne i psychologiczne uwarunkowania dwujęzyczności staroobrzędowców regionu suwalsko-augustowskiego*, Toruń.
- Grek-Pabisowa I., 1968, *Rosyjska gwara starowierców w województwie olsztyńskim i białostockim*, Wrocław.
- Grek-Pabisowa I., 1983, *Słownictwo rosyjskie wyspy gwarowej staroobrzędowców w Polsce*, Wrocław.
- Grek-Pabisowa I., 1999, *Staroobrzędowcy. Szkice z historii, języka, obyczajów*, Warszawa.
- Grek-Pabisowa I., 2002, *Współczesne gwary polskie na Litwie i Białorusi. Fonetyka*, Warszawa.
- Grek-Pabisowa I., Maryniakowa I., 1999, *Współczesne gwary polskie na dawnych Kresach północno-wschodnich*, Warszawa.
- Grek-Pabisowa I., Ostrówka M., Biesiadowska-Magdziarz B., 2008, *Język polski na Białorusi Radzieckiej w okresie międzywojennym*, I–II, Warszawa.
- Grzegorzewski J., 1916–1918, *Caraimica*, „Rocznik Orientalistyczny”, 1/3, 252–296.
- Heller M., 1930, *Wilno jako ośrodek żydowskiego życia kulturalnego*, WZW I, 262–271.
- Jablonskis K., 1941, *Lietuviški žodžiai. Senosios lietuvių raštinių kalboje*, Kaunas.
- Jacobs N. G., 2001, *Yiddish in the Baltic region*, [in:] *Circum-Baltic languages. Typology and Contacts*, II. *Grammar and typology*, Amsterdam–Philadelphia, 285–311.
- Karaś H., 2002, *Gwary polskie na Kowieńszczyźnie*, Warszawa.

- Klimčuk F., 1985, *Vostočnoslavyjanskij etnonim "Litviny"*, [in:] *International Conference of Balticists. Abstracts*, Vilnius, 168–169.
- Krogh S., 2001, *Das Ostjiddische im Sprachkontakt [...]*, Tübingen.
- Kurzowa Z., 1993, *Język polski Wileńszczyzny i kresów północno-wschodnich XVI–XX w.*, Warszawa–Kraków.
- Lindert B., 1972, *Formanty -(i)uk i -čuk w językach wschodniosłowiańskich*, PSS, IV, 81–87.
- Lizisowa M. T., 2000, *Język „Kodeksu Olszewskiego” (1550)*, Kraków.
- Łapicz C., 1986, *Kitab tatarów litewsko-polskich (paleografia, grafia, język)*, Toruń.
- Łatyszonek O., 2006, *Od Rusinów Białych do Białorusinów. U źródeł białoruskiej idei narodowej*, Białystok.
- Mędelaska J., 1999–2004, *Język polskiej prasy wileńskiej*, I–III, Bydgoszcz.
- Morita K., 2005, *Przemiany socjolingwistyczne w polskich społecznościach na Litwie (region trocki) i Białorusi (region iwieniecki)*, Warszawa.
- Musajev K., 1964, *Grammatika karaimskiego jazyka*, Moskva.
- Nemčenko V. N., 1968, *Dialektnaja leksika v russkih starožilčeskich govorah Litvy*, [in:] *Dialektologičeskij sbornik*, Riga, 36–72.
- Németh M., 2011, *Zwięzła gramatyka języka zachodniokaraimskiego z ćwiczeniami*, Poznań.
- Otrębski J., 1932, *Wschodniolitewskie narzecze twereckie*, III, *Zapóżycczenia słowiańskie*, Kraków.
- Pihan-Kijasova A., 1999, *Literacka polszczyzna kresów północno-wschodnich XVII wieku. Fonetyka*, Poznań.
- Rieger J., Masojć I., Rutkowska K., 2006, *Słownictwo polszczyzny gwarowej na Litwie*, Warszawa.
- Rozwadowski J., Gregorski A., 1995, *Litewska gwara okolic Zdzięcioła na Nowogródzczyźnie*, Kraków.
- Safarewicz J., 1956, *Litewskie nazwy miejscowe na -iszki*, “Onomastica” II, 15–63.
- Sawaniewska-Mochowa Z., 1991, 1995, *Bibliografia prac o polszczyźnie kresowej*, SPK, VI, 223–254; VIII, 265–282.
- Sawaniewska-Mochowa Z., 2002, *Ze studiów nad socjolektem drobnej szlachty kowieńskiej XIX wieku*, Bydgoszcz.
- Skardžius P., 1931, *Die slavischen Lehnwörter im Altlitauischen*, Kaunas.
- Smułkowa E., 2002, *Białoruś i pogranicza. Studia o języku i społeczeństwie*, Warszawa.
- Smułkowa E. (ed.), Budźko I., Guščeva O., Kazanceva H., 2009–2011, *Brasławszczyzna. Pamięć i współczesność*, I–II, Warszawa.
- Stang Ch., 1935, *Die westrussische Kanzleisprache des Grossfürstentums Litauen*, Oslo.
- Stang Ch., 1939, *Die altrussische Urkundensprache der Stadt Polozk*, Oslo.
- Trypućko J., 1955–1957, *Język Władysława Syrokomli. Przyczynek do dziejów polskiego języka literackiego w wieku XIX*, I–II, Uppsala.
- Turska H., 1930, *Język Jana Chodźki. Przyczynek do historii języka polskiego na obszarze północno-wschodnim Rzeczypospolitej*, Wilno.
- Turska H., 1939/1982, *O powstaniu polskich obszarów językowych na Wileńszczyźnie*, SPK, I, 19–121.
- Vanagas A., 1981, *Lietuvių hidronimų etimologinis žodynas*, Vilnius.
- Vanagas A., 2004, *Lietuvos miestų vardai*, Vilnius.

- Verenič V., 1990, *Polskoe-belorusskoe jazykovoe vzaimodejstvie (na materiale mazurskiego ostrovnogo govora v Poles'je)*, SPK, V, 7–141.
- Vidugiris A., 1998, *Zietelos šnektos žodynas*, Vilnius.
- Wasilewski L., 1905, *Jeszcze słowko o Litwie*, "Ogniwo", nr 36.
- Weinreich U., 1952, *Sábesdiker losn in Yiddish: a problem of linguistic affinity*, "Slavic Word" VIII/4, 360–377.
- Weinreich U., 1953/1970, *Languages in contact*, VII ed., The Hague.
- Weinreich U., 1958, *Yiddish and colonial German in Eastern Europe: the differential impact of Slavic*, [in:] *American Contribution to the Forth International Congress of Slavicists*, The Hague.
- Wiemer B., 2003, *Dialect and language contacts on the territory of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania from the 15<sup>th</sup> century until 1939*, [in:] *Aspects of multilingualism in European languages history*, Amsterdam–Philadelphia, 105–143.
- Zdaniukiewicz A. A., 1957–1959, *Archiwum fonograficzne*, ABS 24, 1999: 337–359, with map (ed. L. Bednarczuk).
- Zdaniukiewicz A. A., 1972, *Gwara Łopatowszczyzny*, Wrocław.
- Zielińska A., 1996, *Wielojęzyczność staroobrzędowców mieszkających w Polsce*, Warszawa.
- Zinkevičius Z., 1992, *A Polish-Yatvingian vocabulary*, "Linguistic and Oriental Studies from Poznań", I, 99–133.
- Zinkevičius Z., 1993/1996, *Rytų Lietuva praeityje ir dabar / Vostočnaja Litva v prošlom i nastojaščem*, Vilnius.
- Zinkevičius Z., 1996, *The history of the Lithuanian language*, Vilnius.

## BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ABBREVIATIONS

- ABS – "Acta Baltico-Slavica", Białystok–Warszawa.
- EB – *Etnogenez Belorusov. Tezisy dokladov*, Minsk 1973.
- EP – *Encyklopedia powszechna*, ed. S. Orgelbrand, I–XXVIII, Warszawa 1859–1868.
- GL – *Gedimino laiškai. Chartularium Lithuaniae Res gestas magni ducis Gedymine illustrans*, ed. S. C. Rowell, Vilnius 2003.
- KDW – *Kodeks dyplomatyczny Katedry i Diecezji Wileńskiej*, I (1387–1507), ed. J. Fijałek, W. Semkowicz, Kraków 1938–1948 (*Indeksy* 1994).
- PG – *Polskije govory v SSSR*, I–II, ed. V. Verenič, Minsk 1973.
- PSS – "Z Polskich Studiów Slawistycznych", Warszawa.
- RIS – *Regionalnyj istoričeskij slovar' vtoroj poloviny XVI–XVIII vv. po pamjatnikam pismennosti smolenskogo kraja*, ed. E. Borisova, Smolensk 2000.
- SG – *Slovar' smolenskih govorov*, I–XI, ed. L. Bojarinova, A. Ivanova, Smolensk 1974–2005.
- SGP – Karłowicz J., *Słownik gwar polskich*, I–VI, Kraków 1901–1911.
- SPK – "Studia nad Polszczyzną Kresową", Warszawa 1982–.
- SPNZ – *Sloŭnik belaruskich havorak paŭnočna-zachodnjaj Belarusi i jaje pahraničča*, I–V, ed. J. Mackevič, Minsk 1979–1986.
- WZW – *Wilno i Ziemia Wileńska*, I–II, Wilno 1930–1937.



## ЯЗЫКОВЫЕ КОНТАКТЫ И КОНФЛИКТЫ НА ТЕРРИТОРИИ ВЕЛИКОГО КНЯЖЕСТВА ЛИТОВСКОГО (ВКЛ)

### РЕЗЮМЕ

Виленский уроженец, профессор Уриел Вейнраих, в своей знаменитой книге о языковых контактах (1953/1970), кроме заметок о славянском влиянии на северо-восточный вариант диалекта идиш, не упоминает о языковых контактах на землях бывшего ВКЛ, но справедливо указывает, что особо понимаемая языковая лояльность может привести к агрессии и конфликтам, причём не только языковым. В качестве примера учёный приводит запрет на использование в польскоязычной советской прессе, издаваемой после 1939 года, слов *pan* / 'господин' и *żyd* / 'еврей'. Несмотря на инспирируемые внешними силами языковые конфликты в девятнадцатом и двадцатом веках, жители бывшего ВКЛ всегда находились во взаимных языковых контактах, образуя с древних времён до наших дней многоязычную общность, напоминающую по своей структуре балканскую языковую лигу.

В статье рассматриваются: 1) вопросы терминологии, 2) этнолингвистическая ситуация на территории ВКЛ, 3) функциональное распределение используемых языков и диалектов, 4) примеры языковых транспозиций между ними, и 5) коммуникативное сообщество ВКЛ.

*Słowa kluczowe:* Wielkie Księstwo Litewskie, kontakty i konflikty językowe, transpozycje międzyjęzykowe, wspólnota komunikatywna.

*Keywords:* Grand Duchy of Lithuania, language contacts and conflicts, inter-lingual transpositions, linguistic community.

*Ключевые слова:* Великое княжество Литовское, языковые контакты и конфликты, межъязыковые транспозиции, коммуникативная общность.