

# Belarusian Dialects in Latvian Latgale—Transitional or Mixed?

*Mirosław Jankowiak*

## ABSTRACT

In this article, I intend to analyse Belarusian dialects in South-East Latvia. My primary goal is to establish their current characteristics and, subsequently, to classify them as *mixed* or *transitional* dialects. The analysis will be carried out at three levels: (i) methodological (i.e. with regard to the notions of *transitional* vs. *mixed* dialects and applying the discussion to the Belarusian-Latvian borderland), (ii) statistical (statistical analysis applied to particular phonetic and morphological features), and (iii) qualitative analysis of particular lexemes: the basis of my analysis with the lexicon being the most rapidly changing and interfering language layer.<sup>1</sup> The distinction between two types of dialects, *mixed* and *transitional*, is based on whether the population is bilingual or monolingual. Mixed dialects are characteristic mainly of a bilingual or multilingual population. Another very important factor is whether the speakers of the dialect differ markedly on an idiolectal level. A more accurate analysis of this issue is provided in section 2.

## 1. Introduction: Latgale as a research territory

On maps compiled more than a hundred years ago, the territory of South-East Latvia was classified as a territory settled by Belarusian ethnic groups, and was included in the Belarusian dialectal area; cf. Karskij (1903), the Moscow Dialectological Committee (Durnovo et al. 1914), Rittich (1875) and Dovnar-Zapolskij (1919).<sup>2</sup>

In Latvian tradition this territory has been called ‘Latgale’.<sup>3</sup> It has primarily been inhabited by Latvians in a narrow sense (mainly Lutherans),

---

1 On the basis of the author’s field work in southern Latgale.

2 Somewhat differently in Erkert (1863), who defined the Eastern border as what is the current administrative border, i.e. around Braslaŭ (Mixnevič, ed. 1994: 55; Šykunova, ed. 2004: 74).

3 Latgale amounts to one-third of Latvia’s territory. Around 20% of its population are Belarusians.

Latgalians<sup>4</sup> (mainly Catholics), Russians (Orthodox and Old-Believers), Poles (Catholics), Belarusians (Catholics and Orthodox), Lithuanians (Catholics), Gypsies and other ethnic groups. As a matter of fact, the multiplicity of ethnic backgrounds and religious beliefs has had a lasting impact on the sociolinguistic situation in Latgale. Particular languages and dialects in different periods—depending on the policy of the relevant authorities—have enjoyed different degrees of prestige and relevance in different spheres of life. Speakers of Belarusian dialects were in contact with Standard Latvian, Latgalian dialects, the local variety of Russian (in oral communication), Standard Russian, and a Polish variety of the North-Eastern borderland. For a long period of time, Belarusian itself was used in the family and during contact with neighbours in the territory under investigation. Notably, the local Belarusian dialect was used not only by Belarusians, but also by Poles, Gypsies and Latgalians. The role of Belarusian in Latvia and, more generally, the language situation in Latgale, were discussed in Jankowiak (2009, 2010a, 2010b, 2010c).

The first researcher to study this region was Karskij, who explored this area twice (Kryvicki 2003: 107). He pointed out that it is difficult to determine the borderlines of the Belarusian dialects in the Belarusian-Latvian-Russian borderland due to the fact that they are transitional and “unnoticeably switch into Russian dialects,”<sup>5</sup> which means that the closer we get to the Northern part of Latgale, the more we can speak of Greater Russian dialects, not Belarusian ones (Karskij 1904: 11). For several decades later on, there was no serious research on Belarusian dialects in this territory. Then, in 1977, dialectologists began far-ranging field explorations in order to collect materials for the edition of the *Leksičny atlas belaruskix narodnyx havorak* (hereafter LABNH). Lexical units were recorded from the bilingual or multilingual population, and not only from the indigenous one, but also from inhabitants who had come from the Belarusian SSR to the Latvian SSR after World War II. Three regions of the Latvian SSR were explored at the time: the Daugavpils district, the Ludza district and the Krāslava district. The material collected was included in a new

4 Latgalians and Latvians are considered to belong to one nation, but because of differences in religion (Latgalians are predominantly Catholics while other Latvians are typically Lutherans) and language, I treat them separately.

5 Here and in the following, translations into English are mine (MJ).

dictionary, the *Sloŭnik belaruskix havorak paŭnočna-zaxodnjaj Belarusi i jae pahraničča* published in 1979–1986 (SPZB 1979: 8, 19).

The recordings I have collected from 2004 until 2007 serve as the empirical basis for this study. I have visited 26 villages and the town of Krāslava (and gathered more than 100 interviews and 120 hours of recordings in total). The linguistic analysis is based on 20 hours of recordings from 10 people from Latgale (indigenous population) and 10 people who arrived there from the Belarusian SSR after 1945 (from so-called West Belarus).<sup>6</sup> Each informant was interviewed for one hour (ca. 12 pages of standard Word text per person, together: 240 pages in phonetic transcription). The material collected from the informants who had arrived from Eastern Belarus was not taken into account (due to their small number in the area).

Latgalian subdialects (Latv. *latgaliskās izloksnes*) are spoken by the Latvian population of the area. Therefore, Belarusian was in contact primarily with Latgalian subdialects and not with Standard Latvian (Rudzīte 2005: 100, 101; Breidaks 2007: 592). Belarusian-speaking people have had contact also with a Polish dialect, the so-called “Polish language of the Northern Borderland” (Pol. *polszczyzna północnokresowa*), which is characterized by many features typical of Belarusian, Russian and the Baltic languages (dialects). This dialect is found in the Baltic-Slavic borderland, more accurately, in the North-West part of Belarus, in Lithuania (Eastern part) and Latvia (in Latgale). This variant of Polish in Latgale was described by Ostrówka (2001) in her doctoral thesis.

More than a hundred years ago, Karskij pointed out that, in the North East of Latgale, Belarusian dialects had been coming into contact with Russian subdialects of the Pskov dialect group.<sup>7</sup> Therefore, historically, they had an impact on the subsequent nature of the Belarusian dialects in that territory. However, this has now changed. Currently, in the area

6 In this article, I distinguish between Eastern Belarus and Western Belarus according to historical conditions (Western Belarus was a part of Poland until 1939) and the linguistic situation: Eastern Belarus was previously subject to Russification, while, in Western Belarus, the official language until 1939 was Polish. The broader linguistic situation in Belarus, the co-existence of Belarusian and Russian from a historical point of view, was described by Zaprudski (2007: 97–118).

7 The Pskov dialect group has been discussed in numerous monographs and articles, for example, in contributions to *Pskovskie govory* (1968).

I examined, Pskov dialects no longer exist, with the local variation of standard Russian playing a more significant role.

According to the classification accepted in Belarusian dialectology, the area under investigation belongs to the North-East Belarusian dialects, and, together with the Vicebsk region and the area of Mėry and Braslaŭ, is included in the sub-group of the Northern dialects (LABNH 1993: Maps XVII, XIX), also called the Polack group (LH 1969: Map 72). The features of these dialects were described in more detail in Barszczewska & Jankowiak (2012: 132–33).

In Belarusian dialectology, apart from the traditional division of dialects into so-called belts (BRuss. *polasy*) of dialects, there are also so-called zones. Belts of dialects are determined on the basis of phonetic and grammatical features and demonstrate the role of East-Slavic tribes in the formation of the Belarusian dialects. Zones are distinguished mainly on the basis of lexical features. It shows the closeness of the Belarusian lexical stock to its neighbouring languages (or dialects): Polish, Baltic (mainly Lithuanian), Russian, Ukrainian (Barszczewska & Jankowiak 2012: 126).

According to this division, our area belongs to the Northern zone. The conventional border runs north of the line marked by the following places: Pastavy-Vilejka-Dokšycy-Krupki. The distinguishing features of this area are found mainly in lexical units, to a lesser degree in phonetics, morphology and syntax (Astrėjka 2006: 25). The dialects of this zone (including the area I have investigated) combine phonetic and morphological features from the North-East dialect with lexical features from the South-West dialects; for instance, inflectional suffixes ending in *-c'* in the first conjugation of the verbs for 3<sup>rd</sup> pers. singular and plural of present and future tense (e.g., *ʒ'e ĭana ʒyv'ec'* 'where she lives' instead of the West form *ʒyv'e*) and words like *spadnica* 'skirt', *studńa* 'well' instead of Eastern *jubka* and *kolod'ež*.

Determining the nature of Belarusian dialects as *transitional* or *mixed* is definitely not an easy task. In view of multilingualism and of the complexity of processes taking place in the borderlands, this seems almost impossible. Belarusian dialects mix with different languages and dialects: Latvian, Latgalian, Russian, and Polish. Therefore, I will confine myself only to the relationship between the Belarusian dialects in question and the local variety of Standard Russian.

The chances of preserving the language in the context of multilingualism can be defined on the basis of the notion of ‘diglossia’<sup>8</sup> and ‘ethnolinguistic vitality’. Strict criteria for the first one were defined by Landry & Allard (1994: 15–42), such as: linguistic criterion (genetic proximity of languages), sociological criterion (i.e. diglossia creates conflicts), functional criterion (functional distribution of languages) and the criterion of stability (whether there are changes in the distribution of languages in particular spheres of life). Giles (1997), together with other researchers, noticed that ethnolinguistic vitality is influenced by the following factors: the status of the language, its prestige in economic, social and socio-historical dimensions, the size of its population, its dispersion, and community organization (supported by the state). As far as the Baltic-Slavic borderland is concerned, these approaches have been applied in research on the Polish language of the Northern Borderland cf. Zielińska (2003: 97–109) and on Belarusian dialects cf. Zielińska (2003: 97–109) — Jankowiak (2009: 172–76).

All these aspects of diglossia, ethnolinguistic vitality or bilingualism are closely linked with many criteria that will be described in the next part of this article.

## 2. Analysis

### 2.1. *Defining the terms of transitional and mixed dialects*<sup>9</sup>

The issue of mixed and transitional dialects has been broadly discussed and there have been numerous monographs and papers devoted to this subject (cf., inter alia, Małecki 1933; Stieber 1938; Karaś 1958; Proxorova 1991, 2002; Klimčuk 2003; Wiemer & Erker 2012 and many others).

The starting point for this analysis will be criteria described in two articles written by Smułkowa (2002a: 336–48; 2002b: 349–54), where

8 In the present paper, the terms ‘diglossia’ and ‘bilingualism’ have been used in the sense adopted for the Belarusian-speaking area by E. Smułkowa, who refers to Ferguson (1959) and Fishman (1985). Fishman distinguishes bilingualism from diglossia, bilingualism without diglossia and diglossia without bilingualism. Bilingualism is characterized by switches between two languages that are not conditioned by the situational context, whereas diglossia typically shows switches that are triggered by some situational context, by social conditions (pertaining to various spheres of life) or by particular languages.

9 The issue of *mixed* and *transitional* dialects has been discussed in detail in Wiemer and Erker (2012/13).

she discusses these terms in relation to the Belarusian language area. Smułkowa suggests the following criteria could make it possible to determine the nature of the Belarusian dialects: (i) territoriality, (ii) possibility of classification and direct reference to one of the dialects (languages), (iii) genetic proximity of the interacting dialects, (iv) bilingualism (possibility of alternate use of both interacting dialects), (v) idiolectal features, (vi) relative prestige between the dialects (languages) involved, (vii) occurrence of hypercorrect forms, (viii) permanent innovations that are the result of overlapping system features of the interacting dialects, (ix) realization of certain proto-Slavonic features in accordance with dialect A and realization of other features in accordance with dialect B, (x) variable realization of one proto-Slavonic feature in accordance with dialect A and in a different situation in accordance with dialect/language B. All these criteria are described in more detail below.

Before beginning the analysis, however, we need to clarify some methodological issues. Most linguists, including Smułkowa, approached this problem in situations in which two dialects are in contact. The situation in Latgale is slightly different. We have Belarusian dialects (in two varieties: the variety spoken by the local population and the variety spoken by people who came to Latvia from the Belarusian SSR after World War II), the local variety of Russian (no dialect), Polish (dialect) and other dialects (Latgalian) and languages (standard Latvian). Ideally, one could compare all these languages and dialects together, but, due to limitations in the material, I will only discuss the Belarusian dialect (in two variants—two groups, indigenous and immigrants) and Russian (local variant of standard language): dialect vs. language. Due to the relatively universal nature of the criteria proposed by Smułkowa, they can be used to describe the linguistic situation in other areas and in relation to dialect vs. language, not only dialect vs. dialect. These criteria can also be described in relation not only to an indigenous population, but also to people who came to the area, for example, after World War II.

### 2.1.1.1. *Territoriality*

Territoriality is understood by Smułkowa as an area densely inhabited by people who speak a specific dialect. This criterion is necessary for describing transitional dialects that are the result of the historical develop-

ment of dialects belonging to genetically close languages and interacting with each other over a long period of time.

The transitional nature of Belarusian dialects in Latgale was described by Karskij, who pointed out that it is difficult to mark the border between them and the dialects of Greater Russia in the North of Latgale, i.e., it is impossible to determine where Belarusian dialects finish and where Russian ones begin, due to the lack of a clear-cut boundary on the respective feature continua.

Mixed dialects can be characterized by territoriality, but this is not necessarily so. They might be a result of language contact between a local population and people who have settled there only recently. The Southern part of Latgale is inhabited by people speaking Belarusian (two varieties of a dialect) and Russian, and all of them inhabit these areas in compact settlements.

Historically, South Latgale could probably be considered to be a place with a transitional Belarusian-Russian dialect. At present, due to the fact that many people who live there only moved there fairly recently, this criterion could also indicate the rather mixed nature of this dialect.

### 2.1.2. *The possibility of classifying and directly referring to one of the dialects (languages)*

In the case of mixed dialects, we can say without a doubt that the dialect in question belongs to one of the languages. Moreover, interlocutors are able to assign their speech to one of these languages. The inhabitants of the borderland where transitional dialects exist are not able to determine whether their speech belongs to language A or B.

Notably, it is often only particular language layers such as phonetics or morphology that are affected. This implies that, while the lexicon could be mixed in nature, the phonetics or morphology may be genuinely Belarusian.

The material collected explicitly makes it possible for the dialects of concern to be qualified as being primarily Belarusian. The evidence comes from phonetics, morphology and syntax. At the same time, there are more Russian words in the lexicon. The informants called their language a *smešanyj jazyk*, 'a mixed language' (they do not say that it is Belarusian or Russian), considering it to be a mixture of Belarusian, Russian and other languages, but they are able to show specific elements

and describe them as Russian or Belarusian. This applies to relations between the Belarusian dialect and Russian. When I asked about differences between the speech of local inhabitants and immigrants, my interlocutors usually had no doubts; they described their own speech as closer to Russian with some Belarusian elements, and the speech of immigrants as closer to Belarusian with some Russian elements.

### *2.1.3. The genetic proximity of the interacting dialects*

In line with Smułkowa, this criterion speaks in favour of transitional dialects. The genetic proximity facilitates the interaction between languages that is so clearly visible, for example, along the Polish-Belarusian-Ukrainian or Belarusian-Russian borderland.

Both codes—Belarusian dialects and the local variant of Russian—belong to the East-Slavic branch and are, therefore, genetically extremely close to each other. The two variants of Belarusian dialects are genetically even closer. This coexistence has lasted for decades, and, in historical terms, we can, therefore say that these dialects were transitional in nature in the past. It should also be noted that transitional dialects have an organized system, whereas mixed dialects exhibit high idiolectal differentiation.

The Belarusian dialects in Latgale are considered to be in contact with Latvian and Latgalian (not with Slavic Languages), which are not genetically very close.

### *2.1.4. Bilingualism—optionality in the use of both interacting dialects*

According to Smułkowa's paper, speakers of a transitional dialect do not speak any other dialect besides their own (I do not take the standard language learnt at school into consideration here). In the case of mixed dialects, one often come across a situation where bilinguals—depending on the interlocutor or the topic of the conversation—switch to the other language where the second language is not their mother tongue (primary language).

In Southern Latgale, the oldest generation is mainly monolingual. They do not use Russian, although they understand it very well. However, depending on the interlocutor, the number of Russian or Belarusian lexemes may vary: the interlocutors believe they are switching to Russian



or Polish, but actually continue speaking their dialect, merely infusing it with a higher frequency of words from Russian, Belarusian or Polish.

### 2.1.5. *Idiolectal features*

Depending on the level of fluency in the other language/dialect, there is a different level of language interferences in the speech of each individual. This results in significant idiolectal diversity within a dialect on an individual level. Idiolectal features, as noted by Smułkowa, are typical of mixed dialects.

The material collected indicates great diversity in the informants' speech, not only on the dialectal, but also on the individual level. Here we can talk of a high level of idiolectal differentiation. A few minutes of conversation are enough to notice that the interlocutor either uses two or more words (Belarusian and Russian) to describe one lexeme, or one word is realized once in Belarusian pronunciation and another time with Russian phonetical features, e.g.

- (1) *mai z'ec'i yavarac' skavarada // tak išče yavorac', pajšoŭ ty v Boyu*  
 'my children say "frying pan" //but also they say "go with God"  
 [W 1927 Vecborne, BY]<sup>10</sup>
- (2) *a brac'ik to uže bylo drugoje, brac'ik za č'etyr e yoda akončyŭ šes'c'*  
*kłas* 'and (with) my little brother it was different, (my) brother in  
 four years finished six classes' [W 1914 Krāslava, BY]

In the example provided above, one interlocutor pronounces [\*g] as a [g], as in Russian, and a few seconds later, in the word *hod* 'a year', [\*g] is realized in the manner typical of Belarusian, as [ɣ]. This clearly shows the mixed nature of Belarusian dialects in Latgale.

### 2.1.6. *The prestige of one of the dialects/languages*

According to Smułkowa's paper, mixed dialects are usually characterized by the prestige of the secondary code, which is frequently the standard language and/or has the status of the official language. Russian definitely has greater prestige than the Belarusian dialects in Latgale.

10 M—man, W—woman, 1914—a date of birth, LV—from Latvia, BY—from Western Belarus.

Pieces of conversation with my respondents show that, for locals, Russian definitely has greater prestige than the Belarusian dialect:

(3) *b'elaruskij samyj paskudnyj* 'Belarusian language [among other languages] is the nastiest' [W1926 Stremki, BY]

(4) *iana [ruskaja mova] l'epšaja čym Belaruskaja mova* '[Russian] is better than Belarusian' [M 1988 Piedruia, LV]

### 2.1.7. *Hypercorrectness*

In line with Smułkowa, this phenomenon also testifies in favour of mixed dialects. Hypercorrect forms are created when the interlocutor wrongly considers a particular form to be in accordance with the norms of the standard language, or as more cultivated. This process occurs when one language has greater prestige. In South Latgale, Russian has greater prestige than Belarusian, and foreigners who try to speak Russian correctly often use noticeably hypercorrect forms. In the material I collected, I did not find hypercorrect forms, even though they might have been expected.

### 2.1.8. *Permanent innovations that are the result of the overlapping system features of the interacting dialects*

The long-standing co-existence of two dialects (languages) within one territory often results in specific innovations typical of a particular transitional dialect only. These include, among other things, new lexemes (or grammatical forms) that have permanently been replacing earlier words (forms). My analysis showed that, in the speech of interlocutors, there are no innovations specific only to the Belarusian dialect in that region.

### 2.1.9. *The realization of certain proto-Slavonic features in accordance with dialect A and the realization of other features in accordance with dialect B*

In transitional dialects, certain Proto-Slavonic features are realized in accordance with the norms of dialect/language A, while other features are realized in accordance with dialect/language B. As an example, Smułkowa provides the following forms (typical of the Belarusian-Ukrainian linguistic borderland in Podlasie): *ʒ'eń* 'a day', *č'eń* 'a shadow' with Belarusian *dzekanne* and *cekanne* instead of Ukrainian forms: *děń*,

*teń* or verb forms (in the infinitive): *xodyty*, *robyty* ‘to walk, to make’ characteristic of Ukrainian instead of Belarusian *xaz’ic’*, *rab’ic’*.

2.1.10. *The variable realization of one proto-Slavonic feature in accordance with dialect A and in a different situation in accordance with dialect/language B*

In mixed dialects, one Proto-Slavonic feature can be realized in accordance with the norms of dialect/language A, and, in a different situation, the same feature can be realized in accordance with dialect/language B. This realization can occur not only within the frames of a dialect, but also on the idiolectal level (even in the speech of one and the same person).

My data show that several years ago, phonetic, inflectional and syntactic features were generally realized in accordance with the norms of Belarusian (or Belarusian dialects), with only a few being realized in the Russian manner.<sup>11</sup> Currently, one can observe a higher degree of variation: Russian and Belarusian realizations vary much more frequently, not only on the dialectal, but also on the idiolectal level. This is in contrast with the lexical stock, which has already been varying for decades. Examples:

- (5) *jon try yady išou z ġermańii s pl’enu* ‘he was gone from Germany since three years from captivity’ [W 1927 Piedruia, LV]
- (6) *u vołas’c’i tam rabotajec’ ženščyna, łatyška rabotajet* ‘there in municipal office a woman works, a Latvian [woman] works’ [W 1933 Krivoselci, LV]
- (7) *tam parńišk’i tancaval’i, dobryja xłopcy* ‘boys danced there, good boys’ [M 1926 Upmale, BY]

The results of my analysis of Belarusian dialects in Latgale, based on the criteria described by Smułkowa, are shown below. The table lists the features that are specific to mixed or transitional dialects, and compares them to the linguistic situation in Latgale.

<sup>11</sup> During my field studies, I asked my interlocutors to compare specific words and forms they had used in the past and now use in the present.

	Criterion	Transitional	Mixed	Latgale
1	Territoriality	+	+/-	+
2	Classification to one of the dialects	-	+	+
3	Genetic proximity of interacting dialects	+	-	+
4	Bilingualism	-	+	+
5	Idiolectal features	-	+	+
6	Prestige of one of the dialects/ languages	-	+	+
7	Hypercorrectness	-	+	?
8	Permanent innovations	+	-	-
9	Realization of certain proto-Slavonic features in accordance with dialect A and other features in accordance with dialect B	+	-	-
10	Variant realization of one proto-Slavonic feature in accordance with dialect A and in a different situation in accordance with dialect B	-	+	+

Table 1.

The analysis above has shown that the dialects I investigated in Latgale are characterized by almost all criteria specific to mixed dialects (according to Smułkowa). There is one exception: the criterion of genetic proximity. This criterion is a little bit doubtful for borderlands, where we have many languages and dialects (not just languages that are genetically close to each other). This was pointed out by Wiemer & Erker (2012: 2.8.), who also paid attention to features concerning bilingualism that are relevant not only for genetically close languages, but also for languages like Russian and Lithuanian. These linguists also raised doubts about the criterion of permanent innovations.

### 2.2. Selected linguistic features—statistical approach

Above, I applied a criteria-based analysis to the dialects under investigation. In this section I will apply a statistical approach. The corpus consists

of 240 pages of phonetic transcripts (120 pages for each group, i.e. for indigenous Belarusians and for those who settled in the area after 1945).

Regarding lexical features, a qualitative difference between the two groups was observed. While the phonetic, morphologic and syntactic features do not diverge structurally, there are quantitative differences. For the latter I have confined myself to some specific features. I have selected only those features that are spread across the whole area under investigation. I also chose those features that are not included in the dialectological atlases, but that nevertheless indicate the Belarusian typology of dialects and highlight the progressing process of Russification. Eight phonetic and four inflectional features have been selected (cf. Jankowiak 2009: 125–51 for details). Thus, only phonetics and inflection were analysed statistically. The frequency of occurrence of syntactic and lexical features is so low that, in this case, applying this method seems to make no sense.

In my statistical analysis I have proceeded as follows: first, for feature (x) I defined the number of potential positions for every informant (column [2]),<sup>12</sup> then I compared the absolute number of its occurrence (column [3]) with occurrence in a different form (or with lack of occurrence)—(y) (column [4]). Second, I summed up the values mentioned above in absolute numbers and in percentages. Due to differences in the number of possible chances of occurrence of the feature in idiolects, I carried out checks in order to assess the contribution of feature (x) and other possibilities (y) for every informant (columns [5] and [6]) and to present the average value of contribution distinguishing these values for the whole group in percentages.

The reason for this approach was to eliminate any possible inaccuracy in the method that might have resulted from a difference in the number of possible occurrences of a specific feature in the speech of particular informants. A similar analysis is carried out for the other group. Eventually, after moderation, the results of both analyses are compared.

---

12 Potential positions = all possible moments and places in words where the specific feature could possibly be.

	Number of chances of occurring feature (x)	Number of occurrences of feature (x)	Number of occurrences in a different form or lack of occurrence (y)	Contribution of occurrence of feature (x)	Contribution of occurrence of a different form or lack of occurrence - (y)
[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]
1	200	178	22	0,89	0,11
2	120	100	20	0,83	0,17
3	190	177	13	0,93	0,07
4	195	182	13	0,93	0,07
5	168	150	18	0,89	0,11
6	220	201	19	0,91	0,09
7	218	194	24	0,89	0,11
8	193	105	88	0,54	0,46
9	209	101	108	0,48	0,52
10	243	103	140	0,42	0,58
<b>SUMMA</b>	<b>1956</b>	<b>1491</b>	<b>465</b>	<b>77,10%</b>	<b>22,90%</b>
		76,23%	23,77%		

**Table 2:** Example quantitative analysis.

Below is the presentation of three selected features concerning phonetics, since this is the level of language structure traditionally considered to be the basis for defining to which language of the two the dialect belongs. This is contrary to the morphology or syntax, which plays a complementary role.

### 2.2.1. Pronunciation of the voiced, fricative [ɣ]

In East-Slavic dialects, there are three voiced velar consonants: plosive [g], fricative [ɣ] and pharyngeal [h]. The first one occurs in the standard Russian language and the majority of Russian dialects. In Belarusian, the consonant [ɣ] has always been pharyngeal, fricative, never plosive

(Jankoški 1974: 118, 119), and it occurs in the entire Belarusian speaking territory. In the case of Belarusian, we can say that the spirantization of [g] into [ɣ] took place between the ninth and the thirteenth or fourteenth century (Wexler 1977: 97–103).

The occurrence of voiced [ɣ] is much broader than the territory of Belarus; together with the Ukrainian-speaking territory<sup>13</sup> and the territory of South Russia, it creates a compact area of dialects where there is no [g]. It seems important that the voiced [ɣ] is observed in territory adjoining Belarus, such as the Pskov region, which borders on the regions of Latgale and Vicebsk. One question needs to be raised: can this be considered a Belarusian influence? Opinions differ among Belarusian and Russian linguists. In the region where I carried out my research, Belarusian dialects are predominantly in contact with standard Russian, and with the language of local Old Believers who preserved their Russian and where no [ɣ] is exhibited. We can assume, then, that in the Southern part of Latgale, the voiced [ɣ] occurring in Belarusian dialects highlights their Belarusian character; on the other hand, the consonant [g] could indicate that a process of Russification is in progress. A similar analysis can be provided for the remaining two features discussed below.

According to research carried out to date, we can state that a voiced [ɣ] is very common in the speech of both indigenous Belarusians and those who moved there after 1945. This is true of words of both Belarusian and Russian origin:

- (8) [...] *s"eła kal'a iolačk'i, **payrełas"á, payrełas"á** i čakaju kayda papka uže poiž"ec" na s"nedańńe, i tady pajdu daroškaĭ, bajus"á uže is"č"i pa **yetym luyu**, tak is"č"i ž **ńe mayu*** 'I sat near the pine, I heated up and I am waiting for when my dad will go for breakfast and then I will go this way, I am afraid to go through the meadow, but I can't go' [W 1914 Krāslava, LV]
- (9) *rana **vyyańuc"**, **vyyańuc"** na pol'e karou, a ĭa bos"eńkaja, **noy'i m'orzl'i**, karova pas"okaĭec", pakakajec", ĭa **b'ayu tudy noy'i yrec"*** 'In the morning they move the cows, move the cows on the meadow, and I barefooted, legs were freezing, the cow will sniff, grunt, and I run there to heat my legs' [W 1923 Gaisieli, BY]

13 See more on [h] in Ukrainian language and dialects in Shevelov (1979: 349–59)

We need to highlight, however, that parallel to the voiced [h], [g] also exists, even in utterances from the same informants, independent of their origin. The frequency is very low:

- (10) *try yady išoŭ z ġermaniġi, s pl'enu, draŭ z ġermaniġi s pl'enu, i yeta ġe c"ip'er, yeta bylo u vos"emnacatym yadu* 'He had been gone from Germany, from slavery, and it was not now, it was in [19]18'  
[W 1927 Piedruja, LV]

A statistical analysis showed that [ɣ] prevails and the differences in the speech of the two researched groups are only slight. I registered 92,90% of potential positions of occurrence in the speech of the indigenous population, compared to 92,10% among those who arrived here after 1945. The percentage of the Russian [g] was 7,10% and 7,90%, which highlights the Belarusian character of the dialect. Pronunciation of the voiced [ɣ] is one of the most characteristic and noticeable features for the informants, who could also guess the origin of the interlocutor based on this.

### 2.2.2. Occurrence of the labial [ɥ], the so-called short semi-vowel

The labial floating [ɥ], commonly called the short or semi-vowel [u], is typical of all Belarusian dialects and standard Belarusian. It arose in place of the historical [v] and [l]. The change of [v] into [ɥ] was connected with the disappearance of reduced sounds—the previous *v̆* and *v̆* (e.g. *krov̆*—*krou* 'blood', *kriv̆da*—*kryuda* 'harm'). This phenomenon is registered in relics of literature from the thirteenth century (Jankoŭski 1974: 93).

There are two reasons for the change from [l] to [u]—a phonetic reason and one of analogy. The phonetic change of the non-palatalized [l] into [u] took place only in the groups *t̆lt* and *tblt* after reduced sounds, when [l] was located between two consonants (e.g., *v̆lk̆*—*voŭk* 'wolf'). This change occurred after the loss of the *jers* (i.e. the reduced front and back vowel of middle height) and is registered in relics of literature from the fifteenth century. The change as a result of analogy was related<sup>14</sup> to uninflected participles of masculine gender such as *robil̆*—*robiu*, which later became the basic form of the past tense (Jankoŭski 1974: 94–95).

14 As Jankoŭski points out, this was an effect of analogy. Previously existing adjectival participles like *čitav̆*, *znav̆*, where *-v̆* changed into *v* and then into *u*. Wexler (1977: 165) claims that this change was of a purely morphological nature.



The statistical analysis of the material collected showed that the Belarusian realization dominates the speech of both indigenous and migrant informants (91,00% and 95,10% of potential chances of occurrence, respectively):

- (11) *u daŭnaŭje ŭremja, i es"l'i xto tam s k'is"el'eŭcaŭ tak'i, iak sas"et tut byuŭšy bl'iže, to mašyna i es"c"* [...] 'in old times, if somebody was from [village] Kiselevci, as the neighbour I had here, [I had] a car [to help and use]' [W 1933 Kryvosel'cy, LV]
- (12) *tam i žaŭniŭs"a, tam i v'enčaŭs"a, i ija tam dažyŭ aŭ da p'ec"z"es"at s"em l'et, tady ija s"udy pryjexaŭ, i tut u p'edruj pražyŭšy uže dvaccac" l'et* 'there I got married, there engaged, and there I lived until I was 57, and then I moved here and here in Piedruia I have already lived for 20 years' [M 1920 Piedruja, BY]

We need to highlight, however, that the Russian form, i.e. with [v] and [l], occurs in parallel with utterances of one and the same interlocutors, that is, on an idiolectal level:

- (13) *za sprav'adl'ivas"c", za česnas"c", za l'ubof, i čaŭav'ek čaŭav'eka l'ub'iŭby* 'for justice, for righteousness, for love and (that) humans would love each other' [M 1923 Kräslava, LV]
- (14) *u p'atn'icu ks"onc pryježžaŭ, učyŭ, mal'icca nas Boyu, mal'icca, a c"ap'eraka advučyl'i trošku* 'priest arrived on Friday, [he] taught [how] to pray to the God, to pray, and now [they] unlearn [us] little' [W 1923 Gaisieli, BY]

I registered 9% of possible occurrences of forms with the Russian realization of historical [v] and [l] in the speech of indigenous population, compared to 4,90% in the speech of the migrant population. This highlights the marked Belarusian nature of this feature, and the only slight influence of Russian, but at the same time it is noticeable that the process of Russification has affected the language of the indigenous population.

2.2.3. *Distinguishing / not distinguishing the ±palatalized nature of [r]/[r']*  
 The occurrence of only the non-palatalized [r] is typical of standard Belarusian, also in positions where it was historically palatalized (e.g., *raka* against Russian *r'eka* 'river'). It must be assumed that [r'], depalatalized earlier than the fourteenth century as non-palatalized [r], is registered in relics of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries (Jankoŭski 1974: 121, 122).

The majority of Belarusian dialects do not distinguish between palatalized and unpalatalized [r]: it is either palatalized [r'] as attested in the South of the country—in dialects of Palesse of the Ukrainian type—and in the East, at the border with Russia, where Belarusian and Russian dialects are included in the so called “soft-r” dialects (Rastorgujev 1960: 62). Or it is unpalatalized [r], as in the rest of Belarus, i.e. the region of Měry and Braslaŭ, where only the non-palatalized [r] was registered by DABM (1963: Karta 42).” We can, therefore, expect that there should also be an area on the Latvian side where only non-palatalized [r] occurs.

The material collected showed that the non-palatalized [r] prevails in the speech of indigenous Belarusians in those positions where it was historically palatal, i.e. before front vowels. See some examples:

- (15) *c"ap'er l'uz"i slabyje, rańše byl'i krapčejšyje, i p'itańne ne takoje bylo, a jašče strańejšaje* 'now people [are] weak, before [there] were stronger' [W 1923 Piedruja, LV]
- (16) [*Partisans*] *tak Kokušynu spal'il'i, Stroneušynu spal'il'i, Barnatouščynu, Łuy'i* [...], *kal'a rečk'i byl'i, a za rečkaj, Němcy za rečku zaišl'i* 'guerillas burned [village] Kokušyna, Stroneušyna burned, Barnatouščyna, Luhi, near the river [there] were, and on the other side of the river, Germans moved on the other side of the river' [W 1926 Upmale, BY]

Sometimes, however, we can observe a switch from Belarusian to Russian pronunciation in the speech of one and the same informant. The occurrence of palatal [r'] is typical mainly of words of Russian origin; this may result in:

- (17) [...] *pryjexal'i, us" a bal'ńica na aytobus"i, no xac"el'i pasmatr'ec" yetu svaz"bu* 'they came, the whole hospital was in the bus, [they] wanted to see this wedding' [W 1927 Piedruja, LV]
- (18) *tam u b'elarus"i napr'im'er na poxarany, ies"l'i ty votku, za votku očeń stroga, tam ies"l'i votka na stal'e, to tam ks"onż ne pajez"ec" xarańic* 'there, in Belarus, for example, during a/the funeral, if you [are going to drink] vodka, it was very strict, if there [was] vodka on the table, the priest will not go to the funeral' [W 1933 Lupandy, BY]

During the statistical analysis, I paid attention only to those forms (words) where the palatal [r'] historically existed. In the speech of the migrant population, realization of the non-palatal [r] dominates (89,00% of potentially possible situations), but in the speech of the indigenous population, the proportion was only 66,50%. This shows a greater influence of Russian on the speech of the local population.

The precise quantitative analysis of the chosen phonetic and inflectional features and general analysis of the remaining selected phonetic, morphological or syntactic features showed that the dialects investigated are clearly of a Belarusian nature. There are, however, symptoms of Russian influence, especially in the speech of the indigenous population. The character of dialects was presented not only for particular elements of the language structure, but also on the idiolectal level. It can be assumed that, from a longitudinal perspective, their specificity may change, i.e. they will probably acquire the nature of mixed dialects.

#### 2.2.4. *The mixed nature of the lexicon of Belarusian dialects*

There are a great number of lexical borrowings in Belarusian dialects—words of Polish, Lithuanian, Latvian and certainly Russian origin in the Northern part of Belarus and in the Southern part of Latgale as well. I will carry out a qualitative analysis comparing two groups: the speech of the indigenous population and that of the migrant population that arrived from Belarus after 1945. I will show the mixed nature of the lexical stock only in relation to Belarusian and Russian (I will pay no attention to other languages).

The material collected showed that, several decades ago, there were quite considerable differences between the vocabularies of the two groups analysed. For many years, indigenous Belarusians have been constantly using lexemes that are typical of the North-Eastern belt of Belarusian dialects (closer to the Russian lexical stock), and people who arrived in Latvia after World War II used the words occurring in West Belarus (frequently identical to Polish words, but with changed phonetics). Unification of the language of both groups is currently being observed. Language diversity should be explained by demographic-social factors (sex, age, education) and not only by categories of geographic origin (Jankowiak 2009: 156–57).

The vocabulary of the migrant population merged with the lexis of the local population, and the Belarusian lexemes, which cannot be compared with the Russian ones, are out of use. During my field work, I noticed, however, that my interlocutors often used several lexemes to denote one and the same particular thing, phenomenon or activity. This is also true of the utterances of single individuals. We can, therefore, observe the mixed nature of the lexis of Belarusian dialects on an idiolectal level: *або//ілі*<sup>15</sup> ‘or’, *бацька//ацец* ‘father’, *добры//харошы* ‘good’, *хата//дом* ‘house’, *другі//втары* ‘the second’, *глядзець//смагрэць* ‘to watch’, *грошы//дзенгі* ‘money’, *мова//язык* ‘language’, *троху//немножка* ‘a little’, *вёска//дзярэўня* ‘village’ and many others.

Some 30 lexemes were analysed. They were taken from dialectological dictionaries and indicate not only the nature of the vocabulary (Western or Eastern), but also make it possible to observe the process of ongoing Russification. A few examples are given below.

#### 2.2.5. Occurrence of the words *трэба/нада* ‘have to’

In the territory where Belarusian is spoken, there are two words meaning ‘have to, must’: *трэба* (identical to the Belarusian lexeme and similar to Polish *trzeba*) and *нада*, which is similar to Russian *надо*. The border of the isogloss runs along the line of the following areas: Pastavy-Vilejka-Lepel-Šumilina-Krasnapol, and it divides Belarus into two parts. *Трэба* is registered in the Southern part and *нада* in the Northern part. The farther to the North you go, the more frequently *нада* is registered.

15 Recorded examples are provided in the form similar to the pronunciation of my interlocutors.

Linguists emphasize that a visible lack of a border means that, in the past, there was a strong expansion of the lexeme *трэба* in the territory where *нада* previously occurred (cf. LH 1969: 125, 126, Karta 50).

In the Southern part of Latgale, dialectologists registered the occurrence of the lexeme *нада*, which is connected to interference with Russian (cf. DABM 1963: Karta 227). During my research, and in both the indigenous and the migrant population, I only registered the form that is identical to the Russian equivalent. Interviews with Belarusians who came from Belarus showed that, several decades ago, they used the lexeme *трэба*.

- (19) [...] *nada* *že ž'e nie buc" iexac" z"imoj, drovy vaz"ic' družiam, dapamažy družiam, padzarabotac' nada, no* '[we] need to go somewhere in the winter, carry the wood for friends, help friends, [we] need to earn [additional money]' [W 1914 Krāslava, LV]
- (20) *nada zapauńac', skol'ka tam kuda małaka raschodovajieš, skol'ka sam zjeu, skol'ka skatu, skol'ka sabaku dau* [...] '[we] need to fill in [documents], how much and where [you] are distributing milk, how much you ate alone, how much you gave for cattle, how much [you] gave for a dog' [W 1933 Lupandy, BY]

#### 2.2.6. Occurrence of the words *бульба/картошка/картофля* 'potatoes'

In the Northern part of Belarus, near South Latgale, dialectologists registered three words meaning 'potato': *бульба* (occurring in the majority of Belarusian dialects and the Belarusian literary language), *картошка* (identical to the Russian word *картошка*), and *картофля* (not very frequent) (DABM 1963: Karta 277). During interviews with my interlocutors, I registered that the form *бульба* was common and known even among the indigenous population. In Latgalian dialects, there are forms such as *bul'ba*, *bul'bis*, *bul'va*, *bul'vis* (LVDA(L) 1999: Karte 44), and the migrant population used this lexeme several decades ago.

At present, the most common word meaning 'potato' is *картошка*, seemingly due to the influence of Russian. The word *бульба* appears much less frequently, and only in the utterances of people who came here after 1945. The word *картофля* was registered very rarely:

- (21) *pas”c”el’ic” matka, skac”erce na stoł, kartošk’i vysypała, kastrul’u na stoł i b’eruc” i įaduc” z adnoj [miski] ‘mother will put the tablecloth on the table, spilled potatoes, pot on the table and [they] take and eat from one bowl [W 1928 Krāslava (Priedaine), BY]*
- (22) *nada įexac” [...] bul’bu kapac” [in Belarus], i nel’z”a b’as yetaj bumažk’i, v’izu nada vyb’irac” [‘we need to go [...] dig potatoes [in Belarus], and it is forbidden without this paper [visa], you need to get a visa’ [W 1928 Kraslava (Priedaine), BY]*
- (23) *pryxoz”ic” “kak u vas, užo us”o pas”ejał’i?,” ia skazaų “us”o, tol’k’i kartofl’i nie možna pasaž”ic” [‘he] comes “what’s new? Did you plant the potatoes already?” and I told “everything, but only we can’t plant potatoes” [M 1907 Saulkrasti, LV]*

### 2.2.7. Occurrence of the lexemes *жывёла/быдла/ском* ‘cattle’

Linguists registered at least nine lexemes defining *cattle*. In the Northern parts of Belarus adjoining Latvia, these are: *скаціна* (common across the whole of the country), *ском* (identical with Russian, occurring in dialects of North-East Belarus), *быдла* (identical with Polish *bydło*, occurring only in territory adjoining the border with Lithuania and Latvia) and less frequently, in North Belarus—*жывёла* (identical with the form in standard Belarusian); cf. DABM (1963: Karta 293).

Numerous interviews with informants showed that only the lexeme *ском* was popular with the indigenous population, but people who came here after 1945 used different words. During my field work I could register only *ском*, which indicates that the remaining ones are out of use.

- (24) *kałxozny skot pas”v’il’i, vot, i my z bratam iz”om, uže zaynaųšy karoų, i b’ažym įayady, z”eml’aniku takuju [‘we] herd farm cattle, and we go with my/our brother, after bringing the cattle, [we] run to [pick up] blueberries, strawberries’ [W 1936 Piedruja, LV]*
- (25) *c”ip’er u nas skata net, my uže nie z”eržym, a tak i koń byų i karo-va i us”o, xaz”ajstfa bylo, no ‘and now [we] have no cattle, we don’t keep [cattle], but we had a horse and cow and everything, [we] had a farm’ [W 1927 Vecborne, BY]*

2.2.8. Occurrence of the words *вёска/дзярэўня* 'a village'

Occurrence of three lexemes meaning *a village* is typical of the Belarusian territory. These are *вёска*, *дзярэўня* і *сяло*. All three forms occur in the whole territory of Belarus. *Сяло* is less frequent, *вёска* is the most common in the centre and West of the country and is identical with the form of standard Belarusian. The lexeme *дзярэўня*, in different phonetic variants, dominates in the East of the country, i.e. in the belt of North-Eastern dialects, and is closer to the Russian *деревня*.

Dialectological atlases show that the word *вёска* appears more frequently in the West (region of Mėry and Braslaў), but the word *дзярэўня* appears in parallel with the word *вёска* slightly farther to the East, near the village of Bihosava (cf. LABNH 1997: Karta 122). It can be assumed that Latgale should be an area where both lexemes occur.

Interviews with the indigenous population prove that only the lexeme *дзярэўня* existed in the territory of Latgale, but *вёска* appeared after 1945, together with the immigrants. An analysis of the material collected showed that the form *дзярэўня* definitely dominates (always among the indigenous population and often with the migrants); on the other hand, the word *вёска* was registered less frequently and only among people who came from the Northern part of Belarus.

- (26) *у з”арэўні us”o štak łučše, i karovu з”eržac”, is”v’iňonka з”eržac”, i kur’ica i avarody, us”o įos”c”* ‘in the village everything was better, and we kept a cow, and a pig, and chickens and gardens, everything is’ [W 1927 Piedruja, LV]
- (27) *a mama bl’iže Druia, c”ap’er з”арэўніu zovuc” Mark’i, raňše zval’i Trybux’i з”арэўніu, bal’šajia była* ‘mam [lived] closer to Druia, now the village is called Marki, before it was Trybuxi village, it was bigger [village]’ [W 1935 Kryvoselcy, BY]
- (28) *tancaval’i, tancaval’i, v’ečarynk’i byl’i, muzykanty byl’i svai u našaj v’osk’i* ‘they (used to) dance, they danced, there were parties, our (own) musicians in our village’ [W 1933 Lupandy, BY]

### 2.2.9. Occurrence of the words *хворы/бальны* ‘ill’

Dialectologists registered the occurrence of only two lexemes in the Belarusian territory to describe someone who is ill. These are *хворы* and *бальны*. It is difficult to define a precise border of this isogloss. However, the first word, identical to the Polish *chory*, occurs in central and West Belarus. The word *бальны* (similar to the Russian *больной*) was registered in the East.

Both forms were registered in the Braslaŭ and Mëry region by dialectologists (DABM 1963: Karta 319). Contemporary material I collected in South Latgale showed that only the lexeme *бальны* exists. The form *хворы* was not registered at all, even with the population who came here after the war. However, I came across the verb *хварэць*, ‘to be ill’, several times.

- (29) *ïon tam byu bal'noj, i navučyus" arazyavaryvac" pa ñem'ecku, i patom ïon tady udrau i pryjšou* ‘he [father] was there, sick, and he learned to speak German and then he ran away from there [from the concentration camp in Germany] and came back home’ [W 1927 Piedruja, LV]
- (30) *s"v'akroŭka sparal'izoŭvana, bal'naja inval'itka, ña možec" rab'onka ŷl'až"ec"* ‘mother in law was palsied, sick invalid, [she] can't take care of the child’ [W 1928 Krāslava (Priedaine), BY]

The material analysed makes it possible to observe some processes that have taken place in recent decades, namely:

- what the lexis of indigenous population looked or looks like (i.e. is there a further process of Russification?);
- how the speech of the people who came here after World War II merged with the vocabulary of the local people (who were under the influence of Russian much longer).

Several decades ago, the lexical stock of local inhabitants corresponded to what was typical of the belt of North-Eastern Belarusian dialects, i.e. it was closer to Russian. After the war, the vocabulary of the Belarusians who arrived from the Mëry and Braslaŭ region clearly showed a Western



nature, i.e. closer to standard Belarusian and very often similar to Polish forms.

In recent decades, there have been significant changes in the speech of immigrants, unifying it with the language of indigenous Belarusians and thus becoming similar to Russian. Therefore, we can talk about a process of ongoing change in the lexical stock within the migrant population. Initially, it was typically Belarusian, and is now showing mixed Belarusian-Russian features, with Russian dominant (parallel use of various lexemes to define the same objects not only within one village, but also even within the same utterances of identical informants, i.e. on an idiolectal level).

The mixed nature of the lexical stock was registered at other borderlands as well, e.g. the Belarusian-Russian one. Proxorova (1991: 23, 24) drew attention to the fact that one and the same interlocutor using Belarusian and Russian words in parallel is common at the border of the Mahilëü and Smolensk regions in historically transitional Belarusian-Russian dialects. The same nature of the lexical stock displayed itself in collected materials that became the basis for the dictionary of the Braslaü region, edited by Smułkowa (2009).

### 3. *Conclusions*

Above I have analysed the characteristics of Belarusian dialects functioning in the South-Eastern part of Latvia. The following characteristics are discussed on three levels: terminologically, statistically and lexically. The first one, i.e. the terminological level, is the most dubious. The best empirical results undoubtedly come from the statistics, but this involves collecting a lot of material from the whole area. The lexicon was analysed because of its specificity and the fact that it 'split off' the structure from the dialects researched. Lexical changes in diachronic understanding are of a slightly different nature and their process is not fully paralleled when compared to processes in phonetics or inflection. Nevertheless, the material analysed allows several general conclusions to be formulated:

(i) Dialects located between the Belarusian dialects and those of Greater Russia can be recognized rather as transitional, as part of both a diachronic and a synchronic approach (in relation to Belarusian dialects-dialects of Greater Russia), if we concentrate mainly on the speech of the indigenous and not the migrant population. As far as the local variant of

Russian is concerned (close to the standard language), we should rather discuss interference or the mixed nature of the dialect.

(ii) The speech of indigenous inhabitants and of those who arrived after World War II should be analysed at the same time, both in a diachronic and a synchronic approach. Certain language phenomena surfaced in the speech of the indigenous population decades earlier than in the language of the migrants.

(iii) Qualitative and quantitative analyses showed that the phonetic, inflectional and syntactic features betray Belarusian characteristics, while certain symptoms of Russian interference are also visible. One proto-Slavonic feature is realized in one situation in accordance with Belarusian and in another with Russian continuants. Statistically, Belarusian forms prevail. Therefore, it can be assumed that the process of mixing two language codes began decades ago. As a result, we can expect that, in future, local dialects will be mixed in nature on the level of the particular elements of the structure. This process started earlier in the speech of the indigenous population.

(iv) The lexical stock should be discussed separately, as it used to have West Belarusian (as far as the migrant population is concerned) and East Belarusian (with local inhabitants) characteristics. At present, we can observe the unification of the lexical stock of both groups, which is mainly Russian or typical of the North-East Belarusian dialect belt (frequently identical to the features of adjoining Russian dialects). In the case of the indigenous population, it can be understood that several decades ago its nature was mixed (at present it is becoming closer to Russian); on the other hand, these processes influenced the vocabulary of the migrant population later, which also acquired a mixed nature.

### *References*

- Astrejka, Vera, 2006, "Severnaja gruppa belorusskix govorov kak odna iz zon mežjazykovogo vzaimodejstvija," *Proceedings of the 4<sup>th</sup> International Congress of Dialectologists and Geolinguists*, ed. A. Timuska, Riga, pp. 25–31.
- Breidaks, Antons, 2007, "Ievads baltu valodniecība, 2 daļa," *Antons Breidaks: Darbu izlase 1*, eds. I. Jansone, A. Stafecka & V. Šaudiņa, Riga, pp. 567–96.

- Barszczewska, Nina & Mirosław Jankowiak, 2012, *Dialektologia białoruska*, Warsaw.
- Bogorodskij, B.L., 1968, *Pskovskie govory II: Trudy vtoroj Pskovskoj dialektologičeskoj konferencii 1964 goda*, Pskov.
- DABM (1963): *Dyialektalahičny atlas belaruskaj movy*, Minsk.
- Durnovo, N.N., N.N Sokolov & D.N. Ušakov, 1914, "Opyt dialektologičeskoj karty russkogo jazyka v Evrope: s priloženiem očerka russkoj dialektologii," *Trudy Moskovskoj Dialektologičeskoj Komissii 1915 5*, Moscow.
- Ferguson, Charles A., 1959, "Diglossia," *Word* 15, pp. 325–40.
- Fishman, Joshua A., 1985, "Bilingualism and Biculturalism as Individual and as Societal Phenomena," *The Rise and Fall of the Ethnic Revival: Perspectives on Language and ethnicity*, (ed.) J.A. Fishman, Berlin & New York, pp. 39–56.
- Giles, Howard, 1977, *Language, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations*, London.
- Jankoŭski, Fedar M., 1974, *Historyčnaja hramatyka belaruskaj movy: Častka I—uvodziny, fanetyka*, Minsk.
- Jankowiak, Mirosław, 2009, *Gwary białoruskie na Łotwie w rejonie kraślawskim. Studium socjolingwistyczne*, Warsaw.
- Jankowiak, Mirosław, 2010a, "Wielonarodowość i wielokulturowość Łatgalii w aspekcie społecznym i historycznym," *Językowe i kulturowe dziedzictwo Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego: Księga jubileuszowa na 1000-lecie Litwy*, eds. J. Mędelśka & Z. Sawaniewska-Mochowa, Bydgoszcz, pp. 48–55.
- Jankowiak, Miraslaŭ, 2010b, "Leksika belaruskamoŭnyx żyxaroŭ Lathalii (na przykładzie Kraslaŭskaha rajona)," *Polsko-białoruskie związki kulturowe, literackie i językowe*, eds. S. Kawaloŭ, R. Radzik & M. Saje-wicz, Lublin, pp. 397–406.
- Jankowiak, Miraslaŭ, 2010c, "Belaruskaja mova u Latvii: status, sfery vykarystannja, perspektyvy," *Acta Albaruthenica* 10, Warsaw, pp. 301–10.
- Jankowiak, Miraslaŭ, 2012, *Belaruskija havorki u Kraslaŭskim rajone Latvii. Sacyjalinhvistyčnaje dasledavanne*, Belastok-Vilnia.
- Karaś, Mieczysław, 1958, "Z problematyki gwar mieszanych i przejściowych," *Język Polski* 38 (4), pp. 286–96.
- Karskij, Evfimij, 1903, *Ėtnografičeskaja karta belorusskogo plemeni: Trudy Komissii po izučeniju plemennogo sostava naselenija Rossii 2*, Petrograd.

- Karskij, Evfimij, 1903–21, *Belorusy* 1, 2, Warsaw, 3, Moscow-Petrograd.
- Karskij, Evfimij, 1904, *Belorusy: Vvedenie k izučeniju belorusskoj slovesnosti s priloženjem dvux kart*, Vilnius.
- Klimčuk, Fiodar, 2003, “Peraxodnyja havorki i punkt adliku,” *Pograničza języków. Pogranicza kultur. Studia ofiarowane Elżbiecie Smułkowej*, ed. A. Engelking & R. Huszcza, Warsaw, pp. 88–91.
- Kryvicki, Alaksandr, 2003, *Dyjalektalohija belaruskaj movy*, Minsk.
- LABNH, 1993, *Leksičny atlas belaruskix narodnyx havorak* 1, Minsk.
- LABNH, 1997, *Leksičny atlas belaruskix narodnyx havorak* 4, Minsk.
- Landry, Rodrigue & Réal Allard, 1994, “Diglossia, Ethnolinguistic Vitality, and Language Behavior,” *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 108 (special issue: *Ethnolinguistic Vitality*), pp. 15–42.
- LH, 1969, *Linhvistyčnaja heahrafija i hrupoŭka belaruskix havorak*, eds. R.I. Avanesau, K.K. Atraxovič & Y.F. Mackevič, Minsk.
- LVDA(L), 1999, *Latviešu valodas dialektu atlants. Leksika*, eds. B. Bušmane, B. Laumane & A. Stafecka, Rīga.
- Mafecki, Mieczysław, 1933, “Do genezy gwar mieszanych i przejściowych (ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem granicy polsko-czeskiej i polsko-słowackiej),” *Slavia Occidentalis* 12, pp. 80–90.
- Michnevič, A., ed. 1994, *Belaruskaja mova: Ęncyklapedyja*, Minsk.
- Ostrówka, Małgorzata, 2001, *Współczesna mówiona polszczyzna na Łotwie*, Ph.D. diss., Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw.
- Proxorova, Svetlana, 1991, *Sintaksis perexodnoj russko-belorusskoj zony: areal’no-tipologičeskie issledovanija*, Minsk.
- Proxorova, Svetlana, 2002, *Eščë raz o jazykovej nepreryvnosti*, Minsk.
- Rastorgujev, Pavel, 1960, *Govory na territorii Smoleńščiny*, Moscow.
- Rudzīte, Marta, 2005, *Darbi latviešu dialektolōģijā*, Rīga.
- Shevelov, George, 1979, *A Historical Phonology of the Ukrainian Language*, Heidelberg.
- Smułkowa, E. (ed.), 2011, *Brasławszczyzna: Pamięć i współczesność*, vol. 2: *Słownictwo*, Warsaw.
- Smułkowa, Elżbieta, 2002a, “Pojęcie gwar przejściowych i mieszanych na polsko-białorusko-ukraińskim pograniczu językowym,” *Białoruś i pogranicza: studia o języku i społeczeństwie*, ed. E. Smułkowa, Warsaw, pp. 336–48.
- Smułkowa, Elżbieta, 2002b, “Propozycja terminologicznego zawężenia zakresu pojęć: ‘gwary przejściowe’ — ‘gwary mieszane’,” *Białoruś i po-*

- granicza. Studia o języku i społeczeństwie*, ed. E. Smułkowa, Warsaw, pp. 349–54.
- Smułkowa, Elżbieta, 2002c, “Dwujęzyczność po białorusku: bilingwizm, dyglosja, czy coś innego,” *Białoruś i pogranicza: studia o języku i społeczeństwie*, ed. E. Smułkowa, Warsaw, pp. 414–24.
- SPZB, 1979, *Sloŭnik belaruskix havorak paŭnočna-zachodnjaj Belarusi i jaje pahraničča* 1, Minsk.
- Stieber, Zdzisław, 1938, “Sposoby powstawania słowiańskich gwar przejściowych,” *Prace Komisji Językowej PAAU* 27, Kraków.
- Šykunova, H. & L. Jazykovič, eds. 2004, *Atlas historyi Belarusi: ad starožytnasci da našych dzjën: dadatak da 6-tomnaj* “*Encyklopedyi historyi Belarusi*,” Minsk.
- Wexler, Paul, 1977, *A Historical Phonology of the Belorussian Language*, Heidelberg.
- Wiemer, Björn & Aksana Erker, 2012/2013, “Übergangs- und Mischdialekte: eine unnötige begriffliche Differenzierung?” *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie* 69 (1), pp.1–55.
- Zaprudski, Siarhiej, 2007, “In the Grip of Replacive Bilingualism: The Belarussian Language in Contact with Russian,” *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 183, pp. 97–118.
- Zielińska, Anna, 2003, “Czy polszczyzna północnokresowa ma szanse przetrwania? (W świetle koncepcji dyglosji i żywotności etnolingwistycznej),” *Acta Baltico-Slavica* 27, pp. 97–109.