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Ethno-graphical boundaries of Whiteruthenia.

Whiteruthenian (Kryvian, Byelorussian) language and ethnographical traits are very distinct, but on the territories which belonged a long time to another state, the Whiteruthenian language and other ethnographical traits came more or less under foreign influence and it became sometimes necessary to prove that such territories are ethnographically Whiteruthenian.

In this article it is the language which determines almost exclusively the ethnographical boundaries.

Starting from the lake of Peipus from the point which lies north of town of Pechora, the boundary with Estonians runs approximately along the state boundary directly south so that the towns of Pechora and Izborsk remain on the Whiteruthenian side; reaching thus the Latvian boundary it goes further in the same direction to the railroad station Korsawka in the Lucyn district 1) which is considered the boundary of the Whiteruthenian homogeneous territory. From here the boundary runs southeast within 5-10 km of Sebesh district. Reaching the river Sinyucha, the boundary turns sharply to the west and from the lake Cherza — to the northwest, then it makes an archlike turn almost to the boundary of the district of Rezhytza, further it goes in a broken line southeast to the boundary of the Lucyn district with the Sebesh and Drysa districts. Between the towns of Rezhytza and Lucyn there are many isolated Whiteruthenian localities. The boundary runs further to the south west, approximately to the line dividing the districts of Lucyn, Rezhytza and Dzvinia from the Drysa district; in the direction of Dzvinia river, 6½ km west from Prydurisk. From this place the Whiteruthenian boundary follows the Dzvinia river to the west to the town of Dzvinia and then to the northwest to the town of Ilukst. The area east of Ilukst is inhabited by Whiteruthenians. There,

1) Beginning from this point the boundary with Latvians and Lithuanians is marked according to E. Kariskij „Etnograficzewska karta belorusskiego plemien“, Petrograd, 1918. Of course the administrative sections used by Kariskij are those of the year 1918. This division, naturally, does not correspond to the present division, however it facilitates the orientation. Concerning the present administrative sections, they change so rapidly, that it is impossible to keep track of them.
exactly on the boundary between the regions of Kurland and Kaunas ends the borderline between Whiteruthenia and Latvia.

From Ilukst the boundary runs south into the region of Kaunas then to the west of the lake Dryswyaty, cutting into the Novosalexandrowsk district.

From the lake Dryswyaty the boundary runs south towards the Vilnia region, to the Drzina river. Crossing the river Drzina it goes through the district of Svencyany in a broken line south and west near the Lithuanian counties of Tverech, Haducieiki, which are on the western side, Svencyany and Whiteruthenian counties Karnai, Lянтупы, Kameliski, which are on the southern side. Still further south Whiteruthenians live in a compact mass in the following counties: Stračia, Stvir, Smetavas, Nesantas, Yaseva, Zacekas, Voistama, Dubatova, Kabylkni, Vinhneva (all in the district of Svencyany.) Then, crossing the Zhamaiacinanka river, the boundary curves through the district of Vilaysia toward the west, almost to the town of Kernava, having the Lithuanian counties on the north — Yanishki, Gedrioci, Shyrvinty, Musniki and the Whiteruthenian counties on the south — Nyamenchyna, Padbyareze, Maishagola, Selechniki, Varvyani, Resha, Mitzkuń, Kardzeyewcy, Shumisk, Bystrytytsa, Rukoiame, Rudomina (all in the Vilaysia district.) Near the town of Kernava the Whiteruthenian boundary moves to the left bank of the Vyalla river and goes in a broken line toward the south, taking into Whiteruthenian territory the counties of Yewye and Troki, on the west the villages Mustsynyany, Dzwerdzieki, Baudancy, belonging to the district of Shamenishki and the village Talkava (Hanushishski county) and further Mizhryche. It leaves the station of Rudzisiki south and moves east and south east to the border of the district of Lida, even crossing it near Padboory. Then it moves along the borderline of the district of Lida leaving on the north the above mentioned Whiteruthenian county Selechniki. Next it runs into the district of Ashmyana whereas the Lithuanian territory contains the county Dzvenishki (with Lithuanian villages Utkuny, Besakony, Shadony, Staglany, Davaty, Mirkuny, Girdzynuny, Kanvalskii) and a part of the Whiteruthenian county of Sedilka with the villages of Hermanishki and Pashele; in this way the Whiteruthenian boundary has on the east the Whiteruthenian counties of Hrwozyshki, Halshany, Traby, on the south the villages of Sybostni, Heranyony, Sedilka, Palščiţa (the last three villages belong to the Sedilka county.) The rest of the counties of the district of Ashmyana are all Whiteruthenian. Further along the boundary cuts the northern part of the Lida district: from Heranyony south west almost to the station Bastysz on the Palese railway and on to Zabalase. From here the boundary goes to the north, leaving on the east the village Pelas and the Lithuanian county Rudam. The mixed county of Eisbyshki remains on the Whiteruthenian side (Novy Dvor, Paradun, Brataloža, Harnastele) and Nacha of the county of Kanyava on the whole Lithuanian. From Eisbyshki the boundary runs south west, leaving on the eastern side the county of Dubocy, to lake Dub. That part of Lida district situated south from there is exclusively Whiteruthenian. In the northern part of the district the Alexandrova county belongs still to the Lithuanian counties (villages Rakishki, Horadna, Kozakowshchyna, Narkushki). From lake Dub the Whiteruthenian boundary goes directly to the borderline of the Horadzen region where the river Ratničanka joins the river Nyoman near Druzgeniki.

The Whiteruthenian language is spoken in the region of Suvalki, in the south eastern part of the Seiny district and in almost the whole district of Augустow.

In the region of Suvalki the neighbors of Whiteruthenians from north west and west are the Poles. Further along the boundary goes from the river Nyoman in the direction of Kopceva to the canal of Augustow and along the canal to the town of Augustow and along the river Nets to the boundary with the region of Horadzen.

In the region of Horadzen the neighbors of Whiteruthenians are the Poles. The boundary goes in a southern direction near Suchyola and Karycin westward toward Knyshyn and Khaooshche (14 km west from Belastok.) then it goes through Suraž to the Narwar river *) and from there to Mizhryche, in the Bela Poldaska district. 2) At Mizhryche starts the borderline with the Ukrainian ethnographic territory, and runs in the southeastward direction in a diagonal line to Lubyaz, so that it misses the town of Bela Poldaska. *) and the city

*) Up to this point the boundary is drawn according to the above mentioned map of Karakij.

2) Whiteruthenian-Polish boundary, drawn in this article, hardly differs from the Polish ethnographical boundary in the east, found in the collective grammar of the Polish linguists: "Język polski i jego historia..." (Encyklopedya polska, t. II-dział III (wz. II), 1915, 253-254) and "Mapa dialektów polskich". 2) I have lived some time at Bela Poldaska and studied the lan-
of Berezoe by 10-15 km. in the south. From Lubyadz the boundary goes to Dubrovitsa and then to the point 16 km north from Alewsk. Further on it runs in same south easterly direction to Patapoivy of the Arruch district and from there to the entrance of the river Ceceraw into Dnepr. On the Whiteruthenian side there are the towns of Charnabyl, Kahanovichy, Awruch, Slavechna, Khabnove and on the Ukrainian side Karascen, Alewsk and Sarny. 4) From the entrance Ceceraw into Dnepr the boundary runs to the town of Oscev by the Dzyasna river and along the river to the mouth of Seim, then it goes directly eastward to point below the city of Hlukhaw. 5) From there the boundary goes south and adds to the ethnographical Whiteruthenia the northeastern part of the district of Pucivel, with the town of Pucivel. In the South the borderline between the Ukrainian and the Whiteruthenian language is the river Seim and in the East the boundary between the Russian and Whiteruthenian language is the eastern boundary of the district of Pucivel. 7) From there on the boundary of the Russian language goes to the north, 25 km east from the town of Dzmitrawsk of the former Kursk region and somewhat east from the towns of Dzmitrawsk and Karachew of the former Orel region. Then it turns slowly eastward toward the town of Bolhnow, from there to the town of Belew, then along the Akra river to the mouth of Vshna, further to the town of Medyn and to the village of Matayewa, which lies somewhat east of the town of Hzhatzak. From here the line proceeds on the right bank of the river Hzhatzak, at a distance of 10-14 km to the borderline between the former regions of Tver and Smalensk.

The boundary drawn in this way brings into the Whiteruthenian language area, many important peculiarities prove that the language is Whiteruthenian; about 10-15 km south from Belsa Podlaska the Ukrainian traits begin to predominate, but even there many Whiteruthenian peculiarities remain.

4) I explained the Whiteruthenian ethnographical character of the territory, north from the described boundary in my article: Dryvivitsa ("Veda", 1952, p. 162-165, about the language see p. 164, and in the article "Dzierwianie" (ibid, p. 165-176, especially p. 171-176).


6) I explained the Whiteruthenian character of the above mentioned part of the Pucivel district in the article "Whiteruthenians of the Pucivel district of the former Kursk region" ("Veda", 1952, p. 241-250).
tionary administrative division it includes the most southern part of the former districts of Hæow and Læha of the former Petersburg region, almost all the Pukow region with the exception of the part of the Porčava district and a large part of the former Tver region. It was generally thought that only the large southern part of the former Pukow region, part of Apocka, Vyallyky Luki and Tarapač districts and a large western part of the Tver region are White Russian territories and the major part was considered to be Russian ethnographical territory. I shall mention the language of this territory, i.e. of Pukow and western Tver region. The same language is spoken in both of them. The language of the Pukow relics differs since the oldest times from the language of the Novgorod relics, i.e. also from the Russian language, since this is the language of the great Novgorod. The old language of the Pukow region was studied especially by N. Karinskaž and A. Shchamatañ. Karinskaž discovered a great difference between the language of the Pukow relics from the 15th and the 14th centuries. He explained this difference through the influence of the White Russian language on the Pukow language and he formulated a hypothesis of the White Russian colonists in the Pukow region in the 13th or in the beginning of 14th century. According to Karinskaž it must have been an extensive colonisação, because the Pukow language of the 15th century had all „the more important phonetical and partly also morphological White Russian peculiarities“, and „the White Russian influence affected the whole Pukow region“. He based his thesis about the late arrival of White Russians into the land of a different Slavic people only on a few linguistic traits, found in the relics, without having any historical or other facts to support it. But his linguistic basis proved illusory. After studying all the facts, Shchamatov stated, that „actually the relics from the 14th cent. hf fewer White Russian traits than those from the 15th cent.; however this could have happened in connection with the fact, that the literature in Pukow came in the 14th or in the first half of the 14th cent. directly under the influence of the Novgorod literature, and that there are no facts explaining the proximity of the Pukow and White Russian dialects through White Russian settlement in the Pukow region. Shchamatov „is inclined to consider the language tie, binding Pukow and White Russian primateval, created through the primeval neighborhood of Pskoviches and White Russians“.

Shchamatov has also found that those traits of Pukow relics, which are absent in the present White Russian language, existed in the White Russian relics of that time, but they were orthographical traits in both of them, brought from Western Bulgaria and Serbia. Besides, it became apparent that such a difference as existed between the Pukow relics of the 14th cent. and those of later times, existed also in the White Russian relics of the same period.

But the opinion of that prominent linguist was not heeded and the Moscow Dialectal Commission in its „Ocherk russkoj dialektologii“ from 1915, referring only to Karinskaž, states that White Russians arrived in Pukow later than the NorthRussians, that the dialect of Pukow is basically NorthRussian with a White Russian layer no older than from the 14th cent.

The Pukow region was 450 years under the assimilating influence of centralistic Moscow and the language was very much russified. But in spite of this, a student of the Pukow language of 1930 says: „All this does not justify us in placing the Pukow dialect among the north-Russian. This dialect is nearer, in our opinion, to the White Russian dialects, what coincides with the opinion of prof. Buzuk, explained in his work: „Ля характерыстцы паўночна-беларускых дыялектаў. — Гутаркі Незалежна г. Вялікае панетка“ (K. A. Неромодская: Говоры дер. Савкино Пушкинского района Псковского округа НРССР, III-2, 1930, б.ч. 597).

The author of this article studied the old and the present Pukow dialect and hopes to publish it as a grammatical treatise. Only a few conclusions of that work will be mentioned here: With the exception of the groups hl, kl. (myhla, pamiaklo) instead of the general White Russian (myla, pamiaklo) all the peculiarities of the Pukow dialect are common either to all White Russian language, or to many of its dialects. Almost all these peculiarities are foreign to the Russian language. After analyzing the traits of the Pukow dialect, noone can doubt, that from the historical point of view it is a pure White Russian language, in its present state it is also White Russian, but much russified language. Change of e and ê (calaviek), š and š (šadni, instead šadni), ž and ž, dissimilating akanie, fusion of š and š, old form of esse in 1st pers. pl. show that the dialect of Pukow belongs to the northern group of White Russian dialects. Because of its groups hl, kl instead of all White Russian l, from protoslavic dl, tl, the Pukow dialect has to a certain measure an individual place in the northern

vytoki.net
The Great Principality of Polatsk had three important centers: Polatsk, Vicebak, and Menak; the most important being Polatsk. This state always included the territory of three regions — later on in the Russian times a region was called a gubernia — the whole region of Vicebak, a large part of Mahilew region with the exception of Minsk- 

Historical boundaries.

The territory of the former Whiteruthenian state was not always the same, and therefore we shall consider the historical Whiteruthenian territory and its boundaries in specific historical periods. There are two main periods in the history of the Whiteruthenian state: 1) a period of individual states and 2) a period of the united state, which was called the Great Lithuanian Principality or Lithuania.

Individual Whiteruthenian States.

More or less documentary history of Whiteruthenia begins in the middle of the ninth century, when the Whiteruthenian tribes were organized in their own separate states. At that time the Normans (Swedes and Norwegians) appeared in the Eastern Europe and shortly afterwards the Ukrainian Kiev became their main center. They attacked the Whiteruthenian territory, plundering rather than levying contributions and letting otherwise the states lead their accustomed life. However, a change occurred during the reign of Vladimir of Kiev in 980, who tried to conquer the Whiteruthenian territory and thus giving an example to his successors, started the wars between the Whiteruthenian states on one hand and the Ukrainians with the Kiev state at the head on the other. The wars with variable outcome resulted finally in the Whiteruthenian victory in that sense, that the states preserved their independence, which fact was legalized at a convention in the Sever town Lubich in 1097. With the exception of Great Principality of Polatsk, which was quite independent, the other states were obliged to help the Ukraine only in case of wars with wandering Turko-Tatars, Whiteruthenians fulfilled this duty very rarely and only when forced by circumstances. On the contrary, the regular allies of Whiteruthenians against Ukrainians were Turko-Tatar tribes (Pecheneg, Kozars, and especially Polowtzi).

We shall enumerate the individual Whiteruthenian states of this period.

...
nian-Drybiclw principality with the greater in Turov near Prypyat. However, when the count Yaroslav son of Vladimir defeated the Turov count Svystopolk, 1017, the principality of Turov was liquidated. With the loss of independence, Turov was governed by younger Kiev counts. The independence of this Dnieperianian Drybiclw state was regained in the middle of the 12th cent. when Kiev became weak and did not play a former role. The main center was again Turov and a smaller one was Plesk. The territory of Turov-Plesk principality was Paleian.

The Great Principality of Razan was inhabited by the White Ruthenian tribe Vyatiches. It contained the following regions: recently gubernias: Razan, Tula, Kala, part of Moscow and a greater part of Orel gubernias. Razan was fought long and stubborn wars with Moscow. With the exception of that part of Vyatiches territory which lies west from the upper Aka, the language of Vyatiches is rusified. However it retained so many White Ruthenian peculiarities, that there can be no doubt about its former White Ruthenian character.

Great Pakow. The great White Ruthenian tribe Kryviches formed not only their own pure tribal state, the Great Princogality of Smolensk and partly Kryvian Great Principality of Polotsk, but also a pure Kryvian Republic — the Great Pakow. Its territory spread by the lake Peips and along the Vyatiches river which enters the lake. At first the Great Pakow was a vassal of the Great Novgorod. In order to liberate Pakow the Great Principality of Polotsk fought long, bitter wars with Novgorod. In 1136 Pakow gained freedom and became independent. It was famous for its commerce and wealth. The inhabitants of Pakow were hostile toward Novgorod as their former conqueror who even after political liberation opposed their independence in church matters, namely their own episcopate, separate from Novgorod.

The Kryviches of Tver. A large number of Kryviches lived in the Great Principality of Tver. They constituted probably about 1/3 of all inhabitants. Besides White Ruthenians there lived also Novgorodians and probably Sarmatians. According to our known sources White Ruthenians were the minority in the Principality of Tver, i.e. they belonged to another state than their own. But on the other side, it is well-known that the Principality of Tver was antagonistic toward Moscow and united often with the Principality of Smolensk and Great Lithuanian Principality which supported and defended it against Moscow.

The importance of the afore mentioned states in political history of White Ruthenian is great. They are also significant as an argument for renewal of political independence of White Ruthenian. We can take the Czech Sudeten as an example. In spite of the fact that in the 11-13 cent. they were settled by a compact mass of German colonists, the Czechs claimed it as their historical territory and succeeded in 1918 to include it into Czechoslovakia. The White Ruthenian states are even more significant for the renewal of political independence, because they are now occupied not by a foreign, but by their own people.

However there are also weak points here. One of them is that the states were not united, although feeling of national unity and political solidarity existed and sometimes expressed itself strongly. Another weak point is that they existed too long before. Therefore prof. Chubatyi holds the opinion in his article printed in 1951 in the ukrainian newspaper Svyoboda that as an argument for renewal of the Ukrainian state, it is necessary to point to the Galitzino-Vyshyn state rather than to Kiev Russ; the former lasted 409 years from the Tatar occupation, i.e. 1240-1649.

The Great Lithuanian Principality.

The arguments about the White Ruthenian character of the historical Lithuania are given by me in Veda, April-June issue 1951. Because of its long existence from the middle of the 13th to the end of the 18th cent., because of its political greatness, its territory, cultural level, political order and perfectly formulated law system, the Great Lithuanian Principality is an enormous argument for the political independence of White Ruthenian. The Great Lithuanian Principality united within its boundaries all the White Ruthenian regions with the exception of the White Ruthenian part of the Tver Principality; but even this part aspired toward the union with Lithuania, under which influence, defense and for some time protection it was. We can safely say that not one of the nations forming at present the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics can boast of such past as the White Ruthenians have, thanks to the period of the Great Lithuanian Principality. Among all the so-called Slav, only Poland can be compared with the Great Lithuanian Principality, in some cases being superior, in other inferior. In law, military organization, foreign and domestic policy of the rulers and government in general, White Ruthenian in the period of Great Lithuanian Principality doubtless was superior to Poland. To 16th cen...
it was also culturally superior, later on Poland has a decidedly higher cultural level. Up to the Union of Lublin 1569 the territory of White-
 ruthenian state was much larger than that of Poland. Moscow-Russia, of course, through the length of existence, its territorial extent and its later greatness surpassed White ruthenia, but in its political organiza-
tion, law and its culture to the 19th cent. remained far behind White-
ruthenia. Concerning cultural level of popular masses, White ruthenia
even now stands above Russia.

I have explained the territorial development of the united White-
ruthenian state in Veda, April-June issue, 1951 where I refer the readers. Here I shall mention only the annexation of the far situated White-
ruthenian and foreign lands. Beginning with the reign of the Great
 Count Gedimin, 1316-1341, Pakow belonged to the united White-
ruthenian state. The rulers of the Great Lithuanian Principality defended it with their military and political power, supported it in church matters, sent there their adherers as rulers and their substitutes. In 1396-97 the
Great Principality of Razan was added to Lithuania. Aukshytas, one
of the two parts of the present Lithuania was annexed to the united
White ruthenian state under its first ruler Mindow. In the middle of
the 14th cent. the Ukrainian lands were added and in the second half of this century, during the reign of Olgert, the White ruthenians
occupied the northern shores of the Black Sea from the mouth of the
Dnepr river to the mouth of Dniester. In 1411 Samogitias became a
part of this state.

In the last quarter of the 15th cent. difficulties began for the
White ruthenian state. It had to fight simultaneously the successor of
Tatars, Moscow and mighty then Turkey. Therefore White ruthenia
lost many of its lands at the end of the 15th cent. and beginning of
the 16th cent. At first it lost the northern shores of the Black Sea
which were won by Turkey. The Great Principality of Razan became
dependent on Moscow in 1489 and was entirely liquidated by it in
1520. The White ruthenian lands along the upper Aka were seized
by Moscow in 1503. At the same time the Smalensk region was lost
with the exception of its western part. Also the Bransk and Sever
regions were lost with the exception of a small area in the west. However in the beginning of the 17th cent. White ruthenians regained them from
Moscow and the state boundaries spread beyond Palanowska and Mar
salsk, Bransk and Trubchewsk. Such was the situation till 1667, when
they were lost by the treaty of Andrusow.

Pakow became dependent on Moscow in 1464 and was subjugated
by it in 1509. At the end of 70ies and beginning of 80ies of the 16th
cent. in the time of war with Moscow, White ruthenia occupied almost
all the Pakow region, but through the treaty of 1582 only greater
part of the Pakow region with Vyalikiy Luki, Kholm and others
remained in the White ruthenian state. They remained there till the
treaty of Andrusow, in 1667.

During the war with Moscow, with interruptions from 1558-1582
and with Sweden and Denmark, the Poles in 1569 took away from
White ruthenians the Ukrainian territory (with the consent of the Ukran
ians) and a large part of White ruthenian ethnographical lands i. e.
part of Padlyashsha (later districts of Belastok, Apgustow and part of
others), southern part of Eastern Palese, (south from the later
administrative boundary of Menak with Kiev region and Volyn (the
territory along the river Vuzh with the towns of Charnabyl, Awruch
and others) and also the territory which was not occupied by Moscow
the western part of Sever (Lubech and other towns). In 1646 this
part of Sever region was given back to White ruthenia. In 1772, at the
time of the first division of the Polish White ruthenian Republic, Russia
usurped the White ruthenian lands situated east from the rivers Divina,
Druya and Dnepr (almost all the region of Vicebsk, the northern
part of Polatszak, all the Imsloisk region, small part of Menak and
Inlands. With the second division of the Republic Russia usurped the
region of Menak, part of the Vilny, Nowhardak and Berese regions.
In 1795 with the third division Russia usurped the Lithuanian territory
and the rest of the White ruthenian ethnographical lands with the
exception of Belastok which was given to Prussia and the district Bela
Padlyaska, which was added to Austria. The Belastok district was annesed by Russia in 1807 and Bela Padlyaska district in 1814 after the
war with Napoleon. (Afterwards Russia turned over the Bela Padlyaska
district to the Polish Congressional State (the territory which was
given to Russia by the decision of the Congress in Vienna.)

All the afore mentioned territories which for a long time formed
individual White ruthenian states or were for a long time part of the
united White ruthenian state — the Great Lithuanian Principality —
are White ruthenian historical territories and their boundaries are histor
ical White ruthenian boundaries. Among the above mentioned territe
ories, the White ruthenian ethnographical ones were much longer a part
of their own state than a part of a foreign state.