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Summary

From 1795 to 1914 the Russian Empire controlled Lithuania. It instilled a ban on Latin letters for Lithuanian texts that lasted for almost forty years (1865–1904). During that time almost sixty Lithuanian books in Cyrillic (i.e., Russian) letters were printed mostly by the initiative of the imperial administrators in Lithuania. Underground Lithuanian books and newspapers were printed in Latin script abroad and dispersed by knygnešiai (book carriers) and read illegally in Lithuania. At the same time, schools that had been teaching Lithuanian were also closed and so-called public “Russian schools” were introduced as a countermeasure to the spreading network of underground private “home” schools, which taught Lithuanian in Latin script.

The book The Experts of Lithuanian in Service of the Russian Empire: Dmitrii Kashirin, Zakharii Lyatskii, and Andrius Poidėnas (Vilnius: Institute of the Lithuanian Language, 2011) recounts linguistic biographies of the three experts who served the administration of the Vilnius Education District to prepare, edit, evaluate, review, and correct certain Lithuanian texts in Cyrillic. Most of the Lithuanian Cyrillic texts approved by the imperial administrators in the Vilnius Education District were distributed to the schools and the populace in the form of primers and public readings. In the rare cases of private initiatives to print Lithuanian books in Cyrillic alphabet (e.g., that of Juozapas Miliuskas), the experts were used by the administrators to criticize and to reject the unwelcome proposals.

By and large this book deals with the life and work of Kashirin, Lyatskii, and Poidėnas: the three experts producing and evaluating Lithuanian Cyrillic during the 1867–1901 period of the ban on Latin script. It does not cover, however, the initial period of Lithuanian Cyrillization from 1864 to 1867, which is associated with the names of other experts: Stanisław Mikucki, Laurynas Ivinskas, Jonas Krečinskas, and Tomas Žilinskas.

1. Dmitrii Kashirin

Dmitrii Kashirin was born January 16, 1812, in Russia, in the vicinity of the city of Penza. After graduating from Moscow University, Kashirin mostly worked as a teacher of Russian in Belarus (Pinsk, 1832–1842; Bobruisk, 1842–1843). It was only in 1844 that he first came to Kaunas, a Lithuanian-speaking territory. In 1846 Kashirin
moved to Ukmergė, where he worked for more than ten years (1846–1855). Then he
returned to Belarus (Slutsk, 1855–1859) and in a few years came back to Lithuania
(Švenčionys, 1859–1860; Vilnius, 1860; Kėdainiai, 1861–1864; Kaunas, 1864–1867). Af-


er Kashirin retired in 1868, he settled in Kalnas Estate (now the district of Pasvalys)
where he eventually died July 3, 1896.

1.1. Sources of Мóкслась дель Ишмóкима

Kashirin was given a task by the administrators of the Russian Empire in Vilnius
to prepare the primer Мóкслась дель Ишмóкима Литовскаго-Русскаго Скрипта и
Арифметики (“A Textbook of Russian-Lithuanian Script and Arithmetic,” МДИ,
1868). At the beginning, the administrators planned that the new primer would be
prepared by Jonas Krečinskis, who had previously transliterated a number of Lithu-
anian books to the Cyrillic alphabet and who was only supposed to amend his book
Буквáрсъ (“Primer”, 1865). However, Krečinskis failed to fulfill the task in time, and
it fell to Kashirin. He had had some experience in textbook publishing: in 1835 he
published his Грамматические Уроки Русского Языка (“Lessons in Russian Grammar”).
The book was severely criticized by Vissarion Belinskii, a literary critic and Kashirin’s
classmate from the years of Penza gymnasium.

Regardless of the initial plan, Kashirin was not preparing МДИ exclusively on the
basis of Krečinskis’ Буквáрсъ. Kashirin collected most Lithuanian books printed dur-
ing the first three years of Lithuanian publications in Cyrillic (1864–1867) and used
them for his new primer. Finally, Kashirin published a Lithuanian primer in Cyrillic
characters, which had been so far the most voluminous (127 pages). Seven sources of
Kashirin's МДИ have been identified (there might have been more): (1) Мокслась
Скай тима Рашта, transliterated by Krečinskis (“a textbook of reading,” МСР,
1867); (2) Буквáрсъ, prepared by Krečinskis; (3) Абецеле Жемайтишкай-Аптувики by
Stanisław Mikucki and Laurynas Ivinskis (“An Alphabet of Lowland [Lithuanian] and
Lithuanian,” Абецеле, 1864); (4) Абецеле Аптувики-Русишка by Tomas Žilinskis
(“An Alphabet of Lithuanian and Russian,” АЛР, 1865); (5) a calendar of 1867 by
Krečinskis; (6) Актасъ иръ Потерей by Jeronimas Račkauskis, transliterated by
Krečinskis (“Act and Prayers,” 1867); 7) Сенасъ Аукса Алторюсъ by Tadas Juzumas
and Račkauskis, transliterated by Ivinskis, corrected by Krečinskis (“Old Golden
Altar,” САА, 1866).

Kashirin used the sources to a different extent. From МСР he only adopted the
lexicon of two prayers for the glosses (МДИ, p. 106); from Буквáрсъ he took the bulk
texts of Абецеле as well as two secular stories and sayings and proverbs (МДИ, pp. 108–
19). From АЛР Kashirin adopted most sentences and short texts putting them in two
different places (МДИ, pp. 23–26, 88–99). Kashirin made use of a single text from
Krečinskis’ calendar of 1867 (Трумпа Жійни апей Искуруюсъ Гывентоюсъ. . . [“Short
Information about the Population. . . ”]; МДИ, pp. 99–105); he might have referred to
another text as well (МДИ, p. 107). Kashirin included three religious texts from
Račkauskis’ Aktaсь ирь Потерей (МДИ, pp. 111–12). From Juzumas and Račkauskis’ Сенасъ Аукса Алторюсъ he might have adopted some forms (e.g., МДИ, pp. 80–81).

Kashirin treated the materials of the sources differently: some were substantially transformed whereas others remained untouched. The texts of МСР and Буквáрсъ underwent most modifications. Абецеле had fewer modifications. Even fewer were found in АЛР. The text of Krečinskis’ calendar of 1867 was hardly modified at all, and Актасъ ирь Потерей remained untouched.

1.2. Dialects

The sources that were substantially modified (mostly МСР and Буквáрсъ, also Абецеле) testify to Kashirin’s attitude to editing. First of all, Kashirin tried to eliminate at least some features of the Lowland Lithuanian dialect: from Буквáрсъ (мýна → ма́на; Памьлинуты → памьлиноти) as well as from Абецеле (анам → ямь; кансня → кáсня). However, even after Kashirin’s modifications several Lowland Lithuanian word forms were preserved; they had slipped from Буквáрсъ (г渡олей; праале́йтись; сöдни) as well as from Абецеле (в élт; тусь).

When editing the texts of the sources, Kashirin inserted some forms which mostly resembled Eastern Highland Lithuanian subdialects (the following forms were added to МСР text: Герáусись; пайдуть; унись; to Буквáрсъ: гардумась; га́уть; грайчáу; to Абецеле: аплайскъ; мань; Унпра́сы). Kashirin knew some Lithuanian, the Eastern Highland Lithuanian subdialect.

When correcting the sources, Kashirin added items which sometimes remind not only dialectal forms widely spread on the territory of Eastern Highlanders, but also those confined exclusively to Panevёžys subdialects. Especially when editing the language materials from Буквáрсъ, Kashirin used <о> to spell the acc. sg. flexion (a in Proto-Lithuanian; pronounced as [ọ] in Panevёžys subdialect): дено; ко; вайдрики-ти → лауме́сь ю́сто (a similar form occurred when correcting Абецеле: мотино). Kashirin, a non-native speaker of Lithuanian, might have spelt <о> due to the interference of Russian (the unstressed Russian <о> is usually pronounced as [a]). However, Kashirin preserved such <о> only in the acc. sg. flexion excluding it from other [a] positions, which probably shows that Kashirin’s examples referred to Panevёžys subdialect. The monophthongized flexion <у> [ọ] in the position of the diphthong [au] (from Буквáрсъ) must have been adopted from the same subdialect (скáйты → скáйты).

The МДИ Lithuanian fragments whose sources have not been identified include (1) section “Азбука” (“Alphabet,” pp. 1–13); (2) two large sections “Калбэй” (“Dialogues,” pp. 27–35) and “Калбэй апе Аритмэтикосъ” (“Dialogues on Arithmetic,” pp. 35–37); (3) section “Мѣрасъ” (“Measurements,” pp. 120–24). All of them contain forms of Eastern Highland dialect, cf. “Азбука”: вáрла; лъ́ика; па́рхине; also “Калбэй” and “Калбэй апе Аритмэтикосъ”: лáйстъ; сесла; унты. Such usage conforms to the fragments inserted by Kashirin in the materials of the sources. Only the section “Мѣрасъ” had no Eastern Highland dialectal forms.

SUMMARY
“Азбука” also has the acc. sg. flexion <o> characteristic of Panevėžys subdialect: жёмо; палдё; лёпо. The same flexion <o> has been also found in two other sections—“Kalbėj” and “Kalbėj ape Aritmėtikosъ”: литото висаро; дідяло няуо; трі-чо далі.

Another feature of Panevėžys subdialect is concerned with the monophthongization of the diphthongs [au], [ai], [ei] in unstressed syllables or syllables with ascending intonation in word-final position, cf. “Азбука”: пётосъ павалюю, also—“Kalbėj” and “Kalbėj ape Aritmėtikosъ”: ашъ тау дяю; Ту парайси гёрзі.

Still another feature of Panevėžys subdialect refers to the unstressed open word-final wide [e] (in the position of the narrow [e] in the Western Highland dialect); cf.: “Азбука”: кулпоя; “Kalbėj” and “Kalbėj ape Aritmėtikosъ”: дяя; Мергіята.

To conclude, the sections of МДИ with unidentified sources “Азбука,” “Kalbėj,” and “Kalbėj ape Aritmėtikosъ” were definitely prepared by Dmitrii Kashirin, the same person who edited and modified texts from Букваръ and Абецеле, who somewhat spoke the Eastern Highland subdialect, more specifically, the Panevėžys subdialect.

The section “Мѣрасъ” has some features not quite characteristic of Kashirin’s writings, like forms from the Lowland dialect, e.g., nasal gen. pl. forms stressed in the word-final syllable: аслюсъ; грудусъ; лауксъ (alongside the forms which have not preserved the nasal resonance: адіну; мийнесъ; скиспуту); also cf. iness. sg. минуто and the lexeme Пинингу. The above manifests the features of a person who knows the Lowland dialect fairly well. “Мѣрасъ” must have been adopted from some other text and not thoroughly edited by Kashirin.

Kashirin’s knowledge of Lithuanian dialects can be related to his biography this way: during a longer period of his life in Ukmergė (1846–1855) and later, during a much shorter period in Švenčionys (1859–1860), he must have learned Eastern Highland subdialects (more specifically, of Panevėžys area [in Ukmergė]); during his life in Kaunas (1844–1846; 1864–1867) and Kėdainiai (1861–1864), he might have learned some Western Highland subdialects.

1.3. Knowledge of Dialects

When editing Lithuanian texts, Kashirin made mistakes. For example, when correcting a text adopted from Букваръ, Kashirin chose wrong grammatical number, case, and gender: Ансъ иштійсы (игіѣ) сау пыйкъсъ балнусъ (исау гава пыйкъосъ балносъ); Арғъ гьло бьть пьйсингай кантей свита? Similar errors can be found in “Kalbėj” and “Kalbėj ape Aritmėtikosъ”: анйнше йосъ пятуеи иръ матуеи; ду акисъ. A native speaker could hardly have made such obvious slips.

An exclusive feature of Kashirin’s publication МДИ is the corrections given in footnotes. They must have been made in Abel’ Syrkin’s printing house, when the text was being typed; some footnotes have a rather direct reference to the proofreader’s notes. (Kashirin himself would not have needed to make references to his own mistakes; upon noticing, he might have easily corrected them in the text.) There are almost two hundred footnotes made by a proofreader; for example, he explained the mean-
ings of the words павэйкласъ, тупти, and чиркшти, and claimed that Lithuanian had no neuter gender (Kashirin’s кóжнасъ-на-но), etc. Such explanatory footnotes are quite unique in the history of Lithuanian press. One of Syrkin’s employees knew Lithuanian much better than the author of the textbook. After МДИ Kashirin received no further assignments concerning the Lithuanian language.

Obviously, Kashirin had had some skills in Lithuanian dialects: the Eastern and Western Highland dialects (including subdialect of Panevėžys area). His Lithuanian language skills, however, remained rather poor.

1.4. Spelling

In the texts produced or edited by Kashirin himself, the principles of spelling are fairly uniform.

<ѣ>. Like Krečinskis, Kashirin tended to use the yat <ѣ> in Lithuanian word roots in cases where he identified a similarity with Russian word roots (with the same character); thus, from Буквáрсъ he adopted ындосъ; ужъ гелъшъ; the words from Абецеле corrected in the following way: аптурсъ → аптърысъ; светимасъ → светитымасъ. Where he saw no similarity with Russian roots, he spelt <е>; thus, from Буквáрсъ he adopted венамъ; жемы; the words from Абецеле modified in the following way: дьна → дена; дайлечкувой → далежкувой. Kashirin also spelled the Lithuanian locative singular case flexion as <ѣ>, which was typical of the prepositional case (предложный) in Russian; so from Буквáрсъ he adopted варгъ; счестимъ; the words from Абецеле modified in the following way: саве → савеѣ.

<э>. Kashirin used <э> to spell the first component of the diphthongs [ai], [ei] in unstressed syllables or syllables having ascending intonation; thus, the words taken from Буквáрсъ were modified to his liking: вейкий → вейкэй; дарьйсы → дарьйсыъ; some other words taken from Абецеле were corrected accordingly: Свейка → Свезика.

<э> was used to spell the sound [e]. Krečinskis used it rather frequently; Kashirin even more so; cf. some modified words from Буквáрсъ: гейй → гейй; гиинйма → гиийма; also from Абецеле: вести → востъ; месъ → мясъ.

<о>. Kashirin usually spelt the diphthongoid [уо] using the single grapheme <о>; probably due to the interference of Russian. Thus, in Буквáрсъ he modified the forms of the Highland dialect in the following way: Атитдымъ → атитдымъ; Пусногасъ → пусногасъ. Even in cases when he transferred Krečinskis’ form, Kashirin often added his own parallel form with <о>: Аньсь дудосъ → Аньсь дуосъ (лісь досъ); дубесь → дубесъ (дубесъ).

<ъ>. Kashirin did not insist on using <у>; he rejected some of Krečinskis’ <у> graphemes used in Буквáрсъ: апъёмъ → апъёми; Кемпшйнесъ → кемпшнине. However, in some words he preserved the character: въсы; мокитьнысъ.

<ъ>. Kashirin tended to write the yer <ъ> in the word-final position after a hard (dark) consonant; for example, he added the yer <ъ> when transferring some texts, despite that in Абецеле it was not used in the word-final position.

<жа>, <жу>, <ча>. Following the rules of Russian spelling, Kashirin often used the characters <а> and <у> even after palatalized consonants <ж> and <ч>; for example,
Абецеле tended to adhere to the phonetic spelling; Kashirin, however, introduced modifications: жожюс → жожус; їшведжяў → їшведжажаў; Тречас → Тречась.

The above illustrates only Kashirin’s approach; still he was not very consistent in all sections of МДИ. For example, when editing Žilinskis’ АЛР, Kashirin preserved his own distribution of <ѣ> and <е> as well as the character <о> to spell [uo]. However, he hardly ever used his usual <э> to spell the first component of the diphthongs [ai] and [ei]. Neither did he, following Žilinskis, use the yer <ъ> in word-final positions. Limited modifications of АЛР do not suggest that Kashirin necessarily rewrote the excerpts of the book in full, the modifications could have been marked in the printed text. Even fewer corrections were made in the text “Трумпа Жійни апей Исикируююсь Гивентоюсь…” taken from Krečinskis’ calendar of 1867; its spelling was hardly changed. Three texts from Račkauskis’ Актасъ иръ Потерей were transferred letter for letter (the book must have been released when Kashirin was finalizing МДИ, and he might have had no time to edit the texts).

Kashirin mostly edited the texts that did not appeal to his superior Nikolai Novikov (МСР and Букварсъ); his dissatisfaction with the texts led to starting МДИ. Kashirin devoted less attention to other sources (Абецеле and АЛР) or did not edit them at all (excerpts from the calendar and Актасъ иръ Потерей). The principles of editing the sources were not uniform, hence the very inconsistent orthography of МДИ. Besides that the primer reflects Kashirin’s limited knowledge of Lithuanian it also looks incomplete. There is no evidence that the administrators were boasting about Kashirin’s publication.

2. Zakharii Lyatskii

Zakharii Lyatskii was born January 7, 1836, in Buslavichi Estate in the Borisov region (now Lahoisk district in Belarus) to the landlord Anton Norbert Lyatskii, Dominik’s son, and the landlady Regina (Irina), Plevakov’s daughter. They claimed that their ancestry had stretched back to the famous family of Lyatskii, who in the time of Sigismund the Old (reigned 1506–1548) returned from Russia to the Polish-Lithuanian state. The family of Lyatskii received the town of Aukštadvaris and other lands as a present. When Anton Norbert, Zakharii’s father, was three years old (1794), both of his parents (Zakharii’s grandparents), Dominik Lyatskii and Ona Januszewska, died. Anton Norbert seems to have been among the first in the family who rejected the Catholic faith in favor of the Orthodox. Zakharii had at least twelve brothers and sisters, and all of them were baptized in Orthodox way.

Zakharii Lyatskii graduated from a cadet school in Polotsk in 1853, then from the first cadet corps in Moscow with the title of an ensign (1857). He joined the Life Guard corps (Finnish regiment), graduated from Nikolai Engineering Academy (1859), and worked on the construction site of the citadel of Kronstadt (1859–1860). Dismissed from military service for family reasons in 1860, he started his career five years later as a civil engineer of the State Property Chamber in Kaunas province (1865–1866),
then received a position as treasurer of Panevėžys district (1867). Alongside his work as a treasurer, Lyatskii was also hired as a teacher of Lithuanian at the Panevėžys Teacher Training Seminary (1873–1895).

Lyatskii was interested in Lithuanian: twice he published his article on the role of Lithuanian in tracing the origins of Russia (1893), and once a small article on the origin of the name Aušros Vartai (“Gate of Dawn,” 1894). In his classes, reviews, and proofs, Lyatskii expressed his attitude toward Lithuanian, its spelling, origin of words, and dialects. Lyatskii was also interested in natural phenomena; he was an enthusiastic meteorologist. In Mikolajevas, his estate of Old Panevėžys, Lyatskii observed the weather, for many years he was writing letters to the Ministry of Agriculture, and was its corresponding member. He published a book A New Explication of all Types of Lighting and St. Elm’s Flames (Новое Объяснение Грозы, Всех Трех Родов Молнии и Огней Св. Эльма, 1885) and articles on natural phenomena. For some time Lyatskii also worked as head of the Free Association of Firemen of Panevėžys. He was engaged in constructing a mathematical scientific gymnasium and built a footbridge across the Nevėžis close to his home, which survives today as a pedestrian bridge. Lyatskii died May 30, 1899, in Panevėžys and was buried in the Orthodox cemetery there. His wife Elena, Afanasii Kovalevskii’s daughter, was buried in the same grave later.

2.1. Scope of Expertise

Upon starting his career as a teacher of Lithuanian at Panevėžys Teacher Training Seminary, in the eyes of the Russian administration Lyatskii also became the chief Lithuanian studies expert. Lyatskii is known to have produced at least nine reviews on the suitability of various Lithuanian manuscripts written in the Cyrillic alphabet for publishing: three reviews on the manuscripts of PM (Русишкась Мокслась дэль Летувнику “Russian Primer for Lithuanians,” 1875); four reviews on Juozapas Milius-Miglovaras’s primers and songs, at least one on Lev Tolstoi’s short stories, and one on Juozapas Liaugminas’ calendar. Considering the period of low productivity for Lithuanian publications in the Cyrillic alphabet and the fact that of all manuscripts evaluated by Lyatskii only four books were eventually published (PM and three short stories by Tolstoi), a total of nine reviews looks numerous. Generally, before Lyatskii the genre of review (different from censorship) produced by a language expert in the history of Lithuanian publishing was not known.

Lyatskii also wrote at least five certificates (equivalent to the censor’s approval) giving permission to publish the translations of Lev Tolstoi’s short stories. Moreover, Lyatskii also proofread Zavadzks’s’ brochure (his numerous comments can be found on its margins) and the translations of Tolstoi’s short stories. Upon meeting with Eduard Wolter, a privatdozent (associate professor) from St. Petersburg, Lyatskii advised him on the Lithuanian words in Jonas Auksaburnis’ liturgical publication Діевішка Літургія Швэ то Іоно Ауксобурнш (“A Divine Liturgy of Saint John the Golden Mouth,” 1887). As a secret trustee of the Russian administration, he also translated...
into Russian two issues of the newspaper Auszna (1893), priest Aleksandras Burba’s two hymns, a fairy tale, and a prayer (1886; later Burba was exiled to a monastery in Grodno for two years), and a brochure Praneszimai Lietuviszkos Draugystės “Byrutės” (“Announcements of the Lithuanian Society ‘Byrutė’,” 1893). Lyatskii reached the peak of his career as an expert of Lithuanian studies and linguistics at the Ninth Congress of Russian Archaeologists in Vilnius (1893), where he was presenting a paper largely based on the facts of the Lithuanian language. Lyatskii also wrote an article on the origin of the name Aušros Vartai (1894) and authored two teaching programs of Lithuanian at Panevėžys Teacher Training Seminary (his own in 1873, and the other with Andrius Poidėnas in 1893). Lyatskii’s linguistic theories can also be found in the surviving reports on the revisions of his classes (1875, 1890, and 1895).

2.2. Editing Русишкасъ Моксласъ

Lyatskii’s attitude toward the spelling of Lithuanian texts in Cyrillic characters, and toward preferences given to some dialectal forms, can be seen in his reviews as well as his handwritten notes in the two texts he was proofreading: the third manuscript of Русишкасъ Моксласъ дэль Летувнику (“Russian Primer for Lithuanians,” РМ, 1875), which has his notes in pencil, and Lev Tolstoi’s short story Ишляйси Угни, не Ужгясинси (“If You Let the Fire out, You Will Never Put It out,” ИУр, 1888) translated by Ipolt Lyutostanskii and which contains Lyatskii’s notes in purple ink.

Lyatskii was correcting РМ in March 1875. The first manuscript prepared by unidentified teachers of Kaunas School Directorate in October 1873, reached Lyatskii in November or December. Lyatskii reviewed the text and sent it back for corrections. The text was changed by the teachers in August 1874, and this second manuscript was sent to inspector Pavel Roshchin in September for review. The manuscript was then forwarded to the Research Committee of the Ministry of Education in St. Petersburg for approval. The committee approved only the Russian section of the text in November; the Lithuanian section was not evaluated. The teachers of the Kaunas Directorate took into consideration remarks made by the Research Committee of the Ministry and sent the rewritten third manuscript to the Vilnius Education District. The teachers, however, were not capable of translating all Russian texts of the primer; thus, the typographer Abel’ Syrkin found a translator himself and attached his translations as an addition to the third manuscript (beginning of 1875). The latter manuscript, including the addition, reached Lyatskii in March 1875; in April his second review and his modifications to the manuscript were sent to Vilnius. The text was again rewritten in Syrkin’s printing house (the fourth manuscript, June 1875). Lyatskii received it for the third review in July 1875. Afterward, the text of РМ was edited once more by Syrkin’s printing house and published. Thus, the manuscripts of РМ had been sent from institution to institution more than twenty times. Judging by the efforts of the administrators in Vilnius, РМ, the most solid Lithuanian book in the Cyrillic alphabet, must have looked exceptional for them.
2.2.1. Three Different Segments Prepared by Teachers

Although the first two manuscripts did not survive, it can still be determined that after receiving the first manuscript, the teachers made some structural changes: they added several Russian texts. After the approval of the second manuscript by the Research Committee of the Ministry of Education, the structure of the subsequent two manuscripts did not change significantly. The only two surviving texts are the third manuscript (with Syrkin’s translator’s addition) and the final publication. The third manuscript has three editing layers: the third (the teachers), the fourth (Syrkin’s translator), and the fifth (Lyatskii).

Some texts prepared by the teachers are the same as in Kashirin’s МДИ; the majority of them, however, come from elsewhere. The analysis of language and spelling has shown that the texts prepared by the teachers are diverse; there are at least three different segments.

The first segment consists of subsections rewritten from Kashirin’s МДИ, the first three texts: (1) “Азбука,” (2) “Краткія Пределожнія,” and (3) “Калбэй” (35r–46v). The teachers were often uncritically rewriting the texts from МДИ; cf. the forms that look adopted from the Lowland dialect: Балоідес; іёутус; Нумій. The teachers also transferred the majority of the morphological forms of Panevėžys subdialect as they were given by Kashirin: парáше (Lith. parašėi ‘you wrote’); рáшто (Lith. raštą ‘message’ acc. sg.) (sometimes, however, the teachers seemed to avoid the forms of that subdialect: Ашъ вісь → Ашъ вісь; Ашъ паіауксі → Аш паіауксю). Occasionally, they added forms generally characteristic of the Eastern Highland dialect: дійды → дэді; гельжы → гэлажы. Thus, at least one teacher from the Kaunas Directorate involved in the preparation of the first segment must have heard the Eastern Highland dialect.

The second segment includes all subsections of the section “Краткія Статьи для Чтенія” (“Short Texts for Reading,” 46v–68r) (eight of twenty-six Russian subsections were translated into Lithuanian). At this editing layer, Kashirin’s Lithuanian examples could have been used to a limited extent since he had only given Lithuanian glosses and questions. The key difference between the first and second segments was concerned with the forms of the Lowland dialect used in the second segment (аденге; лонкун; Мона; пумпуралы; пумпурсу). Particularly conspicuous are the features of the Northern Lowland (Dounininkai) dialect in four subsections: (1) “Бува Венс Мажас Вайкеліс” (“There Was a Small Child”), (2) “Бытись ангъ Панішкоіма Медаусъ” (“Bees [Are] Searching for Honey”), (3) “Паукштилис” (“A Small Bird”) and (4) “Дауг Мету, Дауг Мету” (“Many Years, Many Years”): гійду; жійда; жійма; снійга; івейси. The remaining four subsections have more features of the Highland dialect, but the Lowland dialect there is also rather distinct: (1) “Старыкъ и Волкъ” (“The Old Man and the Wolf”), (2) “Малда” (“A Prayer”), (3) “Крамакасъ” (“Rabbit”), and (4) “Валя” (“Will”). The second segment may have been prepared by one teacher who knew the Northern Lowland subdialect; afterward, four other texts (out of eight) may have been edited to a certain extent following the Highland dialect.

The teachers of the Kaunas Directorate did not clear up the confusion of different dialects obvious in МДИ; rather, the teachers’ texts became even more diverse because
they were prepared by the speakers of different dialects. The orthographic principles, however, were rather uniform in their texts. Differently from МДИ, in both segments the characters <ѣ>, <э>, and <ы> were avoided, the yer <ъ> was not used at all.

The third segment includes four short subsections: (1) “Малда прешъ Моксла” (“A Prayer before a Class”), (2) “Малда по Моксла” (“A Prayer after a Class”), (3) “Личбасъ” (“Figures”) and (4) “Тобличе Даугинимо” (“Multiplication Table”) (68v–70r). Hardly any of these materials were prepared independently; Kashirin’s glosses of the prayers were uncritically transformed into a coherent text. Thus, nothing can be said about the dialect of those who prepared the third segment. The key difference in spelling between the first two segments and the third is the usage of the yer in the latter. Presumably, if the third segment had been prepared by any of the authors of the first two, the yer would not have been added.

Thus, the segments were prepared by at least three unknown teachers; their number could have been larger (cf. the editor who modified the Northern Lowland text according to the Highland dialect). Their knowledge of Lithuanian was not profound; they often took to rewriting МДИ; and Nikanor Savel’ev, director of Kaunas School Directorate, did not manage to find a translator to complete the work. After the teachers edited the first segment (the text taken from МДИ) there still remained errors in the grammatical number (Мáрэ рейкалыйнас), case (Нумáй адáрей), and tense (не мокеяу, не жинайу).

2.2.2. Addition by Abel’ Syrkin’s Translator (Mordukh Levin)

The fourth editing layer is in the addition to the third manuscript of PM (i.e., in Syrkin’s translator’s notebook, 71r–84v). The translator translated significant number of Russian texts and completed the work of Kaunas Directorate teachers.

Syrkin’s translator knew the Eastern Highland dialect; cf. the forms that he used: атавэдэ; acc. sg. вени карты; жуведы; кинтес; the words: dangtis (roof); krekle (rafter); užubraukas (latch). The translator’s dialectal forms and lexicon show that he must have used the subdialect of Utena (more likely) or Anykščiai, or Vilnius area (less likely).

Lyatskii considered Syrkin’s translator’s work of much higher quality than the work of the Kaunas Directorate teachers. Indeed, the translator knew Lithuanian fairly well. He did not manage, however, to avoid certain mistakes—for example, in participles—mainly due to the interference of Russian and/or Yiddish. The translator used the singular nominative case flexion of the masculine active past tense participle to also spell the nominative plural ending and both feminine nominative endings in singular and plural (nom. sg. m. Снега пайутис аркэллэс; nom. pl. m. Катйнис ир гэйдис быва гваннис; nom. sg. f. лапэ сээргэлэ, прэйдис жувю; nom. pl. f. бобос [. . .] сурекя, палатис пилкоя вилка). The translator’s half-participle did not always agree with the noun in gender (Каин гэлдама шаукя гэйделис). He was obviously a non-native speaker of Lithuanian.

The most likely candidate for translator was Mordukh Berko Levin, featured in the list of the employees of Abel’ Syrkin’s printing house of 1877, who in 1835 was
allowed to leave the community of Jews in Molėtai. Levin must have known the dialect of Syrkin’s translator’s text (Molėtai is located in the area of Utena) and was probably a non-native speaker of Lithuanian as well.

Translator Levin’s orthography was not always the same as Kashirin’s or that of the teachers, which is indicative of Levin’s fairly independent views.

&lt;Ъ&gt; Levin avoided the character yat &lt;Ъ&gt; (only very rarely he happened to write анн; светта); Krečinskis and Kashirin had used it frequently.

&lt;Ъ&gt; Like the teachers in the third editing layer, Levin omitted the yer &lt;Ъ&gt; in word-final positions (вето; Пена); although Krečinskis and Kashirin used the character frequently.

&lt;Ъ&gt; Like Kashirin, Levin chose the character &lt;Ъ&gt; to spell the first component of the diphthongs [ai], [ei] in syllables with the ascending intonation (гэйй; гэйделис). Differently from Kashirin, however, Levin liked to use &lt;Ъ&gt; in non-diphthong positions (мэшка; Тилумэ). The character &lt;Ъ&gt; was much more characteristic of Levin’s writing than that of the teachers, who were preparing the first and second segments of the third layer.

&lt;Я&gt; The character &lt;Я&gt; was occasionally used by Levin to spell the secondary sound [e] evolved from [a] coming immediately after [j] (блогу; иокяс). Kashirin had used &lt;Я&gt; much more frequently.

&lt;О&gt; Like Kashirin, Levin spelt the diphthongoid [uo] as &lt;О&gt;, probably due to the interference of Russian and/or Yiddish (cf. Ардос; клони).

&lt;ЖЯ&gt;, &lt;ЖЮ&gt;, &lt;ЧЯ&gt;. Again, differently from Kashirin, Levin tended not to observe the rule of Russian orthography disallowing &lt;Ю&gt; and &lt;Я&gt; after &lt;Ж&gt; and &lt;Ч&gt;; his spelling was mostly phonetic (cf. Арчя; Жюря; пасиджягуси).

There are quite a few similarities between the usage of Lithuanian by Levin and a proofreader’s corrections given in footnotes in Kashirin’s МДИ (see 1.3). It is highly probable that the proofreading of Kashirin’s МДИ was done by the same Levin (a few differences in spelling might have occurred during seven years between the two editions). The scarce text of the footnotes, however, is insufficient to come to a firm conclusion.

2.2.3. Editing by Zakharii Lyatskii

This third manuscript that included the third editing layer by the teachers and the fourth by Levin finally reached Lyatskii’s desk. He produced the fifth editing layer writing his notes in pencil in both sections: the teachers’ and Levin’s.

Lyatskii corrected the Lowland forms of the teachers (алконунъ → алкону; мунес → манес). Lyatskii himself added some Eastern Highland dialect features (ант жоли → ант жолась; важинетъ). Like Kashirin, Lyatskii sometimes used forms and words mostly known in Panevėžys subdialect: &lt;О&gt; in the acc. sg. flexion (апе мотино; Кас эда мэгу → Кас эда мэсо); monophthongized flexion -ai (Аи буваб → Аи буво; матав → мато), some words (suplegos ‘swings’). Obviously,
Lyatskii knew Panevėžys subdialect. According to Būtėnas, Lyatskii must have learned Panevėžys subdialect talking to people, when he worked as a treasurer of Panevėžys district.

Lyatskii could have hardly had better knowledge of Lithuanian than Levin. Lyatskii made the same mistakes in the nominal case of participles due to the interference of Russian (and Levin also probably due to Yiddish). In some cases, however, Lyatskii made attempts to correct Levin’s forms, but rather than modifying participle flexions, he tried to change only their dialectal form (-is to -ęs), cf. nom. m. pl. Комисас ир гайдис бува гивэнис → Комисас ир гайдис бува гивэнес; nom. sg. f. ибегис пэлэ → ибегес пэлэ; nom. pl. f. Ошкелэс пажинис → Ошкелэс пажинис.

Lyatskii’s spelling also differed from any of the other texts mentioned.

<ѣ>. Lyatskii was quite consistent in spelling the flexion of iness. sg. -e as <ѣ> (дутялъ; мишкъ → мишкъ; соди → содъ). He seems to have adopted the singular flexion of the Russian prepositional (предложный) case. Several times Lyatskii used <ѣ> to spell the diphthongoid [ie] (милъ → милъ; пагода → моря). Lyatskii used <ѣ> not as frequently as Krečinskis or Kashirin, but more often than Levin.

<э>. Like Kashirin and Levin, Lyatskii was inclined to spell the first component of the diphthongs [ai], [ei] as <э> in unstressed syllables or syllables with the ascending intonation (диюлев тижаи → лёэй тилэй; милестасе → мэйле). He used <э> in non-diphthongs only occasionally (e.g., пас лапес нёдса → пас лапес пёдна), which seems more similar to the limited usage of <э> by Kashirin rather than its extensive usage by Levin.

<я>. Alongside the grapheme <е> (also occasionally <э>) to spell the sound [e], Lyatskii also introduced <я> (ялесъ; па вяжъ; ане дёдес → ане дёдя). Kashirin had used <я> more frequently, whereas Levin did that rather seldom, usually to spell [e] of secondary origin.

<о>. Like Kashirin and Levin, Lyatskii used <о> to spell the diphthongoid [uo] (важъо → важъо; Двокъ → Докъ).

<ъ>. Lyatskii tried to avoid the character <ъ> (диёрбы → диёрби; иотъ → иотъ), still he sometimes wrote it (мёдус → мътас; тинай → тънай).

<шъ>, <шшъ>, <ча>. Like Kashirin and differently from Levin, Lyatskii tended to apply the rules of Russian orthography in Lithuanian spelling (кате → катшкуса; милкёртэс → вайлкинис чабатей; пэлэ → журке).

<ъ>. Again like Kashirin but unlike Levin, Lyatskii suggested using <ъ> in word-final position (Клайсикетъ; сарматосъ) and always emphasized this idea in his reviews.

<ў>. Like Mikucki and Ivinskis in Абецеле, Lyatskii suggested using the non-existent Russian character <ў> with breve ˘ to spell the second component of the diphthong [au] (in digraphs <аў> and <яў>). At the beginning, especially when editing the teachers’ layer, Lyatskii used <ў> with no diacritic more often (аўшра; сиргаву; тикрысъе); further in the manuscript, however, the character <ў> became rather frequent (апавшатъ; лаийдъ; иўнасъ). The digraph <аў> was also used in Belarusian spelling. The character <ў> in the manuscript of PM seems to be the only Lyatskii’s character modifying the graphics of Russian alphabet.
2.2.4. Editing by Mordukh Levin

The publication _PM_ is not a verbatim copy of the third manuscript with the texts and notes written by the teachers, Levin, and Lyatskii. The final printed text is clearly distinct from all editing layers of the third manuscript: the modifications are more numerous than one could have expected from a proofreader at a printing house. Before publishing, the manuscript should have been rewritten again (that fourth manuscript did not survive). The language, spelling, and corrections in the publication leave no doubt that in Syrkin’s printing house the same Levin continued to work further on the text of _PM_. Rewritten so many times, reviewed and approved, the text was edited again upon the initiative of the printing house, probably without the administrators’ consent (which had also been the case before, when the language in Kashirin’s _МДИ_ was amended in footnotes).

Levin differently modified all three layers of the third manuscript: (1) the teachers’ primary text, (2) his own translation, and (3) Lyatskii’s editing.

1. Levin modified the teachers’ layer according to the Eastern Highland dialect that he knew (дангеусь → дымиусь; уж гёлаки → ужу э’лаки). He avoided the Lowland dialect forms and words that Lyatskii had left uncorrected (дубесь → добесь; мусц → муссе). He insistently inserted his favorite character <!> not only to spell (like Kashirin and Lyatskii), the first component of diphthongs (гёре → гэраэ; падьйгет → падьйгетъ), but also the sounds [e] and [e] (дёдя → дёдэ; Седж → Сэджкъ). Levin very rarely inserted the character <!> (кэйлиц → кэляс; майджес → майджесъ) and tried to avoid the yat <!> altogether (дёль → дёль; Не норёк → Не норёкъ). The yer <!> used in word-final position made the text very different from his own translation; it might have been an allowance to Lyatskii’s requirement.

2. Levin showed considerable tolerance in his own translation by preserving the majority of forms of the Eastern Highland dialect (смикча; ужалинейсъ); he did not change the historically and geographically limited lexicon (дунгуеясъ; су ужубрауку). He only sometimes amended one or another aspect of his own language: added a diminutive suffix (гричья → гричьяла; Паукшитис → Паукшителисъ); several times eliminated the Eastern hard (dark) [l] (су сньяла → су сньял; Сньяла → Сньяла); occasionally edited words (Вес крата рулос → Весь крата кулос; клоны → Клоны). The orthography was touched upon by himself also only occasionally: several times Levin inserted <!> (герей → герей) and <!> (еджа → эджа), eliminated the previous unintentional <!> (ань → ане); or accidentally inserted it (вешкелъ → вёшкелъ). Again, the most distinct difference from the spelling in his own translation was the yer <!> added in the word-final position.

3. Levin let into the publication quite a few modifications, suggested by Lyatskii, on the language and orthography of the teachers. Sometimes, however, Levin modified some of Lyatskii’s forms of Panevėžys subdialect (гёдё → гёдёй; мильте → мильтай). Also Levin introduced into Lyatskii’s corrections some forms of the Eastern Highland dialect (жусю; ужолай). Levin replaced some words of the teachers or Lyatskii (ишпильда, крёмту, машина, скрида); sometimes the teachers’ rather than Lyatskii’s word was accepted (кайлис), or both options were combined: палка (пагалисъ); шались (пусс).
Levin had an opportunity to review his own translations after Lyatskii’s correction; Lyatskii’s modifications, however, were scarce. Levin accepted some of Lyatskii’s dialectal corrections (cf. Levin’s атадара ↔ Lyatskii’s атадара ↔ Levin’s later preserved атадара; гуля ← гули ↔ гули). Levin also approved of Lyatskii’s efforts to more frequently mark palatalized consonants used in word-final position and did not object to his amendments (дель; ужальтв). Levin preserved the nominative flexions of active past participles modified by Lyatskii; in this case Levin must have trusted Lyatskii more than himself. Lyatskii, however, modified only some occurrences of Levin’s participle endings. In the final publication some participle flexions were spelled in Levin’s style and some in Lyatskii’s.

Still, Levin often restored his own forms (бучія → бучію → бучія; соди → содъ → соди). He did not particularly like Lyatskii’s third-person present tense flexion -ji (бучію, жалію); he restored his own -ja (бучія, жалію). Levin was unwilling to refuse the Eastern Highland [u:] in the Proto-Lithuanian position of а (Друє), or [i:] in the position of е (не атисириждама), or [un] in the position of an (унксти). Sometimes he also kept a variant of Lyatskii: анксти (унксти). Generally, Levin insisted on his own phonetic Eastern Highland forms that were most noticeable to him.

Levin modified Lyatskii’s spelling by adding to the quantity of the character <э>; but he completely rejected <ў>. In general, he must have inserted into the final publication more of his own language facts without Lyatskii’s noticing. Also, Levin knew the Lithuanian language at least slightly better than Lyatskii.

2.2.5. Русишкасъ Моксласъ: Several Editing Layers

In PM, at least six editing layers can be identified. Eight more layers can be seen in its prototype МДИ. A possibility to reconstruct over ten editing layers makes us think that PM language and spelling were the most inconsistent among Lithuanian publications of the time. The PM structural complexity and a possibility to identify its layers can be illustrated by the following example: Krečinskis’ (Буквáрсъ): Та мýса трóба (стýба, секличе) → Kashirin’s (МДИ) Та мýса трóба (стýба, секличе бу́дбнка́съ) → the teachers’ Та мýсу трóба (сёкличе) → Lyatskii’s Та мýсу сэкличе (трóба) → Levin’s Та мýсу сэкличе (трóба). To Kashirin’s three synonyms (трóба, стýба, секличе) Kashirin added the fourth: бу́дбнка́съ. The teachers did not accept Kashirin’s addition; they also deleted Krečinskis’ third synonym стýба, thus, only трóба (сэкличе) remained; the teachers also modified the Lowland Lithuanian мýса given by Krečinskis into the Highland Lithuanian мýсу. Lyatskii swapped the two synonyms: сэкличе (трóба). Levin accepted Lyatskii’s swap but substituted <э> for <э>. Finally, of Krečinskis’ three words, only two remained in the PM publication: сэкличе (трóба); their sequence was decided by Lyatskii, and the character <э> was chosen by Levin. The Highland form мýсу was the teachers’ choice.

Thus, Mordukh Levin, Syarkin’s translator and editor, can be treated as the key language and spelling editor and proofreader of PM. Lyatskii could be called Levin’s “assistant,” followed by the contribution of at least three teachers and a small share of work done by Kashirin, a preparer of the prototypical МДИ, as well as Krečinskis, Mikucki, Ivinskis, and Žilinskis, the authors of the prototypical sources of МДИ.
2.3. Linguistic Attitudes

2.3.1. Comparative Linguistics

Lyatskii was known for his interest in comparative linguistics. His inclination was manifest in his two programs of teaching Lithuanian in the Panevėžys Teacher Training Seminary (1873 and 1893), a report on Lyatskii’s classes by director Stepan Borichevskii (1875), three revisions of Lyatskii’s classes (1875, 1890, and 1895), Lyatskii’s paper for the Ninth Congress of Russia’s Archaeologists in Vilnius (1893), his reviews, and finally, the memoirs about Lyatskii collected by Petras Būtēnas. At that time, Lyatskii was not the only one interested in linguistic theories on kinship between Lithuanian and Russian. For example, Jonas Krečinskis wrote to Laurynas Ivinskis (1878) that he was interested in identifying if Lithuanian was closer to Old Slavonic or Russian and asked Ivinskis to translate some phrases into Lithuanian for this purpose.

In the program of teaching Lithuanian (1873) Lyatskii explained that Lithuanian words and their derivatives should be learned by comparing Lithuanian and Russian or other Slavic roots. In his report on the revision of Lyatskii’s classes (1875) inspector Pavel Roshchin claimed that Lyatskii had tried to teach Lithuanian by comparing it to Russian; that he had not only contrasted the languages, but also “moved Lithuanian closer to Russian;” that he had sometimes over-exaggerated the similarities between roots and flexions. The seminary’s director, Stepan Borichevskii, pointed out in 1875 that Lyatskii used the method of discovering Russian words by dropping the flexions of Lithuanian words and replacing the letters. Another inspector, Nikanor Odintsov, in 1890 came to the conclusion that Lyatskii was a specialist of Lithuanian; his frequent comparisons of Lithuanian forms and words with those in similar languages (Slavic and Russian) were taken for proof of his expertise in comparative linguistics. Lyatskii’s student Vladimir Lukin recalled Lyatskii’s claims that Lithuanian was very old and originated from Sanskrit; Lyatskii used to demonstrate a significant kinship between Lithuanian and Russian: *arklas* and *соха* (plow), *karvė* and *корова* (cow), and *galva* and *головка, глава* (head).

When reviewing Ipolit Lyutostanskii’s translations of Lev Tolstoi’s short stories (1888), Lyatskii praised the Lithuanian words similar to Russian and sneered at the Lithuanian purists who tried to avoid such similarities at any cost; Lyatskii referred to them as only pretending to the name of an expert (whereas Lyutostanskii was a real expert in his eyes). If such a pretender were to translate the Russian sentence *идти по следамъ зверя* (“to follow the tracks of an animal”), he would never have said *эйти слядэйсъ жверя*; rather, he would attempt to find an expression less similar to the Russian equivalent, like *секёти жверя педэйсъ*. Lyatskii also attributed Eduard Wolter, a privatdozent of St. Petersburg University, to the category of extreme purists. They had met in Panevėžys in 1887 to discuss the Lithuanian language in Wolter’s book that was in preparation Діївiшка Лiтургiя Швэ то Jόно Ақссобьрнью. Later, however, Lyatskii was quite sarcastic about the book.

In his review of Juozapas Miliauskas’ *Lithuanian Alphabet* (1883), Lyatskii emphasized the obvious similarity between Lithuanian and Russian. He established a rule applicable to a large number of Lithuanian words translated into Russian: the endings -асъ or -ась should be dropped; like in *снѣгасъ – снѣгъ*, if the meaning still remained unclear.
(i.e., a Russian speaker failed to identify the word), an attempt should be made to replace “transferrable” sounds, for instance: становъ – стопъ; рудь – рожь. The dropped Lithuanian flexion -асъ should be replaced with the Russian marker of hardness <ъ>, and the dropped Lithuanian ending -исъ with the Russian marker of softness <ь> (акменисъ – камень). Lyatskii thought that the Lithuanian and Russian genitive and dative cases had the same flexions. Even the infinitive flexions in both languages as well as conjugations seemed the same for him. His second program of teaching Lithuanian (1893) included a requirement that in the last grade at seminary, students were to be taught about only a seeming difference between Lithuanian and Russian; the analysis of words (пчела, рожь) should have proved that Russian words had originated from Lithuanian and not vice versa (in the program of 1873 the direction of change was of less concern to Lyatskii, which attests to the later modification in his thinking).

Most of Lyatskii’s ideas about the relationship between Lithuanian and Russian can be found in his paper delivered at the Ninth Congress of Archaeologists (1893). There Lyatskii described Lithuanians as a Russian tribe; he claimed that one of Russian tribes was called Lithuanians (“Русский Князь Рюрикъ избранъ [. . .] изъ русского племени, которое нынѣ зовется литовцами”). Lyatskii also discussed the commonality of Lithuanian and Old Russian (“общности литовскаго и древне-руссскаго языка”). He even discerned a causal relationship: if a word was used in Lithuanian, it must have been used in Old Russian, too (“Печенеги означаетъ Плечегольные, потому что по-Литовски, а значитъ и по древне-русски, ‘печей’ – плечи, а ‘ноги’ – нагие, голые’). The Lithuanian language for him was merely a synonym of Old Russian (“Назвать же онъ вильнымъ [. . .] отъ древне-русскаго, а нынѣ литовскаго слова ‘вильнись’ – волна”). Lyatskii’s method of analysis did not discriminate between examples of Lithuanian and Russian or Slavonic; he seemed to be discussing the features of a single language. Professors Adalbert Bezenberger and Alexander Kochubinskii did not allow Lyatskii to finish reading such a paper at the congress.

Because of comparative linguistics Lyatskii lost the trust of administrators in the Vilnius Education District. The next revision of Lyatskii’s classes by Odintsov (1895) was very critical. The inspector claimed that Lyatskii did not follow the program, the students were unable to decline, Lyatskii failed to make the required entries in the class register, and five students even managed to correct their unsatisfactory grades in the register in Lyatskii’s presence. Odintsov did not mention a single word about language comparison; the period of praising Lyatskii’s linguistics was over. The Vilnius Education District overseer Nikolai Sergievskii suggested to Lyatskii that he think about whether he felt capable of correcting his mistakes and continuing his teaching of Lithuanian in the seminary. Lyatskii grasped the hint and retired (1895).

2.3.2. Sound Shifts: Rules and Laws

Lyatskii defined rules and laws that he explained to his students, described in his articles and reviews.

Consonant shift. In the program of teaching Lithuanian (1873) Lyatskii claimed that the characters “transferred” from one to another, for example, the Russian <C> in
Lithuanian had transferred to <Ж> (смо̲ч̲о̲ – Жмогу̲с̲ь), <ж> to <з> (Lith. Жляме – Russ. земля), <ц> to <ч> (Lith. [?] Гало, гило – Russ. жало; Lith. Ругись – Russ. ро̲ж̲ь), <ш> to <ш> (Lith. Про̲ш̲п̲и̲т̲ь – Russ. проси̲т̲ь). Such “transfers” could be referred to as the laws of consonant shift. In one law, the shift was from Lithuanian to Russian, in the remaining three—from Russian (Slavic) to Lithuanian (no distinct chronological dimension). In his first review of PM (1873), Lyatskii mentioned still another shift: from <ц> to <ч>, since, according to him, the participle туренпись was sometimes pronounced as туренпись, but it was exclusively a shift of Lithuanian. In his review of Miliauskas’ Lithuanian Alphabet (1883) Lyatskii gave an example of the shift that had been mentioned in the program <ц> – <ж> (ру̲г̲и̲с̲ь – ро̲ж̲ь). In the program, however, he discussed the letter shift (буква переходит), whereas in the review he spoke of the sound shift (переходные звуки). During ten years Lyatskii’s ideas and their wording became more precise.

For the Ninth Congress of Archaeologists, Lyatskii pointed out to the largest number of consonant shifts: к=х=с (Bkr. Гелендра́къ – Scythian Гелендрись), с=х=г (Russ. Порогъ – Russ. прахъ), x=е (Russ. [?] турнулось – Russ. туро́въ ло́хъ; Lith. му́сь – Russ. муха), с=у (Lith. вирта́са [i.e., вири́са] – Russ. верхъ), δ=п (Lat. Бору́сы – Russ. По́русъ), ω=с=х (Russ. Воло́ни́скъ – Russ. Воло́хъ). Lyatskii did not clearly identify the direction of change; he blended the examples of many languages as though all of the languages would follow the same laws; Lyatskii used Russian, Lithuanian, Scythian, Belarusian, or even Latin according to his needs. Lyatskii’s shift could be graphically represented as follows: к=х=с=у=и, and equally applied to all the languages he mentioned.

Lyatskii repetedly discussed the same consonant shift in his article on the origin of the name of Aušros Vartai (1894): Lith. [ž] Ж<ж> → Russ. [ž] ж<з> (ж̲ч̲ь, – аз̲ч̲ь, – я; ар̲ж̲-п̲а – зар̲я). Since neither the word aušra (‘dawn’) nor а̲ш̲ (‘I’) followed Lyatskii’s law, he undertook to spell the above words with Ж<ж> [ž], which he said was the correct way. All in all, the overall number of Lyatskii’s consonant shifts could have been more than ten (some of them were three member shifts: к=х=с=у=и).

Vowel shift. In the program of teaching Lithuanian (1873) Lyatskii identified a law of “transferred” vowel characters in two Lithuanian dialects. According to him, in the Highland dialect <е> “transferred” to <э>; in the Lowland dialect <е> was preserved (cf. the Highlanders’ мя́дись, гла́жа and the Lowlanders’ медись, гла́же). Lyatskii might have heard a more open [e] in the Highland than in the Lowland dialect. In his review of Miliauskas’ Lithuanian Alphabet (1883), Lyatskii mentioned transferrable sounds (not characters any more) [а] – [о] (сталась – сталъ). In his paper for the Ninth Congress of Archaeologists he also wrote about other vowel shifts: [о] and [е] (Russ. [?] осьын – Russ. [?] осыпь, [у] <у> and [у] <ы>) (Russ. осьпь – Russ. осипь). It was obvious to Lyatskii that in the latter shift [у] <у> was older and more frequent in Lithuanian than Russian (Lith. сунась – Russ. сунь, Lith. сурась – Russ. серь, Lith. бу̲т̲и̲ – Russ. бь̲т̲и̲). Thus, at this point Lyatskii at least perceived the direction of change in accordance to the understanding of contemporary comparative linguistics.

The program of 1893 specified that the “transferrable” sounds should be taught in the final year of study at the Seminary.
Nasal vowels, merged vowel. Lyatskii knew about nasal vowels in Old Slavonic (Russ. юсъ) and tried to identify their equivalents in Lithuanian. In the program of 1873 he identified the following shift: Lith. жантасъ – Russ. зянь – Pol. żenię. He must have meant the shift of the Lithuanian [en] to the Russian [e], but after the character <ж> he wrote <ан>, in accordance with the spelling rules of Russian. For some reason Lyatskii discerned the reflex of nasal vowels in his favorite example руgisъ – рожь. In his review of Miliauskas’ *Lithuanian Alphabet* (1883) Lyatskii introduced his theory claiming that in positions where in Slavic a nasal character was used, Lithuanian had a merged nasal vowel (слитной гласной юсовой), it is a voiced sound in which the vowels [a], [o], and [u] were as if merged together. Lyatskii gave such an example: the word жасисъ ~ žąsis (goose) had different realizations in different dialects: in one the sound [u] was more distinct, in another—the sound [a], and in the third—the sound [o] (жусисъ, жасисъ, жосисъ) was heard. Lyatskii treated the vowel sound in the root of the word žąsis that he noticed differently produced in three different dialects as a single merged sound. It is a non-existent sound reconstructed by Lyatskii; to spell it, he introduced a special grapheme with a dot above <ȯ>. In other words, Lyatskii projected the sounds of the dialects into the earlier phase of language development. Lyatskii claimed to have heard other vocalic varieties of the root in the word žąsis; according to him, some Lithuanians pronounced it as жонисъ (with <н>).

In the program of 1893, Lyatskii referred to a variety of vowels used in one word виенасъ (vienas one). It leads to an idea that Lyatskii must have thought about another “merged” vowel (even though not nasal) in the root of the word виенас. Lyatskii must have reconstructed one sound <ь>, whose reflexes in the dialects were pronounced in different ways.

As provided in the Seminary program of teaching Lithuanian (1893) the nasal vowels and merged sounds were to be taught by Lyatskii in the highest (last) grade.

Word-initial sound. In his article on the origin of the name *Aušros Vartai* (1894), Lyatskii identified another law not mentioned elsewhere in his writings. The law focused on the word-initial vowel (альдія – ладья; акменисъ – камень; аужра – заря); Lyatskii must have thought that some Lithuanian words in initial positions had vowels which were not found in the Russian equivalents. That, he thought, was evidence to prove that Lithuanian words were of Slavic origin.

2.3.3. Etymology

Lyatskii was fond of etymology. In the program of Lithuanian (1873) he claimed that the word *Lietuva* (Lithuania) had originated from *lietus* (rain). He thought that the root of the word žmogus (man, human) was the same as that of the Russian смочь (be capable of); thus, the word žmogus in Lithuanian had the meaning of “capable of doing everything, omnipotent.” In his paper for the Ninth Congress of Archaeologists (1893) Lyatskii treated the word *variagai* (Varyags) as related to the Lith. *vartyt* (to drive, chase). The place-name Vilnius, according to him, was directly originated from the word *vilnis* (wave) and was chosen in reference to the hilly, or wavy, area. Lyatskii treated the name of the Russian nation Русъ as related to the Lith. руоšти (to prepare)
or “русти” (to move) (as if related to Pol. “рухать”). The word žemaičiai (Lowlanders), according to him, originated from the word žiema (жема winter); it was misleading, he thought, to compare žemaičiai with žemė (жяме land) and consider Lowlanders a peculiar kind of Netherlands. Samogitai (Samogitians), the Latin name for the Lithuanian Lowlanders, was treated by Lyatskii as originating from samanos (moss). Lenkai (Poles) was related to the Lith. lenkti (to bend). Lyatskii believed that the name of the river Nemunas originated from mainyti (change), because the river did not change its flow. The place-name Minsk, he thought, was made from melyne (bilberry), because the surroundings of the place were full of bilberries even during Lyatskii’s time. Alau­nai (Alans) for him was a people who lived on the hills of Alauini; its name was supposedly derived from the Lith. uola (rock). Lyatskii lived in an estate of Old Panevėžys and the river Nevėžis flowed right by his back yard; he thought of the etymology of Nevėžis in reference to the saying Ногъ Швента Казимира вежа крипстъ (“From St. Casimir’s the rut is uneven; it is the ice is melting and the ground gets wet and does not support a carriage”). He must have interpreted the word вежа (rut) as a road; so the Nevėžis for him was “a river and not a road.” Evidently, Lyatskii considered it was not suitable for navigation.

In his article on the origin of Aušros Vartai (1894) Lyatskii interpreted the Lith. gas pada (house, farm) as “immovable property,” which let him derive the Russ. господинъ from gaspada with the meaning of “proprietor.” The Lith. sudaris for him was “a maker of the court proceedings;” thus, the Russ. сударь must have been its shortening.

Lyatskii’s inclination to construct etymologies shows his interest in the language history as well as the popularity of comparative linguistics in general; Simonas Daukantas (1793–1864) had also constructed many unproven etymologies. At the end of the nineteenth century, however, after more than fifty years, Lyatskii’s etymologies did stand out as more controversial in the contemporary research context.

2.3.4. Dialects

The administrators of the Vilnius Education District and the teachers of the Panevėžys Teacher Training Seminary usually failed to see difference in terms Lowland language and Lithuanian language. Nevertheless, they gave preference to the word Lowland, since both those who were born as Lowlanders and those born in Kaunas province were considered speakers of the same Lowland language. In Panevėžys, the name of officially taught language was Lowland rather than Lithuanian. Sometimes in correspondence Lowland was called a dialect and not a language with no distinct difference: the Lowland/Lithuanian language/dialect.

When invited to teach (1873) Lyatskii showed a higher awareness of dialects. In his letter, the Seminary’s director Borichevskii wrote that Lyatskii knew the Lithuanian (i.e., Highland Lithuanian) dialect spoken in Kaunas province and not the Lowland one. Lyatskii must have perceived difference of the dialects of Lowland and Highland Lithuanian; but he implied that this should not become an obstacle to teach the Low-
land language (dialect), since Lowlanders and Highlanders could easily communicate among themselves. As already discussed, Lyatskii could have somewhat mastered Panevēžys subdialect when working as a treasurer.

In his review of Miliauskas’ Lithuanian Alphabet (1883), according to the pronunciation of the root in the word žąsis (goose), Lyatskii identified three Lithuanian dialects: (1) Telšiai dialect that supposedly had a sound [u] (thus, жусисъ); (2) Šiauliai dialect with an [a] (thus, жасисъ) and (3) Ukmergė dialect with the sound [o] (thus, жосисъ). Lyatskii’s approach shows his ability to identify, albeit superficially, some features of Lowland, Western, and Eastern Highland dialects. In Lyatskii’s opinion, the variety containing the merged sound <о> (жосисъ) generalised the pronunciation of all three dialects. In Panevēžys Lyatskii must have been used to the latter form; cf. his editing of the teachers’ layer of PM: жансý → жансы (жо су). Thus, the most general variant was chosen from Panevēžys subdialect. Lyatskii, however, must have made a mistake by calling the variety жосисъ as originating from Ukmergė; in Ukmergė the root of žąsis had the sound [u].

Lyatskii thought that this word in Telšiai dialect had [u] (жусисъ). In fact, in the town of Telšiai the vocalic root was pronounced as [on] rather than [u]. However, a large number of speakers from around Telšiai, who pronounced nom. sg. of žąsis with [o], due to the regressive assimilation of vowels, produced [u] in acc. sg.: žūsъ. Lyatskii may have noticed such pronunciation of Northern Lowlanders around Telšiai and could have chosen it as the basis for Telšiai dialect. Lyatskii must have heard other Lowland variants of the word žąsis; according to him, some Lithuanians also pronounced жонсисъ, because they tended to add <н> to the vowels <у>, <а> or <о>. That was how the word was pronounced in Telšiai; but Lyatskii could hardly have localized the variant жонсисъ.

Lyatskii’s classification of dialects was very subjective, clearly Panevēžys-centered; it depended both on Lyatskii’s knowledge of the language and his place of residence.

When translating the text of Ivan Pososhkov’s brochure Тевишкас Тестаментас Русишкам Карейвюй (“A Father’s testament to a Russian Soldier,” 1887), a certain translator Kiškis of Ukmergė district left many traces of the so-called Eastern Highland Žadininkai subdialect (in stressed positions the vowel [a] was used instead of [o] that was pronounced in many other dialects; cf. дабакис; каки; кажна; недарас; пакалай). According to the Atlas of Lithuanian Dialects, in the twentieth century the feature was only preserved in the northeastern corner of the Vilnius subdialect and some plots of the northern part of the Anykščiai subdialect, also in the adjacent northern areas of Utena subdialect. Lyatskii in his comments left on the margins of the proofs labeled the dialect as archaic and claimed that three quarters of Lithuania failed to understand it. Lyatskii was unable to realize which part of Lithuania used the dialect; he did not recognize it and could only guess that it was archaic. Lyatskii could not measure the understanding of three quarters of Lithuania; he just thought of a suggestive way to criticize the unknown dialect.

On the other hand, Lyatskii perceived the dialect of Ipolit Lyutostanskii (1888) as understandable to the whole of Lithuania (except for a word or two) and could ap-
proximately localize it: he called it of Raseiniai area (россиенскимъ). Indeed the language of translations by Lyutostanskii had quite a few features of the Southern Lowland dialect (Dūnininkai); therefore, Lyatskii quite precisely identified them as representing Lowlanders and gave them a name according to a larger town of Raseiniai. In his previous classification (1883) Lyatskii had identified only the Telšiai subdialect in the Lowland dialect area. It gives us a clue that he improved his dialectal knowledge about Lowlanders.

A more or less frequent encounter with various Lithuanian dialects led Lyatskii to the idea that students at the Panevėžys Teacher Training Seminary should be taught both genetically close dialects—Lowland and Highland, rather than just one. In his program of 1893, Lyatskii emphasized that because of rather distinct differences between the dialects (which must have looked less distinct to him in 1873), students who knew one dialect should also study the other, at least some vocabulary and a couple of other differences. The other dialect for Lyatskii was definitely the Lowland dialect.

Despite that in the area of comparative linguistics Lyatskii identified Lithuanian with (old) Russian (in Lithuanian he discovered hidden Russian), practically in a classroom his teaching had to be complicated even if because of the differences between the Lowland and Highland dialects.

2.3.5. Morphology, Derivation, and Lexicon

In his reviews, programs, and articles, Lyatskii established some rules of word production and word formation. In the program of 1873 he claimed that words denoting agents were characterized by the flexions -is or -us; instruments were identifiable from the flexion -as, and products (results of actions) from -ims. Accordingly, in his paper for the Ninth Congress of Archaeologists (1893) Lyatskii claimed that words ending in -исъ referred to agents: варисъ (the one who drives [something], a shepherd, hunter) (from варити). Such rules were not sufficiently precise, neither did they conform to the contemporary level of linguistic knowledge and research into Lithuanian (established, for example, by the grammar of August Schleicher in 1856).

Lyatskii discussed the processes of building non-finite verb forms: participles, half-participles, gerunds; however, as already mentioned, he did make mistakes when using them (2.2.3). Lyatskii referred to gerunds as днепричастіе and explained that they were made by replacing the infinitival ending -мі с the flexions -ментъ, -мінтъ or -ментъ, depending on a dialect (леантъ or леантъ pouring, верентъ or веронтъ cooking; paper for the Ninth Congress of Archaeologists, 1893); also by modifying the infinitival ending into енть (милентъ loving; review of РМ, 1873).

Active participles were made, according to him, from gerunds (днепричастіе) by adding the agent flexion -исъ (леантисъ pouring; веронтисъ cooking; paper for the Ninth Congress of Archaeologists, 1893).

Lyatskii referred to Lithuanian half-participles as gerunds of frequentative aspect (днепричастіе многократнаго вида). He did not like the teachers’ translation of the
form любя, a Russian дѣепричастіе, as a gerund of frequentative aspect миледами (when coining the term of the gerund of frequentative aspect, Lyatskii must have confused the meanings of two suffixes: the suffix -dam- of half-particples and the suffix -dav- of the past frequentative tense). Lyatskii was not fully aware of the usage difference of gerunds and half-particples (review of PM, 1873).

Lyatskii was able to identify the passive participle надирбтасъ (fake); he attributed, however, the participle артасъ (plowed), formed according to the same pattern, to the derivatives of арть (to plow) (program of 1873).

Lyatskii was right to notice coinciding flexions of the third person for singular and plural; according to him, Аре ([he] plows) would be singular, and Жмоне аре (people plow) would be plural (program of 1873).

He was also correct claiming that the imperative mood was made from the infinitive by replacing м with къ in the singular (не некинъ do not despise) and with кетъ or китъ in the plural (review of PM, 1873).

Lyatskii was good at identifying gender in some words; according to him, the flexions -асъ and -усъ signaled the masculine gender (program of 1873).

Some of his remarks on cases are precise, too. For example, Lyatskii suggested that the prepositional construction Милема пас лаукъ should be modified into the construction with locative case: Милема лаукъ (review of PM, 1873). According to him, the instrumental case in Lithuanian was made with the preposition su (with) (program of 1873).

Lyatskii also registered the derivatives of the word арть, or rather, all words with the root ar-: ар克莱съ, арклукасъ, арклукелисъ, аркласъ, аримо, артасъ, артоисъ (program of 1873).

Lyatskii also commented on semantic and lexical aspects of the language. In his review of PM (1873) to the word written by the teachers гесьміе he added his own remark that гіємэ (hymn) meant “a spiritual hymn,” whereas the usual song was called дайлна or дайнушка. Lyatskii criticised the translation of the first line in the anthem of the Russian Empire. He must have misunderstood the sentence Ант гарса мумс confusing the words ‘garsas’ (sound, fame) and ‘balsas’ (voice); he recommended another translation: антъ гарбя мумъ. The anthem, however, was removed from the second manuscript altogether.

2.3.6. Distortion of Language Facts

Sometimes Lyatskii was led away by his own theories and he proposed the forms which were non-existent in dialects. For example, in the program of 1873 Lyatskii spelt the Lithuanian word prašyt (to ask) as Прошить. The character <o> was transferred from the Russian word просить. In his review of PM (1873), Lyatskii used the non-existent form они ~ аниe (they) alluding to the Russ. ониe. Lyatskii also suggested that the word арвюніот (to wrap around) should be spelt as обвинёть, since in Russian it meant “обвинуть.” The Lithuanian prefix ар- was replaced by the Russian об- to make it closer to the Russian spelling. When editing PM (1875) he applied the same
rule to another prefix: he spelt at- as om- (cf. the Russian prefix om-): не отсижуредама; отсижерете; отмисне. Once he also spelt the prefix iš- as the Russian из-: изьвываю.

In the program of 1873, Lyatskii modified the word žvaigždė (star) to show that his law of “transferrable” consonants worked; according to him, the character <з> should “transfer” to <ж> (alongside Russ. Звезды, Lyatskii included the form Жвеiždas as a more correct form of žvaigždė). In his article on the origin of the name Aušros Vartai (1894) he also identified the “more correct” forms ажъ 1 (alongside аунъ) and аура dawn (alongside аўра).

Such examples support inspector Roshchin’s opinion that Lyatskii tended to somewhat distort language facts. Roshchin noted that Lyatskii wanted to make the learning of Lithuanian easier for his students not only by comparing Lithuanian and Russian, but also by pushing Lithuanian closer to Russian.

2.3.7. Flexion Confusion

Sometimes Lyatskii failed to appropriately use the flexions; he especially happened to confuse the grammatical gender, for example, in the program of 1873 he spelt the iness. sg. Lietuvoje (in Lithuania) as Летова; he also indicated the location as антъ Лётува ~ ant Lietuvą “in Lithuania”. He wrongly used the flexion -е to produce the nom. pl. of Жмоне (man, human): Жмоне — people were plowing). Lyatskii also sometimes made mistakes when editing the text of PM (1875): су күлтотомс коемс → су күлтотейсъ коейсъ. In his paper for the Ninth Congress of Archaeologists (1893) Lyatskii often confused Lithuanian gender-marking flexions, cf.: Сарг (guard); Кел (road) (both have inappropriate feminine flexions). Lithuanian forms уласъ, оласъ, and аласъ were treated by Lyatskii as the singular of ula (rock), probably due to the wrongly added singular masculine flexion. Lyatskii also failed to note difference of the words ula (rock) and ola (cave). The masculine gender of дарбас (work) was wrongly modified into feminine дарба. From Lyatskii’s paper for this Congress Būtenas had an impression that Lyatskii hardly knew Lithuanian at all.

2.3.8. Standardization of Panevėžys Subdialect?

Alongside the forms of Panevėžys subdialect inserted when editing PM (1875), Lyatskii made references to this subdialect elsewhere. In his review of PM (1873), he spelt the word jau (already) using a single grapheme <ё>; speakers of Panevėžys subdialect monophthongized the flexion to [o]. In the program of 1873 the Panevėžys subdialect form Лятувишкасъ slipped into the text: when quoting the title of МДИ (which had the word Лептувишкисъ), he inserted <я>, a monophthongized pre-stress diphthongoid [ie].

Sometimes Lyatskii introduced the forms of Panevėžys subdialect as characteristic of Lithuanian in general. For example, in his paper for the Ninth Congress of Archaeologists (1893), he wrote that people who herded sheep had been called aviuvariai (Авювареi) or simply avariai (Aваре), and added that Lithuanians tended to hide <и>...
(he meant the monophthongization of [ai] in Аваре of Panevėžys area). Affected by such reduction of flexions in Panevėžys subdialect in his review of Lyutostanski’s translations (1888) Lyatskii called the non-monophthongized flexion -ai as hated by the Lithuanians of Panevėžys district. In his review of Miliauskas’ Lithuanian Alphabet (1883) Lyatskii considered the sound of Panevėžys subdialect <о> [o] in the word жосись as the most acceptable; if Lyatskii had ever thought of Standard Lithuanian in Cyrillic script, he might have promoted the form жосись.

When Lyatskii was writing a review of Liaugminas’ calendar (1896), he had already lived in Panevėžys for about twenty-eight years; during the period he should have learned Panevėžys subdialect much better. He began claiming that the language of Panevėžys district was spoken in accordance with grammar: here supposedly the diphthong you [uo] was distinctly articulated and the nasal sound in word-final positions was dropped (e.g., Жемайчю ирь летуво календарюсъ rather than Жемайчюнъ ирь летувононъ календарюсъ as given by Liaugminas). By “in accordance with grammar” Lyatskii must have not necessarily meant a particular grammar, rather, a well-formedness in general (Lyatskii probably failed to notice any major difference between Panevėžys subdialect and the grammatical forms used in the grammars by August Schleicher and Mykolas Miežinis, which were referred to in his writings). Thus, the language spoken in Panevėžys, Lyatskii thought, had also to be used for writing, because of its grammaticality and regularity. The claim that the language spoken around Panevėžys was well-formed is one step to the claim that Panevėžys subdialect was the most suitable for Standard Lithuanian.

2.3.9. Orthography

Lyatskii’s orthography as reflected in his editing of PM (1875) was introduced in section 2.2.3. The present section focuses on his ideas about spelling that were either unique or eventually modified.

<ѣ>. In 1875 Lyatskii spelt the iness. sg. flexion -e as <ѣ>; this letter was also sometimes used to spell the diphthongoid [ie]. Miliauskas was reproached by Lyatskii (1883) for giving preference to <ѣ> rather than <и> and <е>.

When commenting on the proofs of Pososhkov’s brochure (1887), however, Lyatskii claimed the opposite: if the letter <ѣ> was not even needed in Russian, why bother introducing it in Lithuanian? Thus, Lyatskii changed his mind and refused to use the character <ѣ> altogether (“Зачемъ буква ѣ?! Вовсѣ ее не нужно”). Afterward, in neither the texts translated by Lyutostanski (1888) nor in Liaugminas’ calendar (1896), Lyatskii missed <ѣ>; to Liaugminas he even suggested to eliminate it entirely.

<э>. In the manuscript of PM (1875) Lyatskii used <э> to especially mark the first component of the diphthongs [ai], [ei] in unstressed positions or in syllables with the ascending intonation, and sometimes wrote <э> separately. He resented Miliauskas’ intention to eliminate the character <э> together with some others (1883).

In the proofs of Pososhkov’s brochure (1887), however, Lyatskii again claimed the opposite: the character <э> should be replaced with <э> in all positions (like yat <ѣ>); any speaker of Lithuanian would still be able to read the text correctly; non-speakers
could not be helped. In this case, Lyatskii appeared as a conceptualizer of the Lithuanian script; he thought that there was no need to invent an ideal phonetic alphabet marking all shades of pronunciation; the script could be to certain extent approximate, arbitrary, generalizing the pronunciation of more than one dialect. In the review of Lyutostanskiis’s translations (1888) and in the corrections of Lyutostanskiis’s manuscript of ИУr, however, Lyatskii returned to the character <э>. He also attacked the Latin alphabet because of the shortage of grapheme <э> to feature the required sound; this was the reason for Lithuanians to replace supposedly inaccurately <э> with <a>. Lyatskii again insisted on writing <эй> in diphthongs in unstressed positions or in syllables with the ascending intonation; moreover, he suggested that <э> should be used to mark the roots (ei-, ein-, and ėj-) of the word eiti (go); the root ei- in Panevėžys was pronounced as [ai] with the ascending intonation; the spelling of ėj- must have been generalized according to ei- and ein- (with the word initial <э>). In his review of Liaugminas’ calendar (1896) Lyatskii adhered to his idea to spell those diphthongs with <э>. The only position he did not get back to was the spelling of <э> in non-diphthongs.

Lyatskii’s hesitation in 1887 and returning to <э> in diphthongs in 1888 may have occurred because of two reasons. (1) In 1887 Lyatskii worked with other people (Kiškis, Silvestras Baltramaitis, and Viktoras Aramavičius), which indicates that publishing Pososhkov’s brochure probably had not been the task assigned by Vilnius Education District administrators; thus, Lyatskii could have made allowances to the other clients, adjusting to the circumstances. (2) At the seminary Lyatskii taught his students from PM, in which the grapheme <э> prevailed. To refuse it would have meant refusing possibly the most distinct feature of spelling in PM and creating problems for himself during his classes (it must have been easier to reject the grapheme yat <ѣ> because it was rather rare in PM).

<yо>. In his editing of the PM and in many reviews and articles Lyatskii (like other non-native editors Kashirin and Levin) used <о> to spell the diphthongoid [uo]. In 1896, however, Lyatskii seemed to have realized that in Panevėžys district the “merged sound” yoa was very distinct; thus, in his review of Liaugminas’ calendar he began using the digraph <yо> (дуо). Following the example of Lithuanians of Eastern Prussia, Lyatskii even quoted the word in Latin characters with [uo] <ў> (dūti).

<эё>. Lyatskii insisted that the publishers should use the character of the Russian alphabet <ё>. In his review of PM (1873) Lyatskii proposed <ё> instead of <ио> (апвиніоть → обвиніётъ); the same <ё> had to be used for the word jaw (already)—ё. He also suggested replacing Miliauskas’ ииіоктуи with ииъёктуи (1883). In Pososhkov’s brochure Lyatskii wanted <ё> (диок → диёкъ; висакіосе → io = ё) and complained that <ё> was not used even in Russian (1887). He approved of Lyutostanskiis’s orthography and claimed that after having added <ё> “the issue of applying the Russian alphabet for Lithuanian would be solved” (1888). In his article prepared on the basis of his paper for the Ninth Congress of Archaeologists (1893) Lyatskii also used <ё> (ваийкіё; дилюёти). Only when writing his review of Liaugminas’ calendar (1896) Lyatskii began tolerating the palatalization mark <ё> before <о>; thus, he did not reject
Liaugminas’ <io> in the word Рощиоқь and spelled <io> in the words Межио – Мие-жініо and ужкіо́віі eliminating <ё>.

<ў>. The Belarusian grapheme <ў> used by Mikucki and Ivinskis was introduced at some point by Lyatskii when editing the teachers’ layer of PM. Lyatskii’s arguments for using it were provided in the review of Miliauska’s primer (1883). Having compared <ў> with the German aúf and a similar Lithuanian diphthong [au] (дайгъ), Lyatskii suggested that <ў> should be synchronized with <á>, another Russian character, also written with the breve diacritic. “Learners of Lithuanian should find it easier to read” if two characters with the same diacritic were introduced. Lyatskii continued to use the grapheme in Pososhkov’s brochure (лабяусей → Лабъяўсей; сушнау → сунаў), Lyutostanskii’s ИУ (апаўдава; гаспадардаява; кашіні), and the review of Liaugminas’ calendar.

The only effort to accept Lyatskii’s diacritical grapheme <ў> was shown by the typesetters of the newspaper Виленскі вѣстникъ. When typesetting the text of the article on the origin of the name Aušros Vartai (1894), however, they replaced the character, whose precise type was not available, with a similar one with the inverted breve <ў> (Аўштра, аўша).<н>. Lyatskii had his own theory on nasal vowels in the root. In his review of Liaugminas’ calendar (1896) Lyatskii began discussing nasal characters in word-final positions. He suggested spelling the sound [n] hidden in any nasal sound as a lowercase <н>, since the sound was not pronounced in all Lithuanian dialects. This idea signaled a turn in Lyatskii’s thinking—he must have accepted, albeit not completely, the spelling of the nasal sound <н> in the acc. sg. flexion, although he did not write it himself.

The impact of Standard Lithuanian? When Lyatskii started his career as a teacher of Lithuanian in 1873, only some Lithuanians might have dreamed about Standard Lithuanian (in Latin characters). But when Lyatskii resigned in 1895, there was hardly anyone able to read Lithuanian who did not know about the nascence of a common written standard. In his last review of Liaugminas’ calendar (1896) Lyatskii modified his proposals on orthography: he accepted <н> in word-final positions; he used the tautosyllabic digraph <io> (i.e., <i>, to mark the palatalized consonants), and refused <ё>; he also introduced <yo> to spell the (stressed) diphthongoid [uo] replacing the previously used <о>. Lyatskii’s developing linguistic views might have been influenced by the just evolved Standard Lithuanian in Latin characters; all the above cases of tolerance and modification were also features of Standard Lithuanian, albeit in another alphabet (the nasal characters <ą>, <ę>, <į>, <ų>; the marker of softness <i>; the digraph <uo>). Thus, it was not Lyatskii’s orthographic norms that became accepted, but rather the accepted Standard Lithuanian influenced Lyatskii.

2.3.10. Lithuanian Publications in Latin Script

Lyatskii was not only aware of the illegal Lithuanian publications in Latin characters, he has also received a task to secretly translate two issues of the newspaper Auszra, priest Aleksandras Burba’s writings (1886), and the brochure Praneszimai lie-
Lyatskii himself did not ignore illegal publications in Latin characters. For example, in his paper for the Ninth Congress of Archaeologists (1893) Lyatskii gave exactly the same etymology of the words *Perkūnas* and *Perūnas* as earlier was published by Simonas Daukantas (treated them as related to the word *perėti* [to hatch]). The proposed etymology of the word *germanai* (Germanic tribes) by Lyatskii was also equivalent to Daukantas’ one (derived it from the word *giria* [forest, wood]). Both etymologies could have been adopted from Daukantas’ book *Būdas Senowęs-Lėtuviû Kalnienû ir Żamajtiû* (“Character of the Old Lithuanians: Highlanders and Lowlanders,” 1845).

When editing the manuscript of *PM* Lyatskii used the word *gintuvė* (fortress). He also included it into his paper for the Ninth Congress of Archaeologists (1893). The word could have been taken from the writings of Konstantinas Sirvydas, Simonas Daukantas or Dionizas Poška. Since Daukantas’ and Poška’s texts with *gintuvė* were only available in the manuscript format, Lyatskii must have adopted it from Sirvydas’ dictionary *Dictionarium Trium Linguarum* (“Dictionary of Three Languages,” 1713).

In his last review of Liaugminas’ calendar, Lyatskii openly referred to two Lithuanian grammars in Latin script. Reference to August Schleicher’s grammar (1856) was made for the patronymic suffixes, explaining why *Александровичъ* could not be translated as *Александрайтисъ*. Lyatskii may have also adopted Schleicher’s definition of the diphthongoid [uo] ‘ô’; eventually, he started promoting the diphthongoid *yoa* [uo]. From Mykolas Miežinis’ grammar (1886) Lyatskii quoted the name of the locative case (“*vetinis*, *арбо* localis”). Both grammars written in Latin characters were quoted by Lyatskii as authoritative sources.

Thus, Lyatskii read Lithuanian texts in Latin characters for curiosity; he at least made use of Sirvydas’ dictionary, Daukantas’ *Būdas*, and the grammars by Schleicher and Miežinis.

**2.4. Programs of Teaching Lithuanian**

In the last quarter of the nineteenth century, Lithuanian was taught at the Panevėžys Teacher Training Seminary at least in three ways. At the beginning, until the teacher Lyatskii was selected in January 1873, the Vilnius Education District overseer Sergievskii allowed those students who knew Lithuanian to teach those who did not. In February, however, the Minister of Education banned such teaching methodology. When already engaged as a teacher, Lyatskii prepared his first program of teaching Lithuanian (1873), which required that Lithuanian should be taught for half an hour between lunch and the classes after lunch. Three grades (except for the beginner grade) were learning together. The third way of teaching should have been employed after Lyatskii and Poidėnas had prepared a new program of teaching Lithuanian (1893). The beginner and first, second and third graders were to separately have two classes of Lithuanian per week. The classes had to be scheduled during the usual class time, not during the breaks.
The program of 1873 was the first program of teaching Lithuanian officially approved by the education system of the Russian Empire in Kaunas province (and the North-western Region of Russia). It thus made Lyatskii the founder of the official teaching theory of Lithuanian in the North-western Region.

The program of 1893, prepared in collaboration with Andrius Poidėnas, took seventeen pages (cf. slightly more than three pages in the previous program). An obvious difference between the two programs: a large scope of grammatical materials in the new program. Generally, the presentation of the theory seems to be rather consistent and motivated; it starts with simpler and continues with more complex grammatical features. Alongside the comparison with Russian, both programs give attention to grammar, exercises (oral and written), and especially translation into Lithuanian. In 1884 Sergievskii appreciated the translation skills of the Seminary graduates: one of them translated into Lithuanian and prepared for publication Konstantin Ushinskii’s Родное Слово (“Native Word”).

Upon the completion of the program of 1893, a Seminary graduate had to possess Lithuanian skills, which would be equivalent to those that have been gained by a Lithuanian learner of Russian from Nikolai Bunakov’s primer of Russian Азбука и Уроки Чтения Русского и Церковно-Славянского (“An Alphabet and Reading Lessons of Russian and Church Slavonic”). The Seminary graduate should have learned the sections of the Russian textbook translated into Lithuanian, which afterwards would be used in his classes with Lithuanian students, and not more. An essentially updated program of teaching Lithuanian did not raise more ambitious aims of teaching Lithuanian than before.

3. Andrius Poidėnas

Andrius Poidėnas, Adomas’ son, was born November 26, 1859, in the village of Gerultiškis, Parovėja county (to the north-east of Biržai), and baptized Orthodox in Opochka (now Pskov province, Russia). He studied in Panevėžys Teacher Training Seminary (1874–1878), worked as a teacher at schools in Šaukėnai (1878–1880), Kuršėnai (1880–1883), Panevėžys–Piniava (1883–1887), Viešniai (1887–1888), and finally, at the Panevėžys Teacher Training Seminary (1889–1901), where he was promoted by Sergievskii, overseer of the Vilnius Education District. Before that, he had passed the examinations of a district teacher of the Russian language and literature. After Lyatskii left the seminary, Poidėnas replaced him as a teacher of Lithuanian (1895–1901). He took efforts to find a job at the Ministry of Internal Affairs (1896), since the teacher’s job had a bad effect on his health, or so he claimed (according to director Ivan Belyaev, Poidėnas’ nerves were frayed in fact and the illness attained a formidable form). Poidėnas, however, did not change his job. In Panevėžys, Nociagala, and Krekenava his brother Vasilijus Poidėnas worked as a police officer, who from November 1, 1929, received a special knygnešiai (book carriers) pension (he had actually pretended he did not notice book carriers’ activities). Andrius Poidėnas died August 24, 1901, after being paralyzed; he is buried in the Orthodox cemetery in Panevėžys.
Poidėnas’ work in the area of Lithuanian studies did not last as long and was less extensive than Lyatskii’s. Poidėnas collected Lithuanian letters written in the Cyrillic alphabet, and thus earned Sergievskii’s benevolence. In 1887 Poidėnas and Lyatskii met with privatdozent of St. Petersburg University Eduard Wolter in Panevėžys. The latter gave a much higher evaluation to Poidėnas’ knowledge of Lithuanian than Lyatskii’s, since Poidėnas was a native Lithuanian. Together with Lyatskii, Poidėnas read the proofs of Pososhkov’s brochure (1887). It seems that Poidėnas only used proofreader’s marks in the second section of Календарис Свеппу Цель Мету (‘A Calendar of the Holidays of the Whole Year’). The data available from his marks is insufficient to be able to decide the quality of his Lithuanian; it can only be pointed out that, unlike Lyatskii, he did not disapprove of the grapheme yat <ѣ> (cf. Попиещиус → Попьльчусъ, Ash Wednesday). Lyatskii did not finish proofreading Lyutostanskii’s translation of Lev Tolstoi’s short story Кауказа Невальникасъ (‘The Prisoner of Caucasus,’ 1890) because of numerous errors left at the printing house; afterwards, however, the translation was accurately proofread by Poidėnas. Together with Lyatskii, Poidėnas prepared the second program of teaching Lithuanian (1893; see 2.4).

In 1899 Poidėnas was to revise two Lithuanian manuscripts received from Sergievskii: Nikolai Gogol’s play Wedding, translated by Liudvikas Jakavičius, and Juozapas Miliauskas’ primer Буквињисъ (‘Alphabet’).

Jakavičius had considerably shortened Gogol’s Wedding, transferred its action from St. Petersburg to Panevėžys, to Ramygala Street, and the main characters were changed into the concrete local personalities of Panevėžys. Such transformation was called by Poidėnas an immodest openness; he was categorically against staging the play. Poidėnas did not even mention the Lithuanian language or spelling of the manuscript (the Wedding must have been written in Latin, rather than Cyrillic, script; Poidėnas did not need to review the banned orthography).

Miliauskas’ attempt to invent a script for Lithuanians in the manuscript of Буквињисъ, in Poidėnas opinion, came rather late: Lithuanian books had long been published in Russian alphabet (PM); Russian characters were so convenient that “Lithuanians and Lowlanders” most widely used them for writing private letters in their native dialect. Miliauskas’ spelling was interpreted by Poidėnas as an attempt to facilitate the isolation of Lithuanians from the major layers of population (Russians) in the Empire. Poidėnas claimed that the grapheme <i> should not replace the Russian <и>, <е> and <й> (the words Буквињисъ, einys were supposedly spelt wrong). Poidėnas recommended that the Russian characters should be used and not discarded; he even suspected that Miliauskas might have cheated: at the beginning of Буквињисъ he listed all Russian characters but in the following texts skipped <у>, <ю>, <ое>, and <оё>. Poidėnas disliked Miliauskas’ preference of non-Russian way in spelling Lithuanian words whose roots had been as if of the same origin as Russian, for example, торфляха (Russ. тарелка), dynasty (Russ. дрень). Again, it might signal that Poidėnas did not adopt Lyatskii’s approach to avoid the yat <и>, and continued Krečinskis’ and Kashirin’s tradition.

Poidėnas was inclined to give more attention to the cultural aspects of the textbook rather than spelling. According to him, Miliauskas was willing for each Lithuanian to have a textbook so that he/she could learn to read and write. Thus, Буквињисъ had
to be used at home. At this point, Poidėnas saw danger for the public (Russian) school. To provide family schools with primers would mean acknowledging that those schools were legal. Poidėnas also did not like that Miliauskas encouraged creation of Lithuanian literature. Lithuanian literature, albeit written in Russian characters, was supposedly dangerous for the policy of the Russian Empire that promoted closeness of Lithuanians to Russians, whereas the native Lithuanian literature would rather estrange Lithuanians from Russians. Poidėnas generally referred to Lithuanians as people of “foreign origin” (инородцами). In this way, he emphasized his identification with the official discourse of the Russian national policy. Poidėnas approved the idea of the assimilation of Lithuanians; according to Būtėnas, Poidėnas failed to understand the aspirations of the Lithuanian nation.

The final conclusion made by Poidėnas about Miliauskas’ Буквінісъ was absolutely negative. But even Sergievskii found Poidėnas’ opinion too strict. He asked inspector Odintsov for another review, who expressed an idea that such a primer could help Lithuanians adjust and get used to the Russian script. Finally, Sergievskii recommended Буквінісъ for publication; before that, its spelling had to be adjusted to PM, also some short stories had to be skipped or replaced. Poidėnas appeared to be the most conservative of all; differently from Poidėnas, it is not only Lyatskii started to modify his Cyrillic orthography of Lithuanian (rejected <ѣ>, partially also <ё>, limited the usage of <ъ>), but even Sergievskii began to promote the “illegal” way of learning at home.

The scope of attention given by Poidėnas and Lyatskii to the Lithuanian language and orthography was different. In Jakavičius’ or Miliauskas’ manuscripts Poidėnas first of all saw the methodology, teaching content, goals, and political aspects rather than the Lithuanian language. Poidėnas was a native Lithuanian; he was not particularly interested, however, in the history of Lithuanian. Lyatskii’s knowledge of Lithuanian was limited, but he was very enthusiastic about using it and learning about it more. According to Būtėnas, Poidėnas did not use any comparative method; in his classes Poidėnas used the same PM, conjugated and declined Lithuanian words, translated the primer of Russian. In his classes Poidėnas, differently from Lyatskii, did not speak Lithuanian.

4. Conclusion

Kashirin, Lyatskii, and Poidėnas left this world at the turn of the nineteenth century. They did not have an opportunity to see the abolition of the prohibition of Latin characters in 1904. The impact of the language or spelling used in the textbooks МДИ or PM was minimal if present. In 1904 the official Cyrillic script, without having left a more lingering trace, was replaced with Standard Lithuanian in Latin letters.
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