**Gerd Hentschel, Siarhiej Zaprudski (eds.)**

# Belarusian Trasjanka and Ukrainian Suržyk

## Structural and social aspects of their description and categorization

*Gerd Hentschel, University of Oldenburg (Germany)*

# On the development of inflectional paradigms in Belarusian trasjanka: the example of demonstrative pronouns[*]

## 1. Introduction

A central problem with which one is confronted when considering Belarusian trasjanka or Ukrainian suržyk is whether they can simply be regarded as instances of spontaneous mixing of Belarusian or Ukrainian elements (linguistic signs and structures or constructions) respectively with those of Russian, or whether they constitute at least the initial stages of new, albeit mixed and highly varied, "unique" third languages or varieties (new "langues"), evolving from contact between Belarusian or Ukrainian on the one hand and Russian on the other. In other words, the question is whether a spontaneous mixing or a conventional mixing is occurring, or, alternatively, since these categories are not necessarily exclusive, to what extent the mixing is determined by spontaneity ("mixed speech") and convention ("mixed language/variety") respectively.

One piece of evidence that suggests the possibility of new, third languages is the fact that everyone concerned with the phenomena of trasjanka and suržyk (regardless whether they have a negative or neutral attitude toward them[1]) encounters a significant number of speakers who only show mixed speech. If such speakers are asked or, in certain communicative contexts, attempt on their own to speak a "pure" form of one or the other of the two contacting languages they are usually mixing, what essentially happens is that they increase the frequency of signs and constructions of whichever language they are attempting to speak.[2] Traditional linguists in Belarus, the

---

[1] It seems that the only place where a positive attitude toward trasjanka and suržyk can be found now and then is in the arts, for example in pop music and in literature where both are used as a stylistic device; cf. RAMZA (in press), STAVYC'KA & TRUB (2007).

[2] This phenomenon is also known to occur in contact situations where the two languages involved are not as closely genetically or structurally related as is the case here with Belaru-

Ukraine and also in Russia as well as many feature writers, literary critics and "linguist-politicians" tend to place these speakers in the context of cultural decline due to inadequate education. For our purposes, such polemical points of view are, of course, irrelevant. Only the following needs to be added: there can be no doubt that the phenomenon of trasjanka, on which we intend to concentrate in the following (leaving Ukrainian suržyk mostly aside), at least in the early stages of its development, is connected with an incomplete acquisition of Russian, especially by Belarusian rural-urban migrants in the 60's and 70's of the last century during a period of massive industrialization and urbanization in Belarus in the aftermath of the Second World War. This was a time in which the migrants had to establish themselves in a new environment which, also from a linguistic point of view, was Russian-dominated.[3]

The dominant opinion among linguists in Belarus and the Ukraine is that, in spite of the "exclusive speakers" of trasjanka and suržyk, there is no "third", new mixed variety (conventional mixing). The high level of individualization in these forms of speech is emphasized (not only with regard to individual speakers, but also with regard to varying communicative situations, and the varying communicative behaviour of individuals in these situations), and, additionally, the absence of "systematicity" (cf. MASENKO this volume; MEČKOVSKAJA 1994, 2002, 2007; CYCHUN 1998, in press). Although, as a rule, it is not quite clear what is meant by the concept of "systematicity" in this context (it is presumably an "informal" conclusion regarding the unquestionably high level of variation that characterizes both forms of speech), the essence of this point of view is that in the mixed speech of trasjanka (and suržyk), it is obviously possible to use a linguistic "element" (linguistic sign or construction) of either Belarusian (Ukrainian) or Russian

---

sian or Ukrainian on the one hand, and Russian on the other, but are in both respects extremely remote from each other: cf. SWIGART (1992) on mixed speech from French and Wolof.

3   When THOMASON (2003, 22) says flatly, "imperfect learning plays a significant role in the genesis of pidgins and creoles but not in the genesis of bilingual mixed languages", that could be an (over-) generalization which perhaps is justified for "lexicon-grammar splits" of the "structural prototype" of mixed languages (cf. MATRAS 2003) arising from contact between genetically and structurally distant languages but not, or not necessarily, for a "blend" of two genetically related and structurally similar languages.

at (almost) every structural and / or linear position.[4] In other words, elements of Belarusian (or Ukrainian) and Russian which in some respect may be described as functionally equivalent are obviously free variants in trasjanka (and suržyk) discourse, without any limitations on the paradigmatic choice between them. But if it is not possible to identify any regular restrictions on the paradigmatic choice of elements and structures of language X or Y in a given form of mixed speech, then it cannot be reasonable to assume the existence or an ongoing development of a third language (or variety) Z with a langue "containing" rules that determine the distribution of elements or construction from X and Y, regardless of how rudimentary this langue might be.[5]

Clearly, the cited, traditional way of conceiving systematicity is strongly oriented toward the structuralist concept of system. Structuralism and other related approaches which, like the generative approach, stem from it are based on deterministic laws (categorical rules). Beyond the interests of these paradigms lie probabilistic relationships (stochastic interdependencies) within languages, that is, regularities of the kind that the use of (to a considerable extent) equivalent signs and constructions of languages X and Y in a given structural position may in principle be freely varied, although (statistically significant) quantitative differences, i.e. differences in the use of variants from either X or Y, may be observed (cf. CHAMBERS 2003, 25-33). ALTMANN (1972, 3) states for language change in general (i.e. quite independent of speech or language mixing through contact), that a language is at all times not only a "static" system, but also in a "dynamic" stage of transition. The transition from one stage of a language to another is evidenced specifically in the variation between (principally or partially equivalent) segmental or constructional language elements A and B, and even primarily in their free variation, since a strict (exclusively) complementary (positional) variation is a categorical rule. In such transitional phenomena, it is useful to determine differences in the frequency of occurrence between two (or more) competing signs or constructions A and B. The same applies to the question

---

4    Principal restrictions on code-switching, which have been formulated by various students of the phenomenon, are obviously (if at all) not relevant for contact between languages that are genetically and structurally close to each other (cf. HELLER & PFAFF 1997).

5    Gradual and regular restrictions of the free paradigmatic variation between signs and constructions of the languages in contact are also known to be an aspect of the gradual transition from code-switching through code-mixing to "fused lect" according to the assumption of AUER (1998).

regarding the emergence of a new language, a new variety Z, from the contact between two "older" languages, X and Y, as a special case of language change.

In the case of trasjanka there can be a transition in two respects: the first is that this form of mixed speech could be an epiphenomenon related to an ongoing, but as yet incomplete linguistic transition or shift within the Belarusian society to Russian, which would one day be the only language in common use. As far as the "high variety" in the Belarusian linguistic landscape is concerned, there is much evidence to support this: after all, considerably more people can be found with fluency in the Russian standard language (leaving aside "accent phenomena" mainly in the sense of phonetic or phonological interference) than with fluency in the Belarusian standard language (regardless of which of the two standards, "Taraškevica" or "Narkamoŭka" are considered). On the other hand, that which is currently designated trasjanka (or the "core" of it) might develop into a new, relatively stable "low variety" (subvariety), which, for example, despite the trend towards Russian in the standard language, conserves Belarusian elements and constructions, in this way reflecting some sort of regional linguistic identity and linguistic distinction from Russian and Russians. For the future, this would mean some new sort of diglossic situation (cf. HENTSCHEL & TESCH 2006, 240f).

In many respects, the language contact between two genetically and structurally very closely related languages is more similar to the contact between different dialects of one language. With regard to the genesis of new "mixed dialects" from older dialects, TRUDGILL (1986, 95) finds that only after the third or fourth generation does a new, relatively stable code Z emerge, which then exhibits widespread regular, i.e. rule-like, restrictions on the use of elements from the dialects in contact, X and Y (or as the case may be, also additional dialects) as well as new, unique structures that have developed in Z while nonetheless continuing to be strongly characterized by variation, like most varieties without an explicit codification. The phase preceding this is characterized by the widespread free variation of (principally or partially) equivalent elements and constructions from X and Y in the speech of the members of the groups in contact, while at the same time, potential regularities or rules are already suggested in terms of difference in token frequency of these elements and constructions. Thus the genesis of new, mixed dialects seems to proceed gradually, similarly to the way that AUER (1998) as-

sumes for the development of mixed languages i.e. from code-switching through code-mixing to a new "fused lect".[6]

If we consider the beginning of the genesis of trasjanka to be the late 60's and 70's of the last century[7] and keep in mind that the pertinent group, – the rural-urban migrants – was mostly made up of young people at the time of their migration, then we can figure that up to now there are no more than two adult generations of potential trasjanka speakers. Therefore, in the light of TRUDGILL's (1986) research and the research on mixed dialects he quotes, it would be premature to expect a regular, rule-like distribution of the original Belarusian and Russian elements already. With this in mind, the following discussion will be primarily aimed at determining quantitative preferences[8] for the Belarusian, Russian or even new trasjanka-specific forms and struc- tures in the mixed Belarusian-Russian speech, and secondarily at interpreting these findings qualitatively. The analysis will concentrate on competing equivalent word forms with differing "synchronic" origins. Thus the usual paradigmatic point of view in investigating linguistic variation will be cho- sen following socio-linguistic approaches in the tradition of W. Labov. A complete picture of trasjanka speech can of course only be achieved if a syn- tagmatic perspective is also included in the framework of code-switching

---

6    The idea that the genesis of mixed languages occurs via a conventionalization of code-switching in the sense of AUER's (1998) continuum model has recently been questioned (cf. MATRAS & BAKKER 2003a, 17; BAKKUS 2003). Ultimately, however, this criticism aims at "prototypical mixes" from genetically and structurally distant languages, whereby (to a large extent) the content words originate in one source language and the grammar is from the other language. This does not apply to trasjanka, even if it is evident that Russian plays a dominant role with regard to content words in trasjanka discourse. Where Russian and Belarusian do at all differ, grammatical structures and words from both languages can oc- cur.

7    Certainly, there were forms of mixed Belarusian-Russian speech in earlier times as well, especially in those parts of Belarus that belonged to the Soviet Union between the World Wars. But due to the massive urbanization and industrialization of Byelorussia, starting in the 1960s and 1970s, and the epiphenomenon of a massive wave of rural-urban migration mixed Belarusian-Russian speech experienced a "new start" after World War II.

8    In the quantitative analyses, the statistical significance will be established where appropri- ate. Where not otherwise indicated, the significance will be determined using the $\chi^2$-test. The basis is, of course, the respective absolute values and not the relative values usually given in the text.

models (cf. MUYSKEN 2000).[9] For the time being, however, this is not feasible due to the lack of corpus material.

At the present time, no broad corpus data for trasjanka are available. The following analysis is based on a geographically restricted corpus of excerpts from conversations which were recorded in the context of a family gathering (family members, friends and acquaintances) in the city of Baranavičy[10] (it contained roughly 21,000 current word forms in approx. 5,000 sentences or comparable utterances at the time of analysis). This corpus can therefore by no means be considered representative of the "entire Belarusian trasjanka". The question whether on a broad scale trasjanka shows some degree of unification must be answered by future research.[11]

## 2. Demonstrative Pronouns – A Comparison

In Belarusian as well as in Russian, there is a two-level system of demonstrative pronouns whose basic function may be seen in the expression of proximal and distal deixis. The paradigms for both literary languages are as follows:

---

9   The form of code-switching (Muysken himself, as is known, uses the term "code mixing" as a comprehensive concept, reserving "code-switching" for the alternational subtype) that MUYSKEN (2000) designates "congruent lexicalization" would be especially pertinent. Other forms of code-switching, especially inter-sentential or some other forms of the alternational type, can, of course, not be regarded as symptoms for a new "fused lect". They leave the competence of corresponding speakers in both contacting languages intact, i.e. separated (but cf. ZAPRUDSKI in this volume on the relevance of compound bilingualism for the Belarusian situation).

10   For further details cf. HENTSCHEL & TESCH (2007).

11   A corpus including six further "family corpora" from other cities in addition to the corpus from Baranavičy mentioned above is currently being assembled in the Slavic Department of Oldenburg University in cooperation with the State University at Minsk. The research is funded by the Volkswagen Foundation.

| (1) Demonstratives of the proximal deixis: comparison of Br. and R. Forms | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Case | Masc. Sg. | | Neutr. Sg. | | Fem. Sg. | | Plural | |
| nom. | *hėty* | *ėtot* | *hėtae* *hėta* | *ėto* | *hėtaja* *hėta* | *ėta* | *hėtyja* | *ėti* |
| gen. | *hėtaha* | *ėtogo* | like masc. sg. | | *hėtaj* | *ėtoj* | *hėtyx* | *ėtix* |
| dat. | *hėtamu* | *ėtomu* | | | *hėtaj* | *ėtoj* | *hėtym* | *ėtim* |
| acc. | like nom. or gen. | | like nom. | | *hėtuju* *hėtu* | *ėtu* | like nom. or gen. | |
| instr. | *hėtym* | *ėtim* | like masc. sg. | | *hėtaj(u)* | *ėtoj(u)* | *hėtymi* | *ėtimi* |
| loc. | *hėtym* | *ėtom* | | | *hėtaj* | *ėtoj* | *hėtyx* | *ėtix* |
| | Br. | R. | Br. | R. | Br. | R. | Br. | R. |

| (2) Demonstratives of the distal deixis: comparison of Br. und R. Forms | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Case | Masc. Sg. | | Neut. Sg. | | Fem. Sg. | | Plural | |
| nom. | *toj* | *tot* | *toe* | *to* | *taja* | *ta* | *tyja* | *te* |
| gen. | *taho* | *togo* | like masc. sg. | | *toj* | *toj* | *tyx* | *tex* |
| dat. | *tamu* | *tomu* | | | *toj* | *toj* | *tym* | *tem* |
| acc. | like nom. or gen. | | like nom. | | *tuju* | *tu* | like nom. or gen. | |
| instr. | *tym* | *tem* | like masc. sg. | | *toj(u)* | *toj(u)* | *tymi* | *temi* |
| loc. | *tym* | *tom* | | | *toj* | *toj* | *tyx* | *tex* |
| | Br. | R. | Br. | R. | Br. | R. | Br. | R. |

One should first note the differences in the root and stem morphemes, the most striking difference (from an historical point of view) being the prothetic *h-* in the paradigm of the Br. pronouns of the proximal deixis and its absence in the R. counterpart.[12] What should also be noted, secondly, is a difference

---

12 In the Br. dialects, in addition to the proximal deixis demonstratives with the stem-initial prothetic *h*, there is an entire series of other consonant or compositional morpheme prothe-

in the stem-final consonants, in the proximal as well as in the distal deixis (in the proximal deixis, this consonant is simultaneously the "monosegmental" stem[13]): in the plural and instr. sg. of Russian, we find a palatal ("soft") /-t'-/ where otherwise the non-palatal ("hard") /-t-/ stands. This alternation is absent in Belarusian. The difference in the stem-final consonants correlates, of course, with differences in the initial vowel of the R. endings.

Before the differences in the endings are briefly discussed, it remains to be explained which differences at the level of expression are generally relevant to this study of trasjanka. Trasjanka is in the first instance not an academic, but rather a "folk category" (cf. SLOBODA 2006, NÁBĚLKOVÁ & SLOBODA in press), bearing the imprint of language-conscious laypeople rather than of linguistic scholars. For the former this blend of Belarusian and Russian elements in the speech of many Belarusians was not only conspicuous, but also, as a rule, displeasing. There is more to this "blend" than simply the Belarusian accent in Russian, which due to a certain degree of conventionalization has also become known as the Belarusian "natiolect" of Russian (cf. MICHNEVIČ & GIRUCKIJ 1982). If trasjanka is to be made the subject of linguistic investigation (regardless of how unified or not it may turn out to be) and the term becomes a concept in scholarly discourse, then it will also be necessary in the method of analysis to distinguish trasjanka from the Belarusian accent in Russian. That is to say that in the following, those differences in pronunciation between Belarusian and Russian will be ignored which have a purely phonetic character – e.g. different phonetic realizations of unstressed or vowels – or purely phonemic character – e.g. the /r/-/r'/ opposition in R. while the Br. counterpart only has the non-palatal /r/, or the consistent palatal /tš'/ pronunciation of *č* in Russian, while in Belarusian it is non-palatal; cf. also the so-called Br. Cekanje, [c'] (a clearly affricative articulation) instead of the R. [t']; for further examples cf. HENTSCHEL & TESCH (2007) or HENTSCHEL (in press a). The trasjankan and Belarusian "natiolects" share many sound patterns, of course, and precisely due to this these sound patterns cannot be regarded as symptomatic for trasjanka (alone). Only those differences in pronunciation will be considered which are specific to the phonological representation of individual morphemes or morphs, i.e. only m o r p h o n e m i c differences. The hypothesis of a new,

---

ses before the vowel (e.g. *jeny*, cf. AVANESAŬ 1964, 222-223), which, however, do not play a role in this study. Demonstratives that etymologically do not go back to historical *tъ* in the stem, like *hèny* and *jeny*, both for distal deixis, do not occur in this corpus.

13 For this synchronic analysis, we are assuming the Br. {hèt- / t-} and the R. {èt- / t-} stems.

third, and mixed variety Z can only make sense if there is more at stake than phonetic-phonological interference (and maybe spontaneous instances of lexical interference) of an X variety on a Y variety. The forms which, in this sense, differ morphonemically in their sound structure will in the following be designated as "Belarusian" and "Russian" (at least) for reasons of expression. Those forms which are identical except for purely phonetic or phonemic differences will be designated "common". Forms (usually, but not always, morphologically complex) that combine specifically Belarusian with specifically Russian elements, will be designated "hybrids".[14]

Given this background, the following differences for the endings of the Br. and R. demonstratives are obtained:

(A) The first difference in the endings correlates with the difference in the stem-final consonants mentioned above, i.e. with the fact that in R. plural and instr. sg. masc. / neut. there is the palatal /-t'-/ while in the corresponding Br. forms there is the non-palatal /-t-/. Correspondingly, the Br. endings always begin with -y- / [ɨ] (the same in both the proximal and distal deixes), but the R. endings begin either with -i- (proximal deixis) or -e- (distal deixis); e.g. Br. hèt-yja / t-yja – R. èt-im / t-em.

(B) There is a clear difference between the forms for the following individual cases: (a) in the nom. sg. masc., the R. forms show a morphophonemic representation "with t occurring twice", which is the result of a reduplicative process[15] not found in Belarusian: Br. hèt-y / t-oj – R. èt-ot / t-ot.[16] (b) In gen. sg. masc. / neut. we find the irregular (in terms of sound change from Common Slavic to contemporary Slavic languages and dialects) R. ending structure /-VvV/,

14  See HENTSCHEL (in press a) for a detailed discussion of the evaluation procedure. Above all please note that in the approach outlined there the qualification of a linguistic sign or construction as "Belarusian / Br." or "Russian / R." is not based on some sort of "synchronic etymology" but mainly on their resemblance with the Br. or R. codified languages!

15  What is involved here is the reduplication of the historical demonstrative tъ to tъtъ which according to the laws of sound change produces tot. The e is an originally expressive prothetic particle, which was contracted in the pronominal form. The Br. variant of this particle was hè. Similarly, the Br. form of the distal Deixis toj has developed from the composition of two demonstrative (definite) pronouns toj ← tъ plus jь.

16  It is, of course, a simplification to describe the R. -ot here as an ending. (The alternative and usual practice is to assume a stem ètot- with no ending or a "zero" ending.) Nevertheless, for the sake of comparison and the analysis of the "mixed inflectional system" of demonstratives in the trasjanka (cf. below), it makes sense to assume a stem èt- for the varieties analyzed in this study.

which contrasts to the regular Br. /-VhV/. (c) The Br. form of the loc. sg. masc. / neut. is identical to the instr. sg., while in the R. paradigm, the original differentiation is maintained; the contrast in loc. sg., Br. *hétym / tym* – R. *ètom / tom*, results from this.

(C) The Br. literary language shows variants in the nom. and acc. sg. of the fem. and neut. genders for the demonstratives of the proximal deixis. For one thing, we have the "long forms" or "long endings", which clearly differ from those of the corresponding R. forms and endings: e.g. acc. sg. fem. Br. *hèt-uju* – R. *èt-u*. By contrast, apart from the prothetic *h* the short Br. forms are identical to those of the corresponding Russian: e.g. Br. *hèt-u.*[17]

# 3. Results

## 3.1 On the morphonemic structure of the stem

This analysis includes 438 uses of the demonstrative pronouns of the proximal deixis (338) and the distal deixis (100). The first essential finding is that of the 338 demonstratives in the proximal deixis, only 19.2% show the typical Br. prothetic *h*. In other words, over four-fifths of the cases (80.8%) show a stem-initial vowel sound, which is typical for Russian. This clear general predominance of the R. stem-initial sound structure by no means indicates a general preference for Russian stem forms in the corpus analyzed.

In a first step the preferences of morphonemic structures in the stem of demonstratives will be analyzed, thereby differentiating singular and plural numbers in the proximal and distal deixis:

---

17 It is striking that in the different (also the more recent) descriptions of the Br. literary language, the evaluation of these parallel short and long forms varies. The textbook on Belarusian for Germans by HURTIG & RAMZA (2003, 122 ff.) does not mention the short forms; the one for speakers of Russian by KRIVICKIJ, MICHNEVIČ & PODLUŽNYJ (1990, 150) cites them as alternative forms. The BRS (2003, s.v.*hèty*) cites the long forms (in parentheses) as alternative forms. In TSBM (1978), which is known to make use of the concept favouring the convergence with Russian, as well as in RBS (2005), there is no reference to the long forms.

| (3) Stems - Proximal deixis | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number | *n* | /het-/ | /et-/ | /et'-, ec'-/ |
| singular | 271 | 17.7% | 81.6% | 0.7% |
| plural | 67 | 25.4% | 28.4% | 46.3% |

| (4) Stems - Distal deixis | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Number | *n* | /t-/ | /t'-, c'-/ |
| singular | 84 | 100.0% | 0.0% |
| plural | 15 | 86.7% | 13.3% |

The R. stem forms /et-/ and /et'-, ec'-/ clearly dominate in the singular of the proximal deixis[18] (the token frequency of the latter is low since these representations – following the R. pattern – are only to be expected in the instr., cf. above) compared to the Br. /het-/ (R. 81.6% plus 0.7% vs Br. 17.7%). The picture in the plural is completely different: the first thing that stands out is the high frequency of /et'-, ec'-/, i.e. the stem forms with a stem-final palatal consonant sound (46.3%). This is, of course, determined by the fact that they are present in the entire R. plural paradigm. These (and neither /het-/ nor /et-/) are the only stem forms to be classified in the plural as "specifically Russian". On the other hand, they are not quite as frequent as the stem forms with the non-palatal stem-final /t/ (/het-/, /et-/; 25.4% plus 28.4%, i.e. 53.8%), which is a Br. characteristic. Nevertheless, of the latter two stem forms with the non-palatal stem-final sounds, /het-/ and /et-/, only the first can be described as an "unmistakably" Br. variant. The second, /et-/, is in the context of plural and the instr. sg. masc. / neut. specific to trasjanka. It is a hybrid here in the sense that a R. stem-initial sound without the prothetic /h/ is combined with the non-palatal Br. stem-final sound. By contrast, /et/, in the context of the singular, except for instr. sg. masc. / neut., has to be classified as a R. stem.

In the corpus, for the singular of the distal deixis, the only stem form that occurs has the /t-/, i.e. it is the stem form which, except for the instr. sg.

---

18  An articulation with the Cekanje (*ec'-*) is seen as simply the reflection of the Br. accent; cf. Section 2 above.

masc. / neut., can be considered common to Belarusian and Russian. (In the corpus analyzed, there is no form of the instr. sg. masc. / neut. of the distal deixis and for that reason the value for the /t'-/ stem ending is "0" here.) Except for the instr. sg, Belarusian and Russian do not differ in the singular, so the 100%-value of the stem form /t-/ may not seem worth mentioning. On the other hand, it is striking that in the plural, where both languages do differ throughout the paradigm, the form with the non-palatal stem consonant which characterizes the Br. paradigm, clearly is dominant with respect to the R. palatal stem consonant (Br. 86.7% vs R. 13.3%).

In summary, the following can be said about the morphophonemic representation of the stem: in the proximal deixis, where Belarusian and Russian differ in the stem-initial sound, the Russian version is clearly preferred. Nevertheless, the Russian stem allomorphy, expressed in the opposition between the palatal stem-final sound /t'/ (in plural and in instr. sg. masc. / neut.) and the non-palatal stem-final sound /t/, is clearly not preferred. So there is, first, a clear preference for demonstrative stem forms with the Russian stem-initial vowel sound or – in the distal deixis – a common stem consonant, and, second, a clear tendency to avoid allomorphy reflected in the stem (final) consonant, the lack of allomorphy being characteristically Belarusian.

## 3.2 On the choice of endings

**(A) Endings correlating to the palatal or non-palatal stem-final consonants:** The choice of endings in plural and in the instr. sg. masc. / neut. is inseparably linked to the preference for non-palatal stem-final sounds: endings with the typical Belarusian non-frontal -y-, [ɨ] are preferred to the typical Russian frontal vowels -i- (proximal deixis) and -e- (distal deixis) to the same quantitative degree as was the case with the hard stem-final sounds. Except for the forms of the nom. pl. (and those of the acc. pl. homonyms in the context of inanimate nouns), the difference between the Br. and R. endings is reduced to this vowel contrast. For the nom. pl. the following forms occur in the corpus: *hètyja*[19], *ètyja, èti / èci* or *tyja, te / ce*. While *hètyja* und *tyja* represent morphonemically "perfect" Br. word forms, and *èti / èci* and *te / ce* conform to Russian (the variant *ce* with the phonetic Br. Cekanje), *ètyja* is a form specific to trasjanka. With an occurrence frequency of 33.3% (in a

---

19 Some renderings of the ending *–yja* gave an ending-final sound qualitatively more like *e* than the typical Br. *a*.

sampling of n= 48) , this is certainly comparable (not significantly different) to the Br. *hètyja* with 27.1% and R. *èti / èci* with 39.6%. The Br. *tyja* occurs nine times and the R. *te / ce* only once in the corresponding 10 pronominal forms of the distal deixis. A general trend can be seen here: the use of Russian is much more pronounced in the proximal than in the distal deixis.

The absence of two "hypothetically" possible forms for the nom. (acc.) pl. in the corpus should be noted: the first is *\*hèti*, i.e. a form with a Br. stem-initial consonant and a R. stem-final consonant and ending; the second is *\*èty* (which only occurs for the nom. and. acc. sg. inan.; see below), a form with a R. stem-initial vowel and a Br. stem-final consonant as well as a phonotactic adaptation of the R. ending to the Br. stem-final consonant: $i \rightarrow y$ (cf. further below under (C)).

**(B) Individual divergent endings: (a)** In the nom. sg. masc. (and, once again, with the acc. sg. homonyms for inanimate nouns) the same is observed as in the nom. pl. First of all, in the proximal deixis, the "genuine" Br. and R. forms contrast with a specific trasjanka form: this latter, *èty*, with a share of 20.4% ($n = 49$), is a hybrid from a R. stem with a Br. ending. It has a frequency comparable to the Br. *hèty* with 28%, but the R. (like) *ètat*[20] is considerably more frequent with 51%. The Br. ending *-y* and the R. *-ot* (*-at*) are thus in balance here. Secondly, the demonstratives of the distal deixis in nom. sg. masc. also clearly show the influence of Belarusian: Br. *toj* with 87.5%, R. *tot* with 12.5%, $n = 16$. A further interesting detail is found when the choice of ending in the proximal deixis[21] is differentiated according to the two cases, nom. sg. vs. acc. sg. inanimate. While the Br. ending *-y* in nominative ($n = 33$) has a share of 60.6% and the R. *-ot* a corresponding 39.4%, this is reversed in the accusative: Br. 25%, R. 75%, ($n = 16$); this difference is significant: $\chi^2 = 5.47$. In other words, while in the nom. sg. the Br. endings with the forms (*h)èty* clearly dominate, in the acc. sg., *ètat* is dominant, and this dominance is even more pronounced. In this connection it is worth mentioning that a theoretically possible hybrid construction from a Br. stem with a R. ending,*\*hètat*, is absent.

---

20  The R. (like) forms from the trasjanka dialogues are cited in a broad transcription which also reflects the clear specific phonetic interference by Belarusian; in this case, the Akanje, (*ètat* instead of *ètot*), which is similarly pronounced in Russian, but not reflected in the Russian script. However, forms that are "generically" Br. and R. will be consistently cited in the usual "German" transliteration.

21  There are not sufficient entries in the acc. sg. for an analysis of the distal deixis.

**(b)** In the gen. sg. and – in the context of inanimate substantives – also in the acc. sg., we find a clear dominance of the Br. endings with the structure /-VhV/ among the 24 entries: five of the 15 forms in the proximal deixis show the Russian (like) pattern, *ètava*, the other ten the Br. ending with *-h-*. Among the latter there are only two entries for the Br. form *hètaha* (with a prothetic *h*), i.e. the most frequent form is the hybrid from the R. stem with the Br. ending, *ètaha*. In the distal deixis ($n = 9$), there are only entries for the Br. Forms with *-h-* in the ending. It is of interest to take a look at the parts of speech with similar declensions (adjective, adjectival interrogative pronouns like Br. *jaki*, R. *kakoj*, relative pronouns, indefinite pronouns, ordinal numbers as well as anaphoric pronouns). A comparable clear tendency favouring the Br. structure with *-h-* is shown in the corpus of ordinal numbers and indefinite pronouns ($n = 9$ and $n = 11$, respectively): the anaphoric pronouns with 61.4% still show a slight dominance of the Br. ending structure; on the other hand, for the adjectives, we find a balanced relationship ($n = 25$), (cf. HENTSCHEL 2008); for the interrogative pronouns, 'who, what' ($n = 9$), we find exclusively the R. structure with /-v-/.

**(c)** With only seven entries for the loc. singular, there is no basis for drawing conclusions from the demonstratives alone. Again, some of the other parts of speech where the same problem can be examined should be brought into the analysis (adjectives, adjectival interrogative pronouns like Br. *jaki*, R. *kakoj*, relative pronouns, indefinite pronouns and ordinal numbers). The question of interest here is which ending is preferred. In Br. there is an ending of the loc. sg. = instr. sg type, /-im/, i.e. either *-ym* or *-im* (according to the stem-final consonant; with demonstratives only the former) but in R. an ending of the loc. sg. ≠ instr. sg. type with the loc. sg. on /-om/ (*-om/-em*) vs. the instr. sg. on /-im/ (*-ym* or *-im* depending on the stem-final consonant or with the loc. sg. on /-em/ vs. the instr. sg. on /-im/. In other words, the R. loc. sg. always differs in form from the instr. sg. The picture is clear: the R. non-homonymous endings are clearly dominant with a share of 76.3% compared to the Br. ones with 23.7% ($n = 76$). (By the way, the seven demonstratives, three in the near and four in the distal deixis, exclusively show the R. endings.) The Br. homonymous endings of the loc. sg. occur characteristically only with specifically Br. roots or stems, e.g. in interrogative or relative pronouns like *jakim* 'who' (cf. R. *kakom*) or with the ordinal number 'seven' in *sëmym* (cf. R. *sedmom*).[22] The findings in this context also

---

22  Cf. HENTSCHEL (in press a) as well as TESCH (in press) on the almost complete absence of hybrids of the type "Br. root plus R. ending".

allow a statement about the influence of dialect characteristics in the corpus. The demonstrative endings and endings of the parts of speech with an adjective declination in the Br. standard language contain, as has just been outlined, for the instr. sg. and loc. sg. masc. / neut. a non-labial, non-posterior vowel as the ending-initial sound. This is basically the same in the R. instr. sg. (but in some paradigms, as has been indicated, an /-em/ is given), only the R. loc. sg. ending has the labial posterior ending-initial sound /-o/.[23] Endings with a posterior labial vowel for the cases mentioned certainly also occur in the Br. dialects, namely in the southwestern dialects, which also include those around Baranavičy. Then, however, the homonymy instr. sg. = loc. sg. remains. It is significant that not a single form of the instr. sg. masc. / neut. that occurs in the corpus ($n$=17) has a posterior labial vowel. This means that the loc. sg. ending /-om/ in the corpus may without a doubt be attributed to R. influence, and not that of the Br. dialects.

**(C) Variation between long and short forms in the nom. sg. and acc. sg. endings of the demonstratives in the proximal deixis for feminine and neuter:** The important thing in this context – as has been indicated above – is that two forms of variants occur in the Br. Paradigm – a specifically Br. long form (*-aja, -uju, -aje*) and a short form (*-a, -u; -a*). The latter endings mentioned can be considered common elements of both languages.[24] (In Belarusian the shorter endings are – as already indicated – rather "less norm-conformative".) In trasjanka, the long and short forms also compete in the plural of the proximal deixis and in the demonstratives of the distal deixis. The long forms are classified as specifically Br. here, but the short forms as specific to R., not as common forms. Three areas with quite different preferences are clear:

---

23  The representation of the unstressed /o/ following a palatal or historically palatal consonant is *e* in the Russian orthography thus *-em* for the ending of the loc. sg. masc. / neuter. The ending *-em* in the instr. sg.; on the other hand; is stressed and goes back to /-em/.

24  Note: the R. orthography masks the fact that the R. *èta* fem. and *èto* neut. are also homophones.

| (5) Long and short endings of nom. and acc. sg. in feminine and neuter | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Deixis | Congruence Class | Long | Short | $N$ |
| proximal | fem. / neut. | 0.6% | 99.4% | 173 |
| proximal | plural | 55.8% | 44.2% | 52 |
| distal | fem. / neut. | 71.8% | 28.2% | 39 |
| distal | plural | 69.2% | 30.8% | 13 |

The large number of entries ($n = 173$) for the demonstratives of the proximal deixis in nom. sg. and acc. sg. fem. or neut. is above all determined by the 104 entries for the forms of the nom. sg. neut. (with the non-attributive use strongly dominating among the latter[25], where in Belarusian a long form is excluded in various contexts). The conspicuous feature is, of course, the fact that only one single form in the corpus shows a specifically Br. long ending. The dominance of the short common ending is such that it occurs almost exclusively. The situation is completely different in the plural, where the specifically Br. long ending shows dominance (if only slight) compared to the short, here specifically R. endings. This can certainly be accounted for in part by the tendency to avoid stem allomorphy (non-palatal vs. palatal stem-final sound). The short ending that occurs here is the R. –*i*, which is accompanied by a preceding palatal consonant. There is no entry for a Br. adaption of the vowel ending to –*y*. Such a plural form would be homonymous with the Br. form of the nom. sg. masc., *hèty*, or with the corresponding specifically trasjanka form, *èty*.

The matter of avoiding allomorphy cannot, however, play a role in the feminine and neuter singular of the distal deixis, and here the preference for the long Br. endings is even more pronounced than in the plural of the distal deixis. Here, too, the (rather few) short endings can be classified as specific to Russian. These quantitative regularities indicate a very general tendency

---

25 It is known that non-attributive uses of *èto / (h)èta* differ with regard to their categorization as parts of speech: besides qualifying as demonstrative pronouns, they are found in the literature classed as particles or sentence-joining conjunctions. The latter uses of the discussed element have, of course, not been analyzed as demonstrative pronouns. Only such non-attributive uses are considered to be demonstrative pronominal here, in which *èto / (h)èta* occur as the anaphora of propositions or as an anaphoric element with individual reference in copula sentences.

in trasjanka: when there is the option of choosing between a specific Br. and a common (lexical, morphological, or constructional) element, as is most clearly the case in the nom. sg. fem. / neutr. and the acc. sg. fem., the preference for the common element is pronounced. What appears to be happening, therefore, is the elimination of differences – the phenomenon of levelling.

The nom. and acc. pl. forms in the proximal and distal deixis as well as the nom. and acc. sg. of the feminine and neuter in the distal deixis (thus those parts of the paradigms where no common short forms are available) confirm, in addition, a tendency which was described above for the nom. sg. and acc. sg. (inanimate) of the masculine. Although these two case are formally homonymous cases the nom. clearly shows less "Russian" influence than the acc. ($\chi^2 = 5.51$).

| (6) Br. long and R. short endings in nom. and acc. in pl. of the proximal and distal deixes as well as in the sg. of the feminine and neuter of the distal deixis | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Case | Long | Short | $n$ |
| nom. | 72.6% | 27.4% | 62 |
| acc. | 50.0% | 50.0% | 42 |

## 4. Discussion

Thus the analyses show a picture of patterns of demonstrative pronouns in mixed Belarusian-Russian speech which in several cases allows the recognition of manifest, statistically significant, quantitative preferences for one or another form, ending or structure, i.e. preferences for Belarusian, Russian or common forms and even forms specific to trasjanka. On the basis of these preferences and tendencies, the following "idealized" (using the most frequently occurring forms and the strongest tendencies) inflexion paradigms of the demonstratives in the "lect" of the Baranavičy informants can be presented (each with the opposing Br. and R. partial paradigms):

| (7) Comparison of paradigms in the proximal deixis (A) | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Case | Masculine Singular | | | Neuter Singular | | |
| nom. | *hèty* | *ètot* | *èty* | *hètae* <br> *hèta* | *èto* | *èta* |
| gen. | *hètaha* | *ètogo* | *ètaha* | like masc. | | |
| dat. | *hètamu* | *ètomu* | *ètamu* | like masc. | | |
| acc. | *hèty* (inan.) <br> *hètaha* (an.) | *ètot* <br> *ètogo* | *ètat* <br> *ètaha* | like nom. | | |
| instr. | *hètym* | *ètim* | *ètym* | like masc. | | |
| loc. | *hètym* | *ètom* | *ètom* | | | |
| | Br. | R. | Tras. | Br. | R. | Tras. |

| (8) Comparison of paradigms in the proximal deixis (B) | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Case | Feminine Singular | | | Plural | | |
| nom. | *hètaja* <br> *hèta* | *èta* | *èta* | *hètyja* | *èti* | *ètyja* |
| gen. | *hètaj* | *ètoj* | *ètaj* | *hètyx* | *ètix* | *ètyx* |
| dat. | *hètaj* | *ètoj* | *ètaj* | *hètym* | *ètim* | *ètym* |
| acc. | *hètuju* <br> *hètu* | *ètu* | *ètu* | *hètyja* (inan.) <br> *hètyx* (an.) | *èti* <br> *ètix* | *ètyja* (*èti*) <br> *ètyx* |
| instr. | *hètaj(u)* | *ètoj(u)* | *ètaj* | *hètymi* | *ètimi* | *ètymi* |
| loc. | *hètaj* | *ètoj* | *ètaj* | *hètyx* | *ètix* | *ètyx* |
| | Br. | R. | Tras. | Br. | R. | Tras. |

116

| (9) Comparison of paradigms in the distal deixis (A) | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Case | Masculine Sg. | | | Neuter Sg. | | |
| nom. | *toj* | *tot* | *toj* | *toe* | *to* | *toje*[26] |
| gen. | *taho* | *togo* | *taho* | like masc. | | |
| dat. | *tamu* | *tomu* | *tamu* | | | |
| acc. | *toj* (inan.)<br>*taho* (an.) | *tot*<br>*togo* | *toj (tot)*<br>*taho* | like nom. | | |
| instr. | *tym* | *tem* | *tym* | like masc. | | |
| loc. | *tym* | *tom* | *tom* | | | |
| | Br. | R. | Tras. | Br. | R. | Tras. |

| (10) Comparison of paradigms in the distal deixis (B) | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Case | Feminine Sg. | | | Plural | | |
| nom. | *taja* | *ta* | *taja* | *tyja* | *te* | *tyja* |
| gen. | *toj* | *toj* | *toj* | *tyx* | *tex* | *tyx* |
| dat. | *toj* | *toj* | *toj* | *tym* | *tem* | *tym* |
| acc. | *tuju* | *tu* | *tuju* | *tyja* (inan.)<br>*tyx* (an.) | *te*<br>*tex* | *tyja*<br>*tyx* |
| instr. | *toj(u)* | *toj(u)* | *toj* | *tymi* | *temi* | *tymi* |
| loc | *toj* | *toj* | *toj* | *tyx* | *tex* | *tyx* |
| | Br. | R. | Tras. | Br. | R. | Tras. |

---

26 It should be remembered that material from trasjanka discourse is represented in a broad transcription, R. and Br. material in transliteration. The former reflects prevocalic [j] whenever it occurs, not only before /a/ and /u/ as overtly reflected in both languages by the Cyrillic letters я, ю, but before /e/ and /o/ as well, reflected implicitly by the Cyrillic letters e, ë. This means in the case indicated that trasjanka *toje* phonetically and phonologically equals Br. *toe*.

As is always the case, the question is whether or not there is an explanation for the preferences that are shown. The available set of explanations for varieties or forms of speech like trasjanka, which evolve out of contact between genetically very closely related and structurally very similar languages, is essentially the same as that for "internal" morphological changes in a language. The mechanisms "at work" here are comparable to those in the formation of regional Koinés (regiolects) in dialect continua or of historically polydialectal-based standard languages.

(i) One of the most striking tendencies is the avoidance of allomorphy, here the stem allomorphy, as it occurs in the alternation between hard (non-palatal) and soft (palatal) stem-final sounds in Russian. Due to this avoidance of allomorphy, the plural paradigm (the set of preferred forms) with respect to stem-final consonant and endings shows an extensive Belarusian influence in mixed speech patterns. The idealized "trasjanka paradigm" in the plural of the distal deixis (as in the case of the instr. sg. masc. / neut.) is identical with that of the Br. literary language. Except for the initial sound (cf. (ii)), the same is true for the proximal deixis. The Uniformity Principle (according to MAYERTHALER (1981) a subprinciple of the principle of formal reflection of identity and distinctions of 'content') is at work here, though the interference of Br., where this allomorphy does not occur, cannot be ruled out. This phenomenon also supports the assumption that contact-induced language change for the most part leads to the unification of language structures and therefore to the removal of irregularities (ANDERSON 1989, 16f).

(ii) Perhaps the most striking feature, however, namely the widespread absence of the prothetic *h* in the demonstratives of the proximal deixis, cannot be explained by the above. First of all, it has to be noted that Belarusian (in the standard language and still more strongly in its dialects) has been a language with a tendency towards the avoidance of (above all accented) vowel initial sounds. The prothetic /j-/ and, above all, the /w-/, which before accented /u, o/, also in the standard language, is still strongly productive, are doubtlessly more widespread than the prothetic /h-/. Bearing this in mind, the strongly pronounced tendency to avoid stems with the typical Br. stem-initial sound is at first sight astonishing. The explanation for this phenomenon obviously lies in a habit of trasjanka speakers to which CYCHUN (1998) refers. He lists a series of especially salient (sometimes expressive) and highly frequent "markers of Russian" which trasjanka speakers use almost exclusively while avoiding the corresponding Belarusian alternatives. This behaviour is

118

based on their desire to speak Russian.[27] Cychun lists particles like *da* 'yes', *vot* 'there', *imenno* 'namely, exactly' and, among others, also *èto*, which in addition to its function as a demonstrative (nom. and acc. sg. of the neut.) can in Russian also be used as a particle or conjunction. The genesis of trasjanka is known to be closely associated with the desire of the Br. rural-urban migrants to adapt to Russian. Within such a general process of linguistic accommodation (in a broader sense) between two closely related, structurally similar varieties, TRUDGILL (1986, 12-21) further differentiates between accommodation in a narrower sense, which occurs for the most part unconsciously, and those instances where a speaker of variety B consciously imitates variety A. He too, refers to striking linguistic signs and constructions which occur frequently and are indicators of imitation. In varieties based on an incomplete accommodation of B to A, i.e. in a corresponding new variety C, imitations of this nature may also be conventionalized. Our corpus, too, confirms Cychun's observations. Thus, given Cychun's assumption that R. *èto* (in Br. phonetics [ɛta]), is preferred (at least initially in the genesis of trasjanka) to Br. *hèta* due to conscious imitation (whereby the infrequent adnominal uses with neuter substantives is much less relevant than the independent, often sentence initial uses, including non-pronominal ones), a conventionalization of *èto / èta* with a transfer of the initial sound structure to other demonstrative forms in the distal deixis is the most plausible explanation. It is evident that such instances of contact-induced change based on imitation in no way correlate with a tendency toward higher regularity or towards the reduction of markedness.

(iii) A similar case is that of preference for the short forms of the demonstrative pronouns in the proximal deixis in nom. and acc. sg. of the feminine gender. It should be stated first that the prevalence of the short forms *èto / èta* discussed in (ii) may also have played a supportive role in the suppression of the long forms *(h)ètaje* or *(h)ètaja, (h)ètuju*, respectively. The following seems more crucial: there is a demonstrable tendency in our corpus – quite independent of the demonstratives – that whenever common elements occur next to specifically Br. or R. alternatives, the former are preferred. This certainly has in part a psychological motivation related to the learning process, similar to the preference of Germans learning Polish for the expressions *auto* 'car' and *kartofel* 'potato' (which as loans are closer to the

---

27 BLANKENHORN (2003) draws attention to a similar use of such "signal words" and especially so-called discourse markers in the speech of Russian Germans ("Russlanddeutschen") in Siberia.

corresponding German lexemes *Auto, Kartoffel*) than the normative and more commonly used genuine Polish lexemes *samochód* and *ziemniak*. In addition, Belarusian and Russian are strongly significant as symbols in the Belarusian society, as MEČKOVSKAJA has observed on different occasions (e.g. 2002). The preference for Russian or Belarusian is known to correlate in no small degree with the political polarization of the Belarusian elite. The use of an "intermediate form of speech", or an "intermediate variety", can in such cases represent a neutrality strategy (cf. HELLER 1999; 2005, especially regarding English-French code-switching in Canada), which, so to speak, is perfectly accomplished through the use of common elements or varieties of the "conflicting" languages. The almost exclusive absence of long forms in the trasjanka conversations thus correlates characteristically with a widespread acceptance of the short forms as elements of the standard language.

The preference for the cited short forms in nom. and acc. sg. feminine cannot be regarded as a tendency toward higher regularity, either. The Br. demonstratives (disregarding for the moment those alternative short forms in nom. and acc. fem. and neut. of the proximal deixis which are identical with the R. forms) are inflected in all cases and numbers exactly like adjectives (with a comparable stem-final sound), and we find the same set of endings. Russian deviates from this in various positions of the demonstrative paradigms: (a) in the nom. sg. of all genders and numbers as well as in the acc. sg. fem. and, if inanimate, in the acc. sg., masc., neut. and pl., where we find short forms not common for adjectives;[28] (b) in the instr. sg. masc. / neut. and completely in the plural, where (ba) in the proximal and distal deixis the endings occur that correspond to a soft stem-final consonant, whereas in other contexts the ones corresponding to hard stem-final consonants occur, a variation not witnessed for adjectives, and where (bb) in the distal deixis (and some other pronominal paradigms) there are endings not used in adjective paradigms at all. Regarding the paradigms as a whole, the establishment of the short forms in nom. and acc. sg. fem. and neut. of trasjanka would thereby represent an increase in complexity in the sense of an abandonment of the rather strict parallelism of demonstrative (and other pronominal) and adjective inflection characteristic for Belarusian. On the other hand, within the paradigms of the demonstratives of the proximal deixis, this could be seen as an increase in regularity, or a decrease in markedness: the symboliza-

---

28  There are, of course, short forms of Russian adjectives with similar endings. But, as is well known, these are restricted to predicative use, thus reflecting old nominative forms but on the whole lacking the category of case.

tion of nom. and acc. in the adjective paradigms of Belarusian and Russian in feminine, neuter and plural is contra-iconic. These are the only endings with three phonological segments, except for the plural and in part the fem. sg. pattern, where the ending of the instr. is (pl.) or may also be (fem.) tri-segmental. The establishment of short forms with an ending from a single phonological segment in feminine and neuter sg. transforms the contra-iconicity into maximal iconicity because the other endings are at least bi-segmental.

The blocking of this transformation in the plural, i.e. the lack of a plural form *ėty, is clearly related to the avoidance of homonymy with the nom. (acc.) sg. masculine. Beyond that, in the nominative, across the partial para-digms, what has been established by the formal preferences described above is a maximally iconic symbolization of number: ėty, ėta / ėtu, ėta – ėtyja. The establishment of a plural form *ėty instead of ėtyja (which in addition would still be homonymous with the masc.) would destroy this. (On the other hand, a homonymy between the feminine and neuter in nom. sg. oc-curs, which is, at least in the long forms, foreign to Belarusian; but this ho-monymy is only phonetic, and not phonemic.) While the increase in the val-ues of iconicity in relationship to singular and plural forms in Slavic clearly plays a greater role (cf. ANDERSEN as early as 1980, 39 as well as MENZEL 2000, 184ff.) than is generally conceded (WURZEL 1984, 212), nevertheless, these "iconicity effects" may not be more than an accompanying phenome-non to a very general preference in mixed speech for elements which are es-tablished in both literary languages. This cannot be "conclusively" weighed prior to a comprehensive analysis of the inflections in trasjanka.

(iv)  An explanation for the dominance of the Belarusian endings in gen. sg. masc. / neut. as well as in the acc. sg. masc. animate (of the demonstra-tives and of the rather less frequently used ordinal numbers and indefinite pronouns) is not readily apparent. The idiosyncratic character of the /-v-/ in the R. ending should be emphasized. In all other Slavic languages, the ety-mologically regular consonant, /g/ or /h/, occurs in this position. So R. in-flectional forms containing /-v-/ in the gen. sg. might be candidates for the above-mentioned process of imitation. Firstly, however, endings can be re-garded as less ideal candidates in this respect, especially in languages like Br. and R., where reductive processes are widespread, at least in endings without stress, as is mostly the case. Secondly, Br. speakers are familiar with the regular, in all other contexts obligatory phonetic-phonemic correlation between the R. /g/ and the Br. /h/, and with the fact that each of them (but

not /v/) is rendered in the orthography of the respective language with *g* (Cyrillic г / *g*). These two facts could hinder the transfer of an idiosyncratic element like the ending /-VvV/ in a process of unconscious accommodation. To be sure, the rather different picture with the adjectives and, especially, interrogative pronouns deserves notice: most frequently the R. equivalent for "who" (in acc.) is to be found, clearly dominating over the Br. form. But this interrogative pronoun usually appears in the focus of utterances, with an appropriate intonation, and could, like *èto*, discourse-marker and similar forms, belong to the set of salient forms appropriate for imitation. For the balanced relationship of Br. and R. endings in the adjectives, the following can be considered: while there is no general "lexicon-grammar-split" in trasjanka as in prototypical mixed languages (cf. MATRAS 2003), nevertheless the R. influence is much stronger in the lexical morphemes or in the lexical parts of speech, respectively, than in the grammatical (cf. TESCH, in press, and HENTSCHEL, in press a). Admittedly, Br. endings combine rather freely with R. root morphemes, but significantly less often than with common and certainly less often than with Belarusian root morphemes. In addition, it should be noted that for the adjectives, there is a relationship which cannot be explained here: a frequency comparison of the Br. to the R. root morphemes turns out to be extremely unfavourable for the former (2.1% vs. 28.8% for 577 adjective forms).[29] This can, as a side effect, increase the portion of the R. structure with /-v-/ in the adjectives.

(v) The extremely pronounced preference for an ending in the loc. sg. masc. / neut. of the adjectivally inflected parts of speech, which is – in line with the R. pattern – distinct from the instr. sg. masc., is very conspicuous. (There are no differences between the parts of speech apparent here, as was the case with the gen. sg. just discussed, which supports the assumption of an "idiosyncratic role" for the R. /-v-/ when it occurs in the gen. (acc.) sg. of in the context oc masc. or neutr. (only gen.) nouns instead of R. /g/ which in other contexts regularly corresponds to Br. /h/.) Here, too, there is no apparent "explanatory interpretation". Because of structural and frequential char-

---

29 The common morphemes are dominant among root morphemes in terms of token frequency. The corpus evaluated in this connection is only part of the corpus evaluated for the demonstratives (with ca. 15,000 word forms): the following values are found for the three main lexical parts of speech: nouns, $n = 2686$, common 69.6%, R. 25.1%, Br. 5.1%; verbs, $n = 3393$, common 82.9%, R. 11.2%, Br. 5.9%; adjectives, $n = 577$, common 69.6%, R. 28.8%, Br. 2.1%. LISKOVEC (2005) too, refers to the specific role of the adjectives in trasjanka. Cf. further HENTSCHEL (in press b).

acteristics and the absence of any special exposition in discourse, the loc. sg. masc. / neut. is certainly not an element that comes into question as a suitable cue for an imitation of R. speech patterns. Two principles of morphological change could be mentioned: there are several indications that marked categories or sub-categories are rather more liable to accommodation to Russian than the unmarked, e.g. the forms of the anaphoric pronouns in nom. (masc. / fem. / neut. / plural: Br. *ën, jana, jano, jany*, R. *on, ona, ono, oni*[30]) in our corpus for feminine and neuter and especially for the plural are more strongly influenced by Russian than the masculine. With the verb forms of the present tense, 3rd person, the plural forms show the influence of Russian more than the singular forms. In the same way, the forms of the feminine anaphoric pronouns for the homonymous (in the sense of JAKOBSON 1936) peripheral cases (dat., instr., loc.) are dominated by Russian, while for the similarly homonymous oblique central cases (acc., gen.) a preponderance of Br. forms is found (cf. HENTSCHEL in press b for these paradigms). The loc. sg. masc. of the adjective declination fits into this picture.[31] In addition, an adjustment of the Br. formal equivalence loc. sg. = instr. sg. for the adjective inflection patterns to the formal distinction loc. sg. $\neq$ instr. sg. for the nouns (in both languages) was noted. This would, however, be the reversal of an historical change because the case homonymy mentioned is the result of a relatively recent development which has also taken place in Polish. In the same way, the general tendency in the Slavic languages is towards breaking down the formal differences of the adjective inflection in the peripheral cases for masculine and neuter (obviously supported by the relationships in feminine where there is also frequently an ending homonymy, dat. sg. = loc. sg., as in Ukrainian and Croatian). In any case, an increase in the complexity of the formal differentiations can be observed here in the mixed speech of trasjanka.

(vi) Finally, there remains a phenomenon to be discussed which at first appears bizarre: (disregarding the lacking prothetic *h*) the preference for the Belarusian-like form *ety* in the nom. sg. masc. of the demonstrative in the proximal deixis, which in the acc. sg. masc. inanimate is "countered" by the

---

30 The difference is primarily due to the Br. prothetic consonant *j*, and furthermore to the hard (non-palatal) stem-final sound with the corresponding "hard" ending vowel in the plural. The initial vowel sound in Russian is quite similar to Belarusian [a], only slightly more closed and quantitatively reduced: [ʌ].

31 The two other peripheral cases do not offer any additional information here. The endings of dat. and instr. are the same in both languages.

preference for the Russian-like *ètat*, even though in this paradigmatic context there is generally an ending homonymy in both languages. (This phenomenon is also suggested in the plural where R. *èti,* opposite the Br.-influenced *(h)ètyja,* has a significantly higher relative token frequency in the accusative than it does in competition with the same form in nominative, although the use of *èti* goes against the tendency to avoid stem allomorphy.) Such evidence could at first sight be interpreted as an indication of the establishment of a morphologically independent acc., which otherwise is found in Eastern Slavic[32] only in the fem. sg. of different parts of speech (as with some masculine substantives) which in nom. sg. end with /-a/ or /-aja/, respectively. Nevertheless, a sceptical approach would be advisable, as the highly questionable "linguistic status" of trasjanka addressed in the introduction is still unresolved. As stated, trasjanka is in the first instance a folk category. In the corpus which forms the basis for this study, for instance, there is evidence of inter-sentential as well as intra-sentential code-switching (cf. HENTSCHEL in press a, b). The instances of intra-sentential code-switching in individual expressions are sometimes classified as alternating and other times inserting types or so-called "congruent lexicalization" types (following the typology of MUYSKEN 2000).[33] Both motivated (less frequent) and unmotivated (more frequent) switches to Belarusian or Russian respectively are found in the conversations evaluated. These examples of switching are in some isolated instances connected to a few initially distinguishable paradigmatic restrictions in the choice between Belarusian, Russian or common (occasionally also hybrid) elements and structures. There is evidence for a transition at least to code-mixing, if not even to a "fused lect" according to AUER (1998), who emphasizes that in a language community all three "blends" of two contact languages can be simultaneously present. Differentiating these phenomena within individual utterances is sometimes difficult, which implies a considerable methodical problem for the quantitative analysis of "parole data".

---

32  Morphologically independent accusatives are rather the exception, or at least infrequent types, in Slavic. Generally, so-called genitive-accusatives (homonymy between accusative and genitive) are to be found in the context of the sg. of animate masc. nouns and of the pl. of animate or personal or personal-male nouns, nominative-accusatives (homonymy between accusative and nominative) in the context of neut. nouns in the sg. and of inanimate or non-personal or non-personal-male nouns in the pl.: a distribution on the basis of "new" subgenders which evolved in the course of the last millennium.

33  HENTSCHEL (in press b) will offer an analysis of code-switching in the corpus of Baranavičy investigated here.

Moreover, HENTSCHEL & TESCH (2006, 226-240) have shown that sometimes other contact phenomena such as interference of Belarusian in the use of Russian (i.e. a current inter-language phenomenon) or borrowing (in a narrower sense, apart form "nonce borrowings" or insertional switches of, as a rule, just one lexical element) can also be present. In addition to that, it is not clear whether trasjanka will ultimately become a conventionalized "fused lect" of some substandard type or only represents the transition stage of a language change from Belarusian to Russian. This could turn out differently for various groups in the Belarusian society. Some may complete the shift, losing all competence in Belarusian, while others may retain a form of Belarusian, and still others only – or also – speak a "fused sociolect" of the trasjanka type with clear Br. traits. To what extent one or the other occurs depends on future political and social developments in Belarus (cf. HENTSCHEL & TESCH 2006, 240f). As to the phenomenon discussed here, the strong or stronger dominance of the Russian like *ėtat (ėtot)* but also *ėti* in acc. sg. masc. inanimate and the inverse preference of the (in principle competing) Belarusian like forms in the nom. case, *(h)ėty* sg. and *(h)ėtyja* pl., would, in the scenario of an advanced language shift, not be at all unusual: speakers who have largely shifted from Belarusian to Russian still remember the Br. forms of the generally more frequent and unmarked nominatives (i.e. the forms from the more frequent nominative contexts) better than the Br. accusative forms. The question whether this tendency will be conventionalized in a trasjanka pattern with nom. ≠ acc. is at this stage (and in view of the current extent of the corpus analyzed at this moment) unanswerable. Furthermore, future analysis of code-switching phenomena, especially the embedding of the forms discussed in noun phrases with other Br., R. or common elements, would have to be taken into account in the frequency analysis as well.


## 5. Summary

The quantitative analysis of morphological inflection forms (stems and endings) in the mixed Belarusian-Russian speech of trasjanka thus reveals more or less clear preferences, sometimes for Br., sometimes for R. or even for common as well as hybrid elements. These quantitative differences are quite clearly not random. In part they correspond to the principles of morphological change which are assumed to apply to "intra-lingual" morphological, or so-called endogenous change. It has been demonstrated in various studies

that these kinds of principles "regulate" both the morphological development of polydialectal-based standard languages and instances of intra-lingual dialect contact, in other words the "competition of forms" that correlate with such phenomena (cf. MENZEL 2003). From a structural point of view, because of the close genetic relationship and high degree of structural similarity between Belarusian and Russian, the corresponding morphological contact phenomena in mixed Belarusian-Russian speech convey an impression of dialect contact and the mixed speech of trasjanka rather than of the genesis of a new, mixed dialect. The distribution of forms is not chaotic, not completely "individual", as suggested by some students of mixed "East Slavic speech", although it reveals a high degree of variability. The significance of morphological change principles, as developed for example in the naturalness-theoretical approach, is nevertheless clear. As a whole, these principles increase the regularity of the inflectional-morphological patterns. The most convincing example in this analysis is certainly the extremely strong tendency to avoid stem-allomorphy in the partial paradigms of demonstrative pronouns in the singular and plural, which finally also leads to the formation of specific hybrid trasjanka forms and even paradigms.

Other regularities, however, correlate rather with the unequal prestige status of the two languages in contact and the social significance of language(s) in the Belarusian society, in which Russian plays a clearly dominant role, or with the conflict situation between Belarusian and Russian in the symbolism of the political landscape. Here lie the roots of the preferences which have their origin in conscious imitation, as well as the tendency to prefer forms common to both languages. These strategies are neutral in terms of an increase or decrease in morphological regularity and can therefore be a cause of the latter, which has so far been seen to be untypical in contact situations.

## References

ALTMANN, G, 1972: Status und Ziele der quantitativen Sprachwissenschaft. In: Jäger, S. (Hrsg.), *Linguistik und Statistik.* Braunschweig (= *Schriften zur Linguistik* 6)
ANDERSEN, H. 1980: Morphological change: towards a typology. In: Fisiak, J. (ed.), *Historical morphology.* The Hague etc., 1-50

ANDERSEN, H. 1989: Understanding linguistic innovations. In: Breivik, L. E. & Jahr, E. H. (eds.): *Language change. Contributions to the study of its causes*. Berlin, New York, 5-27

AUER, P. 1998: *From code-switching via language mixing to fused lects: Toward a dynamic typology of bilingual speech / Interaction and Linguistic Structures*. Issue 6. Freiburg

AVANESAŬ, P. I. 1964: *Narysy pa belaruskaj dyjalektalohii*. Minsk

BAKKUS, A. 2003: Can a mixed language be conventionalized alternational codeswitching? In: Matras, Y. & Bakker, P. (eds.) 2003b

BLANKENHORN, R. 2003: *Pragmatische Spezifika der Kommunikation von Russlanddeutschen in Sibirien. Entlehnung von Diskursmarkern und Modifikatoren sowie Code-switching*. Frankfurt/M.

BRS 2003 = *Belaruski-ruski sloŭnik*. Minsk

BYBEE, J. & HOPPER, P. (eds.) 2001: *Frequency and the emergence of linguistic structure*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia

CHAMBERS, J. K. 2003: *Sociolinguistic theory. Linguistic variation and its social significance*. 2$^{nd}$ ed. Oxford

CORBETT, G., HIPPISLEY, A., BROWN, D. & MARRIOTT, P. 2001: Frequency, regularity and the paradigm: A perspective from Russian on a complex relation. In: Bybee, J. & Hopper, P. (eds.), 201-226

CYCHUN, G. A. 1998: "Trasjanka" jak ab"ekt lingvistyčnaha dasledavannja. In: *Belaruskaja mova ŭ druhoj palove XX stahoddzja: Matėryjaly Mižnarodnaj navukovaj kanferėncyi*. Minsk, 83-89

CYCHUN, G. A. in press: Soziolinguistische, soziokulturelle und psychologische Grundlagen gemischten Sprechens. In: Hentschel, G. et al. (eds.), in press

DURNOVO, N. N. 1924/2000: Očerk istorii russkogo jazyka. In: Durnovo, N. N. 2000, *Izbrannye raboty po istorii russkogo jazyka*. Moskva, 1-341

FLIER, M. S. 1998: Surzhyk: The rules of engagement. In: *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* XXII, 113-136

GOLOVKO, E. V. 2001: Pereključenie kodov ili novyj kod. In: *Trudy fakul'teta ėtnologii Evropejskogo Universiteta v Sankt-Peterburge*. T. 1. St. Peterburg, 1-36

HELLER, M. 1999: Heated language in a cold climate. In: Blomaert, J. (ed.), *Language ideological debates*. Berlin, 143-171

HELLER, M. 2000: Bilingualism and identity in the post-modern world. In: *Estudios de Sociolingüística* 1/2, 9-24

HELLER, M. 2005: Identities, ideologies and the analysis of bilingual speech. In: Hinnekamp, V. & Meng, K. (Hrsg.), *Sprachgrenzen überspringen: Sprachliche Hybridität und polykulturelles Selbstverständnis.* Tübingen, 267-289

HELLER, M. & PFAFF, C. W. 1997: Code-switching. In: Goebl, H. et al. (Hrsg.), *Kontaktlinguistik. Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung.* Berlin, 594-609

HENTSCHEL, G., 2008: Einige Beobachtungen zur Flexionsmorphologie in der weißrussischen Trasjanka: Zur Variation zwischen weißrussischen und russischen Endungen und Formen beim Verb, Adjektiv und anaphorischem Pronomen. In: Nagórko, A., Heyl, S. & Graf, E. (Hrsg.), *Sprache und Gesellschaft. Festschrift für Wolfgang Gladrow.* Frankfurt, 455-466

HENTSCHEL, G., in press a: Die weißrusssische Trasjanka. Zur Problematik kontaktlinguistischer Untersuchungen nah verwandter Sprachen. In: Kosta, P. & Weiss, D. (Hrsg.), *Slavistische Linguistik* 2006/2007. (= *Slavistische Beiträge*) (als Vortrag gehalten in Zürich im Sept. 2006)

HENTSCHEL, G., in press b: On code-switching in Belarusian-Russian mixed speech ("Trasjanka"). In: Hentschel, G. et al. (eds.), in press

HENTSCHEL, G., TARANENKO, O., WOOLHÍSER, C. & ZAPRUDSKÍ, S. (eds.), in press: *Studies on Belorussian Transjanka and Ukrainian Suržyk as results on Belorussian- and Ukrainian-Russian language contact. (Papers from a conference, Oldenburg, June 15ᵗʰ – 18ᵗʰ 2007.)* Frankfurt

HENTSCHEL, G. & TESCH, S. 2006: „Trasjanka": Eine Fallstudie zur Sprachmischung in Weißrussland. In: Stern, D. & Voss, Chr. (Hrsg.), *Marginal Linguistic Identities. Studies in Slavic contact and borderland varieties.* Wiesbaden (= *Eurolinguistische Arbeiten* 2), 213-243

HENTSCHEL, G. & TESCH, S. 2007: Trasjanka: v kakoj stepeni ona "russkaja", "belorusskaja" ili "obščaja"? Na materiale rečevoj praktiki odnoj sem'i. In: *Mova - literatura - kul'tura / materyjaly V Mižnarodnaj navukovaj konferencyi (da 80 hoddzja prafesara L'va Michajlaviča Šakuna) h. Minsk, 16-17 listapada 2006 hoda.* Minsk, 18 – 26

HURTIG, C. & RAMZA, T. 2003: *Belarussische Grammatik in Tabellen und Übungen.* München (= *Slavistische Beiträge* 435)

KRIVICKIJ A. A., MICHNEVIČ, A. E. & PODLUŽNYJ, A. I. 1990: *Belorusskij jazyk dlja govorjaščich po-russkij.* Minsk

LEHFELDT, W. & ALTMANN, G. 2004: Review of Bybee & Hopper 2001. In: *Journal of Quantitative Linguistics* 11/3, 275-304

LISKOVEC, I. 2005. *Russkij i belorusskij jazyki v Minske: problemy bilingvizma i otnošenija k jazyku.* [unpublished Ph. D. Diss., European University St. Petersburg]

MATRAS, Y. 2003: Mixed-languages: Re-examening the structural prototype. In: Matras, Y. & Bakker, P. (eds.) 2003b, 151-176

MATRAS, Y. & BAKKER, P. 2003a: The study of mixed languages. In: Matras, Y. & Bakker, P. (eds.) 2003b, 1-20

MATRAS, Y. & BAKKER, P. (eds.) 2003b: *The mixed language debate. Theoretical and empirical advances.* Berlin, New York

MAYERTHALER, W. 1981: *Morphologische Natürlichkeit.* Wiesbaden

MEČKOVSKAJA, N. B. 1994: Jazykovaja situacija v Belarusi: Ětičeskie kollizii dvuzazyčija. In: *Russian Linguistics* 18, 299-322

MEČKOVSKAJA, N. B. 2002: Jazyk v roli ideologii: nacional'no-simvoličeskie funkcii jazyka v belorusskoj jazykovoj situacii. In: Gutschmidt, K. (Hrsg.), *Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Standardisierung slavischer Schriftsprachen in der Gegenwart.* Dresden, 124-141

MEČKOVSKAJA N. B. 2007: Trasjanka ŭ kantekste belaruska-ruskich idėalektaŭ: chto i kali razmaŭlae na trasjancy? In: *Vesnik BDU, Seryja 4. Filologija; Pedagogika; Žurnalistyka.* No. 1, 91-97

MENZEL, Th. 2000: *Flexionsmorphologischer Wandel im Polnischen. Eine natürlichkeitstheoretische Untersuchung auf allgemeinslavischem Hintergrund.* Oldenburg (= *Studia Slavica Oldenburgensia* 5)

MENZEL, Th. 2003: Refunktionalisierung vs. Abbau substantivischer Flexionsmarker in den slavischen Sprachen. Zur Frage der Erklärbarkeit im morphologischen Wandel. In: Stolz, Th. & Kolbe, K. (Hrsg.), *Methodologie in der Linguistik.* Frankfurt/M. etc., 81-101

MICHNEVIČ, A. E. & GIRUCKIJ, A. A. 1982: O jazykovom i lingvističeskom statuse „naciolekta". In: *Variativnost' kak svojstvo jazykovoj sistemy (tezisy dokladov). Moskva. Institut vostokovededenija AN SSSR, 1982.* Čast' 1, 77-79

MUYSKEN, P. 2000: Bilingual Speech. Cambridge

NÁBĚLKOVÁ, M. & SLOBODA, M. in press: 'Trasjanka' and 'československčina' (Czechoslovak) as discursive emic categories: their history and present-time uses. In: Hentschel, G. et al. (eds.), in press

RAMZA, T. in press: Die Evolution der Trasjanka in literarischen Texten. In: *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 53 (2008)/3

RBS 2005 = *Russko-belorusskij slovar'*. Minsk

SLOBODA, M. 2006: Folk views on linguistic variation and identities in the Belarusian-Russian borderland. In Hinskens, F. (ed.), *Language Variation – European Perspectives*. Amsterdam, 217-231

STAVYC'KA, L. & TRUB, V. 2007: suržyk: mif, mova, komunikacija. In: Stavyc'ka, L. (red.), *Ukraïnsko-rosijs'ka dvomovnist'. Lingvo-sociakul'turni aspekty*. Kyïv

SWIGART, L. 1992: Two codes or one? The insiders' view and the description of codeswitching in Dakar. In: Eastman, C. M. (ed.), *Code-switching*. Clevedon etc., 83-102

THOMASON, S. 2003: Social factors and linguistic processes in the emergence of stable mixed languages. In: Matras, Y. & Bakker, P. (eds.) 2003b, 21-39

TESCH, Sv. in press: Zur morphologisch „hybriden" (weißrussisch-russischen) Bildung von Wortformen in der Trasjanka In: Hentschel, G. et al. (eds.), in press

TRUDGILL, P. 1986: *Dialects in contact*. Oxford

TSBM 1978 = *Tlumačal'ny sloûnik belaruskaj movy*. T. 2. Minsk

WURZEL, W. U. 1984: *Flexionsmorphologie und Natürlichkeit. Ein Beitrag zur morphologischen Theoriebildung*. Berlin

**Резюме**

Центральный вопрос данной статьи – а именно: возможно ли развитие «собственных» флективных парадигм в смешанной белорусско-русской речи, обычно называемой трасянкой, отличающихся от белорусских и русских – составляет часть более общих вопросов, касающихся форм «восточнославянской» смешанной речи в Беларуси и Украине. В начале статьи автор задается вопросом, что́ может означать в принципе, т. е. на метатеоретическом уровне, утверждение различных исследователей в Беларуси и Украине (resp. суржика), что трасянка является «бессистемной», если даже не хаотичной формой речи. При этом, естественно, никто не заявляет о том, что вся смешанная речь «бессистемна» или «хаотична» (на ней ведь не только говорят, но ее и понимают, т. е. она используется как средство коммуникации). Речь скорее идет о «бессис-

темном» выборе между белорусскими и русскими элементами, т. е. знаками (лексемами, морфемами) и конструкциями, а также – как дополнительно подчеркивается – элементами, общими для обоих языков, и такими, которые специфичны для трасянки. Этот выбор, как видно с «первого взгляда», детерминирован нестрого, т. е. не происходит согласно «безоговорочным» (или «категориалым) правилам, которые с точки зрения структурного языкознания (и большинства более поздних лингвистических подходов) составляет суть языковой системы, системности. Но это – как аргументируется в данной статье – отнюдь не значит, что выбор является хаотичным, т. е. чисто случайным. Скорее следует эмпирически проанализировать предпочтения (преференции) в данном выборе на основе наблюдаемого языкового поведения, при помощи квантитативных методов. Другими словами, следует проверить, не существуют ли в определенных контекстах (структурных и коммуникативных) предпочтения употребления белорусских или русских элементов. При эмпирическом обнаружении таких преференций ставится другой более общий вопрос, касающийся как трасянки так и суржика: является ли смешение в речи «чисто» спонтанным, или существуют основания предположить, что в определенной степени уже произошла конвенционализация? При наличии преференций в репрезентативной мере имеет место последний вариант.

Трасянка и суржик представляют собой, как известно, смешанную речь, основанную на контакте двух генетически близкородственных и структурно очень похожих языков: белорусского и русского или украинского и русского. За исключением асимметричного положения соответствующих контактных языков в плане социального престижа (в пользу русского языка, resp. украинского с переменами, произошедшими в 1990-е гг.) этот языковой контакт можно скорее сравнить с контактом диалектов.

В Европе возникновение новых смешанных диалектов из более старых контактных диалектов часто происходило в контексте индустриализации, урбанизации и сопровождающей данные феномены миграции из сельской местности в город. Подобные общественные процессы имели место и в Беларуси в 60-х и 70-х гг. прошлого века, и именно с ними связано появление современного варианта смешанной белорусско-русской речи.

Исследуя подобные ситуации новых смешанных диалектов, часто новых городских диалектов, британский языковед P. Trudgill указал на

тот факт, что конкурирующие языковые знаки и конструкции из разных контактных диалектов очень долго могут существовать как свободные варианты, и стабилизация, т. е. более четкие ограничения в пользу одного или другого варианта возможны лишь в третьем или четвертом поколении. Дорога к такой стабилизации лежит через преференции / предпочтения, т. е. через более высокую или более низкую частотность в употреблении одного или другого варианта (-ов). В этом аспекте в высшей степени вариативный характер трасянки, т. е. ее варьирование между белорусскими, русскими, общими и специфическими элементами и конструкциями, представляется абсолютно нормальным.

Эмпирическую базу для представленного в данной статье анализа составляют словоформы указательных местоимений, взятые из корпуса семейных разговоров между членами семьи и их знакомыми из белорусского города Барановичи, который (корпус) к моменту анализа охватывал 21.000 словоформ, из них более чем 400 употреблений указательных местоимений. Т. е. эти данные являются репрезентативными лишь для семейного «лекта», характеризующегося явным сосуществованием белорусских и русских элементов и конструкций. Информанты могут быть охарактеризованы как носители трасянки в первом и втором поколении.

На основе этого материала может быть установлен целый ряд предпочитаемых форм и свойств указательных местоимений в «трасяночной» речи:

А. Доминирование корня, который, с одной стороны, (а) не демонстрирует протетическое *g* /h/ (как в белорусском языке, напр. *гэты*) и (б) не имеет корневой алломорфии, которая в русском выражается в альтернации между палатальным /t'/ во множественном числе и творительном падеже ед. ч. мужского и среднего рода и непалатальном /t/ в остальных случаях. Таким образом при «ближнем» и «дальнем» дейксисе отмечаются парадигмы, отличающиеся как от русского, так и от белорусского, лишь частично совпадающие с белорусскими или с русскими парадигмами.

Б. В ближнем дейксисе в именительном падеже ед. ч. отдается предпочтение образцу типа *эты* м. р., *эта* ж. р., *эта* ср. р. (т. е. «кратким» формам в ж. и ср. р.; в ж. р. также в винительном падеже: *эту*) в отличии от множественного числа, где отдается предпочтение «длинной» форме *этыя*, что также отличается от белорусских и русских образцов в смысле «гибридного набора» форм им. п.: *эты – эта – эта – этыя*.

В. Очевидное предпочтение белорусского окончания /-VhV/ русскому окончанию /-VvV/ в родительном падеже ед. ч. м. р. (в контексте одушевленных существительных и в винительном падеже) и ср. р.

Г. Также очевидное предпочтение русского окончания /-om/ белорусскому окончанию /-im/ в предложном (местном) падеже ед. ч. м. и ср. р., которое в русском всегда отлично от творительного падежа. В белорусском же оно совпадает с творительным.

Д. Предпочтение формы *эты* в ближнем дейксисе, которая за исключением отсутствующего протетического *g* соответствует белорусскому, и предпочтение формы *той* в дальнем указании русским альтернативам *этот* и *тот* в именительном падеже м. р., при небольшом изменении этих отношений в винительном падеже.

По крайней мере, для части приведенных явлений возможны объяснения, базирующиеся на принципах, сформулированных в рамках Естественной Морфологии и (собственно) касающихся внутриязыкового («неконтактного») морфологического изменения. Другие же явления, основывающиеся не на неосознанном процессе аккомодации, а скорее на осознанной имитации (в понимании P. Trudgill'a) можно объяснить асимметричным положением в плане социального престижа, решающегося в пользу русского языка. В общем и целом, данные явления свидетельствуют о том, что в дистрибуции и образовании ряда форм вовсе не царит хаос, а намечаются более или менее явные преференции отдельных форм или окончаний и, таким образом, начало конвенционализации «смешивания». В трасянке (точнее, в «трасяночном лекте» исследованного семейного контекста) можно даже отметить собственные парадигмы указательных местоимений, отличающиеся как от белорусского, так и от русского. Существуют ли такие или подобные тенденции в других областях Беларуси, должны показать будущие исследования, которые должны опираться на более объемный корпус.