

THE FRANCIS SKORYNA KRYVIAN (WHITERUTHENIAN)
SOCIETY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES IN THE U. S., INC.

Dr. JOHN P. STANKIEVICH

ETHNOGRAPHICAL and HISTORICAL
TERRITORIES and BOUNDARIES
of WHITERUTHENIA
(Kryvia, Byelorussia)

NEW YORK

1953

THE FRANCIS SKORYNA KRYVIAN (WHITERUTHENIAN)
SOCIETY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES IN THE U. S., INC.

Dr. JOHN P. STANKIEVICH

ETHNOGRAPHICAL and HISTORICAL
TERRITORIES and BOUNDARIES
of WHITERUTHENIA
(Kryvia, Byelorussia)

*Ze zbiorów
J. Ławryka*

NEW YORK

1963

vytoki.net

Modern Library
Archiv Narodowe
Fond 123 sprawa C76

Dr. JOHN F. STANKIEWICZ

ETHNOGRAPHICAL AND HISTORICAL
TERRITORIES AND BOUNDARIES
of WHITERUTHENIA
(Kryvia, Byelorussia)

...of the boundary between the regions of Kryvia and Kam...

Ethnographical boundaries of Whiteruthenia.

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

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

Starting from the lake of Peipus from the point which lies north of town of Pechora, the boundary with Estonians runs approximately along the state boundary directly south so that the towns of Pechora and Izborsk remain on the Whiteruthenian side; reaching thus the Latvian boundary it goes further in the same direction to the railroad station Korsavka in the Lucyn district¹⁾ which is considered the boundary of the Whiteruthenian homogeneous territory. From here the boundary runs southeast within 5-10 km of Sebesh district. Reaching the river Sinyucha, the boundary turns sharply to the west and from the lake Cherza — to the northwest, then it makes an arclike turn almost to the boundary of the district of Rezhytza, further it goes in a broken line southeast to the boundary of the Lucyn district with the Sebesh and Drysa districts. Between the towns of Rezhytza and Lucyn there are many isolated Whiteruthenian localities. The boundary runs further to the south west, approximately to the line dividing the districts of Lucyn, Rezhytza and Dzvinak from the Drysa district, in the direction of Dzvinak river, 6½ km west from Prydrusk. From this place the Whiteruthenian boundary follows the Dzvinak river to the west to the town of Dzvinak and then to the northwest to the town of Ilukst. The area east of Ilukst is inhabited by Whiteruthenians. There,

¹⁾ Beginning from this point the boundary with Latvians and Lithuanians is marked according to E. Karskij „Etnograficheskaia karta belorusskogo plemeni“, Petrograd, 1918. Of course the administrative sections used by Karskij are those of the year 1918. This division, naturally, does not correspond to the present division, however it facilitates the orientation. Concerning the present administrative sections, they change so rapidly, that it is impossible to keep track of them.

exactly on the boundary between the regions of Kurland and Kaunas ends the borderline between Whiteruthenia and Latvia.

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

From the lake Drysvyaty the boundary runs south towards the Vilnya region, to the Dzisna river. Crossing the river Dzisna it goes through the district of Svencyany in a broken line south and west near the Lithuanian counties of Tverech, Haducishki, which are on the western side, Svencyany and Whiteruthenian counties Kamai, Lyn-tupy, Kamelishki, which are on the southern side. Still further south Whiteruthenians live in a compact mass in the following counties: Stracha, Svir, Shemetava, Nestanishki, Yaseva, Zanzarach, Voistama, Dubatova, Kablyniki, Vishneva (all in the district of Svencyany.) Then, crossing the Zhamaicyanka river, the boundary curves through the district of Vilnya toward the west, almost to the town of Kernava, having the Lithuanian counties on the north — Yanishki, Gedroici, Shyrvinty, Musniki and the Whiteruthenian counties on the south — Nysmenchyna, Padbyarsze, Maishagola, Salechniki, Varnyany, Resha, Nyzmenchyna, Kardzeyewcy, Shumak, Bystrytza, Rukoime, Rudomina (all in the Vilnya district.) Near the town of Kernava the Whiteruthenian boundary moves to the left bank of the Vyalla river and goes in a broken line toward the south, taking into Whiteruthenian territory the counties of Yewye and Troki, on the west the villages Mustynyany, Dawherdzishki, Bahdancy, belonging to the district of Skumelishki and the village Talkava (Hanzhishki county) and further Mizhyrecha. It leaves the station of Rudzishki south and moves east and south east to the border of the district of Lida, even crossing it near Padborye. Then it moves along the borderline of the district of Lida leaving on the north the above mentioned Whiteruthenian county Salechniki. Next it runs into the district of Ashmyana whereby the Lithuanian territory contains the county Dzyavenishki (with Lithuanian villages Utkuny, Benakony, Shadony, Staglany, Davyany, Milkuny, Girdzyuny, Kanvalishki) and a part of the Whiteruthenian county of Sedliska with the villages of Hermanishki and Pasheli; in this way the Whiteruthenian boundary has on the east the Whiteruthenian counties of Hrowzhyski, Halshany, Traby, on the south the villages of Sybotniki, Heranyony, Sedliska, Palitnitsa (the three last villages belong to the Sedliska county.) The rest of the counties of the district of Ashmyana are all

Whiteruthenian. Further along the boundary cuts the northern part of the Lida district: from Heranyony south west almost to the station Bastuny on the Palese railway and on to Zabalsce. From here the boundary goes to the north, leaving on the east the village Pelasa and the Lithuanian county Radun. The mixed county of Eishyshki remains on the Whiteruthenian side (Novy Dvor, Paradun, Bratalozha, Harnastale) and Nacha of the county of Kanyava on the whole Lithuanian. From Eishyshki the boundary runs south west, leaving on the eastern side the county of Dubichy, to lake Dub. That part of Lida district situated south from there is exclusively Whiteruthenian. In the northern part of the district the Alexandrova county belongs still to the Lithuanian counties (villages Rakishki, Horadna, Kozakowahchyna, Narkushki). From lake Dub the Whiteruthenian boundary goes directly to the borderline of the Horadzen region where the river Ratnichanka joins the river Nyoman near Druzgeniki.

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

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

In the region of Horadzen the neighbors of Whiteruthenians are the Poles. There the boundary goes in a southern direction near Suchovola and Karycin westward toward Knyshyn and Khaoschcha (14 km west from Belastok.) then it goes through Surazh to the Naraw river *) and from there to Mizhyrecha, in the Bela Podlaska district. **) At Mizhyrecha starts the borderline with the Ukrainian ethnographic territory, and runs in the southeasterly direction in a diagonal line to Lubyazh, so that it misses the town of Bela Podlaska *) and the city

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

**) Whiteruthenian-Polish boundary, drawn in this article, hardly differs from the Polish ethnographical boundary in the east, found in the collective grammar of the Polish linguists: „Język polski i jego historia...” (Encyklopedia polska, t. II-dział III (cz. II), 1915, 253-254) and „Mapa dialektów polskich”.

*) I have lived some time at Bela Podlaska and studied the lan-

of Berasce by 10-15 km. in the south. From Lubyazh the boundary goes to Dubrovitzka and then to the point 16 km north from Alewsk. Further on it runs in same south easterly direction to Patapovichy of the Awruch district and from there to the entrance of the river Ceceraw into Dnepr. On the Whiteruthenian side there are the towns of Charnabyl, Kahanovichy, Awruch, Slavechna, Khasnoye and on the Ukrainian side Karascen, Alewsk and Sarny. *) From the entrance Ceceraw into Dnepr the boundary runs to the town of Oser by the Dryasna river and along the river to the mouth of Seim, then it goes directly eastward to point below the city of Hlukhaw. *) From there the boundary goes straight south and adds to the ethnographical Whiteruthenia the northeastern part of the district of Pucivel, with the town of Pucivel. In the South the borderline between the Ukrainian and the Whiteruthenian language is the river Seim and in the East the boundary between the Russian and Whiteruthenian language is the eastern boundary of the district of Pucivel. *) From there on the boundary of the Russian language goes to the north, 25 km east from the town of Dzmitrawsk of the former Kursk region and somewhat east from the towns of Dzmitrawsk and Karachew of the former Orel region. Then it turns slowly eastward toward the town of Bolkhov, from there to the town of Belw, then along the Aka river to the mouth of Volha, further to the town of Medyn and to the village of Matayeva, which lies somewhat east of the town of Hzhatzak. From here the line proceeds on the right bank of the river Hzhatzak, at a distance of 10-14 km to the borderline between the former regions of Tver and Smalensk.

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

*) I explained the Whiteruthenian ethnographical character of the territory, north from the described boundary in my article: Dryhvoły („Veda” 1952, p. 162-165, about the language see p. 164, and in the article „Dziarwianie” (ibid p. 165-176, especially p. 171-176).

*) I proved this boundary in my article „Severane” in „Veda” 1952, p. 238-241.

*) I explained the Whiteruthenian character of the above mentioned part of the Pucivel district in the article „Whiteruthenians of the Pucivel district of the former Kursk region” („Veda” 1952, p. 241-250).

ethnographical territory almost all the former Smalensk region, with the exception of the Eastern part of the Hzhatzak district, the greater part of the former Kaluha region and large parts of former Orel and Kursk regions. This boundary was drawn by the Moscow dialectological Committee. *) to which were later added the findings of a prominent member of this Committee, I. Golanov. *)

Approximately east from the town of Vyazma in the Smalensk region and also in the Kaluha and Orel regions with the exception of the Trubchewsk district and in the Kursk region with the exception of the Pucivel district, the Whiteruthenian language is very much russified, it remained, however, basically Whiteruthenian. The inhabitants of these territories also feel that they are different from the Russians.

From the above mentioned point on the borderline between the Smalensk and Tver regions the Whiteruthenian-Russian boundary passes into the Tver region and along the left bank of the Volha river at a distance of 40 km. Having reached the point opposite the entrance of the river Malady Tud into the Volha river, it runs along Volha at a distance of 30 km and further along in the same north westerly direction to the point opposite the town of Dzyamyansk, 30 km eastward; from here it runs straight to the west to the town of Dzyamyansk. Thus the boundary runs through the Tver region, having on the Whiteruthenian side a group of lakes with the lake Seljher and the towns of Astashlawa, Selizharawa, Rizewa and Zubtzoza.

From the above mentioned town of Dzyamyansk the boundary runs directly westward to the point below the town of Porchova where it turns rather sharply in the north western direction straight to the point opposite the entrance of the river Chornaja into the Peipus lake at a distance of about 60 km from the lake, further straight to the Peipus lake near the mouth of the Chornaja river.

The territory defined in the north and east by the drawn boundary, in the west by the borderline with Estonia and Latvia, in the south by the Whiteruthenian Polatzak and Vicebsk regions consists of the Pakow region and part of the Tver region. According to the recent preve-

*) Н. Н. Дурново, М. Н. Соколов, Л. Н. Уманов: Опыт диалектологической карты русского языка в Европе (Труды Московской Диалектологической Комиссии, V, Москва 1915).

*) И. Голанов: Несколько новых данных к вопросу о географическом пространстве дисмалешенского языка (Сборник статей в честь акад. А. Н. Соболевского, АИРС, Ленинград 1928, 6. 479-483).

lutionary administrative division it includes the most southern part of the former districts of Hdow and Luha of the former Petersburg region, almost all the Pakow region with the exception of the part of the Porchava district and a large part of the former Tver region. It was generally thought that only the large southern part of the former Pakow region, part of Apochka, Vyalikiya Luki and Tarapec districts and a large western part of the Tver region are Whiteruthenian territories and the major part was considered to be Russian ethnographical territory. I shall mention the language of this territory, i. e. of Pakow and western Tver region. The same language is spoken in both of them. The language of the Pakow relics differs since the oldest times from the language of the Novgorod relics, i. e. also from the Russian language, since this is the language of the great Novgorod. The old language of the Pakow region was studied especially by N. Karinskij and A. Shachmatov. Karinskij discovered a great difference between the language of the Pakow relics from the 15th and the 14th centuries. He explained this difference through the influence of the Whiteruthenian language on the Pakow language and he formulated a hypothesis of the Whiteruthenian colonists in the Pakow region in the 13th or in the beginning of 14th century. According to Karinskij it must have been an extensive colonisation, because the Pakow language of the 15th century had all „the more important phonetical and partly also morphological Whiteruthenian peculiarities“ and „the Whiteruthenian influence affected the whole Pakow region“. He based his thesis about the late arrival of Whiteruthenians into the land of a different Slavic people only on a few linguistic traits, found in the relics, without having any historical or other facts to support it. But his linguistic basis proved illusory. After studying all the facts, Shachmatov stated, that „actually the relics from the 14th cent. have fewer Whiteruthenian traits than those from the 15th cent; however this could have happened in connection with the fact, that the literature in Pakow came in the 14th or in the first half of the 14th cent. directly under the influence of the Novgorod literature, and that there are no facts explaining the proximity of the Pakow and Whiteruthenian dialects through Whiteruthenian settlement in the Pakow region. Shachmatov „is inclined to consider the language tie, binding Pakow and Whiteruthenia primeval, created through the primeval neighborhood of Pakoviches and Whiteruthenians“.

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

But the opinion of that prominent linguist was not heeded and the Moscow Dialectical Commission in its „Očerk russkoj dialektologii“ from 1915, referring only to Karinskij, states that Whiteruthenians arrived in Pakow later than the Northrusians, that the dialect of Pakow is basically Northrusian with a Whiteruthenian layer not older than from the 14th cent.

The Pakow region was 450 years under the assimilating influence of centralistic Moscow and the language was very much russified. But in spite of this, a student of the Pakow language of 1930 says: „All this does not justify us in placing the Pakow dialect among the north-russian. This dialect is nearer, in our opinion, to the Whiteruthenian dialect, what coincides with the opinion of prof. Buzuk, explained in his work: „Да характарыстыкі паўночна-беларускіх дыялектаў. — Гутарка Несельскага й Вяліскага павета“ (К. А. Церопольскій, Говор дер. Савкино Пушкинского района Псковского округа, ИРЯС, III-2, 1930, бач. 597).

Author of this article studied the old and the present Pakow dialect and hopes to publish it as a grammatical treatise. Only a few conclusions of that work will be mentioned here: With the exception of the groups hl, kl. (myhla, pamiaklo) instead of the general Whiteruthenian (myla, pamiaklo) all the peculiarities of the Pakow dialect are common either to all Whiteruthenian language, or to many of its dialects. Almost all these peculiarities are foreign to the Russian language. After analyzing the traits of the Pakow dialect, no one can doubt, that from the historical point of view it is a pure Whiteruthenian language. In its present state it is also Whiteruthenian, but much russified language. Change of e and ě (calaviek), ě and ě (ěadni insted siadni), ě and ě, dissimilating akannie, fusion of ě and e, old form of **eme** in 1st pers. pl. show that the dialect of Pakow belongs to the northern group of Whiteruthenian dialects. Because of its groups hl, kl instead of all Whiteruthenian l, from protoslavlic dl, tl, the Pakow dialect has to a certain measure an individual place in the northern

dialectal group, but it differs from other dialects of this group much less than this whole group differs from the southern dialectal groups of the White Ruthenian language. ¹⁹⁾

Historical boundaries.

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

Individual White Ruthenian States.

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

We shall enumerate the individual White Ruthenian states of this period.

¹⁹⁾ In the longer, White Ruthenian part of this article, there are many facts, arguments and proves for the White Ruthenian character of the border areas within the above drawn ethnographical boundaries.

The Great Principality of Polatzak had three important centers: Polatzak, Vicebak, and Menak, the most important being Polatzak. This state always included the territory of three regions — later on in the Russian times a region was called a gubernia — the whole region of Vicebak, a large part of Mahilew region with the exception of Imscislav district and of the southern part of this region, and a large part of Menak region. The recently organized districts of Dziana and Braslaw belonged to the embryonic part of the Polatzak center, just as Vyaleika belonged to its Menak part of the Polatzak state. In the period of its highest development the Polatzak state included in the west all the western White Ruthenian territories with Vilnya, Nowharadak, Slonim, Vawkavysk, Horadzen up to the boundary of Poland; in the south a part of Palese with Slatzak, Kletzak and other cities. Also some part of the present Latvia including the principalities Gercike and Kukeinos. With the exception of a few short interruptions (one of them in the 10th cent. lasted about 20 years and the others only couple of years), the Polatzak principality always remained an independent state.

The Great Principality of Smalenak occupied the entire Smalenak region with Mazhaik and Rzhewa which city belonged during the Russian period to the Tver region. It further contained the district of Imscislav and Tarapetz. Also the part of the Tver region with the city of Klichaw (Astashkava) belonged to the Smalenak principality.

The Great Principality of Sever included the Sever region, i. e. the later Chernihaw and Kursk regions and a part of the Orel region. It contained also a southern part of the Mahilew region. Toward the end of the 12th cent. the Smalenak and Sever principalities conquered Kiev and kept it until the Tatar occupation.

The Principality of Turow and Pinsk suffered a miserable fate. At first the White Ruthenian tribe of Dzervyanians, which reached south to the Ipen river, the right tributary of the Dnepr, formed there a tribal state, called Dzerva with a developed political order. The centers were the cities of Awruch, Iskaracon (now Karascon) and Malin. The Dzervyanians waged uninterrupted wars with the Ukrainian Palanians. When they were conquered by the Ukrainians in the 10th cent., they lost their independence. Therefore little later together with another White Ruthenian tribe Dryhvicehs they formed a new Dzervya-

nian Dryhwich principality with the center in Turów near Prypyat. However, when the count Yaroslav son of Vladimir defeated the Turów count Svyatopolk, 1017, the principality of Turów was liquidated. With the loss of independence, Turów was governed by younger Kiev counts. The independence of this Dnieperian Dryhwich state was regained in the middle of the 12th cent., when Kiev became weak and did not play its former role. The main center was again Turów and a smaller one was Pinsk. The territory of Turów-Pinsk principality was Palee.

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

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

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

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

However there are also weak points here. One of them is that the states were not united, although feeling of national unity and political solidarity existed and sometimes expressed itself strongly. Another weak point is that they existed so long before. Therefore prof. Chubaty holds the opinion in his article printed in 1951 in the Ukrainian newspaper Svoboda that as an argument for renewal of the Ukrainian state, it is necessary to point to the Galitzia-Volyn state rather than to Kiev Rus; the former lasted 109 years from the татар occupation, i. e. 1240-1349.

The Great Lithuanian Principality

The arguments about the White-ruthenian character of the historical Lithuania are given by me in Veda, April-June issue 1951. Because of its long existence from the middle of the 13th to the end of the 18th cent., because of its political greatness, its territory, cultural level, political order and perfectly formulated law system, the Great Lithuanian Principality is an enormous argument for the political independence of White-ruthenia. The Great Lithuanian Principality united within its boundaries all the White-ruthenian regions with the exception of the White-ruthenian part of the Tver Principality; but even this part aspired toward the union with Lithuania, under which influence, defense and for some time protection it was. We can safely say that not one of the nations forming at present the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics can boast of such a past as the White-ruthenians have thanks to the period of the Great Lithuanian Principality. Among all the so-called Slavs only Poland can be compared with the Great Lithuanian Principality, in some cases being superior, in other inferior. In law, military organization, foreign and domestic policy of the rulers and government in general, White-ruthenia in the period of Great Lithuanian Principality doubtless was superior to Poland. To 16th cent.

it was also culturally superior. Later on Poland has a decidedly higher cultural level. Up to the Union of Lublin 1569 the territory of White-ruthenian state was much larger than that of Poland. Moscow-Russia, of course, through the length of existence, its territorial extent and its later greatness surpassed White-ruthenia, but in its political organization, law and its culture to the 19th cent. remained far behind White-ruthenia. Concerning cultural level of popular masses, White-ruthenia even now stands above Russia.

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

In the last quarter of the 15th cent. difficulties began for the White-ruthenian state. It had to fight simultaneously the successor of Tatars, Moscow and mighty then Turkey. Therefore White-ruthenia lost many of its lands at the end of the 15th cent. and beginning of the 16th cent. At first it lost the northern shores of the Black Sea which were won by Turkey. The Great Principality of Razan became dependent on Moscow in 1483 and was entirely liquidated by it in 1520. The White-ruthenian lands along the upper Aka were seized by Moscow in 1503. At the same time the Smalensk region was lost with the exception of its western part. Also the Bransk and Sever regions were lost with the exception of a small area in the west. However in the beginning of the 17th cent. White-ruthenians regained them from Moscow and the state boundaries spread beyond Palanawka and Masalak, Bransk and Trubchewsk. Such was the situation till 1667, when they were lost by the treaty of Andrusow.

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

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

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





WHITE RUTHENIA (BYELORUSSIA)
БЕЛАРУСЬ
 ETNOGRAPHICAL & HISTORICAL BOUNDARIES
 ЭТНОГРАФИЧНЫЯ І ІСТОРЫЧНЫЯ ГРАІІЦЫ

PRESENT ETNOGRAPHICAL BOUNDARIES: ЦЯПЕРАШНЯЯ ЭТНОГРАФИЧНЫЯ ГРАІІЦЫ

STATE BOUNDARIES:	ГАСПАДАРСТВАВЫЯ ГРАІІЦЫ:
TILL 1303 ————— ДА 1303г.	TILL 1569 ————— ДА 1569 г.
TILL 1500 ————— ДА 1500г.	TILL 1667 ————— ДА 1667 г.
TILL 1490 ————— ДА 1490г.	TILL 1772 ————— ДА 1772 г.
TILL 1509 ————— ДА 1509г.	TILL 1793 ————— ДА 1793 г.
TILL 1520 ————— ДА 1520г.	TILL 1795 ————— ДА 1795 г.

BOUNDARIES OF THE GREAT PRINCIPALITY OF SIZAN IN 1520 — ГРАІІЦЫ ВЯЛІКАГА КНЯСТВА СІЗАНСЬКАГА ў 1520г.

SCALE: 1 : 4,000,000 [63.25 miles = 1 inch / 40 KM. = 1 CM.]



