Sigitas Lūžys
Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania

LINGUISTIC IDENTITY: BETWEEN MULTILINGUALISM AND LANGUAGE HEGEMONY

Summary. A priori accepting multilingualism as a value, we must understand that it is not permanent. It is empowered by our mother tongue, which creates an essential opportunity as well as a precondition for the acquisition of competences of other languages. However, the language itself, being a tradition, i.e., a living process, is affected by other languages, so the identity of a language cannot be understood without an understanding of its curriculum vitae. The historical path of the Lithuanian language comes from the world of multilingualism. Urban life in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania is unimaginable without the people speaking Polish, Belarusian, Ruthenian, Latin and Yiddish. Real multilingualism did not separate people into "us" and "other; this phenomenon emerged later, after some centuries, with the disappearance of urban multilingualism in the urban culture and manifesting as a certain opposition against the "others', as efforts to create a natural for many people identity-divide which has impact and unities on the basis of a language. In the multilingual world the perception prevailed that we are all "us" but different. The real, conversational and every day multilingualism enabled the dissemination of contextual meaning, reception of different thinking and nuances of a global outlook rather than only communicating information. The emergence of one, the most important and rational, "global" language hegemony determines a new communication which does not require the competence of several languages (even the knowledge of the neighbors' language), as communication proceeds through a certain mediator and in the long turn embraces various areas of life. However, bilingualism is not the final result; the hegemonic language trespasses the boundaries of the purpose of the lingua franca and aims at overtaking the functions of the native language. So, what is the role and destiny of the latter? This is what the study aimed at discovering.

Keywords: linguistic identity; native language; language hegemony.

Introduction

"Anyone wishing to hear how Indo-Europeans spoke should come and listen to a Lithuanian peasant," stated Antoine Meillet, one of the most influential French linguists a century ago (Fischer & Jensen, 2012). Accepting multilingualism as a value, we must understand that it is not something that has been given to us or something that is permanent. It is empowered by the mother tongue, which creates an essential opportunity as well as a precondition for the acquisition of competences of other languages. However, the language itself, being a tradition, i.e., transmission—a living process, was affected, is

being affected and will be affected—more or less—by other languages, so the identity of a language cannot be understood without an understanding of its curriculum vitae. The present of a language accommodates its past. It will also determine its future, and to predict the future of a particular language today is possible only by looking at the interaction of its users with other languages.

Lithuania's geopolitical situation enables the Lithuanian language to be seen as an illustration of the manifestations and variations of such a contact: the language of a small nation whose territory borders both the small nation of the same linguistic group, Latvians, and the territory of the extinct cognate language, inhabited by the largest German-speaking nation, expelled by the largest Slavic nation in the middle of the 20th century, and also the current neighbors, Belarusians and Poles, who were in the same one state for many centuries.

With regard to the identity of a particular language, it is again necessary not to lose sight of the factor of language development itself, which encompasses the mechanism of the coexistence of languages, their mutual influences and effects on each other at a specific time and under specific political-social conditions. Today's language is not identical to yesterday's language, although it is the same language. As Seneca put forward in the letter *Ad Lucilium* (Ep*.* 58.22), "Nemo nostrum idem est in senectute qui fuit iuvenis; nemo nostrum est idem mane qui fuit pridie" ["None of us is the same in old age as he was in youth; none of us is the same the next day as he was the day before"] (Seneca, 2016, 155).

The First Existential Clash of Languages

Languages change, including the mother tongue, and we are all experts in that process. The perception of the mother tongue itself is changing. We all know that the mother tongue is the language a person learns first. However, in today's circumstances, the concept itself is not easy to define, because living in a world of active migration from one country to another creates mixed families, where the father is of one nationality and the mother is of another nationality. It is not easy for everyone to decide which language is their first or mother tongue.

This could be evidenced by the fact that, for example, according to the 2011 Lithuanian Census, 1.4 percent of people found it difficult to decide which language is their mother tongue; 18.2% of Belarusians and 15.4% of Ukrainians living in Lithuania considered Russian as their mother tongue and 17.2 thousand inhabitants indicated two mother tongues: mostly Lithuanian and Russian, Lithuanian and Polish, Polish and Russian. There were cases when the language of grandparents who actively helped raise a child was yet chosen as a mother tongue. This means that a person can speak two (or even more) mother tongues. Therefore, it should be called native bilingualism or multilingualism.

In addition, the naming of the mother tongue itself differs in different languages. In general, three descriptions can be distinguished: native language—many of our neighbors call it, for example, родной язык (Russian), родная мова (Belarus), рідна мова (Ukrainian); valoda (Latvian); mother tongue—in most southern and western European languages, such as madrelingua (Italian), lengua materna (Spanish), materinji jezik (Croatian), mateřský jazyk (Czech), materský jazyk (Slovak), Muttersprache (German); the Poles call it father tongue język ojczysty. This is exactly what Mikalojus Daukša called the Lithuanian language in 1599.

However, this language, the mother tongue of the mother or father, that is, the first language the person gets acquainted with or perhaps learns, is very fast exposed to a different language environment when the child enters a pre-school education institution or, if for some reason succeeds in staying home longer, finally comes to school. Such a transition to a fundamentally different language was experienced by everyone born in a dialectally strong family.

The first existential clash of languages occurs in a person's life when crossing the school threshold. The linguistic transformation in a small person's consciousness is frightening and dramatic: when learning he/she has to give up naming his/her world for some reason and accept another, alien, stranger, unmotivated world: even the surrounding trees change: instead of *ėglių, bezų, riešucių, grūšių* or *bobingių[1]*. Eglės [fir tree], alyvos [lilac], riešutmedžiai

---

[1] Hereinafter, the words in Dzūkai dialect will be written in italics.

[hazelnuts], kriaušės [pears] or serbentai [currants] (standard Lithuanian) have to be used; natural phenomena also change—it turns out that the sun does not wade (*nebrenda* = leidžiasi [sets]), the sky does not silt up (*dumbliuotis* = aptrauktas debesų [becomes foggy], the fog does not come down, but rises, and so on. *Špokas, knyvė, busilas* [names of birds] quiet down, and instead of them sučiulba varnėnas [a starling twitters], suklykia pempė [a lapwing screams], and sukalena gandras [a stork pecks]. The weekdays also change their names, *panedėlis, utarnykas, sereda, četvergas, pėdnyčia, subata* and *nedėlia* disappear and pirmadienis [Monday], antradienis [Tuesday], trečiadienis [Wednesday], ketvirtadienis [Thursday], penktadienis [Friday], šeštadienis [Saturday], sekmadienis [Sunday] settle in their place. Ordinary things also change treacherously: *kukelis* turns into plaktukas [a hammer], *piela* into pjūklas [a saw], *raikštė* into virvė [a rope], *dziegorius* into laikrodis [a clock], *čeverykai* into batai [shoes]. The transformation reaches even the phases of the moon: *padaužai* [priešpilnis], *jaunas* [jaunatis]*, senagalys* [delčia] disappear. The changes have also affected the morphology: instead of the usual "*Kadu jai nuvej*?" it is necessary to ask "Kada jie nuėjo?" ["When did they go?"]. This is how the school language comes into your world and turns out to be the only right one, more important than your native one – your mother and father, brother and neighbor's tongue.

But soon comes the realization that the world of that language is also limited—only to school. Beyond its boundaries, I can return to the world of my language. However, the contradiction does not disappear: friends who are already trying to speak "a school language" make you feel indignant, a strict "do not Lithuanianize" appears. And, of course, talking to family members about the flaws of friends, you tend to say "They Lithuanianize". It does not take long when the means of teaching and the media start having an active impact, and the identity of the mother tongue shifts, the image of a new language as a better, more advanced one takes root in the consciousness. You quietly agree that to use the verbs vairuok and paslėpk [drive and hide] is better than *kėravok* and *pakavok*, you know that the dead are buried rather than hidden (kavoti = slėpti [hide]; laidoti [bury]), and that a kind address "slūgela" means nothing at all, as it is a borrowed word ... but it was so good to hear it ... Such the first entry into another linguistic world leaves a mark on

human consciousness.

This way, depending on the presentation of the new language, either the joy of discovery or the rejection of a trivial invaluable past is formed. If the new language is presented through the direct or indirect incorporation of the old language, growth is experienced not only by preserving but also by increasing self-worth. Such a teaching method in which the knowledge of the language user is employed and adapted is extremely effective. In this way, the old dialect or language not only remains as a wealth of experience, but also becomes an aid to learning the new language. For example, diacritical marks added to 'nasal vowels' in the words ąžuolas [oak], žąsis [goose], šąla [freezing], and etc. Today, a child simply learns these words by heart, memorizing them mechanically. Whereas a dzūkas knows that the Lithuanian ą with a diacritical mark is pronounced as "ū" [[u:]] in his/her dialect (ūžuolas, žūsis, šūla) and the dilemma when to add a diacritical mark and when not does not exist to him/her ("ū" is changed into a nasal vowel with a diacritical mark). On the other hand, if the disposition is formed that the child's dialect is outdated or contaminated with borrowings that need to be eliminated as soon as possible, the foundations are laid for the subsequent abandonment of this new language as well, in the face of a larger, more "advanced" language. Here is the outset of the path to the death of a particular language or to the disappearance of a small language. The phenomenon of living language identity is its change. As social reality changes, people adapt their language invisibly and instantly.

Change as a Phenomenon of a Living Language

Language, being in our brains, is adaptable to survive, so that we can communicate in new circumstances. Language seems to absorb the social environment, transforming it into a system of signs by its inherent means, making it a self that conveys what is new by naming it. Therefore, language, being the same every day, is always different. But language has no other way of living than through its speakers who create it exactly as it is needed in different circumstances, for different purposes. That is life, movement.

The statement that language, being a creation of all rather than one

individual, adapts to the needs of people who use it and to the changing living conditions, is also proved by the fact that language change processes are intensified at times of historical breakthroughs when truly important political, socio-cultural or economic changes, such as occupation of the state, changes in the political system, the emergence of writing, printed books or electronic means of communication, occur. All levels of language change, although not at the same rate: both the sound system and the lexical system, the coherence of patterns of word formation, the grammatical norms, and the genre forms of language use, and alike. Some variants start to dominate, others slowly retreat to the periphery, leaving room for innovation. Language innovations are often perceived by both language users and linguists in a very ambiguous way: for some they seem to be the disappearance or impoverishment of language, for others—a testimony to the vitality and creativity of language. Sometimes it is said that language changes the world, but in fact it is the world that changes language. The environment in which a person lives inevitably requires the emergence of new concepts in the language. When the requirements go beyond the language coverage, the existence of the language itself is threatened.

Relations between Language and Nation

The basis of language is a nation, the ethnic and cultural community whose members are most often connected by a common language, religion, historical past, economic life, and place of residence. Mikalojus Daukša, a priest, humanist, counter-reformer, and one of the creators of Lithuanian writing, revealed the natural connection between the nation and the language when speaking about the Lithuanian language, although in Polish, more than four centuries ago. In a foreword to the Polish translation of Jakub Vujek's "Postilė-Postilla" published in 1599, in which he addressed the Lithuanian society, encouraging the creation of writing in the Lithuanian language, Mikalojus Daukša wrote: "Where in the world, I say, is there a nation so base and despicable that it does not have these three seemingly innate things of its own: the land of their fathers, their customs and language?" (Korsakas, 1957, p. 65–66).

Paradoxically, but in the Lithuanian language, the transition to another language or the disappearance of one's own language is called the renunciation of the nationality rather than that of the language. In a broad sense, denationalization is a voluntary renunciation of the ethnic identity (as a whole or its individual features) for an individual or group of people in pursuit of one or another goal. The fate of the Lithuania Minor, its Lithuanian inhabitants, is obvious and extremely painful to us. Even during the battles with the Order of Teutonic Knights, there were many cases when the Prussians and Samogitians moved to the conquerors side, seduced by the offered privileges and favors. Many of them quickly became denationalized in order to identify themselves with the higher class—German-speaking colonists—and take advantage of the benefits and rights granted to them. The assimilation and acculturation of the local population finally undermined the vitality of the Prussians (as a peculiar ethnocultural group). After the abolition of serfdom (1807), many new temptations emerged—opportunities to occupy a better position in society by adapting to the culture and lifestyle of the German ruling class.

The stages of the nation's turning away from its own language and the loss of the language and identity were discussed in detail by David Crystal in his book "Language Death" (2005, p. 78): "When one culture assimilates another, the sequence of events affecting the endangered language seem to be the same everywhere." It can be characterized by three broad stages. The first is "immense pressure on the people to speak the dominant language" – the pressure that can come from political, social, or economic sources. It might be 'top down', in the form of incentives, recommendations, or laws introduced by a government or national body; or it might be 'bottom up', in the form of fashionable trends or peer group pressures from within the society of which they form a part; or again, it might have no clear direction, emerging as the result of an interaction between socio-political and socioeconomic factors that are only partly recognized and understood.

But wherever the pressure comes from, the result—stage two—is a period of emerging bilingualism, as "people become increasingly efficient in their new language while still retaining competence in their old". Then, often quite quickly, this bilingualism starts to decline, with the old language giving way to the new. Thus, the third stage starts when the younger generation

becomes increasingly proficient in the new language, identifying more with it, and finding their first language less relevant to their new needs. This is often accompanied by a feeling of shame about using the old language, on the part of the parents as well as their children. Parents use the old language less and less speaking to their children, or in front of their children; and when more children come to be born within the new society, the adults find fewer opportunities to use that language to them. Those families that continue using the old language find that the number of other families they could talk in the old language to gradually decreases; thus, their own usage of the language becomes inward-looking and exceptional, and finally, the language becomes only a 'family dialect'. Outside the home, the children stop communicating with each other in the language. "Within a generation"—sometimes even within a decade—"healthy bilingualism within a family can slip into a self-conscious semilingualism, and thence into a monolingualism" which places that language one step nearer to its extinction (Crystal, 2005, p. 84).

The question arises: can we already see the Lithuanian language at these stages? Does this insight include the fate of our language? The answer is: Yes. The first stage is in full swing. The pressure has already covered all areas: job relations, trade, culture. We see that the dominant English language is penetrating everywhere; its position being strengthened by the constant daily pressure of the media, especially television. It is an effect that Michael Krauss compared to the "cultural nerve paralyzing gas (Crystal, 2005, p. 83). The Lithuanian linguistic emigration in the field of culture, especially musical, is obvious in particular. Even the Lithuanian Children's Song Contest has become an English song contest.

But perhaps the most diligent in this process of denigration and destruction of the mother tongue are we ourselves, the representatives of the academic field. We aim, and quite successfully, to expel the Lithuanian language from science, as if to return to the past or to repeat what the Lithuanian language experienced in the ancient times or during the years of occupation. Scientific monographs and articles are published in English, conferences and seminars are held in English as well. Thus, the second stage indicated by David Crystal—bilingualism—is already a near future here. Then, what follows is semilingualism, and, finally, the English monolingualism.

Judging from the acceleration—it may happen by the end of this century. For the Lithuanian language, destruction is likely to exist in schools for some time to come: history courses will probably pay some attention to the former language of the region.

But is a different perspective possible? Can we see the light at the end of the tunnel? The light must be, for the first words spoken by God were, "Let there be light!" And there was light. Knowing the development of language itself could shed light on the perspective of its possibilities. According to one of the most famous Lithuanian language researchers, professor Kazimieras Būga, "today's language reflects a person's past life, the entire antiquity. Language, being the creation of the past generations, has its own past. Language without people does not live alone. By researching the past of the language, we are also studying the history of the life of a person who speaks that language" (Būga, 1924, p. 3). Thus, a language, its identity, and linguistic phenomena can be well understood only by knowing the history of the language, because the current pronunciation, grammatical forms, constructions and vocabulary are the products of a long development that has lasted for centuries and millennia (Zinkevičius, 1984, p. 5). It is also important to know the language environment, the impact of environmental change on the language, the interactions of language with other languages, the society of language users and its development. Our language has survived throughout a thousand years. The years of constant becoming. Couldn't it live for another thousand years?

Multilingual Historical Path of the Lithuanian Language

Looking at the past ages of the Lithuanian language, a constant spectacle of multilingualism is in sight. Perhaps this is the coded opportunity for the survival of small languages? It is the world of multilingualism that the historical path of the Lithuanian language derives from. Let us take a closer look at this. Our old state—the Grand Duchy of Lithuania—was formed as a multinational, multilingual and multi-religious state. Its inhabitants, officially called "Lithuanians", spoke various languages. The Lithuanian language was used only in the western part of that state (and across the border with the Teutonic

Order, somewhere in the Livonian estates), that is in the ethnographic Lithuania, although a privileged stratum of the Lithuanian descent was also located in the Far East in many state centers, where the Lithuanian military crews were located (Zinkevičius, 1987, p. 111). The state was forced to use multiple languages for internal and external communication. The origins of multilingualism in the old Lithuania and the possibilities for its formation should be sought in the religious tolerance of the state, emphasized already in the early stage of the functioning of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

An illustration of this can be the message of the envoys of Pope John XXII in 1324 about their reception in Vilnius. During the reception, the Lithuanian ruler Gediminas stated that he would allow for example:

> Christianos facere deum suum colere secundum morem suum, ruthenos secundum ritum suum, polonos secundum morem suum et nos colimus deum secundum ritum nostrum, et omnes habemus unum deum.

> [For Christians, to worship their god according to their customs, for Russians—according to their rites, for Poles— according to their customs, and we worship God according to our rites, and we all have one God.] (Letters of Gediminas, 1966, p. 127, 129).

Here, the parallel naming of Christians, Russians, and Poles indicates the determination of religious affiliation according to the linguistic feature of the rites. Thus, in addition to Latin and the Old Church Slavonic languages, the Lithuanian language was placed as equivalent: "et nos colimus deum secundum ritum nostrum" [and we worship God according to our rites].

The importance of languages for religious rites is also stated in the letter of the ruler of Lithuania Gediminas to the monks of the Franciscan Order of May 26, 1323, in which he asks to send: "nobis hoc anno quatuor fratres scientes polonicum, semigallicum ac ruthenicum ordinetis, tales ut nunc sunt et fuerunt" [this year four brothers who speak Polish, Zemgale and Russian, as they are now and as they were [before]] (Letters of Gediminas, 1966, p. 55). This shows that multilingualism was promoted by the desire to integrate the Lithuanian state in the cultural, economic, as well as political sense (even in the pre-Christian period) into the Europe of that time.

The geopolitical situation of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, its presence in the field of interaction between two civilizations—Byzantine (Orthodox) and Latin (Catholic)—and the ethnic diversity of the population were essential factors that prevented one language and one ethnic group from dominating for a long time (Narbutas, 2006, p. 144). Complex diverse cultural, religious, and political processes shaped the civic consciousness associated more with the state than with the ethnos or language. This self-awareness became a gathering force in accepting the influence of two different civilizations, described as Slavia Latina or Romana and Slavia Graeca or Orthodoxa, and transforming it into Lithuania Latina and Lithuania Graeca (Narbutas, 2006, p. 144).

Thus, in the 15th and 16th centuries, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was a state with a dominant Catholic religion, its rulers Lithuanians still understood local Baltic languages or dialects, but wrote and read in the Church Slavonic language, spoke Eastern Slavonic dialects, which eventually developed into the Belarusian or Gudian and Ukrainian languages, and considered themselves descendants of the ancient Romans. The centralizing state policy was based on citizenship and economic pragmatism rather than nationality. Thus, in the apparatus of the government, be it the Council of Noblemen, the Chancellery or the army, various linguistic and ethnic groups or individuals came together, and therefore the most optimal means of communication was chosen in each specific situation. This means, as a result, had no imperative role outside the situation. A Lithuanian, who carried out clerical work in the Old Slavic language or the Ruthenian, wrote the ruler's letters in Latin, and continued to communicate in his native language in a private environment, remained a Lithuanian or Rusyn.

This was noted by Meletijus Smotrickis, the author of polemical writings in his treatise *Werificacija niewinności* at the beginning of the 17th century when he spoke about faith (Verificatia [post 16 VI 1621], p. 60):

> Jeśli są prawdziwa Ruś (iakoż maią być y muszą), bo nie iuż zaraz y ze krwie się ten wyradza, kto się w Wierze odmienia: nie iuż kto z Ruskiego Narodu Rzymskiey wiary zostaie, zaraz y z urodzenia Hiszpanem albo Włochem zostawa, Ruśin Szlachetny postaremu. Nie wiara abowiem Ruśina Ruśinem, Polaka Polakiem, Litwina Litwinem czyni: ale urodzenie y krew

Ruska, Polska, y Litewska.

[If there are true Ruthenians (and there have to and must be),
the blood of one who changes the faith is not immediately
perverted: it is not the case that if one of the Ruthenian people
adopts the Roman faith, he immediately becomes Spanish or
Italian by nature. It is not faith that determines if A ruthenian
is a Ruthenian, a Polish is Polish or a Lithuanian is a Lithuanian,
it is our nature – Ruthenian, Polish and Lithuanian nature].

The divide between the dualistic system of written culture formed in Lithuania
was in the political interests of the state rather than personalities: Gudian
production was mostly used for domestic affairs, Latin and German – for foreign
ones (Gudavičius, 1999, p. 444). The representatives of various nationalities
worked in the ruler's office, including Lithuanians (beginning with
the 15th century). The Latin or Gudian field of work was not determined by
nationality or religion but by education: there were Lithuanians who wrote in
Gudian (Jonas Kušleika) or Gudians who wrote in Latin (Jonas Sapiega)
(Gudavičius, 1999, p. 445). It is true that the cost of maintaining a Latin scribe
was four to five times more expensive than that of a Gudian. In Kaunas,
the German language played a significant role (Gudavičius, 1999, p. 446).

Thus, in the 16th century, the office of the ruler used the Slavic (old
Belarusian or Ruthenian) language of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, which
prevailed during the reign of Vytautas the Great. The official status of
the Ruthenian language was established in 1588. The Third Statute of Lithuania
was approved: „Писар земъский маеть по руску, литерами и словы рускими,
вси листы, выписы и позвы писати, а не иншым езыком и словы" [The scribe
of the Land must write all messages, records and summons in Ruthenian and
not in any other language and words]) (Статут, 1989, p. 140). Therefore, until
1697, the paperwork of the land courts and the Supreme Tribunal in Lithuania
was conducted almost exclusively in the Ruthenian language. In other
government institutions of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, which were not
directly obliged by the Statute of Lithuania to maintain clerical work in
the Ruthenian language, the Polish language was introduced in the first half of
the 17th century. Latin was predominant in public and personal writing. In
the 17th century, the position of the Polish language was strengthened.

It was precisely in the 16th century that the positions of individual

languages, which eventually strengthened, enabled the formation of at least four cultural codes for the dissemination of information, which survived until the 19th century. These were the Lithuanian, Latin (Roman), Gudian and Polish or Sarmatian cultural models (Kuolys, 2000, p. 11–13). In addition, in the 16th century we find some attempts to explain the origin of the Lithuanian language. The theory of Roman Lithuanian origin was developed; attempts were also made to substantiate it with certain linguistic data. In this respect the treatise "De moribus Tartarorum, Lituanorum et Moschorum fragmina X, multiplici historia referta" (On Tatar, Lithuanian and Muscovites customs), written in the middle of the 16th century by Mykolas Lietuvis (Latin: Michalo Lituanus) and published in 1615, is of a particular interest. About 10 fragments of the treatise have survived (published in Basel in 1615). Mykolas Lietuvis entered the history of linguistics as one of those authors whose writings already contain sprouts of the comparative method (Sabaliauskas, 1979, p. 240). To argue that Latin is the native language of Lithuania, and that Lithuanian is derived from Latin, he presented 74 unambiguous Latin and Lithuanian words which sound identical.

The politicization of the language, carried out in 1697, when the Polish language was established in the State Chancellery under the law of Coequation, meant fundamental changes in the language policy of the state. However, the multiethnicity and multi-denominational nature of the state-maintained multilingualism in cultural communication, literature, religion and science. Multilingualism moved from the State Chancellery to public paratheatrical events, establishing itself in commemorative creations, where it was mostly expressed by multilingual greetings from the rulers and the noblemen. The main role was definitely still played by Latin, which was entrenched in spoken and written culture. On the other hand, it is not very surprising to see the old academic Greek and Hebrew used in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, as well as Ruthenian, church Slavonic, Polish, German, or rather exotic seems Syrian, Latvian, Hungarian, Finnish, Belgian, English, Scottish, Irish, Italian, Spanish, Czech that were also used. However, in the palace of the Grand Dukes of Lithuania, in the center of the multinational state, rulers and other guests were also greeted in Lithuanian, on an equal footing with other ancient and modern languages.

Lithuanian books were published in the Lithuanian state in the 16th–17th centuries in two variants of the written language. There is not a single book of that period written in any other linguistic formation derived from the area of other dialects (Zinkevičius, 1987, p. 273). The privileged stratum of the ethnographic Lithuanian population of that time, the nobility and the soldiers of that time probably played the most important role in the process of forming the colloquial interdialects that gave rise to these variants of written language—"Lithuanian language" and "Samogitian language". These languages were used by the nobility of the old Lithuania before becoming Polonized; first of all, by the clergy who, when the passions of the Reformation ignited, considered writing in their mother tongue an important means of achieving their goals.

During this period the first Lithuanian dictionary – the first in the Balts' language—was published by Konstantinas Sirvydas: Dictionarium trium linguarum—a trilingual (in Polish, Latin and Lithuanian) dictionary published at the beginning of the 17th century (around 1620), republished four times during the century. It was the first secular book published among all mainly religious publications of the 16–18th centuries in Lithuania. In the Great Lithuania it was the only published dictionary until the end of the 19th century.

The linguistic competition took place under the conditions of "Cuius regio, eius religio" (Lat.) ("In a [prince's] country, the [prince's] religion"). However, with the victory of the Counter-Reformation in the country, the Church became an important factor of Polonization, a tool of further Christianization and opposition to the Lithuanian language. From the ancient times the Polish clergy tolerated the Lithuanian language as much as it was necessary to teach the people the truths of the faith. The Lithuanian language had long been called "pagan". Suppose God does not understand the prayers said in this language; thus, we need to pray in Polish only (Zinkevičius, 1990, p. 73).

Pupils were forbidden to speak Lithuanian not only at school but also beyond its walls, as well as with their parents when they came to visit their children. There were also penalties for this, for example, a sign with the inscription "osioł" (a donkey) was hung on the neck, which the person had to wear until he caught another Lithuanian-speaking person (Lukšienė, 1970,

p. 102). The contempt for the Lithuanian language was exhibited everywhere—in the manor, in the church and in the school; consequently, it affected the peasants' psyche.

This resulted in being ashamed of the mother tongue, avoiding speaking it in public places; whoever was able tried to speak non-Lithuanian with their children so that they would not be despised. After all, according to the public opinion, the consensus was formed that the Lithuanian language was suitable for a "kitchen and barn" as it is a rough, poor, uncharted language. And this was happening at a time when the world of science, due to the Indo-European comparative linguistics, recognized Lithuanian as having best preserved the Indo-European language model among all living languages (Zinkevičius, 1990, p. 81).

According to professor Alvydas Butkus (2011, p. 97), "Catholicism itself eventually acquired the concept of the Polish faith (polska wiara), which was especially strengthened in the 19th century during the tsarist post-religious repression, when it became a counterweight to the crumbling Orthodoxy and Russification." The fierce linguistic struggle broke out after the uprising of 1863, when the Russian authorities began the process of depolonizing the Catholic Church, seeking to replace Polish, the language traditionally established in the Catholic religion alongside Latin, with Russian as the state language. The Russification of the Catholic Church was to serve not only the linguistic integration of the West but also religious unification, which was practically hindered by Latin. In 1848, the tsar's order, aiming at protecting the inviolability of Orthodoxy, banned the use of the Russian language for Catholic purposes (Merkys, 2002, p. 61). In fact, this commandment recognized Latin as a major obstacle to the conversion of Orthodox to Catholicism. Another command as of 1869, which cancelled the ban but did not concern the Latin language, was to serve the depolonization of the Church and the aggression of Orthodoxy. The depolonization manifested itself in the obligatory requirements for the church to introduce Russian prayers for the tsar and his kinship, the rite, sermons and other additional prayers.

In order to determine the priorities and sequence of implementation of the tsar's order, for the first time the attention was drawn to identify the language used by the majority of parishioners, Lithuanian-speaking

parishes were singled out, which highlighted the ethnic Lithuanian-Slavic border. The Church's depolonization action preserved the Polish language as a means of consolidating Catholics and severely prevented the emergence of languages used by peasant ethnocultural communities and their use in churches, as determinants of non-sacred ecclesiastical languages due to modern social changes (Merkys, 2002, p. 62).

In the 19th century, during the Russian occupation, the language of the government, science, the army and other areas of public life was Russian, the language of the Church was Polish-Latin, and the language of home was Lithuanian. Thus, an educated Lithuanian had to be at least trilingual. As a result, this multilingualism enabled to sustain the Lithuanian language under the conditions of repressive Russification.

During the World War I the German administration in Vilnius used to issue its orders in five languages rather than one: German, Lithuanian, Polish, Belarusian and Yiddish. Even the announcement of the January 26, 1918, about the organization of the Lithuanian language courses, signed by Jonas Vileišis, chairperson of the Education society "Šviesa" ["Light"], was written in the five languages. At the beginning of the 20th century, this kind of Lithuania was seen by Europe. The first project of Paul Hymans, published on May 20, 1921, aimed at regulating the relations between Lithuania and Poland and proposed to transform Lithuania into a federal state of 2 cantons (Kaunas and Vilnius) with Lithuanian and Polish languages as equal ones and common Lithuanian and Polish economic and foreign policy.

Conclusion: Perspectives and Millennial Experiences

Thus, the tactics and strategy of multilingualism are based on the preservation of languages. It makes it possible to eliminate the deadly confrontation between a large and small languages. Of course, it also affects the language itself, resulting in a relative change in language identity. But multilingualism also inspires faster and more effective learning of a new language, taking the function of language rather than its form as its starting point, understood as the need of the language user, the goal, focusing on the meaning created at the moment of language use. It is true that the European Union's

multilingualism policy—the Babel of 24 official European languages—seeks to protect Europe's linguistic diversity and to promote the learning of its official languages. But learning them all for an ordinary citizen would be a lifelong job. The work would be facilitated by dividing the languages into related blocks: Roman, Germanic, Slavic. Learning at least one language from the block presupposes the possibility of understanding other languages more or less. An example would be the Baltic States, where multilingualism is most prevalent of all EU countries. According to the 2012 EU research, 52% of the country's population in Lithuania speak three languages or more, 54% in Latvia and 52% in Estonia (Piller, 2012). Of course, Members of the European Parliament have the right to speak in their mother tongue. But how does Parliament avoid confusion?

In this situation the English language and translation is of a great help. According to Umberto Eco, the European language is translation (Eco, 2001, p. 315). But the same English language also competes actively and successfully with translation (and time shows that it wins). It can be assumed that the words of the poet Arthur Rimbaud, written in a letter to Paul Demeny in 1871, have been fulfilled: "Moreover, since all words are ideas, the time of universal language will come [...]. This language will spread from soul to soul and will cover everything: smells, dreams, colors [...]." (Eco, 2001, p. 12). Is it not about the future monolingualism in the European Union? Is there no threat to the linguistic absolute monarchy? It is very similar to the statement of another Frenchman, priest Noel-Antoine Pluche, paraphrasing Louis XIV, "C'est la langue" (Eco, 2001, p. 310).

For two thousand years, we have been seduced by a vision of a special language that everyone can understand and understand perfectly. The great miracle of language, the ability to "speak in other tongues"—in languages they did not know—is described in the Acts of the Apostles (CSB, Act 2), describing the day of Pentecost: "Then they were all filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak in in different tongues than the Spirit enabled them."

In Jerusalem there lived "devout people from every nation under heaven. When this sound occurred, a crowd came together and was confused because each one heard them speaking in his own language. They were astounded and amazed, saying:

> Look, aren't all these who are speaking Galileans? How is it that each of us can hear them in our native language? Parthians, Medes, Elamites; those who live in Mesopotamia, in Judea and Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia, Phrygia and Pamphylia, Egypt and the parts of Libya near Cyrene; visitors from Rome (both Jews and converts); Cretans and Arabs—we hear them declaring the magnificent acts of God in our own tongues! (Apd 2, 4–13 The Bible, 2015).

They were "amazed and perplexed", saying to one another: "What does this mean?", but some sneered and said, "They're drunk on new wine.". So, what should we strive for in balancing multilingualism and language hegemony: the spirit of a magical language? Or a young wine? Or "come back to earth" and take a look:

> Pilate had a notice prepared and fastened to the cross. It read: JESUS OF NAZARETH, THE KING OF THE JEWS. Many of the Jews read this sign, for the place where Jesus was crucified was near the city, and the sign was written in Aramaic, Latin and Greek (Jn 19, 19–20, The Bible, 2015).

For centuries, the Homo trilinguis (speaking three languages) has been the ideal of the cultured person.

References

Būga, K. (1924). Aisčių praeitis vietų vardų šviesoje: su dviem žemėlapiais. Kaunas.

Butkus, A. (2011). Baltų tautinio sąmonėjimo skirtumai ir jų įtaka dabarties politikai. *Lituanistica*, *57*(1), 83.

Crystal, D. (2005). *Kalbos mirtis*. Tyto alba.

Eco, U. (2001). *Tobulos kalbos paieškos Europos kultūroje*. Baltos lankos.

Fischer, B. & Jensen, M. N. (Eds.) (2012). *Translation and the reconfiguration of power relations: Revisiting role and context of translation and interpreting*. LIT Verlag, Münster.

Gudavičius, E. (1999). Lietuvos istorija nuo seniausių laikų iki 1569 metų. Lietuvos rašytojų sąjungos leidykla.

Korsakas, K. (1957) (Ed.). *Lietuvių literatūros istorijos chrestomatija*.

Feodalizmo epocha. Valstybinė grožinės literatūros leidykla.

Kuolys, D. (2000). Visuomenės raidos projekcijos XVI amžiaus Lietuvos Didžiosios Kunigaikštijos raštijoje. *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*, *5*. Pradai.

Lukšienė, M. (1970). *Lietuvos švietimo istorijos bruožai XIX a. pirmojoje pusėje*. Šviesa.

Merkys, V. (2002). Rusų kalba Vilniaus vyskupijos bažnyčiose 1866–1883 m. *Lituanistica*, *3*(51).

Narbutas, S. (2006). Latinitas LDK raštijos raidoje. *Senoji Lietuvos literatūra*, *21*. Lietuvių literatūros ir tautosakos institutas.

Pašuta, V., & Štal, I. (1966) (Eds.). *Gedimino laiškai*. Mintis.

Piller, I. (2012). Multilingual Europe. *Language on the Move*. https://www.languageonthemove.com/multilingual-europe/

Sabaliauskas, A. (1979). *Lietuvių kalbos tyrinėjimo istorija iki 1940 m.* Mokslas.

Seneka, L. A. (2016). *Laiškai Lucilijui*. Sofoklis.

The Bible (2015). Lietuvos Biblijos draugija.

Verificatia niewinności y omylnych po wszytkiey Litwie y Białey Ruśi rozśianych żywot y uczćiwe cnego narodu ruskiego o vpad przyprawić żrzodzonych nowin pod młościwą pańską y oycowska nawyższey y pierwszey po Panu Bogu narodu tego zacne[g]o zwierzchnośći y brzegu wszelkiey sprawiedliwośći obrone poddane chrześćianskie vprzątnienie [post 16 VI 1621] [Bractwo Św. Ducha].

Zinkevičius, Z. (1984–1994). *Lietuvių kalbos istorija 1–6.* Mokslas.

Статут Вялікага княства Літоўскага (1588). Тэксты. Даведнік. Каментарыі, 1989. „Беларуская савецкая энцыклапедыя" імя Петруся Броўкі.

Sigitas Lūžys
Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas, Lietuva
sigitas.luzys@vdu.lt

KALBOS TAPATYBĖ: TARP DAUGIAKALBYSTĖS IR KALBOS HEGEMONIJOS

Santrauka. *A priori* priimdami daugiakalbystę kaip vertybę turime suvokti, kad ji nėra nuolatinė. Daugiakalbystė įmanoma tik dėl mūsų gimtosios kalbos, kuri sudaro esmines sąlygas išmokti kitų kalbų. Tačiau pati kalba kaip tradicija, t. y. gyvas procesas, yra veikiama kitų kalbų, todėl kalbos tapatybė nesuvokiama nesupratus jos *curriculum vitae*. Istorinis lietuvių kalbos kelias ateina kaip tik iš daugiakalbystės pasaulio. Būtų sunku įsivaizduoti Lietuvos Didžiojoje Kunigaikštystės miesto gyvenimą be žmonių, kalbančių lenkų, baltarusių, rusėnų, lotynų ir jidiš kalbomis. Tikroji daugiakalbystė neskirstė žmonių į „savus" ir „svetimus"; ši skirtis atsirado vėliau, praėjus keliems šimtmečiams, kada miesto kultūroje ėmė nykti miestui būdinga daugiakalbystė. Ir visa tai pasireiškė kaip tam tikras susipriešinimas su „svetimais", kaip pastangos sukurti tartum natūralią daugeliui žmonių tapatinimosi skirtį, kuri daro įtaką ir kalbiškai vienija. Daugiakalbiame pasaulyje vyravo suvokimas: nors ir skirtingi, visi esame „savi". Tikroji, kasdienė, buitinė daugiakalbystė įgalino tarp kalbų ne tik informacinę komunikaciją, bet ir kontekstinės reikšmės sklaidą, mąstymo ir pasaulėvokos niuansų perėmimą. Atsiradus vienos, pačios svarbiausios ir racionaliausios „globalios" kalbos hegemonijai, atsirado ir nauja komunikacija, kuriai nėra svarbu, kad žmogus mokėtų kelias kalbas (nesvarbu tampa net mokėti ir kaimyninių šalių kalbas), nes komunikacija vyksta per tam tikrą tarpininką ir ilgainiui apima įvairias gyvenimo sritis. Tačiau dvikalbystė nėra galutinis rezultatas; hegemoninė kalba peržengia *lingua franca* paskirties ribas ir siekia perimti gimtosios kalbos funkcijas. Tad koks yra pastarosios vaidmuo ir likimas? Būtent į šį klausimą ir siekiama atsakyti straipsnyje.

Pagrindinės sąvokos: kalbinė tapatybė; gimtoji kalba; kalbos hegemonija.