Lithuanisation of Personal Names of the Polish Minority in Lithuania

Justyna B. Walkowiak

Poland

Abstract

The article presents the Lithuanisation of personal names of the Polish minority in Lithuania as implemented since the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the rebirth of an independent Lithuanian state at the beginning of the 1990s. This policy applies to personal names in their written form recorded in official documents and it constitutes part of Lithuania's overall official language policy. The approach adopted has been inspired by the tripartite division into language policy, ideology and practice as proposed by Spolsky and Shohamy (cf. 1999: 31-32), as well as by Schiffman's idea of 'linguistic culture' (1996: 5). First the linguistic principles of transposition have been presented, then language ideology has been discussed in its selected historical, legal and linguistic aspects. Finally the divergences in practice from the rules of Lithuanisation are outlined.

* * *

Language Policy

Among language policies, two types are usually distinguished: *de jure* and *de facto* ones. The analysed policy is of the former type. Its legal framework is composed of a number of laws and regulations, one of which is the decree of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania of January 31, 1991:

> Given names and surnames of Lithuania's citizens of ethnicity other than Lithuanian shall be written in identity documents with the use of Lithuanian spelling and Lithuanian letters. At a citizen's written request given names and surnames shall be written:
> a) according to pronunciation, without grammatical transformations (without Lithuanian suffixes), or
> b) according to pronunciation, grammatically transformed (with Lithuanian suffixes).[1]

Another legal act is the Constitution of the Republic of Lithuania (1992), stating in Art. 14 that 'Lithuanian shall be the State language'. Finally, the Law on the State Language (1995) stipulates that 'Genders, which are prescribed by laws, of personal names of the citizens of the Republic of Lithuania shall be used in the Republic of Lithuania. Personal names shall be changed and corrected in the manner prescribed by laws' (Art. 15).

The rules for the transposition of personal names from Polish to Lithuanian have been established by the State Commission of the Lithuanian Language (*Valstybinė lietuvių kalbos*

---

[1] Official translation can be found on the website: Republic of Lithuania (2015). In fact, what is added to names is inflectional endings (*galūnės*), not derivational suffixes (*priesagos*).

komisija, henceforth VLKK). The Lithuanian and Polish alphabets, which both have 32 letters and are based on the Latin script, differ significantly. The letters *ć, ł, ń, ó, ś, w, ź, ż* are used in Polish but not in Lithuanian, whereas *č, ė, į, š, ų, ū, ž* are used in Lithuanian but not in Polish. Moreover, the letters *ą, ę, v, y* are used in both languages (the letter *v* in Polish only for loanwords), yet with different phonetic values. All the differences in the stock of letters have a direct bearing on the transposition, whose detailed principles are described below. The examples used are those given on the VLKK website.

The Polish letters *ą, ę* are generally used to represent nasal vowels, whereas their Lithuanian counterparts, once nasal, nowadays represent oral sounds. Consequently, *ą, ę* are replaced in Lithuanian with om/em before the bilabial stops *b, p*, e.g. *Dąbrowski – Dombrovski(s)*, *Kępski – Kempski(s)*, and with *on/en* in all other cases: *Łątkowski – Lontkovski(s)*, *Wężyk – Venžyk(as)*. It is noteworthy that nasal vowels in the dialect of Polish spoken by Poles in Lithuania (dialekt północnokresowy) may exhibit asynchronous nasalisation[2] (Rieger *et al.* 2006: 25); therefore the aforementioned spelling matches the dialectal pronunciation. The Polish letter *i* as a mark of softness before *e, ę* disappears in transposition into Lithuanian: *Bielikowicz – Belikovič(ius)*, *Niedzielska – Nedzelska*, *Czekień – Čeken(is)*, *Dzięgielewski – Dzengelevski(s)*, *Mieczysław – Mečyslav(as)*, though it is preserved before other vowels: *Białecki – Bialecki(s)*. The Polish letter *ó*, non-existent in Lithuanian, is replaced by its phonetically equivalent letter *u*: *Piórko – Piurko / Piurka*, *Józef – Juzef(as)*.

Also the letters corresponding to consonants undergo changes in transposition from Polish to Lithuanian. The letter *j* before consonants is rendered as *i*: *Ajdukowicz – Aidukovič(ius)*, *Domejko – Domeiko/Domeika*. Polish letters with diacritics that do not exist in Lithuanian (*ć, ł, ń, ś, ź*) are replaced with the same letters without diacritics (*c, l, n, s, z* respectively, e.g. *Ćwikliński – Cviklinski(s)*, *Paweł – Pavel(as)*, *Jasiński – Jasinski(s)*, *Śniadecki – Sniadecki(s)*, *Kuźma – Kuzma*). Since most of these diacritics (except for *ł*) mark palatalisation in Polish, such spelling does not reflect standard Polish pronunciation. However, in the dialect of Poles in Lithuania letters *ć, ń, ś, ź* are pronounced as semipalatal, not fully palatal (this phenomenon is in Polish sometimes called *śledzikowanie*), thus the Lithuanised orthography in a limited way matches the actual pronunciation. The letters *c, l, n, s, z* are rather obvious choices as replacement for *ć, ł, ń, ś, ź* because of their visual similarity to the letters they replace. As regards pronunciation, *č, š, ž* might also be considered substitutes for *ć, ś, ź*; such an alternative solution, however, would lead to confusion and to the lack of one-to-one correspondence between the sets of the replaced and replacing graphemes since the latter also correspond to the Polish *cz, sz, ż* (moreover, there does not appear to be any alternative equivalent in Lithuanian of the letters *ł, ń*).

The letter *i* is inserted after *l* when followed by *a, ą, o, ó, u*: *Grzela – Gželia*, *Ludmiła – Liudmila*. However, in names of non-Polish origin, such as *Jolanta* or *Adelajda* (*Adelaida*), *t*here is no insertion. The Lithuanian equivalents of *w, ż* are *v, ž* respectively: *Władysław – Vladyslav(as)*, *Wanda – Vanda*, *Żmijewski – Žmijevski(s)*, *Ważny – Važny/Važnas*.

Finally, Polish diagraphs *cz, sz* undergo replacement with Lithuanian letters *č, š* which correspond to the phonemes that are their closest phonetic equivalents: *Czesław – Česlav(as)*, *Szejnicki – Šeinicki(s)*. The diagraph *rz* becomes *š* after *ch, k, p, t*, and *ž* in all other cases:

---

[2] In Polish *rozłożona (asynchroniczna) wymowa samogłosek nosowych.*

Krzywicki – Kšyvicki(s), *Przemysław – Pšemyslav(as)*, *Trzebiński – Tšebinski(s)*, *Rzecki – Žecki(s)*, *Grzegorz – Gžegož(as).* Such spelling reflects perseveratory assimilation of voicing.

Because there are no geminates in Lithuanian, double consonants in Polish names undergo reduction to single letters: *Dowgiałło – Dovgialo/Dovgiala, Anna – Ana, Violetta – Violeta, Emma – Ema.*

Language Ideology (Linguistic Culture)

The Historical Aspect

As Schiffman observes, 'language policy is ultimately grounded in linguistic culture, that is, the set of behaviours, assumptions, cultural forms, prejudices, folk belief systems, attitudes, stereotypes, ways of thinking about language, and religio-historical circumstances associated with a particular language' (1996: 5). The ideologies that constitute the background of the policy under consideration may be explored in their three aspects: historical, legal and linguistic.

On the historical plane, for several centuries Lithuania and Poland jointly formed a state known as the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. In the years 1772-1795 the polity underwent three partitions, the last one erasing the dual state completely from the map of Europe for 123 years. By the end of the 19th century, with Lithuania still under imperial Russian rule, it had slowly become clear that Polish-Lithuanian relations needed to be redefined:

> At the turn of the twentieth century, there was no Lithuanian state. The elite, reared in Polish culture and living in the Belarusian and Lithuanian provinces of the Russian Empire, consciously cultivated the traditions of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of 1772. Yet reconstruction of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was out of the question, not only for political reasons related to the military power of the Russian Empire but also because the evolution of the popular consciousness tended toward the creation of national states and not to the reconstruction of multiethnic ones on the basis of historical precedent. (Eberhardt 2003: 25-26)

At the turn of the 20th century, with several decades of Herderian-style national revival behind them and having developed some intelligentsia of their own, Lithuanians considered themselves wronged by how they had been treated in the Commonwealth, in which Polish had been the language of the upper classes, of culture and – since the end of the 17th century – also of state administration, with minoritised Lithuanian deemed fit only for peasants. Poles, in their turn, regarded Lithuanians as ungrateful younger brothers with incomprehensible aspirations to independence.

Poland and Lithuania were resurrected as independent states in the aftermath of the First World War. In this way Lithuanian, formerly *de facto* a minoritised language, became *de jure* a majority, national language, with an accompanying language policy. In the 1930s a campaign was launched to de-Slavicise personal names in Lithuania:

> Surnames were the most problematic. They had been reworked and distorted in various ways under the influence of enforced denationalization. Often in a given family group some would have a Lithuanian, others a Polonized or Slavicized surname [...]. There was a desire to restore the original forms of these altered Lithuanian surnames. To this end [the linguists] accurately recorded the surnames as used by the people and created an index (about 260,000 entries) for them. Preparations were made to publish a dictionary of original Lithuanian surnames, but time ran out. The onset of World War II and the occupation of Lithuania interrupted the work. (Zinkevičius 1998: 308-309)

The situation in which there was an official majority form of a personal name and a different minority form was not entirely novel to Lithuania since a large part of its territory had long been multiethnic and multicultural, with a long-standing tradition of the *sui generis* diglossic existence of equivalent forms of personal names in different languages, including Lithuanian dialects. Until the end of the 17th century the language of official records in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was Chancery Slavonic, whereas the population of this state at its largest included, alongside Lithuanian, several other non-Slavonic ethnicities (e.g. Prussian, Jewish, Livonian, Latvian, German). Of considerable importance is also the fact that between the end of the 18th century and the end of the First World War Lithuania had been a province of the Russian Empire and therefore at least for some of this period personal names were Russified. Russification intensified in the years 1864-1904, when printing books in the Latin alphabet was strictly forbidden and only the Cyrillic script was allowed. All these facts made name changes that took place in the interwar period a relatively familiar phenomenon to those affected, not only in Lithuania but also in Latvia and Estonia, which two countries to some degree shared with Lithuania their history both in the GDL and in the Russian Empire:

> Personal names became an object of contention as [after 1918] all three Baltic states demanded conformity to national orthographic traditions – in Latvia and Lithuania names are declined and usually gender marked, and non-Latvian names were officially written with endings conforming to this pattern. Original spellings could usually be included in parentheses and always used in signatures. Cyrillic-written names were Latinised in conformity with those principles. (Hogan-Brun *et al.* 2009: 32)

The Soviet rule in Lithuania in the years 1940-1990 led to the gradual marginalisation of Lithuanian, manifested in such phenomena as Lithuanian-Russian code-mixing, or in increasing functional diglossia. Russian played an increasingly important role as the language of science, administration, army and public life (Baločkaitė 2013, Hogan-Brun *et al.* 2013). The pressure of Russification relented slightly in mid-eighties, shortly before the collapse of the Soviet Union.

With the re-emergence of independent Lithuanian state, the Lithuanian language regained the status it had enjoyed before the war. The status of Russian was reduced to that of a minority language, which it now shares with Polish. In the census of 2011 Poles were found

to constitute 6.6% of Lithuania's population (200.3 thousand), Russians – 5.8% (176.9 thousand), Belarusians – 1.2%; other minorities do not exceed 0.5% each.

For a relatively long period, there have existed two conflicting narrations about the Polish-Lithuanian past and present relations. To this day Poles tend to consider the series of unions signed with Lithuania between 1385 and 1569 as an achievement that enhanced the country's stature on the international arena. Lithuanians, in their turn, see the unions as detrimental to Lithuanian statehood, with the Union of Lublin in 1569 considered particularly odious. Also particular historical figures are differently evaluated today. King Jogaila (Władysław Jagiełło), who in 1385 signed the Union of Kreva, is highly regarded in Poland as one of the founders of the power of the Commonwealth. At the same time he is held in such low esteem in Lithuania that in 1930 a symbolic lawsuit was even brought against him in the Samogitian town of Kaišiadorys: he was found guilty of treason and sentenced to death, with all memory of him erased from Lithuanian history (Venclova 2013: 27).

As Nowicka observes, 'the basic elements of the policy toward ethnic minorities in the pre-war Lithuanian state [...] are exactly rehashed in independent Lithuania of the 1990s' (2000: 81). The Lithuanian narration includes the thesis that there are no Poles in Lithuania, only Lithuanians forcibly Polonised several generations ago, whose national awareness needs to be (re-)awakened. By contrast, the Polish narration, especially when linked with right-wing political leanings, includes sentimental idealised memories of the imagined peaceful coexistence of nations in the past, oblivious of the actual ethnic tensions of the interwar Polish state. Nevertheless, certain facts might indicate that the acceptance by Lithuania's Poles of their Lithuanised names seems to be increasing, as evidenced by their use in public space in informal situations, where they are not obligatory: on the Internet or on tombstones (Radczenko 2013).

The long period of cultural dominance of Polish in the GDL and of the concomitant neglect of Lithuanian, coupled with some Proto-Indo-European features it preserved, made language one of the core values of Lithuanian culture in the sense attributed to this term by Smolicz:

> Core values can be regarded as forming one of the most fundamental components of a group's culture. They generally represent the heartland of the ideological system and act as identifying values which are symbolic of the group and its membership […] Poles provide one of the best examples of a culture where the native language has the status of a central or core value. (1999: 105, 106)

Smolicz identifies what he calls language-centred cultures, among which he includes Poles and Lithuanians (1999: 28). The language-centredness of these two languages unquestionably reinforces each of the two narrations.

The Legal Aspect

The legal aspect is subsumed under ideology for two reasons. First, laws may reflect what people think about language; second, people's convictions may be based on what they know from experience and are accustomed to. As regards internal legislation, non-Lithuanian letters

or diacritics are not allowed in Lithuania. A similar policy is pursued by Latvia. Art. 19 of the State Language Law of 1992 stipulates that personal names of citizens have to conform to the norms of Latvian, which implies not only the use of Latvian letters but also the addition of endings corresponding to the Latvian language grammatical system, including the appropriate genders.

However, as a comparison with policies in other European states shows, such a strict approach is not the only possible option. For instance, as Satkauskas (2008) notes, foreign diacritics are admitted in personal names of citizens in Italy, Denmark, Germany and Slovenia. Also Sweden allows 26 foreign letters with diacritics, mostly vowels, apart from the 29 letters of the Swedish alphabet (see the article by Märit Fränden (2016) in vol. 4 of these proceedings). In Northern Ireland any Unicode character can be used for registering a child's name. In the USA regulations differ from state to state, but in general, despite the rather liberal American attitude to choosing given names, surnames are subject to certain limitations:

> Prohibitions of accent marks and other diacritical marks are common. For example, the California Office of Vital Records provides a handbook to county vital records departments that states birth names can be recorded using only 'the 26 alphabetical characters of the English language with appropriate punctuation if necessary.' The handbook further specifies that 'no pictographs, ideograms, diacritical marks' (including 'é,' 'ñ,' and 'ç') are allowed [...] Kansas imposes similar restrictions. In Massachusetts, the 'characters have to be on the standard american [sic] keyboard. So dashes and apostrophes are fine, but not accent marks and the such.' New Hampshire prohibits all special characters other than an apostrophe or dash. (Larson 2011: 169)

In Poland some surnames of German origin with non-Polish diacritics (e.g. *Brandstätter*, *Möller*, *Krüger*), as well as some surnames written in Polish letters but with non-literal pronunciation (e.g. *Gieysztor*, *Schramm*, *Chopin*) have long been in official use. In the dictionary of all Polish surnames in use in 2002 (Rymut 2005), there are also some other surnames with foreign diacritics (e.g. *Veličković*). Since 2005, the names of members of minorities in Poland may be spelled using minority alphabets.[3] The letters used in the names of foreigners by the media and by publishers of books often include *ø*, *ß*, *ð* and other non-Polish letters (*Jo Nesbø, Karl-Markus Gauß, Jóhanna Sigurðardóttir*).

On the international plane, Lithuania's membership in supranational organisations and treaties (e.g. Council of Europe since 1993, the European Union and NATO since 2004) has brought Lithuania's domestic legislation under the direct influence of international laws and supranational judicial institutions. This influence potentially brings into play also actors from outside the European Union:

> The local language situation in the Baltic has also seen intense internationalisation, with a variety of governments (most prominently of Russia) and a host of international organisations involved in an international battle over the status of

---

[3] There are nine officially recognised national minorities in Poland (Belarusians, Czechs, Lithuanians, Germans, Armenians, Russians, Slovaks, Ukrainians, Jews) and four ethnic minorities (Karaites, Lemkos, Roma, Tatars).

languages, often cast in terms of language rights. The at times overwhelming interest of international organisations in the Baltic language situation and the stubborn adherence by the Baltic States to their intention to change their language regime significantly [i.e. from the domination of Russian to the domination of titular languages] has the potential to bring about some profound refinements of understandings about human rights, national rights, and citizenship as well as about discrimination and related areas. (Hogan-Brun 2009: 5-6)

Most relevantly, Lithuania has been party to the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (henceforth FCNM) since 2000. Art. 11 (1) of FCNM states that 'every person belonging to a national minority has the right to use his or her surname (patronym) and first names in the minority language and the right to official recognition of them, according to modalities provided for in their legal system'. This means, as the explanatory report clarifies, that 'a state may use the alphabet of their official language to write the name(s) of a person belonging to a national minority in its phonetic form'. While the rendition of Polish names into Lithuanian is not quite consistent, in principle it *is* phonetic, and thus in the first cycle of the monitoring of FCNM implementation (2003) it occasioned only the following comment:

> The Advisory Committee regrets that, in spite of the discussions that have been ongoing for several years both at the national level and in the context of bilateral relations, no commonly approved solution has yet been found on the modalities of transcribing the surnames and first names of persons belonging to national minorities (in particular the Poles) in passports […] The Advisory Committee hopes that the parties concerned will be able to identify an acceptable solution as soon as possible.

The Advisory Committee mentioned in the second-cycle opinion (2008) the draft law drawn up in 2005 by the Ministry of Justice, then under examination in parliament; according to the draft, personal names 'when not originally written in Latin characters' were to be 'phonetically transcribed using the Latin script, without the addition of Lithuanian characters'. In all likelihood, this opinion mistakenly referred to the names of Lithuanian Russians, not Poles, since it is Russian and not Polish that uses a non-Latin alphabet.

The third monitoring cycle (2013) notes 'the absence of progress in the long-standing controversy' and stresses that 'efforts to promote the correct use of the official language in Lithuanian should not extend to altering the spelling of names that originate in other languages, simply because the holder of the name is a Lithuanian citizen'. Further, VLKK is quoted as emphasising that 'foreign proper names do not belong to the system of the Lithuanian language and therefore they need not be Lithuanised'.

The Linguistic Aspect

The question whether foreign proper names are part of the Lithuanian language system (or if so, then to what extent) is of relevance to the third, linguistic aspect of the ideology. There are two contradictory traditions, Polish and Lithuanian, concerning the writing of foreign anthroponyms. In Polish the general rule provides that the original spelling of a name is preserved at the expense of pronunciation, whereas in Lithuania the spelling is sacrificed for the sake of (approximated) pronunciation.

In Polish the debate about which option to choose started as early as the beginning of the 19th century. The idea of intact spelling, which ultimately prevailed, was supported, among others, by famous Polish linguists Zenon Klemensiewicz and Witold Doroszewski. Bartmińska and Bartmiński (1978: 96-103) list the main arguments put forward since the 19th century in favour of the present solution:

- Distorted orthography is an obstacle in recognising the names of famous personages, although certain traditional Polonised forms – such as *Szopen* (*Chopin*), *Szekspir* (*Shakespeare*), *Wolter* (*Voltaire*) or *Kartezjusz* (*Descartes*) – have become so established in the Polish culture that reverting to their original form might be harmful to the language.
- Language users are continually confronted with new foreign-language surnames that they have never heard before, so those not versed in foreign languages might not even be aware of the difference between the spelling and the pronunciation of a newly encountered name.
- Some claim that Polonisation is indispensable for correct declension of surnames, but no matter if one writes *Lacroix*, *Le Beau*, *Menou*, *Daru*, or *Lakroa*, *Lebo*, *Menu*, *Dariu*, the declension is equally problematic; furthermore, in the case of certain surnames Polonisation may even render declination more difficult: *Lanselo*, *Klero*, *Lebrę* are more intractable in that respect than *Lancelot*, *Clairot* or *Le Brun*.
- Literal pronunciation is not so evil as to be avoided at all costs.
- Each language has a different inventory of sounds, so the pronunciation preserved at the expense of spelling is nevertheless only approximated, never accurate; it can be accepted as satisfactory only in the case of different scripts when it is the only solution. Even then it is the lesser evil and may lead to confusion – one may consider for instance the various renderings in Polish of the name of the famous Mongolian military leader: *Dżengis kan*, *Djenguis-Khan*, *Gengis-Kan*, *Zingiscan* and many more.
- In the case of a language less popular in a particular country there may be discrepancies in the particular ways in which names are written on the basis of their pronunciation, since different writers may transcribe the same name differently.

In contrast with Polish, contemporary Lithuanian perpetrates the tradition of adapting foreign proper nouns to fit the Lithuanian alphabet and declension. In reference books there appear such forms as *Džordžas Vašingtonas* (*George Washington*), **Liudvikas van Bethovenas**/*Betovenas* (*Ludwig van Beethoven*), **Džonas Lokas** (*John Locke*), *Fransua Žeraras Žoržas Nikolia Olandas* (*François Gérard Georges Nicolas Hollande*) or **Čarlzas**

Darvinas (*Charles Darwin*). The practice in the media is not uniform. For instance, referring in the nominative case to the president of France, in the same year 2013, the Lithuanian press and the electronic media used various forms, ranging from the original to the most adapted, e.g.:

> *François Hollande* (the portal Tiesos);
> *Francois Hollande* – without the cedilla (the Lithuanian-language website of the embassy of France in Lithuania);
> *Francois Hollande'as* (Lietuvos rytas, Lietuvos žinios, the portal Delfi);
> *Francois Hollande'as* (Fransua Holandas) – the portal VilniausDiena;
> *Fransua Olandas* (Lietuvos aidas, Respublika).

The actual inconsistent usage is paralleled by a diversity of opinions about how best to render in writing foreign-language features in Lithuanian. As Mikulėnienė notes,

> Discussion about the writing of foreign proper nouns in the original has been on in Lithuania for over more than ten years. The supporters of the traditional orthography are for writing foreign forms based only on the pronunciation. The introduction of the Latin letters Q q, X x, W w in Lithuanian print is compared to treason by some radical members of the public. The public is polarised: those for writing foreign proper nouns in the original […] and against it. (2009: 50)

Language

Given names and surnames fulfil different roles in the onomastic system and therefore will be discussed separately. As regards Lithuanised Polish given names, their orthography differs from both standard Polish and standard Lithuanian orthography. In fact, a whole new onomasticon developed, unnoticed by normative name dictionaries, although present in the minds of name users. The table below presents some examples.

Polish name	Lithuanian name	Lithuanised name
Agnieszka	Agnė, Agnetė	Agneška
Andrzej	Andrius, Andrys	Andžej(us)
Anna	Ona	Ana
Ewa	Ieva, Jieva	Eva
Franciszek	Pranciškus, Pranas	Franišek(as)
Grzegorz	Grigalius, Grigas	Gžegož(as)
Jan	Jonas	Jan(as)
Jerzy	Jurgis	Ježis
Józef	Juozapas, Juozas	Juzef(as)
Katarzyna	Kotryna, Katryna	Katažyna
Krzysztof	Krystupas, Kristapas	Kšyštof(as)

Łukasz	Lukas	Lukaš(as)
Małgorzata	Margarita	Malgožata
Paweł	Paūlius, Povilas	Pavel(as)
Piotr	Petras	Piotr(as)
Rafał	Rapolas	Rafal(is)
Ryszard	Rikardas	Ryšard(as)
Tadeusz	Tadas	Tadeuš(as)
Tomasz	Tomas	Tomaš(as)
Witold	Vytautas	Vitold(as)

Table 1. Polish, Lithuanian and Lithuanised given names

By contrast, the specificity of surname Lithuanisation is not limited to their distortion. Equally noticeable are discrepancies between the forms postulated by VLKK and those actually used. The following table presents selected examples; the sources of these names are bilingual websites of Polish minority organisations in Lithuania and of schools in Lithuania where Polish is the language of instruction.

Polish	Lithuanised according to rules	Actual Lithuanisation	Discrepancy
Adamajtis	Adamaitis	Adomajtis	back vowel reduction (*akanye*)
Masojć	Masoic	Masoit	*t* instead of *c*
Andruszkiewicz	Andruškevič	Andruškievič	preserved *i* before *e*
Brzozowska	Bžozovska	Bržozovskaja	preserved *r* before *ž,* Russian ending
Błaszkiewicz	Blaškevič	Blaškievic	preserved *i* before *e*, *c* instead of *č*
Bogdziewicz	Bogdzevič	Bogdevič	*d* instead of *dz*
Bujnicki	Buinickis	Buinickas	ending -*as* instead of -*is*
Jedziński	Jedzinski	Jedinskij	*d* instead of *dz*, Russian ending -*ij*
Michalkiawicz	Michalkiavič	Michalkevič	*ke* instead of *kia*
Poczykowska	Počykovska	Počikovska	*i* instead of *y*
Rekść	Reksc	Rekst	*t* instead of *c*

Table 2. Surname Lithuanisation in principle and practice

Certain observed inconsistencies might be a result of the history of surnames in Lithuania. For instance short forms ending with -*oit*, -*eit* (e.g. *Masoit*, *Dudoit*, *Vilkoit*) are typical of Lithuania Minor, where they developed under German influence. In several cases Russian endings (-*ij*, -*aja*), usually formed at the time of the Soviet Union, are preserved. It was possible to remove them after 1990, but not everybody used that opportunity. Inconsistent registration practice led to confusion (e.g. each of the Polish surnames *Sienkiewicz*, *Sinkiewicz* is in practice rendered in Lithuanian as *Senkevič* or *Sinkevič*).

It must be stressed that while some surnames of Lithuanian Poles are of Polish/Slavic etymology (e.g. *Baranowski/Baranauskas*, *Makowski/Makauskas*, *Malinowski/Malinauskas*,

Kozłowski/Kazlauskas), others – e.g. *Ławrynowicz/Laurynavičius*, *Masojć/Masaitis*, *Możejko/Mažeika*, *Rymsza/Rimša* – are indeed genetically Lithuanian (Baltic). The proportion of genetically Slavic surnames among Poles in Lithuania is probably similar to that in all Lithuania. Due to the predominance of Slavic languages in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, approximately 70% of surnames in contemporary Lithuania are of non-Baltic, mostly Slavic origin (Vanagas 1976: 74). Needless to say, name origin does not determine one's national self-identification.

Justyna B. Walkowiak
Adam Mickiewicz University
Poland
justwalk@amu.edu.pl

References

Baločkaitė, R. (2013) 'On Ideology, Language, and Identity: Language Politics in the Soviet and Post-Soviet Lithuania'. *Language Policy* 13.1. 41-61.

Bartmińska, I. and Bartmiński, J. (1978) *Nazwiska obce w języku polskim*. Warszawa: PWN.

Hogan-Brun, G., Ozolins, U., Ramonienė, M., and Rannut, M. (2009) *Language Politics and Practices in the Baltic States*. Tallinn: Tallinn University Press.

Eberhardt, P. (2003) *Ethnic Groups and Population Changes in Twentieth-Century Central-Eastern Europe*. Armonk, N.Y: M.E. Sharpe.

Frändén, M. (2016) 'Surnames in the Melting Pot: Presentation of a Project on Surnames and Immigration'. In: Hough, C. and Izdebska, D. (eds.) *Names and their Environment. Proceedings of the 25th International Congress of Onomastic Sciences, Glasgow, 25-29 August 2014*. Vol. 4. Glasgow: University of Glasgow. 225-229.

'FCNM: country-specific opinions and comments'. Date of access: 12.02.2016. Available online at:
  http://www.coe.int/en/web/minorities/country-specific-monitoring#Lithuania

Larson, C.F.W. (2011) 'Naming Baby: The Constitutional Dimensions of Parental Naming Rights'. *The George Washington Law Review* 80.1. 159-201.

'Lietuvos lenkų pavardžių ir vardų rašymo Lietuvos Respublikos piliečio pase taisyklės'. Date of access: 12.02.2016. Available online at:
  http://www.vlkk.lt/aktualiausios-temos/svetimvardziai/perrasa-is-lenku-kalbos

Mikulėnienė, D. (2009) 'On the History of Lithuanian Orthography: Traditions and Innovations'. *Acta Balto-Slavica* 33. 45-52.

Nowicka, E. (2000) *Polacy czy cudzoziemcy? Polacy za wschodnią granicą*. Kraków: Nomos.

Radczenko, A. (2013) 'Na Facebooku i na cmentarzu: Zniekształcone nazwiska na własne życzenie?' *Delfi*. Date of access: 12.02.2016. Available online at:
  http://pl.delfi.lt/aktualia/litwa/na-facebooku-i-na-cmentarzu.d?id=61156313.

Republic of Lithuania (2015) 'Law on the State Language'. Date of access: 12.02.2016. Available online at: http://www.minelres.lv/NationalLegislation/Lithuania/Lithuania_Language_1995_English.htm

Rieger, J., Masojć, I. and Rutkowska, K. (2006) *Słownictwo polszczyzny gwarowej na Litwie*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo DiG.

Rymut, K. (2005) *Słownik nazwisk używanych w Polsce na początku XXI wieku*. CD-ROM.

Satkauskas, R. (2008) 'Use of Diacritics: Towards a New Standard of Minority Protection?'. *Lithuanian Foreign Policy Review* 21. 112-135.

Schiffman, H.F. (1996) *Linguistic Culture and Language Policy*. London/New York: Routledge.

Smolicz, J.J. (1999) 'Who Is an Australian? Identity, Core Values and the Resilience of Culture'. In: Secombe, M. and Zajda, J. (eds.) *J.J. Smolicz on Education and Culture*. Melbourne: James Nickolas. 11-49.

Spolsky, B. and Shohamy, E. (1999) *The Languages of Israel: Policy, Ideology, and Practice*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Vanagas, A. (1976) 'Printsipy i struktura slovarya sovremennykh litovskikh familiy'. In: Kalakuckaja, L.P. (ed.) *Onomastika i norma*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo 'Nauka'. 71-79.

Venclova, T. (2013) *Wilno: Przewodnik*. Warszawa: PIW.

Zinkevičius, Z. (1998) *The History of the Lithuanian Language*. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla.