

Lilia Citko

University of Białystok

Poland

e-mail: l.citko@uwb.edu.pl

ORCID: 0000-0002-8340-4814

RELICS OF THE DUAL CATEGORY IN WEST RUTHENIAN CHRONICLES OF THE 16th AND 17th CENTURIES

Abstract. The article is devoted to characterising the forms of the dual documented in two preserved examples of West Ruthenian literature from the 16th–17th centuries. They represent the first (*Supraśl Chronicle*) and last (*Bychowiec Chronicle*) redactions of the chronicles of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Chronicle literature reflected the state of the living language of that period to a greater extent than religious texts subordinated to the canons of Church Slavonic tradition. The aim of the research was to analyse the degree of preservation of the dual category in relation to the unified Rus' period. An analogous period of Polish language development was also taken into account. The analysis of dual declensional and conjugational forms excerpted from the text was discussed within three groups: natural pairs, combinations with the numerals *dwa-dwie*, *oba-obie* ('two', 'both'), and duality conditioned by context. Despite signs of regression in each of the studied groups, the dual still retained a certain vitality, mainly in the chronologically older *Supraśl Chronicle* (1519). In the sphere of nominal declension, this was most clearly documented by noun forms in distribution with the numerals *dwa-dwie* (mainly in Nom/Acc), with feminine formations showing a somewhat greater number of uses than masculine formations. The dual number was preserved in trace amounts in syntactic groups reflecting combinations of nouns with congruent forms of adjectives and pronouns. In conjugation, the dual was preserved in the 3rd person aorist, used as a specific stylistic device in narratives of the past. Analysis of the source material proved that in the 16th–17th century period, the dual as a grammatical category expressing pairing/duality showed clear regression, with its role being gradually taken over by the plural.

Keywords: Grand Duchy of Lithuania, chronicles, West Ruthenian languages, grammatical category of the dual.

1. Introduction

Issues related to the use of the dual number in old Ruthenian writings have been the subject of interest for many scholars in the field of Ruthenian language history (cf. Žolobov 1998; Крысько & Жолобов 2001; Dong-

soo 2002; Maruyama 2014). According to Old Ruthenian writings, the dual began to disappear as a grammatical category in the living language already in the 13th century (Зализняк 1995: 77–78, 118). However, the use of dual declension and conjugation forms was common in Great Ruthenian texts until the 14th and 15th centuries (Шахматов 1959: 208), especially when describing the so-called natural duality and combining nouns with numerals *dwa-dwie* ('two'), *oba-obie* ('both'). West Ruthenian texts have also preserved *dualis* as a relic, although it was increasingly replaced by the plural (Булыка et al. 1979: 90).

The following discussion focuses on the use of dual forms in selected *latopis*¹ from the Grand Duchy of Lithuania dating from the 16th and 17th centuries. Chronicles are a better reflection of the living language² of the period than sacral texts which were subject to the demands of the Orthodox church tradition, preserving many of their archaic linguistic features. The main purpose of this text is to analyse the preservation of dual forms documented in textual sources, with particular attention to the similarities and differences in comparison with the Unified Rus period. Also taken into account is the longevity of dual forms in Polish, which influenced the development of West Ruthenian languages during the existence of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (cf. Bednarczuk 1999: 113–128). The dual category in these languages has not yet been the subject of a separate study. Mentions of the topic have mostly appeared in academic textbooks on historical morphology (Булыка et al. 1988: 96–100).

2. Longevity of Dual Forms in Certain Slavic Languages and Dialects

Inherited from Proto-Slavic and characteristic of all Slavic languages, the grammatical category of the dual number, thanks to the associated nominal forms, created the possibility of flexible expression of pairs or duality. Within this category, adjectives, pronominal adjectives, and verbs, forming a syntactic group together with the noun, took on appropriate dual endings. The dual number included seven cases, although within the paradigm some forms were homonymous. Homonymy occurred in the following cases: 1) Nom-Acc-Voc, 2) Gen-Loc, 3) Dat-Instr.

Most Slavic languages have lost this category, which has only been preserved in the peripheral Sorbian languages and in Slovenian (Stieber 1979: 97). The development processes in the central Slavic regions led to the disappearance of the dual in individual languages within a similar time period.³

Scholars assume that in Polish the use of the dual number ended in the middle of the 16th century (Słoboda 2012: 41), although they simultaneously point out that in 17th century texts *dualis* had still not completely disappeared (Rejter 2002: 101–102; Migdał & Rzepka 2002: 141–167). Dual forms can sometimes reappear even in 18th and 19th century texts, albeit only for stylistic purposes (e.g. the humorous use of the dual form *dwie babie* by Adam Mickiewicz in *Pan Tadeusz*).

Remains of the old dual form, mainly in the names of naturally doubled body parts, have been preserved in Slavic languages as irregular plural forms, such as the Polish *oczy* ('eyes'), *uszy* ('ears'), *plecy* ('back', which is plural in Polish), Belarusian *вочы, вушы, плечы*, Russian *уши, плечи*, and Ukrainian *очи*. In the case of the Polish noun *ręka* ('arm'), the former *dualis* is now used as the plural form (*ręce, rękoma*), or even the singular (Loc. *ręku*). Vestigial dual forms have also been preserved in lexicalised numerals, such as the Polish *dwieście* ('200') or Belarusian *дзвесце* (a combination of the nominative of the singular forms of the numeral *dwa* – 2 and *sto* – 100), as well as in phrases, such as *mądrej głowie dość dwie słowie* ('two words are enough for the wise') or *cztery gęsi, dwie niewieście uczyniły jarmark w mieście* ('four geese and two women made a ruckus in the town'). In Eastern Slavic languages, apart from the preservation of dual forms, their traces can also be found in some plural endings. The Russian suffix *-a* in the nominative plural of masculine nouns, such as *бока, рога, глаза, берега*, is derived from the dual form (Борковский & Кузнецов 2007: 204).

Local dialects have preserved more vestiges of the dual form as a separate formal-semantic category than the literary language. In Polish dialects the dual forms of verbs in the present tense – 1st person *-wa* (*niesiewa*) and 2nd person *-ta* (*niesieta*) (– 'carry') are found in the western part of the Lublin region, around Tarnobrzeg, Puławy, and Kielce, as well as in northern Kashubia. The same dialects also have dual forms of pronouns: Gen./Loc.: *naju-waju* and Dat./Instr.: *nama-wama*. As far as nouns are concerned, vestigial dual suffixes in the instrumental case: *-oma, -ama*, are quite common in northern Silesia, western Greater Poland, and northern Kashubia, but they are used to denote the plural (Dejna 1993: 214, 225–228).

Remnants of the dual have also been preserved in some Eastern Slavic dialects. In some Belarusian dialects it takes the form of *femininum* and *neutrum* nouns in combination with the numeral *два, дзве, абодва, абедзве* as well as *тры, чатыры*, e.g. *аб'едз'в'е кал'ас'е* ('both wheels'), *дз'в'е н'іс'м'е* ('two letters'), *тры з'ім'е* ('three winters') etc. (Блінава & Мяцельская 1980: 70). These structures are common in dialects of north-

western Belarus, and occasionally in the dialects of central Belarus, but are absent in north-eastern ones. According to Belarusian sources, their range is delineated by the line running through Vasilishki Navahrudok-Stowbtsy-Babruysk-Rechytsa-Kamaryn (DABM, map 206, p. 207).

Both Belarusian dialects and their literary form have preserved dual forms in the names of body parts that come in pairs: *вочы, вушы, пл'ечы, кал'ен'і*. In dependent cases, such as the instrumental, the former dual form *вачыма, пл'ачыма*, as well as *дз'в'арыма*, coexist as an inflection variant alongside plural forms: *вушам'і, пл'ачам'і, дз'в'арам'і*. Similarly, in the locative, dual forms *у вушы, у вачу* exist as alternative forms to the plurals *у вушах, у вачах* (Блінава & Мяцельская 1980: 70).

3. *Dualis* in Selected Editions of West Ruthenian Chronicles

Transformations within the discussed grammatical category are one of the elements of the evolution of the entire inflection system of western Ruthenian languages. Their characteristics are described in works discussing the chronicles of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (Citko 2006: 82–200; Grabowska 2020: 89–194). Scholars believe that one of the oldest, the *Supraśl Chronicle*, dated to the 15th century, is the first compilation of Lithuanian-Belarusian chronicles.⁴ The later *Bychowiec Chronicle*, which is the third and longest codex, comes from the turn of the 16th and 17th century and has been preserved in transcription into the Latin alphabet dating to the 17th–18th centuries.⁵ Both versions of the chronicles, to a greater or lesser extent, document remnants of the dual number in noun declension as well as in other declensional forms and in verb conjugation. The analysis of their use in these sources takes into account the functioning of dual forms as:

1. words denoting natural pairs;
2. words occurring in combination with the numerals two (*dwa-dwie*), both (*oba-obie*);
3. words indicating pairs as determined by context.

Examples illustrating the various forms are quoted in accordance with the conventions of the source text – Cyrillic script for the *Supraśl Chronicle* and the Latin script for the *Bychowiec Chronicle*.

3.1. *Dualis* in Noun Declension

3.1.1. In the natural duality category, the regular *dualis* suffixes are documented by the following examples:

a) **-ā-stem declension:**

Gen: *жена некая двѣ лѣте безъ **ногу** лежаше* (39v), *и паде от **руку** его неколко* (30); Acc: *а сами **руце** и нози повели осечи* (63), *приемъ Олегъ Игоря на **руцѣ** си* (7v); Instr: *не обретаѣ покоя **ногама** своимъ* (61v), *а иныхъ **рукама** поимаша* (77, 77v); Loc: *bi bo w **ruki** ich* 8;

b) **consonant declension (*s):**

Nom/Acc: *в то вѣрѣмъ разболишася у Володимера **очи*** (17v); *от вѣры чисты имѣюще **очи*** (25v); *и выимаша ему **очи*** (87); Gen: *дондеже отиде насадъ изъ **очию** его* (29v); Instr: *и споведа ему едину радость-нымъ **очима*** (29); *widziacz to panowe Litowskije **oczuma** swoimi* 76.

In the last example, the possessive pronoun *swoimi* takes the instrumental plural form instead of the expected dual. The lack of agreement within this syntactic group demonstrates that the form *oczuma* was acquiring the categorical value of the plural.

The remaining nouns among the paired body parts take, in each case, endings matching the appropriate plural paradigm.

a) **-ā-stem declension:**

Gen: ***ruk** swoich* 77; Acc: *а сами **руце** и **нози** повели осечи* (63), *изряднеи же душоу в **руци** божи* (26), *и вдасть Киев в **руци** Дмитрови* (31); *петосон на **ноhi*** 66, *dast w **ruki*** 75; Instr: *а **руками** изымаша князеи* 40 и 2 (77); *иныхъ **руками** поимаша* (82); ***rukami** роутано* 47; Loc: *w **rukach** nepriyatelskich* 60.

b) **-ǫ-stem declension** (after the suffixes of the older *s declension had aligned with it):

Dat neutr.: *niewiedaiuczъ ni **oczom*** 73.

3.1.2. In the group containing nouns that appear in combination with the numerals *dwa-dwie* ('two') and *oba-obie* ('both'), there are also a few attestations of the regular use of the dual. The following examples should be considered undoubted relics of declension:

a) **the -ǫ-stem paradigm:**

Nom/Acc masc.: *и подняста **два варяга*** (45); *приехали от митрополита **два протодиякона*** (47v), *в **два часа ноци*** (53); Nom/Acc neutr.: ***двѣ лѣте*** (39v); ***dwe lete** y bolsze* 23;

b) **-jǫ-stem paradigm:**

Nom: *бѣста в него **два мужа**, Асколод и Дирь* (6v); Gen: *тѣмъ же отецъ не любляше, бѣ бо от **двою отца**: Ярополка и Владимера* (15v);

c) **-ā-stem paradigm:**

Acc: ***жонце двѣ*** (96v); *on widel u kniazia Semena **dwe sestruczne** jeho krasnych* 36.

It should be noted that the adjectival form in the genitive plural: *krasnych* may be an indication of the plural function of the word *sestryczne*.

d) **-jā-stem** paradigm:

Асс: *и биша пороки по **две недели** (26v), за **две недели** поколибашася земля в ноци (87); meł ieśmy za soboju try żony, **dwe Lachowicy**, a tretiuiu Nemkiniu 36; y podkali wielikoho kniazia Gidymina, na rece na Otmenne (...), **dwe mili** 14; y meszkał w korola **dwe nedeli** 62.*

An unambiguous interpretation of the cited examples as dual forms may be problematic due to the lack of syntactic markers confirming their dual nature. The endings of *-ā-* declension, to which soft-stem feminine nouns have been adjusted, are formally identical to the dual in the nominative/accusative plural.

In dependent cases, with the exception of accusative, the texts of both chronicles contain no examples of the dual being preserved in the analysed group. This confirms the conclusion of scholars of both historical Polish (Łoś 1927: 3; Siuciak 2008: 60) and East Slavic languages (Шахматов 1959: 211; Булыка et al. 1979: 90) that the dual category was preserved the longest in the nominative/accusative, more often in feminine formations.

e) **-ŭ-stem** paradigm:

Асс: *уби Розвилода и **сына** два (13v); ja maju dwa **syny** (45).*

The preservation of the dual suffix in the nominative/accusative of the **-ŭ-** declension in *dwa **syny*** ('two sons') may additionally be supported by the analogous general masculine plural **-ŏ-stem** suffix, as in *dwa bobry* ('two beavers') 37, *dwa czelowieki* ('two men') 24. By contrast, in the phrase **сына два**, attested in the *Supraśl Chronicle*, the noun form takes on an analogous dual suffix of the masculine **-ŏ-** paradigm. This model of a numeral-noun group is preserved in modern Russian. In the combination of the numeral *dwa* ('two'; later also *trzy* – 'three' and *cztery* – 'four') + the dual nominative of **-ŏ-stem** nouns, after the dual had vanished, it was replaced by the genitive singular with the identical suffix *-a* (albeit with different word stress, e.g. *два шага́ / с первого ша́га*) (Борковский & Кузнецов 2007: 206). Belarusian and Ukrainian have preserved nouns in the nominative plural form in similar syntactic groups, e.g. *двы-тры-чатыры стал'ы, двы-три-чотири стол'и*. The difference in this respect, as documented in historical writings, was noted by E. Karski (Карский 1956: 108). His conclusions are confirmed by examples from the *Bychowiec Chronicle*, where both the numeral *dwa* and *trzy-cztery* imply the noun form in the nominative plural, e.g. *dwa hody* (44), *try hody* (44), *czotyry syny* (19) etc.

f) **-i-stem** paradigm:

Асс masc.: *стояша два **дни** (75); стрегущи обою **пути** (29).*

The *Supraśl Chronicle* preserved two examples of the use of the dual form in the accusative, which could have been preserved thanks to homophony with the accusative plural form.

Acc. fem.: *woysko Litowskoie uczynili **dwe haty*** (77).

g) **consonant** paradigm (*r)

The text contains one example of the dual in the accusative additionally preserved due to homophony with the Acc pl form: *u **двѣ дщери*** (16).

As can be seen, the list of instances of the dual after the numerals *dwa-dwie, oba-obie* is rather limited in the *Chronicle*. The plural forms supplanting it appear more frequently. The change from the dual to the plural can be seen across various cases and declensions.

a) **-ā-** declension:

Nom: ***dwe żonki** chożywali* 26; Gen: *om **обоух странь*** (49); *z **obu stron** mnohich pobili* 69; Acc: *na **obedwe strony** popuszczaiut* 61; Instr: *z **dwema doczkami** korolewnami* 64;

b) **-jā-** declension:

Loc: *nedoszedszy wesi zowemyia Wedroszy wo **dwuch milach*** 69.

The vanishing *dualis* category has managed to leave a trace in **-jā-** declension in the form some variant suffixes in certain cases. There are only a few examples attesting to that, but they are worth noting for the sake of completeness in presenting this category on the basis of the *Bychowiec Chronicle*. The plural instrumental suffix of **-jā-**stem declension *tysiacza* was formed following the Dat.-Instr. pattern of the dual, cf. *z **nekolka tysiaczma*** 62, *so szestma **tysiaszczma*** 73.

c) **-ǫ-** declension:

Nom masc.: *zmerli **dwa braty*** 13; Gen neutr.: *pod **двою лѣтъ*** (6v); Dat masc.: *Бувъшися **обоумъ полком*** (33), *нѣлзе снятисѣ **обоумъ полькомъ*** (46v); Acc masc.: *князѣи велики **Швигригаило два го-ды*** (73v), *И стрѣтоша **польци обоу*** (50v), *Кестутеи пошлетъ **два человекеы** к Полоцьку* (92); *wziali u nich **dwa bobry*** (37);

d) **-jǫ-** declension:

Nom: ***koroli oba** [...] zjedutsia do Głogowa* 61;

e) **-ǔ-** declension:

Dat: *tym **dwom synom*** 63; Acc: *y zostawit po sobi **dwuch synow*** 61; Instr: *kniahiniu ieho z **dwema syny*** 48, *pryiedet k nemu kniaź Olelko z Kopyła, z **dwoma syny*** 56;

f) **-ī-** declension:

Instr. fem.: *kniaź Michayło ... kazał wsim polkom **obema hatmi** reku perechodyty* (77).

3.1.3. The expression of duality through contextual means is seldom accompanied by regular dual forms, cf. *твори Олег мѣр с **царема** грецькыма, с Леоном и Олксандром* (9v); *подняста два **варяга мечима** под пазусѢ* (45); *посла Владимир ко **царема** Василию а Костонтину* (17); *и посла Владимир ко царема Василию а Костонтину: Сеи град **ваю** сильныи **взях*** (17).

The lack of explicit textual markers of duality implies the frequent use of plural forms, cf. *как поидуть **жонки** покладати (...) однои жонъки всклати порты да выити вон со другою жонкою* (96v); *рече ко Осколodu и Дирu: Вы не естъ **князи*** (7v).

3.2. *Dualis* in other Declension Forms and in Conjugation

The studied chronicles preserve the dual in the declension of other parts of speech and in conjugation to varying degrees. The use of dual forms of adjectives or pronouns within a nominal group, and of verbs as predicates, as is well known, is dependent on and congruent with the noun. In the *Bychowiec Chronicle*, which is chronologically later than the *Supraśl Chronicle*, dual is attested only twice, and only in the personal pronoun *on* ('he'), cf. Dat./Instr.: *Mindohowiże przysławszy posły swój, reka neczyni **ima** miłost* (7); *y posła Daniło Erdywida, y na pomocz sobi Rusi y Połowcy, y mnoho wojewania byst meży **ima*** (8).

A greater number of attestations of the dual in both declensional and conjugational forms is characteristic of the *Supraśl Chronicle*. With regard to pronouns, it is worth noting the use of the dual number in the Dat/Instr: *не полюбился **има*** (88), *не обретаѣя покая ногама **своима*** (61v); *и бысть брань межи **има** обоих* (32).

Agreement with nouns is attested by two examples of dual forms of adjectives in the instrumental: *твори Олег мѣр с **царема** грецькыма, с Леоном и Олксандром* (9v); *и споведа ему едину **радостьюма** очима* (29).

The use of the dual in conjugational forms shows a clear dependence on grammatical tense. In the examples attested in the *Supraśl Chronicle*, dual forms were replaced by plural forms in the present and future tenses in the 1st and 2nd persons: *Яко гости есмо угоръския, **идемъ** во Греky, Олга князя, Игоря княжича; **придете** к намъ к родомъ своимъ* (7); *и посла Владимир ко царема Василию а Костонтину: (...) ако сестру **имаете*** (17); and in the 3rd person: *а **докончаютъ** межи себе князь Кестутеи велики и велики князь Олгирд* (88v).

A greater number of textual instances of the dual are found in past tenses, particularly the aorist. The presence of the aorist in the chronicles is

regarded as one of the distinctive linguistic and stylistic features of this genre of Old Ruthenian writing. The narrative nature of the chronicles, which present the history of events in an annual arrangement, is best reflected by temporal forms denoting completed, short-lived actions that took place in the past.

In the *Bychowiec Chronicle* aorist *dualis* is only documented once, in the 3rd person, cf. *oni moze uwedawszyma y bežasta ko kniaziu Daniłu y Wasilku* (7).

Aorist forms of the dual were much more frequently used by the author of the older *Supraśl Chronicle*, which includes only the 3rd person, cf. *И бѣста в него два мужа, Асколод и Дирь, и спросистася у него ко Царюграду с родомъ своимъ. И поидоста по Днепру, и узри-ста на горе градокъ малъ и вопросиста* (6v); *И посласта ко Исколodu и Диру. Они же придоста* (7); *Осколод и Дир княжиста во Кieve* (7); *и подняста два варяга мечима под пазусть* (15); *царие ради быша, и умолиста сестру свою Анну* (17v); *Всеволод же и Мьстиславъ стояста* (...) *и познаста брата* (23v).

Isolated attestations of the 2nd person *perfectum* dual can be found in the *Supraśl Chronicle*: *Аще тѣломъ отишла еста отсуду, но молитвою помозъте ми* (20).

It should be emphasised that the productivity of the dual as a category of the past tense also diminished, as evidenced by examples of its replacement by the plural, cf.: *Асколъд и Дирь седоша во граде и владоша ими* (6v); *разболишася у Володимира очи* (17v).

Dualis in the imperative has only one attestation: *Брате Глѣбе. Вели грести, да поможеве сроднику нашему Александру* (29).

4. Conclusion

As the analysis of the cited material shows, the longevity of dual forms in the language of the West Ruthenian chronicles varies considerably. In the *Bychowiec Chronicle* (16th–17th centuries), the dual is a clearly regressive category, while it is better preserved in the *Supraśl Chronicle* from 1519. Overall, both works demonstrate a regression of dual forms, observed both within the group of nouns denoting natural pairs and within the group of lexemes combined with the numerals *dwa-dwie* ('two'), *oba-obie* ('both'), as well as in the group documenting duality conditioned by context.

Despite signs of decline, the dual still exhibits a certain vitality. In the area of nominal declension, this is most clearly documented by noun forms occurring with the numeral two, mainly in the nominative/accusative, with a slightly higher number of usages found in feminine formations than in masculine ones: *жонце дьвѣ, две sestryczne, две недели, две Lachowicy, две mili, две nedeli / два варяга, два протодиякона, два часа, два мужа*.

Dual forms have survived only marginally in syntactic groups reflecting the combination of a noun with agreeing forms of adjectives: *царема грецькыма, радостьнымы очима* and pronouns: *ногама своима*.

With regard to conjugation, source documentation of the dual essentially comes down to attestations of 3rd person aorist forms, noted only in the *Supraśl Chronicle*, e.g. *пoudоста, узруста, вopросуста, княжуста, умолиста, посласта, стояста, познаста*. In the *Bychowiec Chronicle*, the aorist dual is recorded only in one instance (*bežasta*), but in the 3rd person singular and plural forms its frequency is decidedly higher (Citko 2006: 171–172). The presence of dual forms in the aorist, expressing completed actions in the past, is a specific stylistic and narrative device typical of the chronicle-writing genre, which abounds in accounts of past events.

The presented source material, which documents a clear regression in the use of the dual within each of the analysed groups, demonstrates that in the 16th–17th centuries the dual number ceased to fulfil its original function of expressing pairs or duality; its role was gradually taken over by the plural. This process is an example of a general tendency towards the simplification of the inflectional system of the language and its evolution towards a clearly defined opposition between singular and plural.

NOTES

¹ *Latopis* is the Ruthenian equivalent of the medieval chronicle. The word is derived from *lemo* ‘year’ referring to the yearly organisation of the narration. From the 12th to the 16th century these chronicles were the main source of Ruthenian historiography; they were compilations, combining historical facts with tales, legends, and earlier documents. The traditions of Kievan Rus gave rise to the West Ruthenian chronicles, expressing the idea of unifying Belarusian and Lithuanian lands (Чамярыцкі 1969; Чамярыцкі 2015).

² This language was referred to in Polish as: *prosta mowa* (‘simple speech’), *ruska mowa* (‘Ruthenian speech’), *język ruski* (‘Ruthenian language’), *prosta ruska mowa* (simple Ruthenian speech). Modern scholars sometimes call it the Old Belarusian (Pol. *starobiałoruski*) or Old Ukrainian (Pol. *staroukraiński*). It was infused with features of local (Belarusian and Ukrainian) dialects, mainly in terms of its phonetics and vocabulary, and since the 16th century has been increasingly influenced by Polish. It developed in opposition to Old Church Slavonic, which was a sacral language with a limited social function (for more on this topic, see: Мозер 2002; Мякишев 2008: 26–32; Temčinas 2017).

³ Issues concerning the dual, including its preservation in Slavic languages, have been comprehensively presented by A. Dostál (1954).

⁴ The *latopis* was found by professors from Vilnius, M. Bobrowski and I. Daniłowicz in 1822 in the monastery library in Supraśl (hence its name). The paper is based on this edition: *Супрасльская летопись*, In *Полное собрание русских летописей*, vol. 35, Москва 1980: 36–67.

⁵ The *Bychowiec Chronicle* was published in print by the historian T. Narbutt as part of the series *Pomniki do dziejów litewskich: Kronika litewska*, Vilnius 1846. This edition was used to excerpt the source material for this paper.

HISTORICAL SOURCES

Супрасльская летопись. (1980). In Н.Н. Улащик (eds.) *Полное собрание русских летописей. Летописи белорусско-литовские*, vol. 35 (с. 36–67). Москва: Издательство Наука.

Kronika litewska. (1846). In *Pomniki do dziejów litewskich: pod względem historycznym, dyplomatycznym, geograficznym, statystycznym, obyczajowym, orcheograficznym* itp. zebrane przez Teodora Narbutta, Wilno: Nakładem Rubena Rafałowicza księgarza wileńskiego.

REFERENCES

- Bednarczuk, L. (1999). *Stosunki językowe na ziemiach Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego*. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza Edukacja.
- Citko, L. (2006). „Kronika Bychowca” na tle historii i geografii języka białoruskiego. Białystok: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku.
- Dejna, K. (1993). *Dialekty polskie*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Dongsoo, J. (2002). *The use of dual forms: scribal practices in a morphosyntactic actualization (patterns in selected old Russian gospel manuscripts, 14th through 17th cc.)*. The Ohio State University.
- Dostál, A. (1954). *Vývoj duálu v slovanských jazycích, zvláště v polštině*. Praha: Nakladatelství Československé akademie věd.
- Grabowska, K. (2020). *Język Latopisu supraskiego 1519 r. Fonetyka. Fleksja. Słowotwórstwo*. Białystok: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku.
- Łoś, J. (1927). *Gramatyka polska*, cz. III: *Odmiennia (fleksja) historyczna*. Lwów–Kraków: Wydawnictwo Zakładu Narodowego im. Ossolińskich.
- Maruyama Y. (2014). Употребление дуальных форм в житийных текстах старорусского периода: лексический, грамматический и прагматический факторы. In M. Nomachi, A. Danylenko, P. Piper (eds). *Grammaticalization and lexicalization in the slavic languages. proceedings from the 36th meeting of the commission on the grammatical structure of the slavic languages of the international committee of slavists*. 55, 51–62. Munchen: Verlag Otto Sagner.
- Migdał, J., Rzepka, W. R. (2002). Wygasanie form dualnych rzeczowników w polszczyźnie XVI i XVII wieku. In W. Książek-Bryłowa, H. Duda (eds.), *Język polski. Współczesność. Historia*, 141–167. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL.

- Rejter A. (2002). Fleksja. In D. Ostaszewska (eds.), *Polszczyzna XVII wieku. Stan i przeobrażenia*, 73–180. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Śląsk.
- Siuciak, M. (2008). *Kształtowanie się kategorii gramatycznej liczebnika w języku polskim*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Słoboda, A. (2012). *Liczebnik w grupie nominalnej średniowiecznej polszczyzny. Semantyka i składnia*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Rys.
- Stieber, Z. (1979). *Zarys gramatyki porównawczej języków słowiańskich*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Temčinas S. (2017). Języki kultury ruskiej w Pierwszej Rzeczypospolitej. In M. Kuczyńska (eds.) *Kultura Pierwszej Rzeczypospolitej w dialogu z Europą. Hermeneutyka wartości*. T. XI *Między Wschodem i Zachodem. Prawosławie i unia*, 81–120. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
- Žolobov, O. F. (1998). *Symbolik und historische Dynamik des slavischen Duals. Simvolika i istoričeskaja dinamika slavjanskogo dvojstvennogo čisla*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.
- DABM (1963). *Дыялектычны атлас беларускай мовы. Карты*. Мінск: Выдавецтва Акадэміі Навук БССР.
- Блінава, Э., Мяцельская, Е. (1980). *Беларуская дыялекталогія*. Мінск: Вышэйшая школа.
- Борковский, В.И., Кузнецов, П.С. (2007). *Историческая грамматика русского языка*. Москва: Издательство ЛКИ.
- Булыка А., Жураўскі А., Крамко І. (1979). *Гістарычная марфалогія беларускай мовы*. Мінск: Навука і тэхніка.
- Булыка А.М., Жураўскі А.І., Крамко І.І., Свяжынскі У.М. (1988). *Мова беларускай пісьменнасці XIV–XVIII стст.* Мінск: Навука і тэхніка.
- Жолобов О.Ф., Крысько В.Б. (2001). *Историческая грамматика древнерусского языка*, т. 2: *Двойственное число*. Москва: Азбуковник.
- Зализняк, А.А. (1995). *Древненовгородский диалект*. Москва: Языки славянской культуры.
- Мозер М. (2002). Что такое простая мова? *Studia Slavica [Academiae Scientiarum] Hung[aricae]*. 47 (3–4). 221–260.
- Мякишев, В. (2008). *Язык Литовского Статута 1588 года*. Kraków: Lexis.
- Карский, Е.Ф. (1956). *Белорусы. Язык белорусского народа*. Т. 2–3. Москва: Издательство Академии наук СССР.
- Чамярыцкі В.А. (2015). *Летапісы і хронікі Вялікага княства Літоўскага XV–XVII стст.* Мінск: Беларуская навука.
- Чамярыцкі, В.А. (1969). *Беларускія летапісы як помнікі літаратуры*. Мінск: Навука і тэхніка.
- Шахматов, А.А. (1957). *Историческая морфология русского языка*. Москва: Учпедгиз.