



Historic Kyiv Polish. Between North and South Borderlands

Jolanta Klimek-Grądzka

Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski Jana Pawła II
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin
ORCID: 0000-0002-6289-5634

ABSTRACT: The article discusses the specific, both sociologically and geographically determined Polish language of Kyiv, perceived by the author as a “territorial variation of the Polish literary language existing within the circle of Polish and Ruthenian intelligentsia in Kyiv in the 17th century around the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, represented by the prints of the typography of the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra.” The key was the application of linguistic criteria (phonetic, inflectional and syntactic ones) and answering the

question of which variation of the borderland Polish we are dealing with: the northern or the southern one. However, a review of linguistic features shows that the Kyiv Polish language situates itself between the north and south borderlands. At every level of the language, features characteristic of both the southern and northern borderlands are noticeable, with the majority accounting for features common to both regions.

KEYWORDS: 17th century, borderland Polish, history of language, Kyiv.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT: The author declares that there were no conflicts of interest in this study.

AUTHOR'S CONTRIBUTION: The author assumes sole responsibility for: preparing the research concept of the article, the way it is presented, developing the method, collecting and analyzing data, formulating conclusions, and editing the final version of the manuscript.



1. Introduction

Kyiv's centuries-long links first with the Crown, then with the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, depending on the social, political and religious circumstances, took a variety of forms. However, regardless of the current situation and the state affiliation of these lands, cultural links remained extremely strong. One of the factors making this possible was knowledge of the Polish language. This was justified not only by the significant proportion of Poles among Kyiv's urban population, but also by the socio-political role of the language, which resulted in a constantly increasing sphere of its use. Educated Ruthenians had to know Polish, as Aleksej Ivanovič Sobolevskij [2005: 12–13] wrote, because Polish was “until the 17th century the language of office and administration, in some periods replacing the literary language of Ukrainians, and in others constituting a kind of second mother tongue of the educated strata” [Łużny 1966: 9]. However, the broadest range of using the Polish language was outlined by Aleksander Jabłonowski:

In the first half of the 17th century [...] this language, alongside Latin, already prevailed universally among the educated Ruthenian society and became an indispensable subject of instruction in all schools. [...] religious polemics were already conducted predominantly in Polish—on the part of both Uniates and non-Uniates. Even to some extent, writings which included the confession of faith, were also composed in this language; including prayer books. With the progressive polonisation of the Ruthenian society itself, associations, sermons of the clergy, and ever religious books increasingly became Polish. [...] Correspondence of the Blachist clergy, both with strangers and within the community of believers and outside—even between the clergy and non-Uniate institutions—was more frequently conducted in Polish. Signatures on official documents pertaining to clerical matters were increasingly often made in Polish by the very dignitaries of the non-Uniate church—this also reflected the general sentiment of the educated stratum of Ruthenian society. Finally, school records and documents were mostly in Polish. Regarding the secular society, outside the scope of brotherhoods and schools, there is little to say—there, the parting with the Ruthenian language was almost lost for good. [Jabłonowski 1899: 107–108]

Today he is echoed by Natalia Jakowenko, a Ukrainian historian: “in the consciousness of writers a hierarchy of prestige was created, at the head of which (not without the efforts of the reformed school) Polish was placed, while Ruthenian, in which one wrote and joked not long ago, received the status of a language for

domestic use” [Jakowenko 2000: 207; cf. Radyszewski 1996: 9–11]. The extent of using the Polish, Ruthenian and Orthodox languages, as well as the declining stature and popularity of the Orthodox language in particular, had already aroused considerable emotions in the 17th century. In 1640, at the Kyiv Council, one of the Doctors of the Orthodox Church criticised the disturbing polonisation of religious life. He pointed out that religious opponents were taking advantage of the growing unfamiliarity with the Orthodox Church and issuing church books full of errors in the more easily understood Polish language [see Titov 2000: 281–282].

Evidence of the great importance of the Polish language in the intellectual and cultural life of the Kyiv area can be found in the activities of the Polish section of the printing house, which operated at the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra and Mohyla College and throughout the 17th century published texts that were crucial to Ukraine’s emerging cultural, national and confessional consciousness [cf. Melnyk 2008]. Equipped with machinery and materials that Elizjasz Pletenicki, then archimandrite of the Kyiv-Pechersk monastery, bought from the heirs of the Stratyn printer Theodore Balaban, the Kyiv printing house inaugurated its activities (as the first in eastern Ukraine) around 1615. Originally, the outhouse only published Cyrillic books for the Lavra, but this changed when Piotr Mohyla became the head of the Orthodox Church. The first printed Polish-language text, not only in Kyiv but also in the entire Ruthenian lands of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, was *Mnemosyne Sławy, Prac, y Trudow, Przeoswieconego w Bogu Oyca, Iego Mosci Oyca Piotra Mohiły* [Klimek-Grądzka 2023] published in 1633. From then until the end of the 17th century, 22–26 genre-diverse Polish texts were published [see Estreicher 1882; Bandtkie 1826; Kawecka-Gryczowa 1960; Zapasko, Ćsaêvič 1981; Titov 2000; Ogienko 1994; Ćsaêvič 2002]—unfortunately not all of them have survived to the present day [Chomik 2004; Klimek 2009; see section *Sources*]. Polish did not disappear from Kyiv after the city came under the Tsar’s rule (as a result of the Grzymułtowski Treaty of 1686), of which the following are meaningful examples: the greeting of Peter I after his victory over the Swedes at Poltava with a commemorative panegyric “in three languages: Latin, Polish-Ruthenian and Polish” [SGKP: 88], the Russian-Latin-Polish panegyric published at the same time to welcome Tsarina Elisabeth visiting Kyiv (1744) or the six-language *Sacra historia in gratiam puerorum ex Russica in linguam latinam conuersa* [1829; Klimek-Grądzka 2020]. Leszek Bednarczuk even writes that “Polish cultural life flourished in Kyiv in the 19th century until 1917” [Bednarczuk 2018: 172]. Although Kyiv, with its writing output, appears to be an extremely interesting object of Polish studies, the legacy there was for a long time silently overlooked. Ryszard

Łużny lamented that: “the Polish literary output of writers from this circle [of the Academy] is [...] almost completely unstudied, and not only the one never published and preserved in manuscripts, but also the one printed during the 17th and 18th centuries” [Łużny 1966: 7]. Despite the reported shortage of literary works on the works of Polish-speaking writers from the circle of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, there was no significant increase, either on the Polish or the Ukrainian side.¹ The situation in linguistics is somewhat better, although for decades, probably due to the demarcation of linguistic and national influences from the pre-partition period slightly west of Kyiv, Kyivan writings was long overlooked in discussions about the literary heritage of the borderland Polish. This deficiency is slowly being remedied by the efforts made by Wiesław Witkowski [1969], Danuta Moszyńska [1998] and Maria Karpluk [1991, 1998], later Adam Fałowski [2000], Janusz Rieger [2005], Olesia Lazarenko [2002, 2003a, 2003b, 2005, 2011], Julia Domitrak [2012, 2016], Magdalena Hawrysz [2021], and Jolanta Klimek-Grądzka (see section *References*).

Research that has been conducted for a dozen years or so on “the territorial variety of Polish literary language functioning in the circle of Polish and Ruthenian intelligentsia of Kyiv centred around the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy in the 17th century, represented by prints of the Pechersk Lavra typography” [Klimek 2010c, cf. Sicińska 2020], which I refer to as *Kyivan Polish*, has already provided answers to questions about its relation to 17th-century literary Polish. However, the question of whether it should be seen as a southern borderland or perhaps a northern borderland variety is still unresolved. Bearing in mind Bogdan Walczak’s objection that:

political borders do not always coincide with linguistic borders. It would probably not be difficult to defend even a more radical conceptualisation: political boundaries relatively rarely coincide with linguistic ones (in linguistically mixed areas, bilingual areas, etc., where it is impossible to draw a linear linguistic boundary, this is in fact not possible at all) [Walczak 1995: 13; cf. Nowowiejski 1996],

1 “Both Ukrainian and Polish researchers have devoted a great deal of attention to the characterisation of the works of individual writers, but there is a lack of separate studies on Ukrainian literature practised in Polish in recent studies of the history of Ukrainian and Polish literature” [Sowtys 2013: 104]. The multilingualism of the eastern lands of the former Republic of Poland in a literary and cultural context is of interest to western scholars, including Giovanna Brogi-Bercoff [1995, 1999, 2000] and Giovanna Siedina [2011, 2014].

in this study, using only linguistic arguments, leaving aside the geographic and historical criterion, I want to attempt to answer the question of which borderland variety—northern or southern—is associated with the Polish language of Kyiv, formed in the 17th century in the environment of the Lavra and the College.

Janusz Rieger, answering the question, *What do we not know about the borderland Polish language of the 20th and 21st centuries?*, writes:

It has to be assumed that in grammar, regional Polish generally follows the national norms, and that the sometimes rationing of words, which is different sometimes, relates rather to the lexis. The same can be said of syntax, where, for example, one or another use of conjunctions also has to be referred to lexis. Regional Polish is mainly characterised by phonetics and vocabulary. [Rieger 2017: 522]

Following this suggestion, I will try, using studies of 17th-century northern and southern borderland Polish as a point of reference, to identify linguistic features which will make it possible to recognise in the Kyiv variety a reference to one of the borderland variants of Polish.

2. Phonetics

The phonetics reflected in the spelling of the Kyiv prints shows, according to Rieger's thesis, the greatest research potential. The forefront in this regard is the well-documented tradition in the polonics, of distinguishing between clear and retracted vowels. The south-eastern borderlands were not familiar with the retracting of *ą*, and the occasional marking of a clear *a* in Red Ruthenian prints are considered to reflect the influence of Małopolska region by researchers [see Stieber 1966: 42; Nitsch 1954: 46]. Moreover, Katarzyna Sicińska, having examined the southern borderland epistolography, found no deviations from the local rule: "In letters [...] the retracted vowels [...] are not distinguished, the same letters are used for retracted and clear ones" [Sicińska 2013: 109]. The situation is different in the northern borderlands. Alicja Pihan-Kijasowa proved beyond any doubt that "northern borderland prints [...] tried to maintain the principle of distinguishing between light and retracted sounds" [Pihan-Kijasowa 1999: 69], while the absence of clear *á* and retracted *ą* in 17th and 18th-century manuscripts from the northern borderlands was found by Zofia Kurzowa [2006: 78; 2007: 206]. The Kyiv polonics attest not only to a very careful and consistent distinction in writing between a clear *a* and retracted *ą* (e.g. *duszá, obietnicá, nędzá, bogomodlcá, ożuwcá, dárować, publikowác, czytay, cerkiewna, zadumiawszy*), but also to the rendering of the retracted *a* by means of the allograph {o}.

Also, the plural nouns' dative clauses with the ending *-am* support the distinction between the clear and the retracted vowel, manifested in the homophonic identification of [o] and [ã]: *sercam, kallumniam, cerkwiam, trudnościam*.

The records such as: *namniy, nimasz, pułtory* testify to the presence in the Kyiv variety of the retracted *é*—known and more familiar to northern borderland Polish, as described by Iryda Grek-Pabisowa and Irena Maryniakowa [1997: 40–41], and in Lviv Polish [cf. e.g. Kurzowa 2006].

The affinities of Kyivan Polish with both borderland varieties are in turn revealed by an analysis of the ways in which nasal vowels are manifested. Kurzowa [2006] and Pihan-Kijasowa [1999] in the north-eastern borderlands, Ewa Wolnicz-Pawłowska [2003] in the Chełmszczyzna, and Sicińska in the southern borderlands [Sicińska 2013: 136] noticed certain tendencies reflected also in polonics:

- a) decomposition of $\epsilon, q \rightarrow em, en$ before labial or dental: *potempieni, przeklientego, kompano*;
- b) secondary nasalisation² regardless of position in the word or phonetic environment: *pokućię, ucześniecy, nauki, więzząc, potępienie, rożę* (\leftarrow *roże*), *pochłębcow*;
- c) denasalisation of $\epsilon \rightarrow e$, regardless of position in the word or phonological environment: *szate, imie, sie, miedzy, nauke, one, wiare, figure, zasie, poczware, swoie, cene; minelo, przyieli; Naświetszego, dziecieliny*;
- d) synchronic pronunciation of vowel and nasal consonant combinations: *męcześkich, skączenie, przekłęstwu, Jutrżęka, Panięstwo, więcem* (\leftarrow *wieńcem*), *imięnia, przekłęstwu, Bracią* (\leftarrow *braciom*), *kontętuie, samę słońcę* (\leftarrow *samem słońcem*), *cięką* (\leftarrow *cienką*). Similar records of $eN \rightarrow \epsilon$ by northern borderland writers sparked debate among researchers, including Kurzowa, Józef Trypućka and Jan Zaleski, who sought their validation in hypercorrectness. Polemical positions were expressed by Kazimierz Nitsch and Barbara Smolińska, who stated that “the multiplicity of examples, appearing in stylistically very different texts by so many authors of borderland origin, in the absence of such records in other regions of Poland, may indicate that we are not dealing solely with a matter of spelling” [Smolińska 1983: 38]. In light of the data obtained from the Kyiv texts, I find this hypothesis highly plausible, especially as identical records in the southern borderlands are noted by Sicińska [2013: 136];

2 Smolińska shows examples dictated by direct action or from the distance of the nasal consonant, but notes in Poczobut also manifestations that are analogous to those cited by me [Smolińska 1983: 24–25].

- e) forms with a denasalised *q* in prepositional adverbial participle, unfamiliar to the general Polish language [Kurzowa 2006: 99], are quite common in Kyiv texts, e.g.: *przyiowskiy, wydzwignowskiy, powziowskiy, wzowskiy, przeniknowskiy, wionowskiy, wycisnowskiy, stanowskiy* [Klimek 2011]. Identical forms are noted by Smolińska in Władysław Poczobut Odlanicki and Antoni Kazimierz Sapieha [Smolińska 1983: 40], and by Sicińska in southern borderland epistolography, although only “17 examples of this type in 10 authors” [Sicińska 2013: 122];
- f) denasalised final-obstruent voicing [ḁ]: the homograph {ḁ} is manifested as a final-obstruent voicing clear [a], e.g.: *pomoca, laska, Boza, prawostawna, szkodza, swa* or *o: tylo, święto*. The records testifying to the identical pronunciation value of the back nasal final-obstruent voicing and *o* are important not only from the point of view of the considerations conducted here, but also from the point of view of the history of the Polish language. As Kurzowa comments on the ten records she found, “they are [...] important both for the history of the northern borderland dialect and the history of Polish literary language, as they point to the borderland source of this pronunciation” [Kurzowa 2006: 100]. Whether this is a specifically northern feature, however, in light of the findings of Sicińska, noting *q* → *o* [Sicińska 2013: 128], is impossible to determine.

Vocalic phenomena which may be of importance in determining the degree of affinity of Kyivan Polish with the borderland environment are, in addition, the manifestation of *u* // *w* in *au, eu* groups, the degree of normalisation of *-er(z)* from the earlier *-ir, -yr*, the elevation of the articulation of *e* and *o*, g-recoding, and deviations from apophony. Kyiv prints are linked to both borderland varieties by the mixing of *u* and *w* in the foreign group *au, eu*, e.g. *Lawr, klawzurze, aplawzem, aplawz, Mawrytanskich, Kawkaz, Awster, Kawkazowey, restawruie, klawzury, Jozwego*—analogous examples from the northern borderlands are given by, among others, Pihan-Kijasowa [1999: 172], while from the southern borderlands by Sicińska [2013: 175]. It is also impossible to infer from the preservation of the original *-ir, -yr* in place of the new *-er(z)*—*Włodzimierz, halirza, prześcirađem, pociraiqc, wirzgać, na styrze, pirwiastki, papirze, zawiraiq, zbiram, bohатыr*, as this feature is noted by Grek-Pabisowa and Maryniakowa in the north [Grek-Pabisowa, Maryniakowa 1997: 41], and by Sicińska in the southern borderlands [Sicińska 2013: 112]. The same is true for the elevation of the articulation of [o] → [u]: *nieupamięta* and [e] → [u]: *dopiuro*, present throughout the borderlands [Grek-Pabisowa, Maryniakowa 1997: 38; Sicińska 2013: 116], the lowering of [u] → [o] (*notę* ← *nutę*), as well as the somewhat archaising deviations from apophony [Grek-Pabisowa, Maryniakowa 1997: 43; Sicińska

2013: 141], e.g.: *odmienienie* (← *odmianie*), *bielawą* (← *białawą*), *cera* (← *córa*), *żena* (← *żona*); *żenie*; *zagrzebione*. Kyivan Polish is linked to the southern borderland Polish [Sicińska 2013: 114] by an elevation of the articulation of [e] → [i], [y]: *marcypan*, *cmyniarzu*, *Hliba*, *dzıla* (← *działa*), *ty* (← *te*), *krzściłnice*, *wiekim* (← *wiekim*). The transition of the unaccented [o] → [a], *zarzę* (← *zorzę*), *po-mraczone*, *chrabrego*, attested in polonics, is in turn a specifically northern borderland feature [Grek-Pabisowa, Maryniakowa 1997: 35].

Phenomena in the field of consonantal features may also be relevant to the considerations conducted here. First and foremost are disorders of consonant palatability, including not only *h*, *r*, *l*, as was usual in the borderlands. Deviations from the general state in Kyivan Polish language consist in both an excess of palatability—*duchi*, *pieluchi*, *Jaśny*, *rzeć*—and the introduction of secondary non-palatability—*zacmią*, *zdzębło*, *niemowiatkem*, *Słupnikiem*, *zwiercadło*, *w zwiercedle*, *umeramy*. Analogous examples from the south-eastern borderlands are provided by the studies conducted by Kurzowa [2006: 62] and Sicińska [2013: 91], so it is not possible to use these data for detailed conclusions. The analysis of the disordered repartition of *l* and *ł*, about which Grek-Pabisowa and Maryniakowa, following Kurzowa, write that it “[it] belongs to one of the rarely notated both in the past and in contemporary dialects” of northern borderland Polish [Grek-Pabisowa, Maryniakowa 1997: 59] and cite four 17th-century records, is different. Meanwhile, the Kyiv material demonstrates a very high irregularity of the records and documents hundreds of such examples, e.g.: *naymiłszym*, *zakroczyli*, *łecz*, *golębiey*, *napelniona*, *Prowinciałne*, *Modlitwy*, *policzony*, *społeczności*, *pełne*, *publiczney*, *krolestwu*, *wywiklane*, *Osiel*, *zle*, *Kołebce*, *miłczeć*, *odwiłża*, *calkiem*, *lotrami*, *nawrocili*, which, combined with the observations by Sicińska [2013: 166], makes it necessary to look for the origin of the phenomenon in the southern borderlands. On the other hand, the way consonant groups are manifested in the medial sound -*jźrz-* // -*jzrz-* // -*zr-*, -*jszr-* // -*szr-*: *podeyzzrzana*, *poyźrzała*, *przezyźrzał*, *doyźrzała*, *uyźrzycie*, *przyźrzawszy*, *poyzrzy*, *zayzrzy*, *doyzrzeć*, *poyśrzodka*, *pośrzednikiē*, *przezroczystay*, *pośrzedku*, and in the initial sound *zrz-* // *źrz-*, *szr-* // *sr-*: *zrzenicę*, *zrzenicą*, *źrzenice*, *źrzodło*, *zrzodło*, *szrodkiuica*, *szrednim*, *srodek*, allows one to see the phonetic convergence of Kyivan Polish with Vilnius Polish [Kurzowa 2006: 146–147]. Kyiv’s manifestation of the sibilance, hissing and humming ranks, e.g.: *żęby*, *bliźny*, *nieżyczył*, *szedziwe*, *kruszcze*, *ryczerza*, is linked to the same northern variety.

3. Morphology

As Rieger, quoted above, argues, the possibilities of using inflectional features as regional differentiators are negligible, but for the sake of clarity, I would like

to point out those phenomena which persisted longer in the borderland than in ethnic Poland or started to stabilise earlier than there, and as such they allow for identifying similarities between the regions. In Kyivan Polish there are present proper southern infinitives with *-ić* in place of *-eć* [Sicińska 2013: 231]: *patrzyć, myślił, myślić*, as well as rarely found in the material of Grek-Pabisowa and Maryniakowa [1997: 93], by Sicińska (2013) not noted iteratives on *-awa*: *dotrzymawaiq, rozdawaiq, przyznawaiq, przygrawaiq; -iwa, -ywa: wysłuchywa; wykopywaiq, poniechawali*. However, in my opinion the greatest value lies in the old aorist forms present in large numbers in the Kyiv sources [Klimek 2010a in more detail]. Kurzowa, having analysed the correspondence of the Radziwiłł house (from the years 1571–1587, 1596–1615), Sapięha (from the years 1584–1588) and Lithuanian documents (from the 17th century), concluded that “examples of the conditional mode on *-bych* and the past tense on *-ch* in texts written in the northern borderland variety of Polish go well beyond the first decades of the 17th century, also beyond its first half, even reaching its last quarter (the latest example from 1682)” [Kurzowa 2007: 401]. Thus, the researcher refuted the theses made by Witold Taszycki and Stanisław Rospond that limited the phenomenon geographically (Małopolska region), stylistically (“they did not belong to eminently elegant, literary forms” [see Kurzowa 2007: 395]) and chronologically (they do not reach beyond the first decades of the 17th century). Forms of aorist origin occur in eight out of the available fifteen Kyiv polonics, and the number of such records exceeds a hundred, e.g.: *zawitálichmy, zebrzelichmy, wierzylichmy, obaczylichmy, przyszlichmy, rozmierzylichmy, dałbych, przybiegłbych*, which makes it possible not only to see in this feature a link between Kyiv and northern borderland Polish, but also to treat the Kyiv sources as evidence of the accuracy of Kurzowa’s opinion.

The borderland tendency to avoid personal endings in the past tense, and the use of the personal pronoun in this role, is derived from the Ruthenian substrate, so it would be expected regardless of the final attribution of Kyivan Polish. As Kurzowa wrote, in the southern borderlands “the use of past tense forms without endings characterised the language of bilingual people, uneducated people, and urban dialects” [Kurzowa 1983: 112]. Meanwhile, this is a very rare phenomenon in the corpus, indicating the supra-regional character of the Kyiv variety of the language and its convergence with the literary language rather than the regional one. Other verbal inflectional features specific to the Borderlands include the ending *-emy* in the first person plural of the present tense. Other features of verbal inflection characteristic of the Kyiv region include: the ending *-emy* in the first person plural of the present tense: *widziemy, obaczemy, zbawjemy, wierzemy, mowjemy* [also in Sapięha, Smolińska 1983: 21]; the final position of the

pronoun in reflexive verbs: *być nie zdarzyło się; iako o Saule w Dzieiach Apotolskich informujemy się*; or the archaic variety of the verb *jachać*: *iachał, przyiachaliscie, przyiachawszy, iachała*.

Typical of the borderlands—northern or southern—deviations from the general Polish are also noticeable in the inflection of the noun. For the sake of clarity, it is worth mentioning: the dative case of the singular masculine *-u* substituted with *-owi* [Grek-Pabisowa, Maryniakowa 1997: 65]: *wieńcu, przyiacielu, wilku, Stworzycielu (: wielu), Krolewicu (: licu), Jarosławu, mieszkcu, kanonu, stróżu, dłużniku, ku Wschodu, caru (: daru), człowieku (: wieku), wężu (: mężu)*, the locative case of the singular masculine and neuter *-e* substituted with *-u* [Grek-Pabisowa, Maryniakowa 1997: 67]: *w domie, o Saule*, or the plural locative *-ech* in place of the new *-ach*: *na obraziech, w obraziech* [Sicińska 2013: 196].

More numerous than in southern epistolography [Sicińska 2013: 211] in Kyiv prints are simple forms of adjectives and adjectival participles, although their textual function is identical: *będę wolen, powinien iestem, iest godzien, będzie dano, niegodzien iest, iest policzon, zbawion będę, pochowan iest, był osądzon, rozwiązan będę, doścignąć nie można; wszystko żyto przetarto*.

Keeping in mind the reservation that “one should [...] exercise caution in formulating general conclusions regarding word-formation phenomena typical of borderland dialects” [Czarnecka 2016: 374], it is worth pointing out several phenomena illustrating the affinities of Kyivan Polish with borderland varieties. Certainly, there is a substrate basis in the mixing of adverbial formants *-e* and *-o*, which is popular in Kyivan Polish [Czarnecka 2016: 369], e.g.: *kwaśno, srodze, niewidomie, cale, głupie, grubie, bezpiecznie, sowicie, wdzięcznie, mile // miło, snadnie, niegłupie, rzewno, szczero, lacno, ściśło*, as well as in the formation of nouns and adjectives from prepositional phrases with *bez-*: *bezwstydnie, bezbożnik, bezuchologant, bezmozgi, bezsukienny, bezchmurne, bezcielesny, bezświtna, bezzemba* [cf. Sicińska 2013: 385]. Although the regional status of adjectives with the prefix *prze-* is debatable in the 17th century—according to Stefan Hrabec it was a Ukrainian feature [Hrabec 1949], while according to Karpluk [1992] and Stanisław Urbańczyk [1945] it was already a nationwide feature—it is worth pointing out their presence in Kyivan Polish, especially since Sicińska notes only isolated examples [Sicińska 2013: 385], including: *przewielebny, przezczysta, przezacny, przezchwalebny, przeoświecony*. Of particular note are the compound adjectives attested in Kyivan Polish, especially as they occur in great numbers and usually constitute authorial individualisms regardless of the genological and stylistic shape of the text, e.g.: *złotokamienne, świętopapierowa, zimmnorodny, Olymporowna, bystrolotne, Gwiazdostworzyciel*,

nocorownia, gwiazdonośna, drzeworodna, liliorowna, prawosławnoruska, niebo-datna, niebowładny, ciepłorodna, władogromy, owocorodne, wysokolotny, wielkonocny, Bogomyślny, Fałecznościemna, sercolomna. Sicińska sees the reasons for the small share of composites in southern borderland epistolography in the genre-artistic specificity of the texts [Sicińska 2013: 387]. Thus, it is possible to validate such a great popularity of composites in Kyiv material—unlike in letters, however, the high style of polonics and the classical education of their authors are factors supporting vocabulary creativity. Nevertheless, it is not the regional affinities that account for this peculiarity of Kyivan Polish.

4. Syntax

For the sake of completeness of the argument, it is also worth looking at a few syntactic features of the printed works of the Lavra. One of the most prominent is *accusativus cum infinitivo*, a construction known to general Polish speakers at the time, but in a slightly different form. The Kyiv distinction is founded on the high frequency of the so-called proper a.c.i., especially with an infinitive other than *to be*. Kurzowa, in her work *Język polski Wileńszczyzny i Kresów północno-wschodnich XVI–XX w.* (Polish of the Vilnius Region and North-Eastern Borderlands in the 16th–20th Centuries), writing about syntactic properties, found only 25 examples of the use of classical constructions *accusativus cum infinitive* and *nominativus cum infinitivo* in the 17th and 18th centuries. In the Kyiv corpus, there are several times more examples of this type, e.g.: “woźnicá obaczywszy ná świętym THEODOZYM szpláchćinki włośiáne nędzne [...] mniemał go bydz̄ żebraká iákiego”; “błogosławił Cerkiew [...] wystawić i Monástyr założyć”; “ná potępienie wieczne iść áffimuujemy”; “o sądn̄y dniu powiedział siebie niewiedzić” [more: Klimek 2010b]. Borderland pedigree is certainly demonstrated by constant and frequent syntactic constructions of a different type in the Kyiv material, e.g.:

- a) *dla* (*for*) with the genitive expressing the adverbial of purpose or cause: *dla wziątku byli przyszli; dla nieumieiętności bluźniq; dla zazdrości; wielu pomarło dla srogiego zimna; dla Proroctwa nazywamy; pisałem dla nawrocenia; iść po wodę dla omycia naczyńia;*
- b) *za* (*due to*) with an instrumental case as an adverbial of a reason: *za niedbalstwem, za prośbq, za modlitwami;*
- c) *u* (*at*) with a genitive case in the function of an adverbial of place: *u rękú* (vs. *w rękú*), *u przyiaźni, u ognia* (vs. *w ogniu*), *u osła;*
- d) genitive of the maker in the form of *od* (*from*) with a genitive case: *nazwała od kunsztu; odprawuią od Kapłana; od Boga obiecany; od Grzegorza zwyciężony iest; ode mnie zwyciężony będziesz; od nieprzyiaciół są pobici.*

Other word compounds than in general Polish are also quite numerous: *przeciw* (against) + genitive (*przeciw Chrystusa*—against Christ), *bronić się* (defend) + dative (*bronili się nieprzyjaciółom*—they defended themselves against enemies), *bluźnić* (blaspheme) + accusative (*bluźnić onego, bluźnili go*—they blasphemed him), *pytać o* (ask about) + locative (*pytał o przyszłych rzeczach*—he asked about future things); *prosić* (ask) + genitive (*prosić chleba*—to ask for bread); *modlić się* (pray) + dative (*modląc się Bogu*—praying to God); *pieczołować o* (care for) + accusative (*o zgromadzenie pieczołował*—he cared for the congregation); *bronić na* (defend) + accusative (*nie mogąc bronić na tak pobożny uczynek*—unable to defend such a pious deed). None of the mentioned characteristics, although contributing to the specificity of the Kyiv code, allow for the identification of a closer variety of the borderland variety.

Rieger's assertion of the uselessness of the grammatical criterion in determining the regional provenance of a text is confirmed by the analyses conducted so far. Unfortunately, also the application of the second criterion recommended by the researcher, the lexical one, does not work in the case of Kyiv polonics. Above all, because the lexical extra-literary accretions—to put it conventionally—come from the domain of religion/faith/rituality, for which the validation is not, of course, the geographical environment, but the confession of the author and the readers of the texts.

An attempt to answer the question of which variety of historical Polish was used by authors from the circle of the Kyiv Lavra and the Mohyla College, using linguistic criteria, does not provide a clear answer. However, the overview of linguistic behaviour made here shows how Kyiv's Polish, represented by the texts published in the Pechersk Lavra printing house, is located **between** the north and south of the borderlands. On every plane of the language—not only the phonetic or lexical one—one can see features of both south- and north-borderland provenience, and most features are common to both regions. And this applies almost as much to texts written in the 1630s as in the 1690s. Bogdan Walczak, in his article *Jeszcze raz: polski kresowy dialekt literacki?* (Once Again: A Polish Borderland Literary Dialect?) wrote: “contrary to the implicit suggestions by Stanisław Urbańczyk, we are not dealing here with a Polish borderland literary dialect, but with a nationwide literary language tinged to varying degrees with regional borderland characteristics” [Walczak 2001: 324]. This opinion also reflects the peculiarities of Kyivan Polish.

The geographical and historical criterion in the case of Kyiv, although the basis for its application needed updating, is not supported by the linguistic criterion. Thus, the temptation returns—perhaps it is time to call it a necessity—to consider the Polish language of 17th-century Kyiv not in geographical

terms, but in sociological terms, given that it was used by “a human community determined by a certain kind of social bond” [Grabias 1997: 111]. Unlike in the classical sociolects, however, which were limited to in-group communication, the Polish of the Lavra prints crossed the boundaries of the Mohyla College (later the Mohyla Academy) and spread among the broad masses of Orthodox Christians and Uniates living in the former Kyiv province, and with them travelled over a much larger area, as Martel pointed out in a slightly different context: “[Polish as] a formed literary language penetrated the Kyiv academy, got into oratorical texts and spread eastwards to the court environment of the Tsar” [see Verenič 1973: 6].

Translated by Ewa Kisiel

References

Sources

- Bajewski Filip (ca. 1645), *Chorae bini solis et lunae...*, Kyiv.
 Baranowicz Łazarz (1670), *Apollo chrześcijanski opiewa żywoty świętych*, Kyiv.
 Baranowicz Łazarz (1670), *Żywoty świętych ten Apollo pieie...*, Kyiv.
 Baranowicz Łazarz (1671), *Lutnia Apollinowa...*, Kyiv.
 Denisowicz Hilarion (1638), *Parergon cudow świętych...*, Kyiv.
 Galatowski Joannicjusz (1663), *Rozmowa Białocerkiewska...*, Kyiv.
 Galatowski Joannicjusz (1663), *Messyasz prawdziwy...*, Kyiv.
 Jaworski Stefan (1689), *Echo głosu wołającego na puszczy...*, Kyiv.
 Jaworski Stefan (1690), *Arctos coeli Rossiaci...*, Kyiv.
 Jaworski Stefan (1691), *Pełnia xiężyca w kleynocie swięcącego...*, Kyiv.
 Kalnofoyski Atanazy (1638), *Teratourgima lubo cuda...*, Kyiv.
 Kossow Sylwester (1635a), *Exegesis, tj. danie sprawy o szkołach...*, Kyiv.
 Kossow Sylwester (1635b), *Paterikon abo żywoty śś. Oycow peczarskich...*, Kyiv.
Listy świętego oycy Partheniusza do Piotra Mohyły... (1643), Kyiv.
Mnemosyne sławy, prac y trudow Piotra Mohyły... (1633), Kyiv.
 Mohyla Piotr (1645a), *Mowa duchowna przy szlucie...*, Kyiv.
 Mohyla Piotr (1645b), *Zebranie krotkiey nauki...*, Kyiv.
 Orlyk Filip (1698), *Hippomenes sarmacki...*, Kyiv.
 Pimin [Mohyla Piotr] (1644), *Lithos abo kamień z procy...*, Kyiv.

Dictionaries (including the abbreviations used)

SGKP – *Słownik geograficzny Królestwa Polskiego i innych krajów słowiańskich* (1883), ed. Filip Sulimierski, Bronisław Chlebowski, Władysław Walewski, vol. 4, Warszawa.

Literature

Bandtkie Jerzy Samuel (1826), *Historia drukarni w Królestwie Polskiem i Wielkiem Xięstwie Litewskiem jako i w krajach zagranicznych, w których polskie dzieła wychodziły*, t. 1, Kraków.

Bednarczuk Leszek (2018), *Początki i pogranicza polszczyzny*, Kraków.

Broggi-Bercoff Giovanna (1995), *Plurilinguism in Eastern Slavic Culture of the 17th Century. The Case of Simeon Polockij*, "Slavia", no. 64, p. 5–14.

Broggi Bercoff Giovanna (1999), *Plurilinguismo, retorica, e teoria della comunicazione nell'area slava orientale (XVII secolo). Atti del Convegno svoltosi a Roma dal 1 al 2 ottobre 1996*, in: *Plurilinguismo letterario in Ucraina, Polonia e Russia tra XVI e XVII secolo*, ed. Krzysztof Żaboklicki, Marina Ciccarini, Varsavia, p. 117–134.

Broggi-Bercoff Giovanna (2000), *Z zagadnień różnic kulturowych na ziemiach wschodniosłowiańskich na przykładzie trójjęzycznych dzieł Stefana Jaworskiego*, in: *Barok w Polsce i w Europie Środkowo-Wschodniej. Drogi przemian i osmozy kultur. Materiały konferencji naukowej Barok w krajach Europy Środkowej i Wschodniej (Warszawa, 23–25 marca 1999 r.)*, ed. Janusz Pelc, Krzysztof Mrowcewicz, Marek Prejs, Warszawa, p. 69–84.

Chomik Piotr (2004), *Typografie monasterskie w Rzeczypospolitej w XVII–XVIII w.*, in: *Prawosławne oficyny wydawnicze w Rzeczypospolitej*, ed. Antoni Mironowicz, Urszula Pawluczuk, Piotr Chomik, Białystok, p. 77–104.

Czarnecka Katarzyna (2016), *Podobieństwa i różnice w zakresie słowotwórstwa między gwarową polszczyzną północno- i południowokresową*, "Linguistica Copernicana", no. 13, p. 365–377. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.12775/LinCop.2016.018>.

Domitruk Julia (2012), *Glosa do słownika dawnej polskiej terminologii chrześcijańskiej (na podstawie wybranych dzieł Joannicjusza Galatowskiego)*, in: *Język polski dawnych Kresów Wschodnich*, t. 5: *Polskie dziedzictwo językowe na dawnych Kresach*, ed. Ewa Dzięgiel, Katarzyna Czarnecka, Dorota A. Kowalska, Warszawa, p. 55–63.

Domitruk Julia (2016), *Słownictwo kościelno-religijne w XVII-wiecznej polszczyźnie Joannicjusza Galatowskiego*, „Prace Filologiczne”, vol. 69, p. 91–114.

Estreicher Karol (1882), *Bibliografia polska*, vol. 8, Warszawa.

Fałowski Adam (2000), *Polskojęzyczna poezja ukraińska XVI–XVIII w. – uwagi o słownictwie*, in: *Kontakty językowe polszczyzny na pograniczu wschodnim. Prace ofiarowane Profesorowi Januszowi Riegerowi*, ed. Ewa Wolnicz-Pawłowska, Wanda Szulowska, Warszawa, p. 89–95.

- Grabias Stanisław (1997), *Język w zachowaniach społecznych*, Lublin.
- Grek-Pabisowa Iryda, Maryniakowa Irena (1997), *Język polski na Kresach północno-wschodnich dawniej i dziś*, in: *Historia i współczesność języka polskiego na Kresach wschodnich*, ed. Iryda Grek-Pabisowa, Warszawa, p. 27–109.
- Hawrysz Magdalena (2021), *Na styku religii, kultur i języków, czyli o polemicznych aspektach „Paterykonu” Sylwestra Kossowa*, “Roczniki Humanistyczne”, no. 6, p. 39–54. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18290/rh21696-3>.
- Hrabec Stefan (1949), *Elementy kresowe w języku niektórych pisarzy polskich XVI i XVII w.*, Toruń.
- Jabłonowski Aleksander (1899–1900), *Akademia Kijowsko-Mohylańska. Zarys historyczny na tle rozwoju ogólnego cywilizacji zachodniej na Rusi*, Kraków.
- Jakowenko Natalia (2000), *Historia Ukrainy. Od czasów najdawniejszych do końca XVIII wieku*, trans. Ola Hnatiuk, Katarzyna Kotyńska, Lublin.
- Karpluk Maria (1991), *Polszczyzna metropolity Piotra Mohyły w jego polemice z ks. Kasjanem Sakowiczem (ukrainizmy leksykalne)*, “Zeszyty Naukowe KUL”, no. 1–2, p. 189–201.
- Karpluk Maria (1992), *Południowo-wschodnia odmiana polszczyzny na przykładzie języka metropolity Piotra Mohyły (cechy gramatyczne)*, in: *Z polskich studiów slawistycznych*, ser. 8: *Językoznawstwo*, ed. Bohdan Galster, Warszawa, p. 101–106.
- Karpluk Maria (1998), *Ku dalekiemu pojednaniu. Dysputa prawosławno-katolicka metropolity Piotra Mohyły z ks. Kasjanem Sakowiczem*, in: *Czterechsetlecie unii brzeskiej. Zagadnienia języka religijnego*, ed. Zenon Leszczyński, Lublin, p. 37–47.
- Kawecka-Gryczowa Alodia, Korotajowa Krystyna, Krajewski Wojciech (1960), *Drukarze dawnej Polski. Od XV do XVIII wieku*, vol. 6: *Małopolska – Ziemie Ruskie*, Wrocław.
- Klimek Jolanta (2009), *Prolegomena do poloników kijowskich z XVII wieku*, in: *Język polski. Współczesność, historia*, ed. Władysława Książek-Bryłowa, Henryk Duda, Małgorzata Nowak, Lublin, p. 189–203.
- Klimek Jolanta (2010a), *Formy aorystyczne w XVII-wiecznych polonikach kijowskich*, “Roczniki Humanistyczne”, no. 6, p. 29–40.
- Klimek Jolanta (2010b), *Konstrukcja accusativus cum infinitivo w XVII-wiecznych polonikach kijowskich*, “Poznańskie Spotkania Językoznawcze”, vol. 21, p. 61–75.
- Klimek Jolanta (2010c), *Status polszczyzny kijowskiej w świetle granic i zasięgów polszczyzny kresowej*, in: *Żywe problemy historii języka*, ed. Marcin Kuźmicki, Marek Osiewicz, Poznań, p. 179–191.
- Klimek Jolanta (2011), *Polonika kijowskie – nierozpoznana odmiana polszczyzny XVII stulecia? Rekonesans*, in: *Badania historycznojęzykowe. Stan, metodologia, perspektywy – materiały konferencji naukowej, Kraków 21–22 września 2010 r.*, ed. Bogusław Dunaj, Maciej Rak, Kraków, p. 91–101.

- Klimek-Grądzka Jolanta (2020), „*Historia święta dla użytku małoletnich dzieci*” (1829). *Uwagi o języku i stylu*, in: *Verba multiplicia, veritas una. Prace dedykowane Profesor Alicji Pihan-Kijasowej*, t. 1, ed. Tomasz Lisowski et al., Poznań, p. 221–240.
- Klimek-Grądzka Jolanta (2023), *Ku pamięci. „Mnemosyne Sławy, Prac y Trudow...”* (1633), in: *Drogi i bezdroża literatury. Księga jubileuszowa dedykowana Profesor Annie Woźniak z okazji 70 urodzin*, ed. Agnieszka Lenart et al., Lublin, p. 121–137.
- Kurzowa Zofia (1983), *Polszczyzna Lwowa i Kresów południowo-wschodnich do 1939 roku*, Warszawa.
- Kurzowa Zofia (2006), *Język polski Wileńszczyzny i Kresów północno-wschodnich XVI–XX w.*, Kraków.
- Kurzowa Zofia (2007), *Nowe uwagi o genezie i chronologii czasu przeszłego na -ch*, in: eadem, *Z przeszłości i terażniejszości języka polskiego*, Kraków, p. 393–402.
- Łuźny Ryszard (1966), *Pisarze kręgu Akademii Kijowsko-Mohylańskiej a literatura polska. Z dziejów związków kulturalnych polsko-wschodniosłowiańskich XVII–XVIII w.*, Kraków.
- Melnyk Marek (2008), *Św. Piotr Mohyla – reformator prawosławia w Rzeczypospolitej*, “Ethos”, no. 1, p. 99–116.
- Moszyńska Danuta (1998), *O polszczyźnie Sylwestra Kossowa (na podstawie wstępu do „Pateryka Pieczarskiego” z 1635 roku)*, in: *Tematy. Księga jubileuszowa w 70. rocznicę urodzin Profesora Leszka Moszyńskiego*, ed. Krystyna Szcześniak, Halina Wątróbska, Gdańsk, p. 138–143.
- Nitsch Kazimierz (1954), *Z historii rymów polskich*, in: idem, *Wybór pism polonistycznych*, vol. 1, Wrocław, p. 33–77.
- Nowowiejski Bogusław (1996), *Kresowizm – co to takiego?*, in: *Wilno i Kresy północno-wschodnie*, vol. 3: *Polszczyzna kresowa*, red. Elżbieta Feliksiak, Bogusław Nowowiejski, Białystok, p. 43–61.
- Pihan-Kijasowa Alicja (1999), *Literacka polszczyzna kresów północno-wschodnich XVII wieku. Fonetyka*, Poznań.
- Radyszewskij Rostysław (1996), *Polskojęzyczna poezja ukraińska od końca XVI do początku XVIII wieku*, part 1: *Monografia*, Kraków.
- Rieger Janusz (2005), *Kilka uwag o polszczyźnie pisarzy-Rusinów w XVII w.*, in: *Der Text und seine Spielarten im polnischen Barok. Bausteine zu einer Epochensynthese*, ed. Herta Schmid, München, p. 197–208.
- Rieger Janusz (2017), *Czego nie wiemy o polszczyźnie kresowej XX i XXI w.?*, “Slavia Orientalis”, no. 3, p. 519–533.
- Sicińska Katarzyna (2020), *O statusie i nazewnictwie odmian języka polskiego na dawnych kresach wschodnich*, „Prace Filologiczne”, vol. 75, part 2, p. 237–262. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32798/pf.682>.

- Sicińska Katarzyna (2013), *Polszczyzna południowokresowa XVII i XVIII wieku (na podstawie epistolografii)*, Łódź. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18778/7525-903-2>.
- Siedina Giovanna (2011), *The Poetic Laboratory of the Kyiv-Mohylan Poetics. Some Practical Illustrations*, "Studi Slavistici", no. 1, p. 41–60.
- Siedina Giovanna (2014), *The Teaching of Lyric Meters and the Reception of Horace in Kyiv-Mohylanian Poetics*, in: *Latinitas in the Polish Crown and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Its Impact on the Development of Identities*, ed. eadem, Firenze, p. 99–129.
- Smolińska Barbara (1983), *Polszczyzna północnokresowa z przełomu XVII i XVIII w. na podstawie rękopisów Jana Władysława Poczobuta Odlanickiego i Antoniego Kazimierza Sapiehy*, Wrocław.
- Sowtys Natalia (2013), *Pisana po polsku literatura ukraińska w kontekście fenomenu kulturowego polsko-ukraińskiego pogranicza*, "Bibliotekarz Podlaski", no. 2, p. 104–113.
- Stieber Zdzisław (1966), *Historyczna i współczesna fonologia języka polskiego*, Warszawa.
- Titov Fedor (2000), *Tipografija Kievo-Pečerskoj Lavry. Die Druckerei des Kiever Höhlenklosters* [reprint], ed. Martin Erdmann, Walter Kroll, Köln.
- Urbańczyk Stanisław (1945), *Polskie przymiotniki typu przepiękny, przesławny, „Język Polski”*, no. 3, p. 78–82.
- Walczak Bogdan (1995), *Po co i jak badać gwary polskie na Ukrainie*, in: *Studia nad polszczyzną kresową*, vol. 8, ed. Janusz Rieger, Warszawa.
- Walczak Bogdan (2001), *Jeszcze raz: polski kresowy dialekt literacki?*, in: *Studia nad polszczyzną kresową*, vol. 10, ed. Janusz Rieger, Warszawa.
- Witkowski Wiesław (1969), *Język utworów Joannicjusza Galatowskiego na tle języka piśmiennictwa ukraińskiego XVII wieku*, Kraków.
- Wolnicz-Pawłowska Ewa (2003), *Osobliwości fonetyczne w dawnych kresowych księgach sądowych i zapiskach administracyjnych*, in: *Z badań nad polsko-ukraińskimi powiązaniem językowymi*, ed. Dmytro Buczko, Michał Łesiów, Lublin, p. 37–50.
- Веренич Вячеслав Л. (1973), *Польскія перыферыйныя гаворкі на ўсходзе*, в: *Польские говоры в СССР. Исследования и материалы*, ч. 1: 1967–1969, ред. Виктор В. Мартынов, Минск, с. 5–21.
- Запаско Яким П., Ісаєвич Ярослав Д. (1981), *Памятки книжкового мистецтва. Каталог стародруків виданих на Україні. Книга перша (1574–1700)*, Львів.
- Ісаєвич Ярослав Д. (2002), *Українське книговидання. Витоки, розвиток, проблеми*, Львів.
- Лазаренко Олеся (2002), *Засоби стилістично-граматичного вираження тексту (на матеріалі польськокомовних творів Лазаря Барановича)*, в: *Мова і культура*, т. 3., № 5, ч. 2: *Національні мови і культури в їх специфіці і взаємодії*, Київ, с. 11–18.

- Лазаренко Олеся (2003a), *Особливості розвитку польської орфографії у XVII ст. (на матеріалі творів Лазаря Барановича)*, „Слов'янський збірник”, изд. 10, Одеса, с. 54–60.
- Лазаренко Олеся (2003b), *Польсько-українська двомовність Лазаря Барановича у контексті української культури XVII ст.*, в: *Українська історична та діалектологічна лексика: Зб. наук. праць*, изд. 4, Львів, с. 250–254.
- Лазаренко Олеся (2005), *Польська мова у XVII ст. на українсько-польському культурному пограниччі (творчість Лазаря Барановича)*, в: «Українська школа» в літературі та культурі українсько-польського пограниччя, т. 7, Київ, с. 530–542.
- Лазаренко Олеся (2011), *Мовний світ Лазаря Барановича (особливості відмінювання польських іменників)*, в: *Життя у слові. Збірник на 80-річчя В.М. Русанівського*, Київ, с. 191–198.
- Огієнко Іван (1994), *Історія українського друкарства*, Київ.
- Соболевский Алексей И. (2005), *Славяно-русская палеография*, предисл. Владимир К. Журавлёв, Москва.
- [Verenič Váčeslav L. (1973), *Pol'skiâ peryferyjnâ gavorki na ũshodze*, v: *Pol'skie govory v SSSR. Issledovaniâ i materialy*, č. 1: 1967–1969, red. Viktor V. Martynov, Minsk, s. 5–21.
- Zapasko Ākim P., Īsaēvič Āroslav D. (1981), *Pamâtki knižkovogo mistectva. Katalog starodrukiv vidanih na Ukraini. Kniga perša (1574–1700)*, L'viv.
- Īsaēvič Āroslav D. (2002), *Ukraiñs'ke knigovidannâ. Vitoki, rozvitok, problemi*, L'viv.
- Lazarenko Olesâ (2002), *Zasobi stilistično-gramatičnogo uviraznennâ tekstu (na materialî pol's'komovnih tvoriv Lazarâ Baranoviča)*, v: *Mova ì kul'tura*, t. 3., № 5, č. 2: *Nacional'ni movi ì kul'turi v ih specifîci ì vzaēmodii*, Kiïv, s. 11–18.
- Lazarenko Olesâ (2003a), *Osoblivostî rozvitku pol's'koï orfografii u XVII st. (na materialî tvoriv Lazarâ Baranoviča)*, „Slov'âns'kij zbîrnik”, изд. 10, Одеса, с. 54–60.
- Lazarenko Olesâ (2003b), *Pol's'ko-ukraiñs'ka dvomovništ' Lazarâ Baranoviča u kontekstî ukraiñs'koï kul'turi XVII st.*, v: *Ukraiñs'ka iŕtorična ta dialektologična leksika. Zb. nauk. prac'*, изд. 4, L'viv, s. 250–254.
- Lazarenko Olesâ (2005), *Pol's'ka mova u XVII st. na ukraiñs'ko-pol's'komu kul'turnomu pograničči (tvorčist' Lazarâ Baranoviča)*, v: «Ukraiñs'ka škola» v literaturî ta kul'turî ukraiñs'ko-pol's'kogo pograniččâ, t. 7, Kiïv, s. 530–542.
- Lazarenko Olesâ (2011), *Movnij svît Lazarâ Baranoviča (osoblivostî vidmînuvannâ pol's'kih imennikiv)*, v: *Žittâ u slovî. Zbîrnik na 80-riččâ V.M. Rusanivs'kogo*, Kiïv, s. 191–198.
- Ogiēnko Īvan (1994), *Istoriâ ukraiñs'kogo drukarstva*, Kiïv.
- Sobolevskij Aleksej I. (2005), *Slavâno-russkaâ paleografiâ*, predisl. Vladîmir K. Žuravlëv, Moskva.]

Jolanta Klimek-Grądzka, Ph.D., professor at KUL—Institute of Linguistics, John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin. Research interests: history of the Polish language, historical grammar of the Polish language, historical stylistics, emergence and transformation of text genres, historical regional Polish language, history of Polish language teaching.