UNIWERSYTET
IM. ADAMA MICKIEWICZA
W POZNANIU

Aleksander Walicki's *Upominek zecerom od korektora* as an Example of 19th-Century Orthoepic Guidance*

Urszula Sokólska

Uniwersytet w Białymstoku
University of Bialystok
ORCID: 0000-0002-3945-1138

Anetta Bogusława Strawińska

Uniwersytet w Białymstoku
University of Bialystok
ORCID: 0000-0001-8401-3068

ABSTRACT: The aim of the article is, first of all, to present a synthetic study of a little-known 19th-century guide for printers by Aleksander Walicki entitled *Upominek zecerom od korektora* published in 1886 in Kraków. Secondly, placing the orthographic issues referred to in the book in a broad purist perspective, against the background of the 19th-century norm in the eastern borderland variant. Thirdly, drawing attention to the provenance of the words indicated in the guide for printers, which largely reveal the regional identity of its author. As a language enthusiast, and above all an extreme purist, Walicki downplays the fact that perfect knowledge of the linguistic system and usage is necessary to formulate normative recommendations. Sometimes ignorance of these factors leads him to make to erroneous normative judgements.

KEYWORDS: diachrony, graphics, orthoepy, general and borderland Polish, linguistic purism, Aleksander Walicki.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS STATEMENT: The authors declare that there were no conflicts of interest in this study.

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTION: Each author is half responsible 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.

---

* The text was delivered at a scholarly conference dedicated to the memory of Professor Bogdan Walczak, titled *Kulturowe aspekty ewolucji języka. Słowa i słowniki* [Cultural Aspects of Language Evolution: Words and Dictionaries], which took place in Wągrowiec on November 14–16, 2023.

The primary aim of the article is to present the preliminary results of studies on a little-known 19th-century guide for printers by Aleksander Walicki, titled *Upominek zecerom od korektora.* These studies apply classical methods of diachronic linguistics, focusing on the relationships between elements of the language throughout its development.[1] Additionally, the article situates the orthographic issues mentioned in *Upominek* within a broad purist perspective, set against the backdrop of the 19th-century norm in the Borderland variant. Lastly, it draws attention to the provenance of the words highlighted in the guide, which largely reflect the regional identity of its author.[2]

Upominek…[3] by Walicki clearly aligns with the tradition of 19th-century texts pertaining to the broadly understood culture of language, classically interpreted as the "cultivation" of the Polish language, with a focus on maintaining its efficiency and correctness. The list of correctness-oriented publications from this period begins with the brochure by Onufry Kopczyński [1806], who was described by his contemporaries as "a veteran of national grammar, a grammatical code, an extraordinary linguist" [Sokólska 2017: 7]. With the loss of national sovereignty, there came a time of heightened interest in codification issues. The framework of published works was determined by specific external factors: the defeat of 1863, the territorial fragmentation of the state, subjugation, and with these, a growing sense of national threat, along with the interference of the occupying powers (especially in the Russian partition) in cultural life by suppressing all manifestations of Polish identity and the Polish language. In the publishing market of the second half of the 19th century, voices defending the Polish language were raised by: Eugeniusz Łada-Łazowski [1865], Fryderyk Skobel [1871–1877], Aleksander Walicki [1876, 1879, 1886], Jan Karłowicz [ed. ca. 1882, pub. 1984], Ludomir Szczerbowicz-Wieczór [1881], Józef Bliziński [1888] and Edward S. Kortowicz [1891]. Among the defenders of the Polish language at the end of the 19th century were also the authors of contemporary grammars such as: Maksymilian Jakubowicz [1823–1824], Józef Muczkowski [1836], Jan

---

1 A comprehensive paper by both authors of the article is currently in preparation, titled *"Upominek zecerom od korektora" Aleksandra Walickiego. Osobliwy poradnik ortograficzny z drugiej połowy XIX wieku w kontekście polszczyzny kresowej.*

2 Aleksander Walicki was born on 21 January 1826, in Vilnius. He had strong emotional ties to Lithuania, which he referred to as his "homeland". His love for his birthplace and the Polish language of the Borderland region is emphasised in virtually every text he wrote. For further details on this topic, see: Walicki 1876: XVII.

3 The article will reference two of Walicki's treatises: *Upominek zecerom od korektora* (hereinafter abbreviated as *Upominek*, with the specific page number cited) and *Błędy nasze w mowie i piśmie ku szkodzie języka popełniane oraz prowincjonalizmy* (hereinafter: Walicki 1876, with the specific page number cited).

Nepomucen Deszkiewicz [1843], Ksawery Bronikowski [1848], Feliks Żochowski [1852], Henryk Suchecki [1853], Antoni Morzycki [1857], Michał Suchorowski [1862], Józef Mroziński [1882], and Antoni Małecki [1863].[4] The efforts made by 19th-century prescriptivists are distinctly puristic in nature. In this context, purism should be understood as a protective and safeguarding reaction. At its core lies a broadly understood desire for self-preservation; the pursuit of linguistic purity, primarily through the removal of foreign elements, which are seen as superfluous and unnecessary. The term purism, in relation to the Polish language in the northeastern Borderland, signifies a particular attitude towards language. This attitude is manifested in the "cleansing of speech" from specific linguistic foreignness, mainly through eliminative measures. A purist is often compared to a surgeon who does not hesitate to perform drastic cuts, even of large parts of the "linguistic organism" in order to achieve its complete recovery [see Strawińska 2018: 34–38]. In *Upominek…*, Walicki—both indirectly through presenting mainly models of "how one should write" and directly in his concise commentary in the form of a preface—informs the reader that his ambition is to assume the role of a normative codifier.

In this article, the term *orthoepy* (from the Greek *orthoépeia*, meaning 'correct pronunciation, correctness of style') is interpreted broadly, referring to a branch of linguistics concerned with linguistic correctness and language culture in general. It primarily describes the norms of the national language, assesses deviations from these norms, and examines the mechanisms of linguistic errors.[5]

Walicki published *Upominek…* at his own expense in 1886 in Kraków.[6] The author discloses his personal details. He provides his full name, which is notable, as he usually publishes his works under pseudonyms and cryptonyms such as Kuchta, Żeleźniak Aleksander, Al. Żel, and WM Nowogrodzianin; Valìckì,

---

4 For more details, see Klemensiewicz [1981: 666–681].

5 See https://wsjp.pl/haslo/podglad/78254/ortoepia/5196217/nauka-o-poprawnosci-jezykowej [accessed on 25 June 2023] or https://sjp.pwn.pl/slowniki/ortoepia.html [accessed on 26 June 2023]; cf. also Markowski 2017: 25–33, Walczak 1995: 1–16. Kazimierz Polański states that "orthoepy may encompass both orthophony and orthography" [Polański, ed. 1999: 409].

The term *orthoepy* can also be narrowly defined as "the standardised system of pronunciation of a particular language, especially the literary or standard variety; a branch of linguistics concerned with normative pronunciation, closely related to phonetics and phonology", https://www.enciklopedija.hr/clanak/ortoepija [accessed on 13 October 2019]. A comprehensive bibliography on this topic can be found in Majkowska 2015: 141–150.

6 For a more detailed discussion, see also: Ciborowska [Strawińska] 2002: 15–25; Strawińska 2006: 141–151.

Alâksandar; Валіцкі А; Жаязняк; алікісь Алесь.[7] *Upominek…* resembles an orthographic dictionary in form[8], where the author presents selected spelling rules to a specific audience of 19th-century Polish speakers, a purpose clearly suggested by the title itself and confirmed by the very brief preface, which serves as the only form of commentary from the author: "Panowie towarzysze sztuki drukarskiej!" ("Gentlemen, companions in the art of printing!") [*Upominek* 3].

The interpretative aspect of the presented text requires particular emphasis. The enigmatic introduction that precedes the main part of the dictionary[9] is a valuable source of information regarding the motives that prompted Walicki to write a work focused on linguistic correctness. The primary motive—according to the author's perspective—appears to be the need to address the disorder prevailing in Polish orthography, including the improper and often arbitrary linguistic practices employed by authors who treat printers instrumentally, with considerable disregard and condescension. The author writes about this with irony and undisguised sarcasm:

> Zecer nie ma prawa zaprotestować przeciw najwidoczniejszemu nadużyciu, nie ma prawa nie uznać najdziwaczniejszego wybryku, najgłupszej zachcianki autora. Zecer jest obowiązany być wiernem echem równie uczonego i gruntownego znawcy języka, jak i pierwszego lepszego bezczelnego nieuka, korzystającego z cierpliwości papieru.

> The typesetter has no right to protest against the most obvious abuse, no right to reject the most bizarre whim or the most foolish caprice of the author. The typesetter is obliged to be the faithful echo of both a learned and thorough

---

7 He differentiates his pseudonyms in various ways, including the use of Latin script, Russian Cyrillic or Belarusian Cyrillic. A full list of Walicki's pseudonyms can be found at https://wordcat-org.translate.goog/identities/lccn-n2020021998/ [accessed on 26 June 2023].

8 The methodological and substantive structure of the guide, and consequently its segmentation, is well thought out, although certainly not uniform or conventional. On one hand, the reader is presented with a rich lexical illustration of the thematic groups identified by Walicki, related to the most important (in the author's subjective opinion) orthographic issues, such as the spelling of: "With plain *h*", "With *o* without a diacritical mark". "With *ó*", "With *u*", "With a single *n*" or "With single letters" [sic! note by U.S. and A.S.] (as opposed to "With double letters", "Compound spelling" and "Separate spelling". On the other hand, there are occasional categorical normative recommendations from the author, such as: "But the imperative mood in verbs ending in **ować** should be spelled with *u*: *budować—buduj, budujmy, budujcie*" [*Upominek* 17], "One should write *birbancki* not *tski*" [*Upominek* 19], "Accusative *moję, twoję, swoję* not *mają, twoją, swoją*" [*Upominek* 29].

9 The main glossary contains approximately 1400 word forms.

expert in the language, as well as any brazen ignoramus who takes advantage of the patience of paper. [*Upominek* 3]

Hence, this gives rise to his resolute and deliberate imperative of opposition: "wobec gorszącej i wyuzdanej autorów samowoli, wyłamującej się zpod wszelkich prawideł" ("against the scandalous and unrestrained arbitrariness of authors, who break free from all established rules") [*Upominek* 3].

To "bring order" to this orthographic chaos, Walicki sets himself the goal of compiling generally accepted normative rules into a single, systematic whole:

> Żeby więc choć odrobinę przynieść wam ulgi w tych katuszach, jakie znosić musicie, kiedy was zgraja pismaków, zpod wszelkich sztandarów, szarpie i targa w strony rozmaite,—umyśliłem zebrać i zestawić owę niewielką ilość prawideł obwiązujących, na które większość się zgadza, i w których rzadko zdania rozdwojone bywają.

> So, in order to bring you even a little relief from the torments you must endure when a horde of scribblers, from all banners, pulls and drags you in various directions, I decided to gather and compile this small set of binding rules— those on which the majority agree and where differing opinions are seldom found. [*Upominek* 4]

The author's primary intention, therefore, is not to point out glaring orthographic errors, but quite the opposite—to present a wealth of material illustrating the indisputable rules governing the orthography of that time:

> daję wzory jak pisać należy. Opuszczam zaś to wszystko, o czem zdania są poróżnione. [...] Cieszyć się będę, jeżeli się tem przyczynię do ulżenia wam pracy przy korekcie.

> I provide examples of how one ought to write. I omit everything about which opinions are divided. [...] I will be pleased if this contributes to facilitating your work during proofreading. [*Upominek* 4]

However, the guide for printers should not be viewed solely as a source of information on 19th-century orthography.[10] A careful reader will undoubtedly

---

10 From the perspective of a contemporary Polish language user, Walicki's orthographic recommendations such as: ***dłóto***, ***dojutra***, ***jaknajgorzej***, ***nazawsze***, ***pasorzyt***, ***płókać***, ***ponsowy***,

find a wealth of information about the lexical stock of 19th-century Polish. The linguistic material collected in the presented dictionary is varied in terms of its genetic and morphological composition, featuring diminutive structures (e.g. *bródka*, *jagódka*, *kółko*, *mówka* 'short speech'), augmentative forms (e.g. *szklanica*), and various inflectional forms (e.g. *mnóż*, *módl się*, *winszuj*, *w moich ręku*); furthermore, it includes words with broad usage (e.g. *Bóg*, *ból*, *męstwo*, *owies*) as well as those limited to specific regions (e.g. *duga* // *duha* 'wooden yoke over a collar in a single-horse harness', *hrymnąć* 'to fall to the ground with full force', *jędor* 'turkey cock', *hojdać* 'to rock', *huśtać*); and native words (e.g. *bezżenny*, *czynny*, *dziewanna*) alongside numerous borrowings from foreign languages:[11] from Latin (e.g. *faktor*, *fawor*, *habit*, *korespondencja*, *procesja*), Greek (e.g. *gieognozya*, *harmonia*, *hermafrodyt(a)*), German (e.g. *huncwot*, *huta*, *hycel*, *pręgierz*), Czech (e.g. *hańba*, *hardy*, *hojny*), French (e.g. *hotel*), Turkic-Tatar languages (e.g. *harem*, *puha*, often through Ukrainian: *haracz*, *kurhan*, *nahajka*), and Hungarian (e.g. *hajduk*, *hejnał*, *husarz*); as well as internationalisms and words the adaptation of which into Polish is highly complex and often difficult to classify definitively (e.g. *algebra*: Med. Lat. *algebra* from Arabic *al-ğabr*; *haszysz*: Eng. *hashish*, Fr. *haschich*, Ger. *Haschisch* from Arabic *ḥašīš* 'dried herbs; hashish'; *humanitarny*: Eng. *humanitarian*, Fr. *humanitaire*, Ger. *humanitär* from Lat. *hūmānus* 'human'; *ilustracja*: Eng. *illustration*, Fr. *illustration*, Ger. *Illustration* from Lat. *illustrātiō*; *interesować*: Fr. *intéresser*, Ger. *interessieren* from Lat. *interesse* 'damage, loss; benefit, profit; interest; entitlement, permission').[12]

In the understanding of an educated user of Polish at the time, foreign borrowings were not associated with elements of subjective expressive connotation, unlike words of regional provenance, which Walicki undoubtedly introduced into his guide with deliberate intent.[13] In his conviction, however—contrary

---

skówka, *tłómaczyć*, *wbród*, *wpoprzek*, *zpańska*, *żóraw*, and others, certainly stand out. These recommendations do not always find confirmation in the *Słownik Warszawski* (SW) and *Słownik wileński* (SWil).

11   In the referenced brochure, they serve only an informative-nominative function. These issues, due to the breadth of the problems and formal-editing limitations, will not be discussed here.

12   For a more detailed discussion on the complex history of loanwords in the Polish language, see, for example: Walczak 1982; 1999.

13   Walicki—being a true son of the Vilnius region—includes in *Upominek...* Northern Borderland regionalisms, both native and those of East Slavic origin, thus incorporating into Polish language elements borrowed from Ukrainian (*Ukrainisms*), Belarusian (*Belarusianisms*), and Russian (*Rusisms*).

to the recommendations of some 19th-century prescriptivists[14]—they are not considered linguistic errors or grammatical mistakes. In the scholar's view,[15] not only do they not violate the prevailing linguistic norm, but they are even essential elements that illustrate the diversity of the Polish language, both in the stylistic-emotional sphere and in the regional context, as he had already discussed in his earlier works:[16]

> Z prowincjonalizmów bowiem powstał nasz język książkowy, język, którym mówią u nas ludzie ogładzeni. Z nich trzeba go zasilać, dopełniać, a nawet częstokroć poprawiać, wracając do nich jako do źródła niezmąconego cudzoziemszczyzną.

> For it is from provincialisms that our literary language has emerged, the language spoken by cultured people among us. It must be nourished, supplemented, and even often corrected by returning to these provincialisms as an untainted source, free from foreign influences. [Walicki 1876: XXV]

It is important to highlight that these provincialisms[17] reveal the linguistic roots of the author of the work under analysis. They testify to a strong bond

---

14 In the 19th century, the attitude of codifiers and prescriptive linguists towards regionally marked language units was distinctly antagonistic. Even in the pre-partition period, there were calls to standardise the language by eliminating regionalisms [cf. Szylarski 1770; Kopczyński 1778–1785; Sierakowski 1795; Rzepka 1993: 132–150]. Anti-regional tendencies did not wane in later years. Ludomir Szczerbowicz-Wieczór argued that "it is not appropriate to use provincialisms from popular and colloquial speech that do not have widespread recognition" [Szczerbowicz-Wieczór 1881: 44]. According to Aleksander Łętowski, provincialisms are also errors [Szczerbowicz-Wieczór 1918: 10]. Moreover, as Elżbieta Umińska-Tytoń writes, "regardless of the authors' declarations in language manuals, in practice they were opposed to regionalisms. The mere collection of regional lexical forms among those deemed incorrect was an indication to avoid them" [Umińska-Tytoń 2018: 203].

15 Walicki does not comment on this issue in *Upominek…*. He expresses his views on the matter directly in other works, such as Walicki 1876.

16 For a more detailed discussion on the perception of regionalisms and dialectisms in the 19th century, see Umińska-Tytoń 2018; also: Sokólska 2010, Sokólska 2013, Sokólska 2017: 55–76, Strawińska 2018, Strawińska 2022.

17 In the 19th century, the term *provincialisms* referred to words whose usage was limited to certain areas of the national language, but—unlike dialectisms and colloquial forms—they were also present in the language of the educated classes. In the 20th century, this term was replaced by *regionalism* (derived from *region* meaning 'area,' 'part of a larger area'). The triumph of the new terminology is explained by Kwiryna Handke as follows: "the original analogous relationship between the term *provincialism* and the root word *province* ceased

connecting him with the Borderland—a symbolic, almost magical area of his childhood. The presence of lexemes specific to the northeastern Borderland of the 19th century in the text of the guide for printers, alongside general Polish linguistic material, allows for a comparison[18] of 19th-century northern Borderland Polish with the standard Polish language in order to identify similarities linking both language variants as well as differences that separate them, not only in terms of orthography and word formation but also in inflection and lexis.

Among the issues of interest to Walicki, the following can be mentioned:

1. The spelling of slanted vowels

1.1. On the difficulties in writing the slanted o

The difficulties in writing the slanted *o*, specifically the confusion between *ó* // *o* and *ó* // *u*, which plagued users of 19th-century northern Borderland Polish, are also a characteristic feature of the literary Polish of that period. Compared to standard Polish, the Polish spoken in the northeastern Borderland in the second half of the 19th century exhibited a different distribution of *o* and *ó* than in ethnically Polish areas. Broadly speaking, these differences can be considered in two ways: the absence of slanting and the emergence of new slants, meaning the use of *ó* in place of the general Polish *o*. The causes of such deviations from the norm can be traced to the lack of awareness of the historically established alternation between *o* // *ó* which was influenced by the layering of the general Polish language over the indigenous languages of the northeastern Borderland: Belarusian and Lithuanian. This interaction often led to the introduction of *o* in place of the general Polish *ó* (*u*), typically modelled on Belarusian, or conversely, the use of hypercorrect Borderland *ó* instead of the general Polish *o*. In the general Polish of the 19th century, the graphic symbol *ó*, treated as a real equivalent of *u* was firmly established as the norm [Bajerowa 1986: 72–73]. This general tendency is illustrated by the following examples from the analysed guide: ***brózda***, ***chróst***, ***dłóto***, ***Jakób***, ***płókać***, ***próć***, ***ślósarz***, ***śrót***, ***tłómaczyć***, ***tłómok***, ***żórawina***.

---

to function due to the change in the semantic scope of the word *province* […]—today it is synonymous with inferiority to the centre" [Handke 1993: 1]. Given the lack of stylistic or evaluative connotations of the term *provincialism* in 19th-century Polish, in this study, both terms are treated synonymously.

18   The data extracted from the source have been discussed in the context of the 19th-century linguistic norm in its northern Borderland variant. On several occasions, the material has been compared with 17th- and 18th-century norms. In some cases (such as compound and separate spelling or the use of capital and lowercase letters), references to contemporary Polish are also made.

Not all of the instructions provided by the author of the guide for printers align with the orthographic norms of the time. There are instances where—contrary to general Polish orthographic decisions—he recommends using *ó* instead of *o* (i.e. replacing *o* with *ó*) or the so-called peculiar *o* (i.e. the incorrect representation of *o* instead of *ó*). For example, in the section illustrating "*Pisownia przez ó*" ("Spelling with *ó*") [*Upominek* 10–16] Walicki includes some surprising examples in this context, such as: **doróżka** and **paciórek**. He advocates for the representation of *ó* rather than *o*, possibly by analogy to forms accepted by prescriptivists, such as: **nawskróś** 'na wskróś, i.e. from one side, through the interior of something, to the other side', **szczypiór**, **wskróś**, **zwrót**. Walicki also recommends the incorrect spelling "without the slash on the *o*" [*Upominek* 9, 13] in lexemes such as *kościoł*, *ozor* and *półskorek* (a bookbinding term: partial leather binding of a book, i.e. the corners and spine are leather, while the sides are covered with paper), despite the correct form being **skóra** (leather).

1.2. The issue of the slanted e

The old slanted vowel *e* was recorded in the northern Borderland in two ways: either as *i*, *y* or *é*. In most 18th- and early 19th-century prints, the character *é* was rarely used, appearing only occasionally, particularly in the endings -*éj* and -*ém*. The letter *é* (pronounced as clear *e* or *i*, *y*) became widespread in literary language in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, thanks to the grammars of Onufry Kopczyński, which elevated the slanted *e* to the status of a norm. The graphic symbol *é* persisted through the first half of the 19th century, after which it gradually began to disappear. Even between 1861–1871, *é* still appeared in writing, but by the decade of 1891–1900, it had completely vanished in favour of *e*. Ultimately, the disappearance of the letter *é* was solidified by a resolution of the Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1891. The use of the slanted *e* in the form of *i* or *y* is now considered archaic [Dubisz 2012: 53].

Walicki, aware of the 19th-century shift towards identifying the slanted *e* with the clear *e* recommends the "spelling with *e*", or lexemes such as: **bilet**, **mieszać**, **mieszanina**, **ościenny**, **owies**, **pomieszany**, **pośpiech** or **świeccy**. In the text of *Upominek…*, the graphic symbol *é* does not appear. There are also no examples of the former slanted *e* being represented as *i* or *y*.

2. The graphy of nasal vowels

The fluctuations in the representation of nasal vowels are essentially a reflection of the general Polish tendency to stabilise the alternation between ę // ą specially in inflectional stems and word-formation bases, which differs from the practices in the eastern Borderland, where the author of the guide originates.

The Polish language in the northeastern Borderland is characterised by its own tendencies—often caused by unfamiliarity with the general Polish linguistic norm and social usage—to which Walicki also succumbs. On the one hand, in *Upominek…*, he records examples where the nasal vowels are encoded with the orthographic letters ę, and ą in accordance with the norm of the time—before fricative consonants, such as: **gąsienica**, **gąsior**, **grząski**, **męstwo**, **mężobójca**, **nadobowiązkowy**, **uszczęśliwić**, **wąski**, **zwycięski** or **zwycięstwo**, On the other hand, he advocates for using the letters **ę** and **ą** to denote sound clusters that are not nasal vowels,[19] which he explicitly highlights through comments such as: one should write **bronzowy** (rather than *brązowy*), **frenzla** 'a decorative cord for fabric' (rather than *fręzla*), **ponsowy** (rather than *pąsowy*), **trenzla** 'a horse bridle' (rather than *tręzla*)[20].

On the other hand, examples such as: **chętnie**, **dokąd**, **dotąd**, **kolęda**, **miętówka**, **ochędóstwo**, **pokąd**, **potąd**, **prątkiem**, **pręgierz**, **świętokrzyski**, **świętokradca**, **trójząb**, **wątróbka**, **wewnątrz**, **wędką**, **węgorz**, **większy**, **włóczęga**, **zewsząd**, **znikąd** or **zowąd** collected in *Upominek…*, suggest that Walicki is generally an advocate of preserving the identity of the vowels ę and ą before plosive consonants. However, there are instances where the author of the guide for printers supports the graphic representation of the vowels ę, ą and before the plosive consonant *d* as *on*, as seen in loanwords such as: **flondra** and **plondrować**.[21]

Before affricate consonants, both nasal vowels—according to Walicki's guidelines—should not be split. He unequivocally recommends spelling these lexemes "with **ę**": **dzięcioł**, **jęczmienny**, **męczennik**, **pomiędzy**.

---

19 Zofia Kurzowa explains this case as the representation of the nasal vowels ę and ą in the form of diphthongs *en* and *on*, which are characteristic mainly of the northeastern Borderland region [see Kurzowa 1993a: 226]. She describes the splitting of nasal vowels before fricatives as a "phonetic innovation" [Kurzowa 1993b: 48].

20 The commentary cited here is justified by research on 19th-century Polish conducted by scholars such as Irena Bajerowa [Bajerowa 1986: 55–59] and Zofia Kurzowa [Kurzowa 1993: 47–49, Kurzowa 1993a: 226–227]. The representation of nasal vowels before fricatives in the 20th century is described somewhat differently. Halina Koneczna notes that "today's Polish literary ę, ǫ in final position and before subsequent fricative consonants can be described as falling diphthongoids, usually pronounced as **eę~**, **oo~**", where in phonetic transcription, the symbol ~ indicates a strong nasal resonance with indistinct oral articulation [Koneczna 1965: 109–110].

21 Normative sources from the 19th century and the late 19th and early 20th centuries, such as L, SWil, and SW, alongside the forms **flondra** and **plondrować**, also record the variant forms: **flądra** and **plądrować**.

3. Vowel alternations: *e // ∅* and *'e // 'o*

The author of the discussed guide advocates—as confirmed by the recommendation "[spelling—ed. U.S. and A.S.] with *e*" [*Upominek* 18]—for the preservation in writing of archaic forms that retain the old *e*, such as: ***kocieł***, ***kozieł*** or ***osieł***. The newer forms with *o*, were not included by Walicki in *Upominek...*, even though by the mid-19th century they were already being introduced into the literary language.[22] This suggests that the author of the analysed work, either as a strict purist, deliberately chooses the older forms that have been in use longer, or he is unaware of the existence of two competing forms in 19th-century Polish: ***kocieł // kocioł***, ***kozieł // kozioł***, ***osieł // osioł***.

Ignoring the recommendations of contemporary prescriptivists, Walicki in *Upominek...* indicates hypercorrect forms with the so-called "new *e*":[23] ***przedsiębierca*** and ***przedsiębierstwo*** ["with *e*", *Upominek* 18], likely resulting from analogical levelling—***przedsiębierca*** from: ***przedsiębierać***,[24] i.e. *przedsięwziąć* (similar to: *przyniesły* from: *przynieść*).

He also recommends using forms influenced by the Belarusian language, such as ***reparować*** (repair), where the mid vowel *e* in an unstressed syllable has been replaced by ***a*** (a phenomenon known as *akanie*). Additionally, he suggests the hypercorrect form ***horować*** 'to perform exhausting labour; to toil', with ***o*** (rather than ***a***), which likely arose from the tendency to avoid *akanie*.[25]

4. Graphical representations of consonants

4.1. Doubling of consonants

By publishing *Upominek...*, Walicki engages in the ongoing discussion concerning the issue of consonant doubling in both native and foreign words. This tendency, present in earlier periods—especially in the 17th and 18th centuries and persisting into the early 19th century—is particularly evident in adjectives ending in *-any*, *-iny // -yny*. In these cases, the consonant: *n* (*cenny*, *pszenny*, *ranny*) is doubled. However, in the literary language, the norm from the second half of the 19th century onward has been to use single consonants. Walicki, undoubtedly aware of this trend, recommends the spelling "with a single *n*"

---

22 According to Irena Bajerowa, the forms: ***kocieł***, ***kozieł*** and ***osieł*** were still in use at the beginning of the 20th century [Bajerowa 1986: 107–108]. See also Kurzowa 1993a: 231–232.

23 Terminology according to Z. Kurzowa. For more details, see: Kurzowa 1993a: 231.

24 In SW, the lexeme is marked with the qualifier: *rarely used*.

25 Halina Karaś also records the verb in question with the meaning 'to live in poverty' and considers it an archaism in this sense, previously typical of general Polish [see Karaś 2001: 91].

[*Upominek* 19–20] for lexemes such as: **blaszany**, **ceglany**, **miedziany**, **szklany**, **szklanica**, **wiślany**, **wódczany**.

4.2. Assimilation of doubled consonants

At the same time, contrary to the prescriptivists, Walicki in *Upominek…* considers forms such as: **balada** 'ballad', **okienica**, **podostatkiem** 'in abundance', **uczenica**, as exemplary, where assimilation of doubled consonants has occurred. Such recommendations reveal a characteristic tendency among speakers of Polish from the northern Borderland region to avoid consonant doubling, a feature typical of Borderland dialects [more in: Strawińska 2018: 74–75].

4.3. The process of secondary palatalisation

Walicki in *Upominek…* also records hypercorrect forms such as: **pierwiej**, **pojedyńczy** which display secondary palatalisation of consonants.

4.4. Protetic voiced *h*

Walicki attempts to illustrate, using lexical material, the issue he observed in the eastern Borderland at the end of the 19th century—distinguishing between the voiceless velar fricative χ (*ch*) and its voiced counterpart γ (*h*). The material presented by Walicki in *Upominek…* indicates that the voiced γ typically appears in loanwords, especially those of East Slavic origin, such as: **braha** 'mash produced after distilling vodka; a drink made from barley or rye flour', **buhaj**, **bohomaz** 'poor painter, crude painting', **czahary** 'a marshy area overgrown with bushes, unsuitable for cultivation', **hałastra** 'rabble', **harbuz** 'watermelon', **hołota** 'poor people', **hołysz** 'pauper', **hołubić** 'to cherish', **hołubiec** 'a type of dance', **hrymnąć** 'to fall heavily to the ground', **hoży** 'sturdy, spry', **hurkot** 'rattle, clatter', **ohyda** 'disgust', **pohaniec** 'infidel, pagan', **poroh** 'waterfall'. In *Upominek…* there are also examples of the voiced γ in borrowings from German, such as: **cekhauz** 'armory', **harc** 'beginning of a battle, first skirmish between individual horsemen', **harcap** 'a long braid worn by men in the past', **handel**, **hurtem** 'collectively, wholesale', **hamulec**, **harap** ('hunter's shout, used to subdue dogs at captured game', **huncwot** 'rogue, scoundrel', **hycel** 'not only a city worker but also, figuratively, a rogue, rascal'. Other examples include borrowings from Tatar, such as: **nahajka** 'whip made of braided leather', **puha** 'whip made of twisted linen cord', Turkish, such: **derha** 'horse covering', **hajdamaka**, **kurhan** 'burial mound' and Hungarian, such as: **hajduk** 'Hungarian infantryman', **hejnał** 'song played in camp before dawn', **husarz** 'cavalryman, modern-day hussar'.

Based on the list of words compiled by Walicki in *Upominek…*, it can also be inferred that in the 19th century, two conflicting tendencies in the pronunciation

(and consequently in the spelling) of *γ* emerged, depending on the phonetic environment (*γy* alongside *γ'i*). The use of *γy* is supported by the long-standing presence of this group in the language, while *γ'i* becomes established under the influence of German or French pronunciation.[26] Therefore, Walicki recommends spelling with *γy* for certain rare borrowings, such as: **hydra**, **hymn**, **hymen** 'hymen' alongside newer representations with *γ'i* such as: **hiena**, **hieroglif**, **higiena**, **hiperbola**, **hipokryta**, **hipopotam**, **hipoteka** and **hipoteza**.

4.5. The spelling of non-assimilated *z*

In *Upominek…*, we also find several lexemes confirming the presence of the so-called non-assimilated *z* in written Polish of that time (before stop-plosive consonants), such as **zkąd**, **zkądinąd**, **zpod**, **zponad**, **zpoza**, **ztamtąd** or **ztąd**. This spelling, as noted by Bajerowa, dominated in the first half of the 19th century. Contrary to phonetics, it reflects the etymology (or pseudo-etymology) of the word and appears mainly in the aforementioned examples and in endings such as *-zki*, *-ztwo*. It was only in the second half of the 19th century—following *Uchwała Akademii z dnia 31 października 1891 w sprawie pisowni polskiej* (Polish Orthography Resolution adopted by the Academy on 31 October 1891)—that the use of *-ski* and *-stwo* became standard (with the exceptions of **blizki**, **grzązki**, **nizki**, **slizki**, **wązki**). However, words that caught Walicki's attention continued to be spelled inconsistently. The final victory of *s-* and *z-* in these structures came only at the beginning of the 20th century [Bajerowa 1986: 42–43].

5. The spelling of word-final clusters *-ij-*, *-yj-*[27]

Walicki lists in *Upominek…* loanwords ending in *-ya* after alveolar consonants *c*, *d*, *t*, *s*, *z*, such as: **aluzya**, **asymilacya**, **gieodezya**, **hipokryzya**, **homeopatya**, **iluminacya**, **ilustracya**, **iluzya**, **inteligiencya**, **kolekcya**, **komisya**, **korespondencya**, **misya**, **okazya**, **opozycya**, **procesya**, **sukcesya**, **operacya**, and those ending in *-ia* (after consonants other than those mentioned above): **ewangielia**, **gienealogia**, **gieografia**, **gieologia**, **gieorginia**, **Giermania**, **Hiszpania**. All of these reflect the oldest spelling pattern of the **armia-racya** type, which, according to Bajerowa, persisted in general Polish until the end of the 19th century [Bajerowa 1986: 90–104]. The bisyllabic elements *-yja*, *-ija*, *-ije*, *-yje* eventually took on a monosyllabic form. This final shortening became established in the late

---

26 According to Bajerowa's findings, *Uchwały* of 1891 ultimately recommend spelling in accordance with pronunciation [Bajerowa 1986: 139].

27 In *Upominek…*, Walicki revisits topics previously discussed in *Błędy naszych…*, such as irregularities in the use of the letter *j*, issues with the spelling of capital and lowercase letters, and errors in connected and separate spelling [for more details, see Strawińska 2018: 49–59].

19th and early 20th centuries and was ultimately accepted by the Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1918.[28]

6. The spelling of word-initial *ge*-, *gi*- clusters in foreign loanwords
The author of the guide notes forms in which the consonant *g* in foreign words before *e* or *i* becomes *g'*, as well as those where *g* is represented as *j*: *agient* or *ajent*, *gieografia* or *jeografia*, *gieometrya* or *jeometrya, regient* or *rejent*. In 19th-century general Polish, foreign clusters *ge*- and *gi*- in loanwords were written as *je*-, *ji*- // *g'e*-, *g'i*-[29]. Archaic forms, such as the representation of *g* as *je*: *jeografia*, *jenerał*, *jenealogia* persisted until the end of the 18th century. The old *je*- was gradually replaced by two competing forms, *ge*- // *g'e*-. However, by the end of the 19th century, the variant *g'e*- had not been fully supplanted.

7. Rules for word hyphenation
Walicki dedicated the last three pages of his dictionary to illustrating the rules for hyphenating words in Polish. From examples such as: ***nad-morski***, ***nad-robić***, ***pod-łatać***, ***pod-ochocony***, ***pod-ostrzyć***, ***przed-ramię***, ***przed-ostatni*** or ***wez-brać****,* it follows that "compound words should be divided where their constituent parts meet" [*Upominek* 30]. Although not stated explicitly, Walicki imposes on the users of 19th-century Polish the obligation to separate the prefix from the root if the prefix is native and clearly perceptible. If the prefix ends in a consonant (***nad***-, ***pod***-, ***przed***-, ***roz***-, ***wez***-), Walicki advises against transferring it to the next part of the word or adding the consonant from the following part of the word to the prefix. Conversely, for prefixes ending in a vowel (***na***–, ***po***–, ***prze***-, ***we***-, ***wy***-, ***za***-, ***ze***-), according to the author's recommendations, the consonant from the next part of the word should not be joined to the prefix. Thus, words should be divided as follows: ***na-dmuchać***, ***po-dławić***,

---

28   See also: The issue of the letter *j* and spelling in 19th-century Polish was of interest to scholars such as Joachim Lelewel. He engaged in the discussion on Polish orthography in a series of articles during the early years of the 19th century, even before the publication of *Rozprawy i wnioski o ortografii polskiej* in 1830, and before Alojzy Feliński, who is often credited in scholarly literature with introducing the letter *j (jota)* into Polish, published his own linguistic treatises: "Among the numerous proposals by Feliński, one was adopted, namely the introduction of the letter *j* in place of *i* before a vowel (e.g. *jabłko*, *swoje*) and in place of *y* before a consonant and at the end of a word (*bajka*, *kraj*)" [Jodłowski 1979: 41]. In reality, Alojzy Feliński's work [1816: XCI–CIV] was published much later than Joachim Lelewel's texts on **hooked j** and **elongated j**. For further details on this topic, see: Sokólska 2006: 343–356; 2017: 22–29.

29   It was not until the 20th century that the **ge**- group generally became standard [Bajerowa 1986: 133].

po-dwoić, *po-dzielić*, *prze-dmuchać*, *prze-dojka* 'a cow that has not calved this year but is still milked, usually every other day', *prze-druk*, *prze-dumać*, *we-tknąć*, *wy-tchnąć*, *wy-tnę*, *za-tkać, ze-tknąć się.*

In *Upominek...*, the requirement to separate the root from the prefix also applies to the division of consonant clusters such as: -*ski* and -*cki*. Walicki illustrates the rule that if a word ends in -*ski* or -*cki*, only -*ski* or -*cki*, should be hyphened, without the preceding consonant, with the following examples: *birban-cki*, *braban-cki*, *pań-ski*, *krakow-ski*, *litew-ski*, *lwow-ski*, *warszaw-ski* [*Upominek* 29].

8. Compound and separate spelling

In *Upominek...*, Walicki mandates the connected spelling of lexemes such as: *byleby*, *choćby*, *chociażby*, *coby*, and *niechby*. According to Bajerowa's findings, the rules for compound and separate spelling were not fully standardised by the end of the 19th century. This lack of standardisation led to discrepancies and inconsistencies in written forms.[30] In terms of connected and separate spelling, the 19th-century linguistic norm is only partially similar to today's standards. For example, the particle *by*, was written together with the preceding verb and conjunction (in line with contemporary orthographic rules), but also in constructions with pronouns and adverbs, which is a significant violation of today's norms.

Similarly, in the case of compounds with -*ktokolwiek* and -*że*, the norm (as it is today) is compound spelling. Walicki in *Upominek...* recommends, and even insists on, "writing them as compound words": *cokolwiek*, *gdziekolwiek*, *jakkolwiek*, *jakże*, *kiedykolwiek*, *ktokolwiek*, *także*, *tamże* [*Upominek* 25–27].

According to the author of the guide, prepositional phrases should also be written as compound words, such as: *dojutra*, *nanowo*, *naokoło*,[31] *napowrót*, *nateraz*, *nazawsze*, *oile*, *omało*, *otyle*, *owiele*, *pomęsku*, *pomojemu*, *ponaszemu*, *poosobno*, *posąsiedzku*, *pozłotemu*, *wzamian*, *zbliska*, *zcicha*, *zcudzoziemska*, *zdaleka*, *zdawna*, *zfrancuska*, *zkolei*, *zkretesem*, *zosobna*, *zpańska*, *zruska*, *zwęgierska*, *zzewnątrz*, *zżydowska* and conjunctions like *azatem* [*Upominek* 25–28].

In the 19th century, the spelling of combinations with the particle-pronoun *to* was not yet fully stabilised, allowing for both compound and separate spelling.

---

30 This situation persisted even at the beginning of the 20th century [Bajerowa 1986: 44].

31 Piotr Bąk classifies forms such as: *naokoło* and *z zewnątrz* as secondary prepositions, meaning "prepositions composed of prepositions and other parts of speech" [Bąk 1989: 185].

On this issue, Walicki consistently advocates for the compound spelling of lexemes such as *gdzieto*, *ileżto*, *jakto*, *jużto*, *nadto*, *przeto* [*Upominek* 25–27].

9. The spelling of capital and lowercase letters

Walicki records examples of the use of capital letters in the spelling of names, such as: *Abraham*, *Alojzy*, *Eugieniusz*, *Giertruda*, *Halina*, *Helena*, *Hilary*, *Józef*, *Karol*, *Olgierd*; surnames, such as: *Harasimowicz*, *Hłasko*, *Horbaczewski*, *Horbatowski*, *Kochanowski*, *Kraszewski*; nicknames, such as: *Herman*; epithet, such as: *Łappa*; the names of gods, both in monotheistic religions (*God*), and mythological beings, such as: *Hercules*; dynastic names, such as: *Jagiełło*, *Jagielloński*, *Romanow*, *Radziwiłł*; names of inhabitants of parts of the world, countries, members of nations, races, tribes, such as: *Algier (Algerian)*, *Hebrajczyk (Hebrew)*, *Horwatt (Croat)*, *Mohikan (Mohican)*, *Węgier (Hungarian)*, *Żydówka (Jewess)*; and geographical and local names, such as *Abisynia (Abyssinia)*, *Augustów*, *Asyrya (Assyria)*, *Giermania (Germany)*, *Gródek*, *Halicz (Halych)*, *Hamburg*, *Hawana (Havana)*, *Hiszpania (Spain)*, *Kraków*, *Lwów (Lviv)*, *Podhale*, *Prusy (Prussia)*, *Rosya (Russia)*, *Sahara*, *Tarnów* or *Tomaszów.*

According to Walicki's guidelines, lowercase letters should be used for academic titles and titles of dignity, such as: *ambasador*, *doktor*, *dyrektor*, *hrabia*, *imperator*, *pastor*, *profesor*, *prorektor*, *rektor* or *senator*; names of military personnel, such as: *hajduk*, *hetman*, *husarz* or *huzar*; names of professional roles, such as: *bakałarz*, *konduktor* or *lektor*; individuals representing these doctrines and views, such as: *heretyk*, *nihilista*; names of administrative regions, such as: *województwo*; adjectives derived from the names of countries and cities/towns/villages, such as: *hamburski*, *irkucki*, *jakucki*, *kaliski*, *kaukaski*, *litewski*, *lwowski*, *petersburski*, *polski*, *praski*, *ryski*, *suwalski*, *zaporoski* or *warszawski*; and names of academic disciplines, such as: *algiebra*, *gieodezja*, *gieologia*, *heraldyka*, *historya* or *homiletyka*.

The above examples indicate that the author of *Upominek…* operates with a clearly defined understanding of proper nouns and common nouns, even though he does not explicitly provide definitions for these terms. Remarkably, in this regard, the rules applied by Walicki fully align with today's understanding of these concepts.

Conclusion

In Walicki's approach—revealed not for the first time—lies a deep conviction that language is the most important national value, one that must be cared for in a particularly diligent manner. His efforts to improve the quality

of Polish, as expressed in his guide for printers, are verbalised with unparalleled zeal and often with extreme emotional intensity. This assertion is confirmed by the excerpts from *Przedmowa…* (Preface…) quoted in this article. As a passionate enthusiast and, above all, an extreme purist, Walicki fails to recognize a fundamental principle of the communication process: the fact that a thorough knowledge of the linguistic system alone is often insufficient to describe the mechanisms of effective communication. An understanding of linguistic usage is also necessary. The author, however, with his characteristic nonchalance, overlooks the continuous process of language adaptation to changes occurring outside the system as well [cf. Ciborowska (Strawińska) 2001: 213–225]. The consequences of this—manifested in obvious inconsistencies and even erroneous normative recommendations—can often be found in this 19th-century guide for printers.

Translated by Ewa Kisiel

References

Sources

Walicki Aleksander (1886), *Upominek zecerom od korektora*, Kraków.

Dictionaries

L—Linde Samuel Bogumił (1854–1860), *Słownik języka polskiego*, vol. 1–6, ed. 2, Lwów.
SW—Karłowicz Jan, Kryński Adam, Niedźwiedzki Władysław (1900–1927), *Słownik języka polskiego*, vol. 1–8, Warszawa; tzw. słownik warszawski
SWil—Orgelbrand Maurycy, ed. (1861), *Słownik języka polskiego*, vol. 1–2, Wilno; tzw. słownik wileński.

Literature

Bajerowa Irena (1986), *Polski język ogólny XIX wieku. Stan i ewolucja*, vol. 1: *Ortografia, fonologia z fonetyką, morfologia*, Katowice.
Bąk Piotr (1989), *Gramatyka języka polskiego*, Warszawa.
Bliziński Józef (1888), *Barbaryzmy i dziwolągi językowe*, Kraków.
Bronikowski Ksawery (1848), *Gramatyka języka polskiego podług nowszego układu i wymagań praktyczna*, Paryż.

Ciborowska (Strawińska) Anetta Bogusława (2001), *Uwagi prognostyczne językoznawcy z końca XIX wieku*, in: *Przyszłość języka. Kultura i przyszłość*, ed. Sław Krzemień--Ojak, Białystok, p. 213–225.

Ciborowska (Strawińska) Anetta Bogusława (2002), *O niektórych osobliwościach polszczyzny drugiej połowy XIX wieku (na podstawie "Upominku zecerom od korektora" Aleksandra Walickiego)*, "Białostockie Archiwum Językowe", no. 2, pp. 15–25. DOI: https://doi.org/10.15290/baj.2002.02.02.

Deszkiewicz Jan Nepomucen (1843), *Rozprawy o języku polskim i o jego gramatykach*, Lwów.

Feliński Alojzy (1816), *Czy dobrze używamy liter* i, j, y, *i czy nie można by używać ich lepiej*, in: idem, *Pisma własne i przekładania wierszem*, Warszawa, p. XCI–CIV.

Handke Kwiryna (1993), *Przedmowa*, in: *Region, regionalizm—pojęcia i rzeczywistość*, ed. eadem, Warszawa, p. 7–11.

Jakubowicz Maksymilian (1823–1824), *Gramatyka języka polskiego*, vol. 1–3, Wilno.

Jodłowski Stanisław (1979), *Losy polskiej ortografii*, Warszawa.

Karaś Halina, ed. (2001), *Język polski na Kowieńszczyźnie. Historia. Sytuacja socjologiczna. Cechy językowe*, Warszawa–Wilno.

Karłowicz Jan (pub. 1984), *Podręcznik czystej polszczyzny dla Litwinów i Petersburszczan*, ed. around 1882, Wrocław.

Klemensiewicz Zenon (1981), *Historia języka polskiego*, Warszawa.

Koneczna Halina (1965), *Charakterystyka fonetyczna języka polskiego*, Warszawa.

Kopczyński Onufry (1778–1785), *Gramatyka dla szkół narodowych*, Warszawa.

Kopczyński Onufry (1806), *Poprawa błędów w ustnej i pisanej mowie polskiej*, Warszawa.

Kortowicz Edward S. (1891), *Oczyściciel mowy polskiej czyli słownik obcosłów składający się blisko z 10 000 wyrazów i wyrażeń z obcych mów utworzonych a w piśmie i w mowie polskiej niepotrzebnie używanych, oraz z wyrazów gminnych przestarzałych i ziemszczyzn w różnych okolicach Polski używanych z wysłowieniem i objaśnieniem polskiem ułożony dla lepszego wyrażania się*, Poznań.

Kurzowa Zofia (1993a), *Język polski Wileńszczyzny i kresów północno-wschodnich XVI–XX w.*, Warszawa–Kraków.

Kurzowa Zofia (1993b), *O mowie Polaków na Kresach Wschodnich*, Kraków.

Łada-Łazowski Eugeniusz (1865), *Niemieckie, francuskie i błędne sposoby mówienia zebrane z książek, gazet i mowy potocznej*, Lwów.

Łętowski Aleksander (1915), *Błędy nasze. Rzecz o czystości języka polskiego na Litwie*, Wilno.

Majkowska Aneta (2015), *Współczesna norma ortoepiczna. Wokalizm*, "Międzynarodowe Studia Społeczno-Humanistyczne", no. 1, p. 141–150.

Małecki Antoni (1863), *Gramatyka języka polskiego*, Lwów.

Markowski Andrzej (2017), *Polityka językowa a kultura języka*, "Poradnik Językowy", no. 2, p. 25–33.

Morzycki Antoni (1857), *Rys gramatyki języka polskiego*, Warszawa.

Mroziński Józef (1882), *Pierwsze zasady gramatyki języka polskiego*, Warszawa.

Muczkowski Józef (1836), *Gramatyka języka polskiego*, Kraków.

Polański Kazimierz, ed. (1999), *Encyklopedia językoznawstwa ogólnego*, ed. 2, Wrocław.

Rzepka Wojciech Ryszard (1993), *Status regionalizmów w polszczyźnie XIX wieku*, in: *Region i regionalizm—pojęcia i rzeczywistość*, ed. Kwiryna Handke, Warszawa, p. 132–150.

Sierakowski Wacław (1795), *Sztuka muzyki dla młodzieży krajowej*, Kraków.

Skobel Fryderyk (1871–1877), *O skażeniu języka polskiego w dziennikach i mowie potocznej, osobliwie w Galicji*, vol. 1–3, Kraków.

Sokólska Urszula (2010), *O języku "Poradnika dla zbierających rzeczy ludowe" Jana Karłowicza słów kilka*, in: *Dobra rada nie zawada. Rady, porady, poradniki w języku, literaturze i kulturze*, ed. Bogumiła Staniów, Waldemar Żarski, Koszalin 2010 p. 141–153.

Sokólska Urszula (2013), *"Przyczynki do projektu wielkiego słownika polskiego" Jana Karłowicza jako źródło wiedzy o warsztacie leksykografa końca XIX wieku*, "Prace Filologiczne", vol. 44, p. 339–354.

Sokólska Urszula (2017), *"O, mowo polska, ty ziele rodzime". Wokół refleksji nad kształtem polszczyzny*, Białystok.

Strawińska Anetta Bogusława (2006), *Dziewiętnastowieczne rozstrzygnięcia ortograficzne na podstawie "poradnika dla drukarzy" Aleksandra Walickiego*, "Białostockie Archiwum Językowe", no. 6, p. 141–151. DOI: https://doi.org/10.15290/baj.2006.06.11.

Strawińska Anetta Bogusława (2018), *Aleksander Walicki i Aleksander Łętowski o stanie polszczyzny północnokresowej. Ortografia—fonetyka zagadnienia gramatyczne*, Białystok.

Strawińska Anetta Bogusława (2022), *Leksyka północnokresowa jako element deskrypcji zagadnień ortoepicznych w poradnikach Aleksandra Walickiego i Aleksandra Łętowskiego*, Białystok.

Suchecki Henryk (1853), *Zwięzła gramatyka polska*, Lwów.

Suchorowski Michał (1862), *Teoretyczno-praktyczna nauka języka polskiego*, Lwów.

Szczerbowicz-Wieczór Ludomir (1881), *O skażeniu obecnem języka polskiego w prasie*, Kraków.

Szylarski Walenty (1770), *Początki nauk dla narodowej młodzieży, to jest Grammatyka języka polskiego ucząca, a tym samym pojęcie obcych języków, jako łacińskiego, francuskiego, włoskiego i innych ułatwiająca*, Lwów.

Umińska-Tytoń Elżbieta (2018), *Postrzeganie gwary ludowej w XIX wieku*, "Rozprawy Komisji Językoznawczej Łódzkiego Towarzystwa Naukowego", vol. 45, p. 195–207.

Walczak Bogdan (1982), *Z zagadnień etymologizacji zapożyczeń romańskich w języku polskim*, in: *Język, teoria, dydaktyka. Materiały V Konferencji Młodych Językoznawców*, ed. Marcin Preyzner, Kielce, p. 172–194.

Walczak Bogdan (1995), *Przegląd kryteriów poprawności językowej*, „Poradnik Językowy", no. 9–10, p. 1–16.

Walczak Bogdan (1999), *Zapożyczenia leksykalne: teoria i metodologia badań*, in: *Polszczyzna północno-wschodnia 2*, ed. Bogusław Nowowiejski, Białystok, p. 69–107.

Walicki Aleksander (ed. 1: 1876, ed. 2: 1879, ed. 3: 1886), *Błędy nasze w mowie i piśmie ku szkodzie języka popełniane oraz prowincjonalizmy*, Kraków–Warszawa.

Żochowski Felis (1852), *Mownia języka polskiego*, Warszawa.

Websites

https://wsjp.pl/haslo/podglad/78254/ortoepia/5196217/nauka-o-poprawnosci-jezykowej [accessed on 25 June 2023].

https://sjp.pwn.pl/slowniki/ortoepia.html [accessed on 26 June 2023].

https://www.enciklopedija.hr/clanak/ortoepija [accessed on 13 October 2019].

https://wordcat-org.translate.goog/identities/lccn-n2020021998/ [accessed on 26 June 2023].

prof. Ph.D. Urszula Sokólska—Department of Stylistics and Anthropological Linguistics, Faculty of Philology, Faculty of Philology, University of Bialystok. Research interests: history of the Polish language, the main periods of Middle and New Poland, especially regarding the issues of the idiosyncratic language and the borderland Polish language, old and new, as well as the language of the press, the language of literary reportage, the linguistic structure of guides and forgotten dictionaries and treatises discussed in lexicography, lexicology and orthoepy.

Ph.D. Anetta Bogusława Strawińska—Department of Stylistics and Anthropological Linguistics, Faculty of Philology, Faculty of Philology, University of Bialystok. Research interests: Polish borderland language of the late 19th and early 20th century in the context of defensive purism, glamorous creationism, manifestations of globalization and glocalization tendencies in the Polish language in the context of borrowings from English, self-presentation mechanisms in contemporary (pop) culture, personal branding and self-promotion in public space, changes in Polish styles at the turn of the 20th and 21st centuries and communication models in social media.