

Anetta Bogusława Strawińska

University of Białystok

Poland

e-mail: a.strawinska@uwb.edu.pl

ORCID: 0000-0001-8401-3068

Anna Sakowicz

University of Białystok

Poland

e-mail: a.sakowicz@uwb.edu.pl

ORCID: 0000-0001-5685-6076

DEFENSIVE PURISM IN THE NORTH-EASTERN BORDERLANDS. SELECTED ISSUES

Abstract. The aim of the article is to illustrate, on the basis of selected texts of a correctness nature, the specificity of individual linguistic awareness. The subject of the analysis are *Our Mistakes in Speech and Writing Committed and Provincialisms* by Aleksander Walicki and *Paznau prądu* – a text attributed to Walicki. The article adopts Maćkowiak’s original research method, i.e. a descriptive reconstruction of linguistic awareness was used, which allows for reflection on language and its use combined with the analysis of one’s own individual methods of linguistic processing. The term “purism” in relation to the Polish language in the north-eastern borderlands manifests itself in the “purification of speech” from specific manifestations of foreignness, mainly through eliminatory procedures. This type of attitude of Polish users towards the language in relation to the north-eastern borderlands is referred to as “defensive purism”. Analysed writings represent engaged, charged writing, often exposing the writer’s individual position towards the linguistic and cultural phenomena discussed. The subject describing the linguistic and cultural reality in the north-eastern borderlands as a purist-rigorous stands guard over the preservation of Polish distinctiveness, and treats Polishness symbolically as a “defense dam” against the influence of foreign cultures and languages.

Keywords: defensive purism, linguistic awareness, national identity, northern borderland language guides, emotionalism.

The issue introduced in the title is a microstructure of *linguistic awareness*, which is a rudimentary term in today’s discourse on the condition and shape of language. The texts being analysed, i.e. *Błędy nasze w mowie i piśmie popełniane oraz prowincjonalizmy* by Aleksander Walicki (1st ed., Warsaw 1876; 2nd ed., Warsaw–Kraków 1879; 3rd ed., Warsaw–

Kraków 1886; hereinafter: Wal. 1886) and *Paznau Prawdū* (Vilnius 1906; hereinafter: PP 1906) – a poeticized dialogue attributed to Aleksander Walicki.¹ Although the titles of the quoted texts in no way suggest that the area of interest is the North-Eastern Borderland,² Aleksander Walicki dispels any doubts in his preface to the 1st ed. of *Błędów naszych*. The area of his linguistic interests is clearly defined: “The most abundant material was provided to me by Lithuania, as my land of origin” (Pol. “Najobfitszego materiału dostarczyła mi Litwa, jako strona moja rodzinna” – original Polish will be provided for source documents; Wal. 1886: XVII). Whereas PP 1906 begins with the words: “Wioz Pranuk som popa na stanciu Zasłauje”³ (Pp 1906: 1). Zasławie near Minsk in Belarus is one of the points on the private railway line built by Karl Fiodorowicz von Meck (originally belonging to the von Meck family, nationalized at the end of the 19th century), which connected the ports on the Baltic Sea with left-bank Ukraine; it connected the Libavo-Koshedar road with the Landvarovo-Romenskaya railway line.⁴ The main lines of the newly designed road were built in the years 1872–1901. The line ran through the territories of Courland, Vilnius, Kaunas, Minsk, Mogilev, Chernihiv, and Poltava. The Libavo-Romenskaya railway line was run through the city in 1873. In the text, the term Eastern Borderlands (Pol. *Kresy Wschodnie*) is used following the nomenclature used in Polish linguistic research.

The OBJECTIVE of the speech is to characterize the linguistic awareness in the North-Eastern Borderlands at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries on the basis of selected texts representing activist writing, emotionally loaded, often exposing the individual attitude of the writer towards the discussed cultural and linguistic phenomena.

The concept of *linguistic awareness* (Pol. *świadomość językowa*) is often associated with criticism of reductionism in linguistics and the development of the so-called external linguistics (cf. Maćkowiak 2011: 29). Awareness, to invoke Zbigniew Koloch, “is an ontological category [...], it is also a cognitive category, because language enables cognition, and thinking outside language is impossible” (1995). In the *Encyklopedia językoznawstwa ogólnego* (Encyclopedia of General Linguistics) edited by Kazimierz Polański, the term *linguistic awareness* is defined as “the ability to formulate judgements about linguistic expressions (e.g. about their correctness or stylistic values) and about the relations between them (such as synonymy, contradiction). The characteristics of each language user are developed to varying degrees.” (1993: 590, hereinafter: EJO). In the *EOJ*, *Linguistic awareness is juxtaposed with the concept of linguistic intuition, which*

means “linguistic knowledge characterizing each user and allowing them to give an opinion on such aspects of statements as their correctness [...] or incorrectness (non-grammaticality), meaningfulness and nonsense, synonymousness, paraphrasability” (1993: 291). In the theory of transformative-generative grammar, *linguistic intuition* is treated on an equal footing with *linguistic competence*. Depending on the research approach, the term *language competence* can be understood in different ways. Ferdinand de Saussure’s distinction between language (*langue*) as the social side of speech (*langage*) and speaking (*parole*), i.e. its individual manifestation, resulted in the works of Naom Chomsky, who contrasted *linguistic competence* with *linguistic performance* – the specific implementation of competence in an individual act of speech. (1982: 15). Narrowly understood *linguistic competence* is, in other words, “the ability of an adult user of a language to generate and understand statements in a given language or a latent, not fully conscious linguistic knowledge” (Geben 2003: 18). Dell Hathaway Hymes introduced a broader concept, namely *communication competence*, which included the social context of the act of interpersonal communication, i.e. the sender and recipient and the social situation in which this process takes place (1972: 269–293). In later definitions, the analysed term was supplemented with a cultural context. According to Elżbieta Sękowska, “communicative competence consists of cultural knowledge relating to the realities of the civilizational background in which a specific language is used, including knowledge of the rules of communication and a rich repertoire of forms developed by a given community (the so-called cultural competence) and the wealth of human life experiences. An important component of communication competence is the ability to “switch language registers”, i.e. use the appropriate language variant depending on the type of communication situation” (1996: 8). Linguistic awareness is a component of communication competence. Stanisław Gajda (see 1987: 581–592) emphasizes that linguistic awareness can be treated as: a reflection of the actual use of language (based on a linguistic sense – the imagined norm of Polish language users) and a mechanism regulating linguistic behavior (the customary norm). Therefore, linguistic awareness consists of conscious or unconscious patterns, i.e. norms, stereotypes and images, linguistic behaviour, shaped on the basis of previous experiences or received fully formed from one’s environment (Dubisz ed. 1999: 70–71).

Tadeusz Zgółka, in order to unify the understanding of the concept of linguistic awareness, proposes a hierarchical order of its layers. The researcher lists three of its important components. The first is *linguistic competence*, i.e. competence “specific, characteristic of a specific ethnic

language” in contrast to the universal matrix, “which lies at the basis of all natural languages” (linguistic universals), (more: 1996: 13–19). *Language competence* is expressed in an ability to create grammatically correct sentences, but it is not enough in a communicative situation” (Perużyńska 2005: 2017). In that situation it is necessary to know the rules of “the use of language in various situations created by a given social community” (Skudrzykowa, Urban 2000: 86). This knowledge is *communicative competence*, otherwise known as *sociolinguistic competence* (see Skudrzykowa, Urban 2000: 86–87. Communication competence should be seen as directly related to the ability to adapt the style of speech to the communication situation, i.e. “switching/tuning registers” (Perużyńska 2005: 217). The last component of *linguistic awareness* is a *linguistic sense*, i.e. the “private” (using the terminology of T. Zgółka) knowledge of language “revealed in sensitivity to the beauty of the word and the correct use of it” (Perużyńska 2005: 218).

To generalize, linguistic awareness – to invoke Andrzej Markowski’s research – is a relatively permanent set of judgements about language and the “views on language that are characteristic of a person or prevail in a certain environment or social group” (2008: 123–124). They can be either purely intuitive or supported by knowledge of the language.

Both in linguistic and in psycho-pedagogical literature, the term *linguistic awareness* is often identified with such terms as “metalinguage,” “metalinguistic abilities,” “metalinguistic awareness,” “linguistic meta-consciousness,” or “linguistic knowledge” (cf. Kurcz 2011: 40). Jasone Cenoz also proposes treating these terms interchangeably in the Preface to Vol. 6 of the British Encyclopedia of Language and Education (2008: 1).

In turn, Marian Bugajski, distinguishes two concepts of linguistic awareness (in Pol. *świadomość językowa* as opposed to *świadomość lingwistyczna*), the latter of which he understands as “knowledge of the principles of the construction and development of language and the rules of using it. This is both the knowledge of the system and the common and codified standard. Therefore, professional linguists and all those who have linguistic education will be characterized by [this form of] linguistic awareness” (2006: 47, 48). Therefore, it can be concluded that this aspect of linguistic awareness is an element of professional awareness, as opposed to the one which is largely shaped by a common understanding of the world, i.e. involves a significant amount of intuitive knowledge.

Antoni Kiklewicz, on the other hand, points to the existence of two types of linguistic consciousness: individual, including a certain subset of phenomena reflected in the conceptual category of the individual (e.g.: a child stereo-

typically defines the lexeme mother as “an adult who gave birth to a child”), and collective, corresponding to general, collective knowledge about language (Kuszek 2012: 275).

The various definitions of linguistic awareness used in Polish academic discourse are analysed from various perspectives. Polish subject literature lists five types linguistic awareness: normative, descriptive-recording, psycholinguistic, sociolinguistic, and cultural-anthropological (Maćkowiak 2011: 29–42). *Linguistic awareness* has been a widely used concept in English linguistics since the 80’s alongside “holistic” tendencies based on “task-basket approach to language”, opposing narrow formalist methodologies (Carter 2003: 64–65). According to Brian Tomlison, language consciousness is dynamic and intuitive; it is developed gradually (2003: 251–259). The researcher’s findings show that the analysed concept has a multi-layered structure; it is overlaid with the so-called Critical Language Awareness (CLA), focusing on the relationship between language and its social context, leading to the emergence of awareness of the ways in which language represents the world, reflects and constructs power relations (2003: 252). Critical linguistic awareness makes it possible to recognize that “the use of language is not neutral, but is always part of the social struggle, emphasizing the importance of (...) exploring the ways in which language can simultaneously hide and reveal the social and ideological nature of all texts” (Carter 2003: 64).

According to the findings of Krzysztof Maćkowiak, “the reconstruction of language awareness is sometimes dictated by descriptive (...), explanatory (the reconstructed state of affairs allows for a better understanding of other phenomena) or predictive (the diagnosis creates the basis for corrective procedures or forecasting for the future) goals” (2011: 42).

Maćkowiak’s classic method of descriptive and registering reconstruction of linguistic consciousness was used in the presented analysis of the components of individual linguistic consciousness understood as an “act of tension and attention” (Didier 2006) and “mental ability to receive and understand” (Olechnicki 1997).

The term *defensive purism* used in the title of the paper (Nowowiejski 1997a: 161–170, Nowowiejski 1997b: 269–276) in relation to the north-eastern borderlands manifests itself in the “cleansing of speech” from all foreign elements, often through radical elimination measures.⁵ The emergence of purist attitudes is favoured by a state of threat to national and linguistic existence. In Poland, they are the legacy of the period of partitions, when protecting the native language was one of the essential aspects of the struggle for the survival of the nation (see more: Dubisz 1999: 10). In this con-

text, purism should be treated as a defensive reaction (Nowowiejski 1997a: 161–170). It is based on the broadly understood desire for self-preservation, striving for the purity of the language, mainly by removing foreign, and therefore unnecessary, elements from it. Therefore, it should be assumed that purism is only a modifying effort. Purism understood as an “exaggerated concern for the purity and correctness of language” is characterized by certain deductiveness. The overarching thesis, i.e. the pursuit of linguistic rigour, which determines the direction of inference, evaluation and assessment, is expressed by the slogan: “linguistic reality is wrong – it needs to be fixed” (more: Buttler, Kurkowska, Satkiewicz 1986: 70–76). The renewal process most often consists in removing elements of foreign origin, or those considered as such, from the Polish language and replacing them with native equivalents.

Two diametrically opposed basic trends can be distinguished among the purist attitudes:

1. rationalized, moderate – using rational argumentation (represented, for example, by Jan Śniadecki);
2. dogmatic, extreme – coming from an emotional source, mainly the belief that language is a value that should be cared for and defended by everyone against developing in the wrong direction (implemented, among others, by Kajetan Koźmian or Fryderyk Skobel).⁶

The typology of *linguistic purism* has stabilized in works on the history and culture of language. Three types are distinguished:

1. nationalist purism⁷ accepts only native language elements and purist-nationalists aim to defend the language against new borrowings; furthermore: they often remove socially approved foreign loans from the language, disqualifying them for their origin;⁸
2. traditionalist purism recognizes only such ways of speaking and writing as are based on traditional (historic) patterns;⁹
3. elite purism, which identifies the “purity of language” with compatibility with the language of one specific social group – the elite; caring for language purity in this case consists in preventing lexemes or phrases which are characteristic of other varieties of the language, e.g. professional, official, expressive youth phrases, from being used in general Polish.¹⁰

Błędy nasze... and *Paznau praidu* are a living representation of extreme dogmatic purism, in the latter source even ultra-radical or militant. In each of the texts, the author champions the preservation of Polish cultural and linguistic distinctiveness in the borderland region and treats Polishness symbolically as a “defensive bulwark” against the influences of foreign cultures and languages, especially against deliberate Russification, which

had significantly influenced the culture of the inhabitants of the former Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The Russification of Lithuania and Belarus was brutally carried out by Mikhail “Vyeshatiel” [“the hanger”] Muravyov.¹¹ During his rule, the Russian language was introduced into the administration, the judiciary, and education. Polish schools were closed or converted to Russian ones with a ban on the use of the Polish language aimed to weaken the Polish national identity. The educational system was remodelled to promote Russian history, culture, and values. Polish textbooks were replaced with Russian ones, and Polish teachers were often replaced by Russians. The tsarist regime promoted Orthodoxy at the expense of Catholicism, which was the dominant religion in Poland. Catholic churches were being closed or transformed into Orthodox ones under the Moscow Patriarchate. Rusification also involved art. Many Polish literary, musical, and artistic works were censored or banned and artists were forced to create in the Russian spirit. The main purpose of Russification was to introduce Russian social norms. Poles were forced to adopt Russian customs and traditions. The tsarist regime treated Lithuania, a north-western country (cf. Sawaniewska-Mochowa 1990: 6) as ancient Russian lands (Pogóg-Malinowski 1953: 8) and tried at all costs to destroy even the smallest traces of Polishness. Therefore, the main goal of Russification was to create a unified empire in which all citizens (Poles, Lithuanians, Belarusians) would use the Russian language and adhere to Russian values. Poles, with their strong sense of national and cultural identity, posed a powerful threat to this vision. This is attested to by numerous publications,¹² a torrent of which emerged especially after the defeat of the January Uprising. Both discussed texts fit into the general trend of the post-uprising era. The list of several dozen purist texts is opened by a brochure by O. Kopczyński, *O Poprawie Błędów w Ustnej i Pisanej Mowie Polskiej* from 1803. In addition to Aleksander Walicki, the following authors came to the defence of the Polish language in the second half of the 19th century: E. Łada-Łazowski, *Niemieckie, francuskie i błędne sposoby mówienia zebrane z książek, gazet i mowy potocznej*, Lviv 1865; F. Skobel, *O skażeniu języka polskiego w dziennikach i mowie potocznej, osobliwie w Galicji*, t. I–III, Kraków 1871–1877; J. Karłowicz, *Podręcznik czystej polszczyzny dla Litwinów i Petersburszczan*, ed. around 1882, published in Wrocław 1984; L. Szczerbowicz-Wieczór, *O skażeniu obecnem języka polskiego w prasie*, Kraków 1881; J. Bliziński, *Barbaryzmy i dziwolągi językowe*, Kraków 1888; E. S. Kortowicz, *Oczyściciel mowy polskiej czyli słownik obcośłów 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 1891.

The beginning of the 20th century sees the publication of works by: A. Krasnowolski, *Najpospolitsze błędy językowe zdarzające się w mowie i piśmie polskim*, Warsaw 1903; A. Passendorfer, *Błędy językowe młodzieży szkolnej*, Lviv 1902; expanded edition: *Błędy językowe*, Lviv 1904; J. Karłowicz, L. Czarkowski, *Słowniczek najpospolitszych rusycyzmów*, Vilnius 1909. The issues of the purity and correctness of the Polish language in the first half of the 20th century were also taken up by A. Brückner¹³ and A. A. Kryński¹⁴. The list of authors dealing with language counselling can be supplemented with the names: T. Massalski, H. Suchecki, K. Mecherzyński, and others “who ran language columns in magazines or collected linguistic data, handing it to someone else for analysis” (see Umińska-Tytoń 2001: 126).

All the authors of dissertations from the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, who represented various trades and professions,¹⁵ treated their activities as an expression of patriotism dictated by “love and adoration of the Polish language” (Wal. 1886: XIX) and the need to defend it when it was under real threat from invaders. Both presented texts are an illustration of cultural and linguistic mechanisms recorded by patriotic enthusiasts, who were not indifferent to the fate of the besieged nation. Language and religion are values, symbols of group membership, carriers of tradition, priceless treasures; the foundation of national existence, “a link that enables (...) the preservation of national distinctiveness, a defensive bulwark” (more: Strawińska 2018).

A. Walicki presents a *purist* attitude in the traditional lexicographic-encyclopediaic sense.¹⁶ It manifests as “cleansing speech” of specific linguistic manifestations of foreignness, mainly through elimination. The purist is most often compared to a surgeon, who will not hesitate to make drastic cuts to even large parts of the “linguistic organism” in order to completely cure it. The language surgeon considers such decisive “use of the scalpel” to be justified, even if, as a result, it leads to the inhibition of language development. Walicki is undoubtedly such a surgeon who cuts out the *uglies* (Pol. *brzydoty*) from northern borderland Polish, which threatened its further existence (Wal. 1886: 188), *cudackie dziwolągi* (Wal. 1886: 257), *intruzy siejące zgorzsenie* (Wal. 1886: 324). A. Walicki considers borrowings from the Russian language to be particularly blatant linguistic offences, “conditioned by the political and economic dependence of part of the Polish lands on Russia and the strong Russification campaign, especially in the post-

uprising era" (see Karaś 193: 126–151, 1996). He also denounces the presence of numerous borrowings from Belarusian, Lithuanian, Ukrainian, German, Latin, Greek, French and Italian, less often from Czech, Hungarian, Yiddish, as well as Orientalisms and Anglicisms in the northern borderland Polish of the late nineteenth century (Karaś 1993: 126).

According to A. Walicki, external and political factors affect the condition of the national language, but they do not determine the pace of its development or extermination. The situation of the language is decided by its speakers. The further fate of the Polish language in the north-eastern borderlands depended on their attitudes. Therefore, A. Walicki, through his corrective publications,¹⁷ tries to promote, above all, caring for the Polish language and for its correctness and efficiency. In this paper, we refrain from conducting an analysis of normative suggestions, from irregularities in spelling and phonetic errors, through word-formation and inflectional departures from the norm, to syntactic defects contained in the A. Walicki's book. This has already been published in book form (Strawińska 2018). We will focus on generalized theses contained in the preface and comments to individual entries. The elements of individual linguistic awareness presented in the prefaces and comments contained in *Błędy Nasze...* include:

1. the use of explicit colloquial lexemes, especially of an evaluational-emotional character, mainly:
 - 1.1. pejorative, e.g.: *dziki dysonans* (wild dissonance), *ohydne/cudackie/wstrętne wyrażenie* (abominable/weird/disgusting expression; Wal. 1886), *potworny barbaryzm, szpetny błąd, szkaradny zwyczaj, szkaradztwo, szkodnik* ("monstrous barbarism", "ugly mistake", "ugly habit", "ugliness", "pest"; Wal. 1886: 131, 324, 326),
 - 1.2. dismissive, e.g.: *bezsensowność, błaznowanie, ciemnota, małpowanie, mędrkowanie* ("senselessness", "clowning", "backwardness", "parroting", "quibbling"; Wal. 1886),
 - 1.3. humorous, e.g.: "masło maślane" (an idiom for a tautology), "w kark go!, tj. intruza" (which can be loosely translated as "have at him, the intruder"; Wal. 1886);
2. rhetorical forms of persuasion (e.g. in the form of swearwords, rhetorical questions, or discussions with a hypothetical interlocutor):
 - 2.1. rhetorical questions:

ten wyraz zgola nam niepotrzebny, skoro mamy własne: zapal, polot, natchnienie. (...) Używając wyrazu werwa, nic wcale innego nie powiemy, jak używszy wyrazu zapal. Po cóż więc te łamańce i pstrokaczna? ("we do not need this word at all, since we have our own: zeal, fervour, inspiration. (...) Using the word werwa, we

will not say anything else than using the word zeal. So why have this garish mess?"; Wal. 1886: 403, *werwa*), *Czemuż tak wielką wartość przywiązując do czystego mówienia obcemi językami, tak mało dbacie o czystość mowy ojczystej?* ("Why care so little about the purity of our native language and attach so much value to speaking well in foreign languages?"; Wal. 1886: XIV,

2.2. discussion with a hypothetical interlocutor

*Od kilku lat wyraz ten w druku ukazać się zaczął. Kto go pierwszy do języka naszego gwałtem wciągnął, tego nie wiem, ale niech mu tego Pan Bóg nie pamięta, równie niech też będzie miłosierny nad tymi, co ten wyraz bezmyślnie powtarzają. Kiedym go po raz pierwszy w druku spotkał, uderzony zostałem tą dziwną figurą i zabrałem się gorliwie do wynalezienia jego źródła. Com się nad tem namozolił, to Bóg jeden wie tylko! (...) Niemcy go sobie utworzyli ze swego słowa *staffiren*. I niech im to będzie na zdrowie. Ale po jakiego licha my się tym wyrazem jak z czymś osobliwym nosimy, – tego, dalibóg, nie pojmuję! I gdybyż przynajmniej wyraz ten choć na odrobinę mowę naszą wzbogacał, przynosząc nazwę nowej rzeczy, nowemu pojęciu. Gdzie tam! Toż po prostu znaczy nasze otoczenie, to wszystko co przedmiot otacza dla uwydatnienia go, dla ozdoby. Pocóż więc to nadymanie się, kiedy wcale nie ma czego? (...) Wartoby śmieszności tej zaniechać* ("This word has been appearing in print for several years now. I do not know who was the first to drag it into our language, but let God not remember his evil deed and let Him be likewise merciful to those who thoughtlessly repeat this word. When I first saw it in print, I was struck by this bizarre figure and set about finding its source. God only knows the effort it took! (...) The Germans had created it from their word *staffiren*. And all the better for them. But why on Earth do we treat this expression as something exceptional, – by God, I do not understand! And if only this word enriched our speech even a little, bringing the name of a new thing, a new concept. Not at all! It simply means the same as *surroundings*, everything that surrounds the object to emphasize it, for decoration. So why all the posing when there is nothing to show off? (...) It would be better to abandon this silliness."; Wal. 354–355, *stafaż*);

3. combining journalistic and academic style

The academic style has the authors refer to the various "linguistic derailments" in medical terms, such as: *zaraza językowa*, *skażenie języka*, *chorobliwa mania zamięłowania do szpetot* (linguistic contagion,

tongue contamination, a morbid fascination with ugliness). As a remedy, A. Walicki recommends: *cleansing* the Polish language or “disinfecting the tongue thoroughly in order to remove all ugliness” (Pol. *dezynfekowanie staranne języka w celu usunięcia wszelkiej szpetoty*; Wal. 1886);

4. combining an official speech act with an unofficial or semi-official one
The tone of the authors’ commentary takes on an emotional character, especially when it comes to revealing the sources and causes of “disgrace” to the national language, both in its spoken and written versions. This is confirmed, for example, by A. Walicki’s following statement: “Oto mamy wyrób partactwa językowego. Ma to [maestrya – A.S.] niby oznaczać *mistrzostwo*, ponieważ *maestro* po włosku, – znaczy: *mistrz*. Widocznie są ludzie usiłujący piękny nasz język skazać na pozostanie śmietniskiem powszechnym, skoro wszelkie rupiecie i łachmany weń wrzucają” (“Here we have a product of linguistic botchery. This [maestrya – A.S.] is supposed to mean mastery, because maestro in Italian means master. Apparently, there are people who would condemn our beautiful language to become a common garbage dump, since they throw all sort of junk into it.”; Wal. 1886: 183, *maestrya*);
5. satire¹⁸
“Na Litwie powszechnie nazywają włościanina, chłopą, oraz każdego służącego – *człowiekiem*. Jest to zwyczaj zapożyczony od Rosjan (...). Rosjanie nie tylko mówiąc o służącym tak go nazywają, lecz nawet tak go wołają (...)” (“In Lithuania, it is common to call a farmer, peasant, and every servant – man. This is a custom borrowed from the Russians (...). The Russians not only call him that when they talk about the servant, but they even call him that [when speaking to him]”; Wal. 1886: 48–49, *człowiek*);
6. irony
“Niewiele podobno da się znaleźć wyborów tak niedołęznego partactwa, jak wyraz wyżej przytoczony [comment on the word *udotowanie* – endowment, dowry – A.S.]. Doprawdy trudno uwierzyć, żeby kto chociażby dla żartu ośmielił się coś podobnego powiedzieć. Śnać w sprawie kaleczenia mowy rodzinnej bezwstyd nie zna granic. (...) I to nie tylko w mowie ustnej się spotyka, lecz partacze i w druku to uwiecznić pragną. Oby to im ku wiecznej posłużyło chwale” (“Apparently, few examples can be found of such infirm botchery as the word quoted above. It is indeed hard to believe that anyone would dare to say something like that even for a joke. But it would seem that there is no limit to shamelessness in mutilating one’s mother tongue. (...) And it is not only used

in speech, but the botchers would see it immortalised in writing as well. More power to them.”; Wal. 1886: 392–393);

7. biblical style

A. Walicki, assessing northern borderland Polish, repeatedly refers to biblical stylistics, e.g.: “Dzięki Bogu, nie upadliśmy jeszcze tak nisko, żebyśmy rozmyślnie niszczyli cenne pamiątki. Owszem, wszędzie widać krzątanie się około przedmiotów na to zasługujących. Jeżeli jednak pod względem złej woli na zarzut nie zasługujemy, to wszakże lekceważeniem srodze grzeszymy, i to w rzeczach wartości pierwszorzędnej (‘‘Thank God, we have not yet fallen so low as to deliberately destroy valuable heritage. Yes, everywhere you can see the bustling around objects deserving of it. However, if we do not deserve to be accused of bad will, we sin gravely with disregard, and in matters of primary value.”; Wal. 1886: VII).

The borderland purist equates language and nation. Language is treated as a mirror in which the whole “national life” is reflected. And a nation without language cannot function – it is mute. These assumptions correspond to the theses presented by the Herder-Fichte trend in German sociolinguistic thought (cf. Fichte 1808: 141–144, Edwards 1985: 17). Although Walicki makes no direct reference to specific names or terminology associated with this concept, such a comparison comes up naturally. They are triggered by a belief in the symbolic function of language, which is the “essence” of the referenced work. For Walicki, language is synonymous with strength, which allowed Poles living in the north-eastern borderlands to preserve their national character, their own distinctiveness and independence. Walicki describes language as the carrier of tradition, which allows generations to pass on “their entire spiritual being” to their descendants (Wal. 1886: IV). He himself embodied such a model of life. He presented this attitude not only in his writing or proofreading work, but also in his social and private life. One of the editions of *Błędy nasze...* is adorned with this author’s dedication:

“DZIECIOM MOIM:

Atoninie, Józefowi i Zygmunto-
wi
książkę tę przypisuję z życzeniem, aby
miłość ku mowie ojczystej rozniecali
w sobie i pielęgnowali
Petersburg

22 listopada 1878 roku”. (‘‘TO MY CHILDREN: Atonina, Józef and Zygmunt, I dedicate this book with the wish that love for their mother tongue be ignited and nurtured within them. Petersburg, November 22, 1878.”

This entry shows that by 1878 Aleksander Walicki had three children: a daughter, Antonina and two sons: Józef and Zygmunt. This information is confirmed by Geni.pl, an online genealogical portal with global reach.¹⁹

*

* *

The SW definitions of “purism” show that at the beginning of the twentieth century, the word, which had hitherto been neutral, took on a pejorative meaning and is now identified with excessive purity in speech and strict adherence to the rules. SW states that *purism* is characterized by “strict observance of rules,” especially in speech, and a *purist* is not just “one who diligently observes the purity of language,” but “rigorous in religion, morality, and rules” (SW: 437).²⁰

Paznau praidu completes these definitions. The source material is dated to 1904 and printed in the Edmund Nowicki Printing House in Vilnius in 1906. The text is stylized as a biblical parable about the symbolic conversion of a lower rank Orthodox priest who renounced the “schism,”²¹ “worshipped the Mother of God / and thanks to her learned the truth, / Through prayer to her became a Catholic” (Pol. “czcił matkę Bożą²² / i dzięki Jej pomocy poznał prawdę, / Za jej pośrednictwem modlitewnym stał się katolikiem”):

One day a peasant (*muzhik*²³) named Franciszek (*Pranuk*) was taking the priest to the “Zasławie” railway station. The clergyman was going to the “governorate city” to the “palace” of his superior bishop (*vladika*²⁴). During this trip, he urged the Catholic peasant to recognize the superiority of the Orthodox faith:

“Widzisz sam, tutaj nie jest dobrze być katolikiem.

W Rosji katolikom żyje się źle.

Nie mogą sprawować władzy (piastować wyższych urzędów) nawet jeśli są do tego przygotowani i mają odpowiednie kwalifikacje.

Musicie zmienić wiarę. To warunek powodzenia: dobrego życia i bogactwa.

Jeśli to uczynicie Rosjanie będą was traktować jak ‘swoich’.”

“You see, it’s not good to be Catholic here.

In Russia, Catholics live poorly.

They cannot exercise power (hold higher offices) even if they are capable and have the qualifications.

You have to change your faith. This is a prerequisite for success: a good life and wealth.

If you do this, the Russians will treat you as one of them.”

This opinion stirred such anger in the peasant’s soul that he dared to interrupt the priest’s lecture and replied:

*“Tylko katolicka wiara jest gwarantem zbawienia.
Niepotrzebnie strzepisz język popie,
Chociaż wiele kościołów nam odebraliście,
Wśród nas jest jeszcze wielu katolików;
I księży niemało zesłaliście na Syberię (...)
Jednak dobrych księży mamy niemało (...)
Ci Białorusini, którzy są teraz prawosławni, będą, da dobry Bóg, wszyscy katolikami.
Modlitwy wiary fałszywej nikt z nich nie zna (...)
Każdy z nich do kościoła chętnie uczęszcza (...)
Praca wasza nie przyniesie plonu.
Zapamiętajcie popie, nadejdzie kiedyś czas, że w naszym kraju nie będzie popów,
Gdzie cerkwie stoją, tam kościoły staną,
Będzie wiara katolicka znowu rozkwitać.”*

*“Only the Catholic faith guarantees salvation.
No use wasting your breath, priest,
Though you have taken many churches from us²⁵,
There are still many Catholics among us;
And you sent many priests to Siberia (...)
But we have many good priests (...)
Those Belarusians who are now Orthodox will, God willing, all be Catholics.
None of them knows the prayers of false faith (...)
Each of them eagerly attends church (...)
Your work will not bear fruit.
Remember priest, there will come a time when there will be none of yours in
our country,
Wherever your churches stand, ours will,
The Catholic faith will flourish again.*

Before the priest reaches the bishop's palace, he has a change of heart (he was suffering hunger because he had a large family to support – eight “loser” sons: slackers, thieves, drunks, and physically infirm); he re-evaluates his failed family and pastoral life (all parishioners go to church showing respect to Catholic priests who, even exiled to Siberia, find happiness in faith). In the end, the bishop himself converts to “the true faith.” The parable is marked by the following prayer for the intercession of the Mother of God, who “trampled the head of Satan”:

*“Najpokorniej proszę Ciebie i Wszystkich Świętych
Aby cała Rosja odstąpiła od schizmy,
I cała ludność słowiańska stała się katolicka,
Aby na świecie została jedna owczarnia.” Amen.*

"I most humbly ask You and All Saints
For all of Russia to abandon the schism,
And all Slavic people to become Catholic,
That there may be one flock in the world." Amen.

Under the text there is this annotation: "*Złazyu Mińszczuk na Niepokalane Paczecie 1904 roku*" ("Put together by Mińszczuk on the Immaculate Conception of 1904"). The Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary is celebrated in the Catholic Church on December 8,²⁶ which means the text was created on December 8, 1906. The original text can be found in the Eustachy and Emilia Wróblewski State Library in Vilnius. The historical text of *Paznau praydu* was catalogued as written by A. Walicki. Chronology calls this inference into question. Aleksander Walicki died on June 1, 1893, in Warsaw. The text dates back to 1904; it was published in 1906, a dozen or so years after the death of the author of *Błedy nasze...* Other indications that prove that this is not a document written by Aleksander Walicki include its sloppy language and numerous loans of East Slavic provenance. The document fits into the purist trend only thematically. The language of the text does not confirm the assumption that the purity and correctness of the language are, in the author's opinion, a priority in the communication process. The text contains linguistic errors of various types, it is not free of foreign borrowings, especially from Russian and Ukrainian. It contains numerous mistakes in Belarusian. The most frequent linguistic irregularities include: spelling errors, such as: confusing Belarusian and Russian graphic signs, e.g. using "**i**" instead of "**y**" (in Latin alphabet, in Cyrillic script that is: "*и*" instead of "*ы*") [*станіцію* instead of: *станцыю*; *жить* instead of: *жыць*]; Russian "**u**" instead of Belarusian "**i**") [*мазоліш* instead of: *мазоліш* – *гаварыць так шмат, што аж мазолі на языку ўзнікаюць* "mówić tak dużo, że aż odciski na języku powstają" ("speak so much you get calluses on your tongue"), *вудзіш* instead of: *відзіш*, similarly: *змяніць*, *німала*, *нізабракне*, *ніколи*]; using the Russian "**y**" (Polish "*u*") instead of the Belarusian "*y*" (the Belarusian semivowel, i.e. "*u*" following a vowel and not forming a syllable) [is: *начай* – should be: *начай*; is: *правослауе* – should be: *правослаўе*]; Russian "*е*," instead of Belarusian "*э*" [is: *дренна* – should be: *дрэнна*], using "**ѣ**" – an Old Church Slavonic letter for the "*ye*" sound [is: *грамацѣяу* – should be: *грамацеяў*; *Бѣларусаў*, *лѣпей*, *кѣпска*, *вѣру*]; mistakes in the spelling of solid and open compounds, in particular incorrect spelling of particles: is: *німалуюж* – should be: *німалую ж*, is: *кудыб* – should be: *куды б*; using the letter *щ* – *нешчасны*, which is not used in Belarusian (in Bela-

rusian is should be: *нешчасны*); inconsistency in the spelling of some words, e.g. is *зъ*, and sometimes “*сь*” – should be: “*з*”, errors resulting from ignorance of the rule that “*и*” after vowels turns into a semivowel in Belarusian: *y – ŭ* such as: *тады ўсякі; німала ў; праваслаўны; ласкаў; збаўленым*; numerous borrowings such as: *бацько* ‘father’²⁷, *галеча* ‘poverty’²⁸, *скора* ‘soon’, *naczelstwo* ‘leadershi’, *gramota* (gr. *γράμματα*, *grámmata*) a document of an official or private nature in Ruthenia in the 10th–17th centuries²⁹, *галець* ‘become poor’³⁰, *гутарка* ‘conversation’ and borderland phonetic phenomena such as *akanie* (*аўчарня*, *paczęcie*³¹, *злажыў*), local phraseological and syntactic structures: *як у горле косць* “to stick in one’s craw” w gardle’, *патаптала галаву шатана*, ‘trampled the head of Satan’, a syntax modelled after the Russian language: *nadejdzie czas, że w naszym kraju nie będzie popów; będzie wiara katolicka znów zakwitać* (“a time will come that in our country there will be no Orthodox priests; the Catholic faith will flourish again”), undermine this thesis. Aleksander Walicki was called the “thundering Jupiter” by his colleagues from “*Kurier Warszawski*”, as the use of foreign words and phrases spurred him to “holy indignation” (Strawińska 2018: 24). It cannot be ruled out that the author, as an extreme purist, could have created a pastiche deprecating the linguistic indolence of the interlocutors, i.e. *the priest and the peasant (it is by no means an erudite dialogue) in a way that clearly exposes their lack of education*. That, however, rises the why the Belarusian language would be so defective, incorrect? The next issue is the pseudonym used by the author of the text. While the text was indeed published under a pseudonym, as Aleksander Walicki³² used to do, the problem is that none of the lexicographers recorded such a pseudonym as used by him. A. Although Walicki did run a bookstore in Minsk from 1863 to around 1865 (after the fall of the January Uprising, his sister Zofia Sawicka took over the business), making the nickname *Minshchuk*, created from the toponym Minsk, somewhat plausible, but in this case the suffix *-uk* is significant, as it is associated with patronymic formations. The suffix *-uk* in Polish anthroponymy is treated as Russian in origin. Although a Turkish-Tartar or Balto-Slavic etymology cannot be ruled out (see: Czuczka 1963: 70–71; Lindert 1972: 81–87; L. Bednarczuk 1992: 64; Dacewicz 2006: 157). It was recorded as early as in the 16th century in the Polish-Eastern Slavic borderland region (Dacewicz 2006: 157). Initially, it was used to create diminutive forms of names (e.g. *Kostiuk < Konstanty*), then it served as a patronymic form based on the father’s name (e.g. *Iwaniuk < Iwan*) or appellatives (e.g. *Kowaluk < Kowal* [smith]) (Kojder 2015: 283–284). Leonarda Dacewicz’s research clearly shows that, in the dialects of the Polish-Eastern Slavic border-

land, the suffix *-uk* served and still serves to create the names of juveniles (e.g. *psiuk* < *pies* [dog]) (Dacewicz 2014: 78–79). Since the 18th century it has become typical for the Polish-Eastern Slavic borderland, taking a dominant position. At this time, it started to act as a model morphological exponent. In the process of “improving” appellative surnames, the role of the formant *-uk* is limited to the peasant class, where it is added to the names of professions and nicknames (Dacewicz 2006: 158). The pseudonym *Minshchuk*, formally/structurally representing the anthroponymic paternal type, may be a clue That the text could have been written by a descendant; Aleksander Walicki’s son. It would be necessary to establish which of his sons could have written it and to find evidence confirming this hypothesis. The text could have been written by Józef Dominik Walicki living in Lithuania “(? 1870–19.04.1927 Lithuania)”.³³ He had connections with Minsk and Nesvizh.³⁴

The purist attitude is shaped almost exclusively by emotional factors. Sometimes so extreme that they lead to ostracism. However, one should bear in mind that in certain socio-political situations, e.g. in a situation of national captivity, the inclusion of an emotional factor in the assessment of language issues cannot be criticised (Markowski 2008: 127). However, it must not be forgotten that every extreme is dangerous. Inability to compromise or show lenience and the rigour presented by A. Walicki – rather than consolidating members of a nation whose statehood, language, religion are threatened as a result of political actions (e.g. partitions) – may become detonators of aggression and the subsoil of discriminatory tendencies against foreign national/linguistic/religious groups.³⁵ The *Paznau Praudu*, regardless of whether it was written by a descendant of Alexander’s – Józef Dominik or not, confirms that all extremes are dangerous. The author of the text presents an attitude that is derogatory towards otherness, confrontational, even oppressive. The author egocentrically claims the right to be faithful to the traditions of his own nation, while depriving everyone else of the possibility of functioning in cultures they were handed by God or ancestry. It is a demanding, non-conciliatory, and deprecating attitude. The defensive mission of preserving the cultural distinctiveness of nature has been deformed, distorted, and transformed into verbal actions encouraging the elimination of everything else; everything not Polish. *Paznau Praudu* can be treated in terms of a manifesto of individual grievance that the writer had personally experienced in the past. The word *Syberia* is used in the text. The issue of post-insurrection repressions: closing of churches, preventing Poles-Catholics from performing important state functions, poverty result-

ing from the loss of property, the shock of defeat, loss of the sense of security could have and maybe had caused a generational trauma that had not been worked through. Many other insurgent families, like the Waliccy,³⁶ undoubtedly suffered painfully from the defeat of the uprising. The text of *Paznau Praudu* is a tangible, if terrifying its individual and generational dimension, result of a multi-generational Russification action, which consequently leads to disintegration, disrespect for otherness, and above all to the undermining of one's own identity. The cited plot brings to mind Amin Maalouf's reflections on identity. The scholar emphasizes that every person combines numerous affiliations, which are not necessarily in harmony with each other and sometimes force one to make difficult choices. Identity is not given once and for all but is created and transformed throughout our entire lives (2002: 10–31). Perhaps it is with such a complicated identity, understood as self-creation and external identification that we are dealing with in *Paznau Praudu*. It is possible for the author to have been a Russian-speaking Belarusian of Polish origin.

NOTES

¹ The collection of the Eustachy and Emilia Wróblewski Library in Vilnius catalogues the cited source text as part of Aleksander Walicki's oeuvre. The book with reference number 351025 can be found in the Temporary Stock.

² We are aware that the Polish descriptor *Kresy Wschodnie* (i.e. North-Eastern Borderlands), as a loaded term, is not used in the works of Belarusian researchers. Rather, the terms: *borderland* or *region* is used (zob. m.in. Кур'ян, 2005: 18). *Kresy Wschodnie* is a term that has changed its meaning over the course of history. In the Old Polish of the 17th century, this name referred to the military border in Ukraine against the Cossacks and Tatars, and indirectly also the local border forts. It was only in the 20th century that this term began to refer to the entire eastern territories of the former Republic of Poland; since World War II and the shifting of the eastern border of Poland to the Bug river, the term "*Kresy*" is used to refer to all the lands that lie east of this line and historically were part of the Polish state. We distinguish northern Borderlands in the lands of former Lithuania and Belarus and southern Borderlands, i.e. former eastern Galicia and the lands along the Dniester and Dnieper rivers (see more: Kurzowa 1985, 1993).

³ In the original *Zasłaye* (bel. *Заслаўе*, *Засла́вль* [Zaslawye], formerly Zaslów Litewski) – city in Belarus, in the Minsk region, located on the banks of the Svislach River, 12 km north-west of Minsk. The city was mentioned as early as in the 10th century; was the capital of the Duchy of Zaslów. Lexicographic data shows that from the fourteenth century it was part of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. After the second partition of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in 1793 Zaslów (as a city in the Minsk district) fell within the borders of the Russian Empire. In 1904, it had 3,000 inhabitants. There were: 2 schools, a hospital, a pharmacy, a post office, 2 Orthodox churches and a Catholic church (SGKPol 1895: 441). As determined by ESBE, t. 1–2 (Russian-language *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Brockhaus and Efron* published in St. Petersburg in the years 1890–1907, vol. 1–82, exp. vol. 1–4; see References).

⁴ The Libavo-Romenskaya railway line (Blr. *Либаво-Роменская железная дорога*) it was purchased by the state in 1891 and put under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of

Railways. In 1913 the length of the railroad was 1434 km (including 195 km of double-track sections). The rolling stock consisted of 428 steam locomotives, 11 530 freight wagons and 405 passenger cars. In 1903, 2351 thousand passengers and 270 million pounds of cargo were transported; gross income amounted to 17,993 thousand roubles; operating costs 11,627 thousand roubles (see Грыша 2020: 28–35).

⁵ The lexeme *puryzm* (Eng. purism) is a grammatically adopted direct lexical borrowing from French, with the original Latin genesis: Lat. *purus* ‘clean’ → fr. *purisme* → pol. *puryzm*, which is a tangible effect of the influences of French intellectual culture, especially visible in the mature and declining phase of the Polish Enlightenment (more: Starwińska 2018: 38–39).

⁶ Cf. Markowski 1999: 16–17; Idem 2008: 126–132.

⁷ This term is recommended by A. Markowski, due to its neutral characterization. In his opinion, the term national purism is devoid of unnecessary emotional baggage (1999: 19).

⁸ See: W. Cienkowski 1978: 19–30; Markowski, Puzynina 2001: 56–57; Nowowiejski 1997b: 269–276; Porayski-Pomsta 1996, 1997: 82–84; Słoiński 1953: 141; Taszycki 1953; Walczak 1995: 272–279.

⁹ The linguistic practice of writers of the era recognized in the literature of a given country as classical may also be the linguistic and stylistic pattern preferred by traditionalist purists.

¹⁰ In addition to the above-mentioned traditional types of purism, contemporary researchers of the Polish language mention another variant, namely egocentric purism, which considers only an individual, personal linguistic pattern (learned by a specific person at school or family home) to be appropriate. In consequence, they treat forms present only in their personal idiolect as correct, acceptable, and promotable, while stigmatizing all those that go beyond their way of speaking and writing (Dubisz 1999: 9–17). According to A. Markowski, this type of purism is associated with elite purism, which in turn is a link connecting it with traditionalist purism (1999: 21).

¹¹ On 1 May 1863, Muravyov accepted the Tsar’s order to take over the function of the general-governor of the “North-Western Country”, i.e. Lithuania, including the Vilnius, Kaunas, Grodno, Vitebsk, Minsk, and Mogilev governorships. As reported by Michał Szukała, “the first days of June 1863 were the beginning of a great wave of terror. About 180 people were murdered in public executions, almost a thousand were sentenced to hard labour, and seven thousand were sentenced to resettlement in the depths of Russia. At the “Hanger’s” command, estates were confiscated and monasteries, seen as centres of resistance against Russification, were liquidated,” the same terror began in Vilnius 160 years ago. On the order of “Susiatel”, estates were confiscated and monasteries perceived as centers of resistance to Russification were liquidated, “the same terror of Mikhail Muravyov” Susiatel “began in Vilnius 160 years ago”, <https://dzieje.pl/wiadomosci/160-lat-temu-w-wilnie-rozpoczal-sie-terror-michaila-murawjowa-wieszatiela> (accessed: 19.09.2024).

¹² The list of several dozen purist texts is opened by a brochure by O. Kopczyński, *O Poprawie Błędów w Ustnej i Pisanej Mowie Polskiej* from 1803.

¹³ Author of such works as: *Cywilizacja i język*, Lviv 1901; *Wyrazy obce w języku polskim*, Lviv 1907; *Walka o język*, Lviv 1917.

¹⁴ Authors of the handbook entitled: *Jak nie należy mówić po polsku*, Warsaw 1921 (II. ed. 1931). One should also recall S. Szober, author of *Na straży języka. Szkice z zakresu poprawności i kultury języka polskiego*, Warsaw 1937, and, even more importantly, *Słownik ortoeiczny. Jak mówić i pisać po polsku*, Warsaw 1937.

¹⁵ Works on broadly understood linguistic correctness are published by doctors (F. Skobel, L. Czarkowski), lawyers (E. Łada-Łazowski) as well as journalists (A. Łętowski), book-sellers (A. Walicki), teachers (A. Krasnowolski, L. Szczerbowicz-Wieczór, A. Passendorfer), officials (E. S. Kortowicz), and writers (J. Błaziński).

¹⁶ The term *puryzm* (Eng. purism) was first recorded in SWil in the sense of “purity of language, observance of purity of language, i.e. not mixing foreign words or phrases.”

¹⁷ A. Walicki is also the author of a spelling dictionary entitled *Upominek zecerom od korektora*, Kraków 1886. See more: Ciborowska [Strawińska] 2002: 15–25; Strawińska 2006: 141–151; Sokółska, Strawińska 2024 (in print).

¹⁸ This type of technique was used by A. Walicki to ridicule customs or models of behaviour stereotypically attributed to other nations, mainly Russians, but also: Belarusians, Lithuanians, Germans, or Jews.

¹⁹ Geni.pl reports that Aleksander Jan Walicki, had 7 children with Helena Józefa Elżbieta née Uzłowska: Bronisław, Teresa, Maria, Ignacy, Maria, Józef Dominik, and Zygmunt. Three of them died before Antonina was born. <https://www.geni.com/people/Aleksander-Walicki/6000000000970204084> (access: 07.09.2024). As of 08.09.2024, the Geni community has over 192584406 profiles.

²⁰ Witold Doroszewski is also in favour of such an understanding of the concept. SDor registers the word *puryzm* (Eng. purism) in the sense of “sometimes excessive care for the purity and correctness of language; rigorous observance of rules, norms, moral principles; excessive care for the purity and strictness of morals.” A similar definition is provided by the modern online version of the PWN *Słownika języka polskiego* (Dictionary of the Polish Language), which defines *puryzm* (purism) as: “excessive care for cleanliness and linguistic correctness” (<https://sjp.pwn.pl/slowniki/purysta>, accessed: 13.09.2024). According to the online *Dobry słownik języka polskiego* (Eng. Good Dictionary of the Polish Language) – a lexicographic source of a popular nature edited by: Artur Czesak PhD, Łukasz Szalkiewicz PhD, Sebastian Żurowski PhD – a *purist* (Pol. *Purysta*) “is someone who believes that one should cultivate some field of human activity in particular (e.g. language, music, sport, morality, law) and ensure that the rules governing it remain unchanged as much as possible and free of the influence of new fashions or trends (in the case of a linguistic purist, this is associated, among others, with a negative assessment of people making linguistic errors and the tendency to borrow words from other languages); synonyms: formalist; conservative; orthodox; pedant; rigorous; scrupulous” (Pol. *formalista; konserwatysta; ortodoks; pedant; porządnik; rygorysta; skrupulant*) (<https://dobrysloownik.pl/slowo/purysta/47115/>, accessed: 14.09.2024). The term Orthodox (Bl. православный, from the Greek *orthodoxos*) literally means “glorifying, worshipping the law; faithful, right-thinking” (Znosko 1996: 250).

²¹ Here > schism (Bl. *сызмѣ* – *схизма*, пры *схизме*) refers to the “split between the Christians of the western part of the Roman Empire, i.e. the Patriarchate of Rome, and the Christians of the eastern part of the Empire, i.e. the Patriarchates of Alexandria, Jerusalem, Antioch, and Constantinople (...). The term *schizma wschodnia* [Eng. Eastern schism] used in Polish is negatively evaluative and erroneous from the Orthodox perspective. The more correct terms include: *wielka schizma*, *schizma 1054 roku* and *schizma Wschód-Zachód* [the great schism, the schism of 1054 or the East-West schism]” (see more: Kostciuczuk, Tofiluk, Ławreszuk, Misijuk, Charkiewicz 2016: 106). Describing the event of 1054 as the “Eastern schism” inspired Catholics to recognize the Orthodox as schismatics. The sense of superiority of the Catholic religion was based on the full enjoyment of political rights by the faithful of the Latin Church since the 16th century.

²² This is a clear religious provocation directed at the Orthodox faithful. The dogma of the Immaculate Conception of Mary has been present in the Western Church since 1854, while this tenet in the Eastern Churches is similar, but not dogmatized. In practice, Orthodox believers – like Catholics – show great respect to the Mother of God, as evidenced by such terms referring to Her as: Theotokos (Gr. Θεοτόκος, OCS. Богородица), Perpetual Virgin (gr. Αειπάρθερος, OCS. Приснодѣва), Most Holy (Gr. Παναγία, κτῆραγία, OCS. Пречистая), Most Pure (OCS. Пречистаѧ) (Kostciuczuk, Tofiluk, Ławreszuk, Misijuk, Charkiewicz 2016: 8). The Eastern Church, like the Catholic Church, celebrates many

Marian feasts, because the Orthodox faithful, similarly to Catholics, pray for her intercession before her Son – Jesus Christ. Unlike Protestants, who reject Marian worship, indulgences, the worship of saints and relics, the sacrificial nature of the mass, the existence of purgatory, the hierarchical celibacy of the clergy, and the authority and primacy of the pope (which the Orthodox do not recognize as well). Protestant denominations are ascetic in their formula. The cult of work, discipline, and not succumbing to weaknesses are glorified (more: Bartel 1962, Pasek 2014).

²³ SW registers the lexeme *mużyk* as a loanword of Ukrainian origin, meaning ‘simple peasant, boor’. USJPDub adds the qualifiers *colloquial and contemptuous* and notes a dual sense: 1. ‘dumb, backward peasant, especially in former Russia’, 2. ‘a man lacking in manners, unintelligent, dressed in the manner of a peasant’. L, SDor. SB-P confirm that it is a loanword from Belarusian meaning 1. ‘peasant’; 2. colloquial for ‘peasant’; Bl. *музыка* (2012:420).

²⁴ The term *vladika* meant “in old Poland, a lord, ruler, superior; nowadays, most often the honorary title of bishops, archbishops, and metropolitans in Orthodox Churches (used in Slavic languages)” <https://pl.wikipedia.org/wiki/W%C5%82adyka> (accessed: 14.09.2024). More: L, Dor. – *archē* ‘pierwszeństwo’, *iereūs* ‘kapłan’]. Źródła internetowe notują w znaczeniu “pan, zwłaszcza na Rusi” i kwalifikują jako *dawny*. USJPDub poświadcza jako rusycyzm.

²⁵ Antoni Mironowicz’s research shows that the Christianization of the present Belarusian lands and its inhabitants followed the rite of the Eastern Church (Byzantine Christianity). The subsequent influence of other denominations and Churches on these nations was of secondary importance (2011: 81–98). In 1596, an act on the unification of the Latin Church with the Orthodox Church in the territory of the Republic of Poland was adopted at the Orthodox Council in Brest. The unification was based on mutual concessions: the supremacy of the Roman Pope was recognized, as was the Catholic dogma that the Holy Spirit comes not only from God the Father, but also from God the Son, but the Byzantine Orthodox rite was preserved, as well as liturgy and sermons in the Church Slavonic language. One of the reasons for adopting the decisions of the Brest Union was the desire of the Orthodox clergy to become independent from the Moscow Patriarchate. After the Turkish sultan had taken Constantinople in 1453, the importance of the Moscow metropolis increased in 1589, when it adopted the name of the patriarchate of “all Russia” and sought to take over the Orthodox Church in Belarus and Ukraine. In addition, the authorities of the Church hoped for equal rights with the Catholic episcopate. As a result of the union, the Orthodox society was divided into supporters of unification – the Uniates and their opponents, i.e. disuniates, resulting in long-lasting disputes and fights between both sides (including the Cossack wars). The Orthodox Church considers the Brest Union to be a break-up of unity, while the Roman Catholic Church sees it as the largest and most important, after the Florentine Union, attempt to rebuild the unity of the Church. The Union of Brest was an attempt to liquidate the legal, social and cultural impairment of the Orthodox Church and to place the new Uniate Church on an equal footing with the Roman Catholic Church; not all goals were achieved, e.g. Uniate bishops were not admitted to the Polish Senate. The Brest Union also had a political aspect, as it was an expression of sovereignty from the policy of the Moscow tsars conquering the Lithuanian-Ruthenian lands, especially after the creation of the 1589 patriarchate of Moscow and all Russia, claiming sovereignty over the Orthodox Church in the Commonwealth (Likowski 1907, Lewicki 1933).

²⁶ The dogma of Immaculate Conception concerns the protection of Mary from original sin at her conception – <https://dzieje.pl/dziedzictwo-kulturowe/kosciol-katolicki-8-grudnia-obchodzi-uroczystosc-niepokalanego-poczecia> (accessed: 08.09.2024). The truth about the Immaculate Conception of Mary was solemnly proclaimed by the Church as a dogma of faith in the mid-nineteenth century – in an era of growing rationalism and scientism. At the same time, this was a period of development of various forms of spirituality, the creation

of new religious congregations and Marian revelations. The proclamation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary was made officially by Pius IX on December 8, 1854 in the bull "Ineffabilis Deus" (Ineffable God), using the formula: "Blessed Virgin Mary, at the first instant of her conception, by a singular privilege and grace of the Omnipotent God, in virtue of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of mankind, was preserved immaculate from all stain of original sin." According to the Catholic faith, every person coming into the world is marked by original sin. This sin is "transferred" along with the transmission of human nature, which was deprived of original holiness and justice by the First Parents, due to their distrust and disobedience to God – as the first chapters of the Bible state. Original sin – as the Catechism of the Catholic Church (No. 404) explains – is not committed, but incurred, it is not an act, but a state in which a person is conceived. Only holy baptism frees a person from original sin. Mary, on the other hand, was preserved from this inheritance of sin, which is why Scripture calls her "full of grace" (Lk 1,28). The Church teaches that it was fitting that she, who was to become the "Mother of her Creator" and Saviour of the world, should be specially prepared by God. "Immaculately conceived" means not only that Mary was free from original sin, but also expresses her special closeness to God, total trust in God, inner harmony and the fullness of humanity. In 1617, Pope Paul IV banned public statements contrary to faith in Immaculate Conception. In 1661, at the request of King Philip IV of Spain, Pope Alexander VII issued a bull in which he summarized the history of the cult of the Immaculate Conception using the words that Pius IX later repeated in his dogmatic formula. In 1708, Pope Clement XI established December 8 as a feast day for the entire Catholic Church. Finally, on December 8, 1854, Pius IX proclaimed the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

²⁷ Swar notes the lexeme *batko* in this sense – 'father, clergyman' with the annotation: ukr. *bat'ko*.

²⁸ *Галеть ? архаическое (галить?), лягаться, бить задними ногами, брыкаться*. See: В. И. Даль, *Толковый словарь живого великорусского языка, том первый А-З*, Москва 2006, с. 323.

²⁹ "The term was borrowed from Byzantium, where *grammata* meant message, ordinance, and other written documents," *Словарь церковно-славянского и русского языка* 1847: 410. See: Ожегов, Шведова 1997, pp. 146–147.

³⁰ Z. Kurzowa, notes the word *holeć* (of Belarusian origin) in the sense of 'becoming poor, falling into poverty' (1993: 361). Similarly in SW.

³¹ The dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, introduced by the Roman Catholic Church in 1854 is **not recognized by the Orthodox Churches** (although they do emphasize Mary's freedom from personal sin). As far as the cult of the Mother of God is concerned, Orthodoxy perceives that the greatest glory of Mary is divine motherhood; thus, the title *Theotokos*. This title "contains the whole mystery of the economy of salvation" (St. John of Damascus). However, the mystery of the Incarnation of the Son of God is above all an object of prayer and contemplation. See more: H. Paprocki, *Dogmat Niepokalanego Poczęcia: prawosławny punkt widzenia*, "Elpis" 2002, nr 4/6, pp. 253–259.

³² Ludwik Czarkowski does not record *Mińszczuk* in the register of Polish pseudonyms and code names. Aleksander Walicki is credited with using the pseudonyms Fuza, Ładziec Chryzostom, Pauza Symforjan, Miściuk, Żeleźniak; the pseudonyms most commonly used by A. Walicki were: Kuchta, Żeleźniak Aleksander; Al. Żel; WM Nowogrodzianin; Dictionary of pseudonyms and code names of Polish writers compiled Adam Bar notes: A.; Fliza; Kuchta; Ładziec; Chryzostom Ładziec; Chryzostom Ładziec (Nowogrodzianin); Miściuk; Nowogrodzianin; Pauza Symforjan; W.; W. M. Nowogrodzianin; Ż.; Żeleźniak; Żeleźniak Aleksander, p. 127; <https://www.wbc.poznan.pl/dlibra/show-content/publication/edition/117397?id=117397> (accessed: 09.09.2024). He differentiates the pseudonyms, among others, by using Latin, Russian Cyrillic or Belarusian Cyrillic scripts: Valicki,

Alâksandar; Балицкі А; Жаязняк; алікiсь Алесь). A full list of Walicki's aliases can be found at <https://wordcat-org.translate.google/identities/lccn-n2020021998/> [accessed: 26 June 2023].

³³ As stated in Geni.pl (accessed: 16.09.2024).

³⁴ Aleksander Walicki was employed as a curator of the Radziwiłł library and archive in Nieśwież from 1890 until his death (Strawińska 2018: 27). The family photos of Józef Dominik Walicki deposited on the Geni.com portal show place names: Mińsk and Nieśwież.

³⁵ Northern Borderland Purists claim that external, political conditions, although they affect the condition of the national language, do not determine the pace of its development or destruction. The situation of the language – in their opinion – is decided by its users themselves. The further fate of the Polish language in the north-eastern borderlands depended on their attitudes. Therefore, Aleksander Walicki, through his corrective publications, tries to promote, above all, caring for the Polish language and for its correctness and efficiency.

³⁶ Aleksander Walicki was exiled to Tambov, and his property was confiscated. In psychology, constant mulling over painful family experiences is referred to as *rumination* and requires therapy.

REFERENCES

- Bednarczuk L., *Stosunki etnolingwistyczne na obszarze Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego. Zarys problematyki*, [in:] *Dzieje Lubelszczyzny*, t. 6: *Między Wschodem a Zachodem*, cz. 4: *Zjawiska językowe na pograniczu polsko-ruskim*, red. J. Bartmiński, M. Łesiów, Lublin 1992.
- Bugajski M., *Język w komunikowaniu*, Warszawa 2006.
- Buttler D., Krukowska H., Satkiewicz H. (red.), *Kultura języka polskiego. Zagadnienia poprawności gramatycznej*, t. 1–2, Warszawa 1986.
- Cienkowski W., *Kryterium narodowe. Kosmopolityzm i puryzm*, tegoż: *Język dla wszystkich*, cz. 1, pp. 19–30.
- Carter R., *Language awareness*, “ELT Journal” 57, 2003, nr 1, pp. 64–65.
- Cenoz J., *Introduction to volume 6: Knowledge about of Language and Education*, pod red. J. Cenoz, N.H. Hornberger, t. 6: *Knowledge about of Language, 2nd Education*, New York 2008.
- Chomsky N., *Zagadnienia teorii składni*, Wrocław 1982.
- Ciborowska A. B., (Strawińska), *O niektórych osobliwościach polszczyzny drugiej połowy XIX wieku (na podstawie “Upominku zecerom od korektora” Aleksandra Walickiego)*, “Białostockie Archiwum Językowe” 2002, nr 2, pp. 15–25.
- Czuczka P. P., *Do pochodzenia i znaczenia ukraińskich imennikowych utworów z sufiksami -uk, -czuk*, [in:] *Tezy dopowiedzi i powidomień XVII naukowej konferencji. Serija filologiczna*, Użhorod 1963, pp. 70–71.
- Dacewicz L., *Rola sufiksu -uk w kulturze nazewnictwa Podlasia*, [in:] *Munuscula Linguistica. In Honorem Alexandrae Cieslikowa Oblata*, red. Kazimierz Rymut, Kraków 2006, pp. 157–162.

- Dacewicz L., *Historia nazwisk na kresach północno-wschodnich Rzeczypospolitej (XVI–XVIII w.)*, Białystok 2014.
- Didier J., *Słownik filozoficzny*, [w przekł.] K. Jarosz, Katowice 2006.
- Dubisz S. (red.), *Nauka o języku dla polonistów*, Warszawa 1999.
- Dubisz S., *Z historii puryzmu i liberalizmu językowego*, [in:] *Polszczyzna w komunikowaniu publicznym*, pod red. W. Gruszczyńskiego, J. Bralczyka, G. Majkowskiej, Warszawa 1999.
- Edwards J., *Language, Society and Identity*, Oxford 1995.
- Fichte J., *Reden an die deutsche Nation*, Berlin 1808.
- Gajda S., *Nauka o kulturze języka*, „Polonistyka” 1987, nr 8, pp. 581–592.
- Geben K., *Świadomość i kompetencja językowa a warstwy leksykalne w idiolektach młodzieży polskiego pochodzenia na Wileńszczyźnie*, Warszawa 2003.
- Груша А.И., Был ли древнерусский Изяславль сообществом памяти? [в:] *Народы и культуры славянского мира Восточной Европы в исторической ретроспективе (Беларусь, Украина, Россия, Польша)*, ред.-сост. А. Д. Дудько, Гродно 2020, с. 28–35. [A.I. Grusha *Czy starożytny rosyjski Izjaslavl był wspólnotą pamięci?*, [in:] *Ludy i kultury słowiańskiego świata Europy Wschodniej w retrospekcji historycznej (Białoruś, Ukraina, Rosja, Polska)*, pod red. A.D. Dudko, Grodno 2020, pp. 28–35].
- Hymes D.H., *On Communicative Competence*, [in:] *Sociolinguistics*, pod red. J. Pride, J. Holmes, New York 1972, pp. 269–293.
- Karaś H., *Rusycyzmy frazeologiczne w polszczyźnie w okresie zaborów*, [in:] *Studia nad słownictwem XIX i XX wieku*, pod red. W. Kupiszewskiego, t. 2, Warszawa 1913, pp. 126–151.
- Karaś H., *Rusycyzmy słownikowe w polszczyźnie okresu zaborów (na podstawie prasy warszawskiej z lat 1795–1918)*, Warszawa 1996.
- Karpluk M., *Słownictwo cerkiewne w polszczyźnie XVI w. Wybór przykładów*, [in:] *Chrześcijański wschód a kultura polska*, pod red. R. Łużnego, Lublin 1989, pp. 127–147.
- Kiklewicz A., *Znaczenie w języku – znaczenie w umyśle. Krytyczna analiza współczesnych teorii semantyki lingwistycznej*, Olsztyn 2012.
- Kloch Z., *Spory o język*, Warszawa 1995.
- Kostiuczuk J., Tofiluk J., Ławreszczuk M., Misijuk W., Charkiewicz J., *Specyfika polskiej terminologii prawosławnej*, Białystok 2016.
- Kurcz I., *Kompetencja językowa i kompetencja komunikacyjna: ich uwarunkowania biologiczne i społeczne. Model wiedzy językowej człowieka*, [in:] *Język jako przedmiot badań psychologicznych. Psycholingwistyka ogólna i neurolingwistyka*, pod red. I. Kurcz, H. Okuniewskiej, Warszawa 2011, pp. 35–45.
- Кур’ян І., *Беларуска-польскае моўнае памежжа. Праблема навуковага падыходу*, „Acta Albarruthenica”, nr 5, 2005, pp. 17–21. [I. Kurjan, *Bielarуска-польскагемounaje памьежжа. Праблема навуковага падыходу*, „Acta Albarruthenica”, nr 5, 2005, pp. 17–21].

- Kurzowa Z., *Polszczyzna Lwowa i kresów południowo-wschodnich do 1939 roku*, Warszawa–Kraków 1985.
- Kurzowa Z., *Język polski Wileńszczyzny i kresów północno-wschodnich XVI–XX w.*, Warszawa–Kraków 1993.
- Kuszał K., *Przejawy rozwoju świadomości językowej w okresie dzieciństwa i możliwości jej stymulowania*, „Cieszyński Almanach Pedagogiczny” 2014, nr 3, pp. 111–127.
- Kojder M., *Nazwiska patronimiczne z formantem -uk w inskrypcjach nagrobnych na wybranych cmentarzach na południowym Podlasiu*, „Studia Białorutenistyczne. Językoznawstwo” 2015, z. 9, pp. 281–294.
- Lewicki K., *Księżę Konstanty Ostrogski a unia brzeska 1596*, Lwów 1933.
- Likowski K., *Unia brzeska (1596)*, Warszawa 1907.
- Lindert B., *Formanty -(i)uk, -czuk w językach wschodniosłowiańskich*, „Z Polskich Studiów Slawistycznych”, seria 4: Językoznawstwo, Warszawa 1972, pp. 81–87.
- Ławreszuk M., *Baciuszka, prezbiter czy ksiądz? Poszukiwanie wiodącej denotacji w polskiej terminologii prawosławnej*, „Elpis” 2019, nr 21, pp. 15–19.
- Maćkowiak K., *U źródeł polskiej świadomości językowej (V–XV w.)*, Poznań 2011.
- Markowski A., *Postawy użytkowników wobec języka*, [in:] *Mowa rozświetlona myślą. Świadomość normatywno-stylistyczna współczesnych Polaków*, pod red. J. Miodka, Wrocław 1999, pp. 16–17.
- Markowski A., *Postawy użytkowników wobec języka – od puryzmu do laseferyzmu*, [in:] *Kultura języka polskiego. Zagadnienia leksykalne*, Warszawa 2008, pp. 126–132.
- Markowski A., Puzynina J., *Kryteria zewnątrzjęzykowe: narodowe, logiczne, autorytetu, uzusu*, [in:] *Współczesny język polski*, pod red. J. Bartmińskiego, Lublin 2001, pp. 56–57.
- Maalouf A., *Zabójcze tożsamości*, Warszawa 2002.
- Mironowicz A., *Wyznanie a świadomość narodowa Białorusinów*, „Białostockie Teki Historyczne” 2011, nr 9, pp. 81–98.
- Nowowiejski B., 1997a, *Polszczyzna północnokresowa przełomu XIX i XX wieku w świetle ówczesnych wydawnictw poprawnościowych*, „Białostoczczyzna” 1997/1, pp. 161–170.
- Nowowiejski B., 1997b, *Wydawnictwa poprawnościowe z 2. połowy XIX wieku i początków XX wieku jako źródła do historii języka polskiego*, [w:] *Witold Doroszewski – mistrz i nauczyciel*, pod red. B. Falińskiej, Łomża 1997, pp. 269–276.
- Olechnicki K., Załęcki P., *Słownik socjologiczny*, Toruń 1997.
- Ожегов С. И., Шведова Н. Ю., *Толковый словарь русского языка*, Москва: Азбуковник 1997.
- Porayski-Pomsta J., *Postawy użytkowników wobec języka*, [in:] *Nauka o języku dla polonistów*, pod red. S. Dubisza, Warszawa 1996, 1997, pp. 82–84.

- Perużyńska I., *Świadomość językowa studentów filologii polskiej Pomorskiej Akademii pedagogicznej w Słupsku*, "Słupskie Prace Filologiczne. Seria Filologia Polska" 2005, pp. 215–233.
- Polański K. (red.), *Encyklopedia językoznawstwa ogólnego*, Wrocław 1993.
- Rygorowicz-Kuźma A., *Terminologia prawosławna w języku polskim (na przykładzie osób duchownych)*, "Acta Polono-Ruthenica" 2011/16, pp. 403–413.
- Siatkowski J., *O cerkwiźmach w naistarszej polskiej terminologii chrześcijańskiej*, "Zeszyty Naukowe Wydziału Humanistycznego", *Slawistyka 3: Polskie kontakty z piśmiennictwem cerkiewnosłowiańskim do końca wieku XV*, Gdańsk 1982, pp. 97–105.
- Skudrzykowa A., Urban K., *Mały słownik terminów z zakresu socjolingwistyki i pragmatyki językowej*, Kraków–Warszawa 2000.
- Słoński S., *Historia języka polskiego w zarysie*, Warszawa 1953.
- Strawińska A.B., *Dziewiętnastowieczne rozstrzygnięcia ortograficzne na podstawie "poradnika dla drukarzy" Aleksandra Walickiego*, "Białostockie Archiwum Językowe" 2006, nr 6, pp. 141–151.
- Strawińska A.B., *Aleksander Walicki i Aleksander łętowski o stanie polszczyzny północnokresowej. Ortografia – fonetyka – zagadnienia gramatyczne*, Białystok 2018.
- Taszycki W., *Obrońcy języka polskiego*, Wrocław 1953.
- Tomlison B., *How would you define language awereness?*, [in:] R. Bolitho et al., *Ten questions about language awereness*, "ELT Journal" 57, 2003, nr 3, pp. 251–259.
- Walicki A., *Błędy nasze w mowie i piśmie ku szkodzie języka polskiego popełniane oraz prowincjonalizmy*, Kraków–Warszawa (wyd. 1: 1876, wyd. 2: 1879, wyd. 3: 1886).
- Walicki A., *Upominek zecerom od korektora*, Kraków 1886.
- Walczak B., *Działalność kulturalno-oświatowa*, [in:] tegoż, *Zarys dziejów języka polskiego*, Warszawa 1995, pp. 272–279.
- Umińska-Tytoń E., *Słownictwo polszczyzny potocznej XIX wieku*, Łódź 2001.
- Veisbergs A., *Development of the Latvian Language, Purism and Prescriptivism, Humanities and Social Sciences: Latvias. Linguistic Studies in Latvia*, volume 18, issue 1, Spring – Summer 2010, University of Latvia, p. 7–32.
- Zgółka T., *Warstwy świadomości językowej*, [in:] *Świadomość językowa – kompetencja – dydaktyka. Materiały ogólnopolskiej konferencji "Z badań nad kompetencją i świadomością językową dzieci i młodzieży"*, Warszawa 25–26 listopada 1996, pod red. E. Sękowskiej, Warszawa 1996, pp. 13–19.
- Znosko A., *Słownik cerkiewnosłowiańsko-polski*, Białystok 1996.

Słowniki

BrücknerSE – A. Brückner, *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*, Warszawa 1957.

- L – S.B. Linde, *Słownik języka polskiego*, t. 1–6, wyd. 2, Lwów 1854–1860.
Словарь церковно-славянскаго и русскаго языка, t. 1–4, Санкт-Петербург 1847.
Słowar' cerkowno-sławiańskiego i russkiego języka, t. 1–4, Sankt-Pietierburg 1847.
SB-P – T. Chylak-Schreoder, J. Gluszkowska-Babicka, T. Jasińska-Socha (red.), *Słownik białorusko-polski*, Warszawa 2012.
SDor – W. Doroszewski (red.), *Słownik języka polskiego*, Warszawa, t. 1–11, 1958–1969.
SW – J. Karłowicz, A. Kryński, W. Niedźwiedzki (1900–1927), *Słownik języka polskiego*, t. 1–8, Warszawa; tzw. słownik warszawski.
SWil – M. Orgelbrand (red.), *Słownik języka polskiego*, t. 1–2, Wilno 1861; tzw. słownik wileński.
ESBE – *Малый энциклопедический словарь Брокгауза и Ефрона*, t. 1–2, 2-е изд., вновь перераб, СПб. 1907–1909 [*Małyj encyklopedičeskij słowar' Brokgauza i Jefrona*, t. 1–2, 2-je izd., wnow' pierierab, SPB. 1907–1909].
SGKPol – *Słownik geograficzny Królestwa Polskiego*, t. XIV: *Worowo-Żyżyn*, Warszawa 1895, hasło: *Zastaw*, pp. 441.
USJPDub – S. Dubisz (red.), *Uniwersalny słownik języka polskiego*, t. 1–8, Warszawa 2003.
VasmerREW – M. Vasmer, *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Herdelberg 1950.