

Halyna Naienko

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv

Kyiv

h.naienko@knu.ua

University of Lodz

Łódź

halyna.naienko@filologia.uni.lodz.pl

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0485-5068>

Multilingualism of Ukrainian Elites in the Seventeenth Century: The Case of Lazar Baranovych

Introduction¹

In the modern cognitive-discourse paradigm, a language is understood as a fluid, dynamic, and socially constructed semiotic system. Accordingly, multilingualism is defined as a sociolinguistic phenomenon that consists in the competencies and abilities of speakers to use several languages (Madiba, 2021, pp. 322–323).

The communication of multilingual speakers is characterized by the transfer of features of one language to another. Apart from cognitive factors, there are also emotional factors at play here, and the process involves code-mixing, code-switching, and translation. When we only have access to texts and we cannot observe speakers'

¹ I would like to thank Prof. Andrii Danylenko for valuable comments on the earlier version of this paper.

actual practices, the reconstruction of their multilingualism should take into account the scenarios of text creation, editing and correction, etc. There is also the macro level to consider: the social landscape, historical and geographical contexts, dialects, isoglosses, language contact, etc. At the micro level, factors such as social and individual multilingualism, diglossia, and code- and script-switching need to be taken into account (see Berlejung, 2021).

The relevance of the study of multilingualism is evidenced by the interest in this phenomenon in various areas of the humanities – such as psycholinguistics and second-language acquisition (Aronin & Singleton, 2012; Edwards, 1994; Levchuk, 2020) – and the increasing attention to the reconstruction of multilingualism of the past (Berlejung, 2021; Braunmüller & Ferraresi, 2003; Fellerer, 2020; Ligara, 2018).

The multilingualism and multiculturalism of pre-national societies is not in need of proof. For example, the first known printed book by a Ukrainian author was published in Latin in Italy, and the first editions of others, many of which were intended for Ukraine, were printed in Poland by a German printer; the former was the astrological treatise *Iudicium prenosticon Anni MCCCCCLXXX III currentis* [Prognostic View of the Year 1483] (Rome, 1483) by Yurii Drohobych, and among the latter were liturgical books printed in Cracow by Schweipolt Fiol (two with the date 1491, two without) (Ісаєвич, 2001). It was the mastery of several languages that ensured the success of lexicographers of the seventeenth to eighteenth centuries, as described in the already classic studies by Vasył Nimchuk (Німчук, 1980).

The Ukrainian scholarly elite, church intellectuals, and well-known and unknown authors of the pre-modern and early modern periods knew and used several languages. Obviously, the states to which parts of the Ukrainian ethnolinguistic territory belonged at that time (the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, the Polish Crown, and later the Russian Empire) had different educational traditions, including the use of the respective *linguae francae*. In different periods of life, the same person could change their language priorities. It is a well-known fact that such figures as Petro Mohyla (1596–1647), Varlaam Yasynsky (1627–1707), Stefan Yavorsky (1658–1722), Hryhori Hrabianka (before 1666–1738), and Ivan Mazepa (1639–1709) were multilingual. They wrote their works in Church Slavonic, Latin, Polish, Ruthenian (*prosta mova*), French, German, and other languages.

At the same time, it should be noted that the study of social and individual polylingualism of the past, its role and significance in the Ukrainian culture of the early modern period, brings uneven results and has significant gaps. The use of the terms *polylingualism*, *plurilingualism*, *multilingualism*, *polyglossia* in Ukrainian linguistics is rather inconsistent. Leaving this issue for discussion, we employ here the term *polylingualism* along with the parallel term *multilingualism*.

George Y. Shevelov was perhaps the first to show the redistribution of functions of literary languages depending on changes in their social status, thus outlining their

“sociolinguistic” history in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In one of his studies, he observes that the reality of seventeenth-century Ukraine was characterized by a “disordered” (*désorganisé*), surprisingly confusing and artificial use of the written language, or rather of written languages, which perfectly fitted the Baroque style that was fashionable at the time (Shevelov, 1971, p. 252).

One point of interest for linguists has been the process of modifying the linguistic consciousness of individuals in the eighteenth century, when Ukrainians were integrated into the Russian Empire. Based on the diary entries of Mykola Khanenko, a prominent political figure and statesman of the Hetman state, Andrii Danylenko analyzes the dynamics of his language preferences, showing the stability of the old Ukrainian literary and written tradition and the use of vernacular elements despite the gradual influence of the Russian language (Danylenko, 2007b). Lidiia Hnatiuk proposes a reconstruction of the linguistic mentality of Hryhorii Skovoroda; using the categories of cognitive science, she points out the role of the linguistic “multiverse” in its formation (Гнатюк, 2010). It is also worth noting the recent edition of Pylyp Orlyk’s diary, which provides rich material for the study of the linguistic practices of a multilingual person (Sobol, 2021).

The literary heritage of Lazar Baranovych (1595? 1620? – 1693), writer, politician, Archbishop of Chernihiv and Novhorod-Sivers’kyi, has attracted the attention of literary critics, historians, and cultural and religious studies scholars (for a detailed bibliography, see Лямпрехт, 2016, pp. 199–249). In the present article, I focus on his practice of multilingualism, choosing as our material the less studied collection of sermons *Трубы на дни нарочитыя праздниковъ* [Trumpets for Major Feast Days] (Баранович, 1674). The first section offers brief comments on the views of researchers on the issue of language choice by writers of the time, mainly the assessments of Baranovych. In the second section, I illustrate in more detail (in accordance with the comparative method in historical linguistics) how multilingualism can be traced in Baranovych’s handwritten notes on the margins of books (marginalia), which were recently transcribed and published by Marharyta Shamrai (Шамрай, 2005). The third section is devoted to the context of the publication of *Трубы* (Kyiv, 1674), which emphasizes the separateness of the Ukrainian redaction of Church Slavonic. In the fourth section, I illustrate the results of the interference between the Ukrainian language and Church Slavonic by tracing their reflection in texts with different scripts and in different languages. The identification of the structural features of the Ukrainian redaction of Church Slavonic makes it possible to outline the prospects for further study of this phenomenon.

1. Lazar Baranovych's multilingualism and choice of language in the assessment of literary critics and linguists

One of the first researchers of Baranovych's writings, Mykola Sumtsov, gave a scathing assessment of his work, accusing him of scholasticism and detachment from the people; the scholar argued that this was evidenced by the purity of the Slavic language of his sermons (Сумцов, 1885, p. 60). In Sumtsov's view, the choice of language had tragic consequences – he did not mince his words when criticizing Baranovych for being “detached from the people”, for “depersonalization” and “treachery” (Сумцов, 1885, p. 61).

First of all, it should be noted that reproaching seventeenth-century authors for neglecting living language or choosing Church Slavonic at the expense of bookish Ukrainian is anachronistic. The choice of language in early modern societies had nothing to do with the discovery and sense of national identity, which was only emerging at the time, but rather with other factors, including religion (see, for example, Sysyn, 2023; Броджі, 2022, p. 28).

According to Yurii Sherekh (George Y. Shevelov), Baranovych's worldview was affected by the context of the Period of Ruin (*Ruina*) – he is a “crushed person”, shaken in his foundations: “His sword is stuck deep in its sheath, his trumpets do not call for battle, but sound the glory of the enslavers of Ukraine, and in the sounds of the lute he seeks escape from life” (Шерех, 1978, p. 21).² The tactics of adaptation and the hope that the rights of the Ukrainian people would be preserved under the tutelage of the tsar gave way to disappointment and a shift to philosophical themes. Expectation of salvation from the outside was Baranovych's only mistake and one that made him a hero of compromise; the punishment for his orientation toward Moscow was that Moscow eventually condemned his works as unorthodox (Шерех, 1978, p. 26).

Considering the correlation between the choice of language and communicative needs, and, more broadly, the communicative situation, Giovanna Brogi Bercoff writes on the language of *Труби* as follows:

The choice of language, which is mainly Church Slavonic, the exaggerated glorification of the tsar, and the quotations and *exempla* kept in a strictly ecclesiastical plane indicate the author's attempts to adapt to the presumed expectations of the tsar and his court, as well as the Russian church authorities. (Броджі-Беркофф, 2008, p. 187)

In another study she also stresses that the imagery of Baranovych's homilies was oriented to “the needs and mentality of the highest ranks of the imperial court, committed to Orthodox traditions” (Броджі-Беркофф, 2012, pp. 29–30). She considers his works to be perfect examples of the Ukrainian canon, which embodied ideas and cultural values transmitted in different languages and by different formal means, and

² This and other quotations from publications in Ukrainian were translated by the author.

emphasizes that he was at the same time part of both the Polish and pan-Orthodox literary tradition (Броджі-Беркофф, 2012, p. 33).

One can agree with Brogi Bercoff that multilingualism was a “normal” condition for the existence of any literature of that time, and the phenomenon of cross-linguistic creativity was inherent in border societies, mainly in Central and Eastern Europe, until the advent of Romanticism (Броджі-Беркофф, 2012, p. 53). Turning to the issue of language choice by a multilingual person, the scholar aptly summarizes that it did not depend on the conscious will and personal identity of the individual, but rather was made under social, rhetorical, religious, “school” pressure and with the automaticity of assimilating the prestige of foreign languages (Броджі-Беркофф, 2014–2015, p. 44).

Another aspect, the actual artistic one, is noticed by those researchers who consider the phenomenon of switching codes and transitions between graphic systems in the context of the Baroque, the root and essence of the work of intellectuals of that time. David A. Frick notes that the practice of mixing languages was a special kind of Ukrainian Baroque macaronism, which Baranovych transferred from the level of language to the level of genre:

Lengthy quotations appeared in both Latin and Cyrillic-letter Church Slavonic. But Church Slavonic passages also appeared in Latin-letter transliteration, as did Ruthenian proverbs. Baranovych also mixed languages and alphabets mid-sentence and mid-poem, causing Church Slavonic phrases to agree grammatically with Polish contexts and matching Polish distychs to Slavonic ones. This was a special kind of Ukrainian baroque macaronism in which the alphabets and languages of the Latin-Greek borderlands mixed and competed with each other, producing cross-cultural and cross-linguistic rhymes and conceits. Baranovych extended this macaronic approach from the level of languages to that of genre. (Frick, 2003, p. 25)

Brogi also writes of the beauty of the archbishop’s trilingual letters and the stylistic functions of multilingual texts (Броджі, 2022, p. 18).

Thus, researchers view multilingualism as a “normal” situation in border societies, which included Ukrainian society in the seventeenth century, and the choice of language in each case depends on a combination of factors – religious, pragmatic, communicative, cultural, artistic, and stylistic.

2. Mixing languages and scripts in Lazar Baranovych’s handwritten notes

This section is devoted to the peculiarities of Baranovych’s handwritten notes on the margins of books which appear in a source study by Marharyta Shamrai (Шамрай, 2005). The scholar observes that the choice of language depended on the subject matter

of the marginal notes: Baranovych wrote his comments on sermons in Church Slavonic, he poetized or recorded natural phenomena and secular events in Polish, he quoted ancient authors in Latin, and so on (Лямпрехт, 2016, p. 16; Шамрай, 2001). Although it is surprising that Shamrai did not notice the Ruthenian when transcribing these marginal notes, the Ukrainian basis of all the records in Cyrillic is quite obvious.

While deciphering marginal notes in the collection of early printed books held at the National Library of Ukraine, Shamrai identified Baranovych's handwriting in two volumes: № 56 – *Трубы словесъ проповѣдныхъ* [Trumpets of the Homiletic Word] (Kyiv, 1674),³ and № 330 – *Псалмы* [Psalms] (Moscow, 1653).

These notes are interesting, first of all, because they are a record of the switching of codes and the switching of graphics: a sentence begins in Church Slavonic and ends in Polish, or vice versa. There are few such records; as can be seen, the use of Church Slavonic is tied to religious terms and formulas:

- *Сія ест субота преблагословен[н]ая в ню же зачатія Преблагословенная Б[огородиц]а присно Дива Марія 1676 w sobotę przypadło LBAC własną ręką* (Шамрай, 2005, p. 50);
- *Иumen Hluchowski zaczął wiecznost sponczysz временний вик вичная ему память* (Шамрай, 2005, p. 185);
- *kiedy w Cerkwi Книгу Ро[жде]ства Х[ристо]ва читано* (Шамрай, 2005, p. 186).

Second, along with the Church Slavonic ones, there are notes in the *prosta mova*, expressive in terms of lexical content and grammatical features. For example:

- *М[іся]ць под час новя **ніколи** не тмится учит Астрологія, въ фѣв[ралі] нов м[іся]ц **починається, щасливи** бо первородного грѣха затмива;*
- ***новъ** ним своим свѣтом земли **привитаєт першого** дня н[е]бу свое оддаєт;*
- ***другого** на морю **з своим** показується ясностію* (Шамрай, 2005, p. 176; bold added).

Third, in the Church Slavonic records, we note very distinct Ukrainian interjections that determine the character of the Ukrainian (Kyivan) redaction. Here, we will take as a basis the established views on the state of formation of certain subsystems of the Ukrainian language in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (Shevelov, 1979; Мойсієнко, 2016), and its features repeatedly attested in different sources (Besters-Dilger, 2005; Наєнко, 2018).

³ Baranovych published two editions of his sermons with slightly different titles in 1674: *Трубы словесъ проповѣдныхъ* [Trumpets of the Homiletic Word] and *Трубы на дни нарочитыя праздникоѡвъ* [Trumpets for Major Feast Days].

At the graphic-orthographic level, the following features are indicative:

1. Pronunciation of the sound of high-mid elevation [y], and hence the confusion of the graphemes **и** and **ы**, which denoted the etymological *i and *y: *м[о]л[и]тви* (gen.) (Шамрай, 2005, p. 49),⁴ *Неплодним древесам [...] и по добрихъ дѣлехъ вѣчния чаяти мзды праведнаго судиу* (p. 50), *виклад* (p. 53), *прикрившиа, покрил, бих* (p. 54), *откривала* (p. 176), *душы* (p. 186), *Єн[иско]ни* (p. 185).
2. The spelling of the sequences **ги**, **ки**, **хи** is consistently used, which corresponds to North Ukrainian: *вовики* (p. 53), *Паки, грѣхи* (p. 54), *во вѣкъ вѣки* (p. 176), *во бл[а]гихъ желаніе бл[а]гим* (p. 177).
3. The phenomenon of dispalatalization of hushing (post-dental) consonants is clearly represented, as are the cases of one of the oldest Ukrainian changes of [e] to [o]: *Мати Б[о]жою* (p. 48), *Отъ душъ нашихъ* (p. 55), *Исполняющыи* (p. 178), *Величѣ* (p. 184), *рцы души его спасеніе* (p. 186). In Ruthenian, we also record the form *що*: *о що ему и Лутер лаает* (p. 53).
4. Occasionally, there are fixations of the hard [c] in word-final position: *зѣ кадилницѣ* (p. 49), *Б[огородицѣ]а* (p. 50), *заступницѣа* (p. 54), *М[ісяцѣ, ѿтцѣа* (p. 176).
5. It was quite common for Kyivan prints of this period to mark the hard pronunciation of [r]: *Матер Божия, матер свѣта* (p. 48), *ты цару царствуеши* (p. 53), *Лазар четверодневный* (p. 55).
6. The marking of the hardness of the final labial is also attested: *ц[е]р[ко]вѣ* (p. 176).
7. Perhaps the most striking Ukrainian interference is the variation in words with reflexes of the etymological *ě, which is found in the records. In addition to correct spellings with the letter **ѣ**, we often come across **и** in its place, which clearly indicates the pronunciation of [i]: *благовирни, Свитлую свищу и матер свѣта, во тмѣ свитися* (p. 49), *Добрѣ вировати добрѣ дилати уклонятися от зла* (p. 50), *и повидает же ему* (p. 53), *чловическу* (p. 54), *привитаает* (p. 176), *пребывает во вѣкъ вѣки* (p. 176), *Нит [!]* (p. 178), *вѣчная память* (p. 186). The pronunciation of [e] in place of this sound in the unstressed position is common in North Ukrainian, and this spelling also occurs: *мешает* (p. 53).
8. The Middle Ukrainian phenomena include assimilative changes of consonants at the prefix-root boundary, the emergence of a new preposition by merging etymological **изъ** – **съ**: *пред тобою зѣ кадилницѣ* (p. 49), *з тѣлом, з н[е]ба, з тобою* (p. 53), *з своим* (p. 176), *щасливи, оддаает, оддаіе* (p. 176). The result of simplification in consonant clusters is the emergence of colloquial forms: *на Рожество* (p. 48), *празнуем* (p. 49).

⁴ This and all subsequent page references which appear on the list (1–10) are made to Шамрай (2005).

9. Changes at the root-suffix boundary that resulted in the assimilation of [j] and the appearance of geminated soft consonants are not reflected consistently, but the etymological spelling prevails: *спасене* твое есмь... (p. 53), *але зачатія* (p. 50), *спасениєм* (p. 178).
10. It is worth noting the spelling of *фукюра* (p. 53), which conveys the pronunciation of the new loanword with [g], and the loss of the initial *i* in the verb *имати*: *будет мати* жену добру; *Не мають* Духа С. Учителя для того (p. 53).

In his marginal notes, Baranovych used all four languages: Latin, Polish, Ruthenian, and the Ukrainian recension of Church Slavonic, the latter marked by distinct Ukrainian features. The mixing of graphic systems (scripts), which marked the transition from one language to another, makes us turn to interpretations of this original phenomenon, which, according to Danylenko, had only partial analogies in humanistic and Baroque Europe and was caused by the disturbance of ethnic and linguistic balance in the Polish-Lithuanian state as a result of Polish-Latin (Catholic) acculturation (Danylenko, 2012, p. 101). These considerations also refer us to Shevelov's conclusions about the social hierarchy of languages in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (see Section 3.1 below).

3. The choice of language in *Трубы на дни нарочитыя праздникоу* (Kyiv, 1674)

3.1. Kyiv or Moscow?

The analysis of Baranovych's language practice cannot be reasonably complete without taking into account Yurii Sherekh's (George Y. Shevelov's) discussion of the confrontation between Polish and Church Slavonic in the cultural field of the society of that time.

He points to the manifestations of direct pressure, even though he views it in terms of religious rather than linguistic struggle. He identifies the reasons for the feverish appeal to Church Slavonic and attempts to renew it (in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries) as attempts to oppose the Polish-Catholic tradition to another tradition, the Greek-Slavonic one, which eventually interrupted the processes of normal development of the literary language (Шерех, 1949, p. 106). Sherekh writes that the emphasis on Church Slavonic was a great tragedy. According to him, it was "a kind of suicide of the Ukrainian cultural stratum, whose ultimate indirect cause was again primarily Polish pressure, and only secondly the brilliance of Polish culture of the time" (Шерех, 1949, p. 106).

The vicissitudes of the publication of Church Slavonic texts prove that this choice did not always lead to success. In this sense, Baranovych's activity fits into the vector of cultural invasion of Muscovy by Ukrainians, which, according to Sherekh, was generated by the era of universalist concepts (Шерех, 1954), and accordingly involved the restoration of the original Church Slavonic language, the creation of the myth of two Russias, and the theory of political and state continuity between old Kyiv and Moscow of that time.

Researchers are well aware of the story of the “non-publication” of *Трубы* in Moscow. Peter Rolland, who writes on this unsuccessful attempt in great detail, published three letters on the matter that Baranovych had received from Simeon Polotsky. Rolland aptly notes the flowery style of the epistles, which also vividly demonstrate a mixture of Polish and Latin (Rolland, 1992, p. 207). Their rhetorical richness has been analyzed by Brogi, who points out the use of Latin phrases and Church Slavonic quotations from the Holy Scripture (Броджі, 2022, pp. 57–59).

The comments of Polotsky, who was appointed censor and editor of the *Трубы*, on the preparation of the Church Slavonic text are worth quoting. He writes that he plans to correct constructions that were rarely used in Muscovy:

Wiorów w ociosaniu będę się wystrzegał, chyba gdzie inaczej być nie może, mianowicie, in constructione sclavonica, która naszym stronom w rzadkim używaniu. (Rolland, 1992, p. 211; bold added)

In the second letter, Polotsky informs Baranovych that he is sending him a corrected text adapted to Moscow norms, including a reduction in the number of dual forms:

Posyłam tedy przepisane i przejrzone ode mnie, które jeśli nie mało poróżnią z oryginałem, temu się nie racz twa Świętobliwość dziwować, bo quot capita, tot sensus, a mając od Waszej Świętobliwości licentiam, czyniłem jako mógł najlepsze, a jeśli gdzie irrepsit deffectus, niech mi to Ojcowski wybaczy affectus. Słowięszczyzna [sic] nieco odmienna, bom się accomodował tutejszej. Dualis numeros mało wwozdiłem, aby trudność nie była czytającym. (Rolland, 1992, p. 212; bold added)

Latin linguistic terms and catchphrases have different purposes here: the former shift the conversation to the professional level, while the latter mark an elevated, refined register of communication. Switching to Latin in the genres of Ukrainian “business writing” is discussed in particular in the book *Латинська мова в Україні XV – початку XVIII століття* [The Latin Language in Ukraine Between the Fifteenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries] (Миронова et al., 2014, pp. 444–475).

The story in which at first the tsar and the church hierarchs allegedly had nothing against the publication of the collection in Moscow, then the matter was delayed, and then Baranovych received permission to publish his work only in Kyiv illustrates the general tendency for the Ukrainian “cultural offensive” to fail (Шерех, 1954), but

also the problem of the difference between the “Kyivan Church Slavonic language” and the “Moscow language”, a difference that church hierarchs were aware of.

3.2. Polish or Ukrainian?

Baranovych as a Polish-language poet and prose writer has drawn the attention of researchers, despite the fact that his poetry was not always highly appreciated. For example, Ihor Ševčenko notes that “[his] Polish verses were bad, not because he did not know Polish, but because he was a poor poet” (Ševčenko, 1996, p. 121). Brogi Bercoff observes that he focused on Polish-speaking Orthodox believers, offering them works that were not tainted by “Latinism”, and he spoke perfect Polish, which means that the choice of language of his works stemmed from both the political situation and his own tastes and interests (Броджі-Беркофф, 2014–2015, pp. 41–42).

An analysis of the interaction between Polish and Ukrainian in Baranovych's writing practice is offered in a study by Olesia Lazarenko (Лазаренко, 2005), who outlines a number of issues of interlingual contacts, bi- and polylingualism, which ultimately led to the development of the southern Polish borderland (Kresy) dialect. The scholar captures Baranovych's use of Ukrainian lexical elements related to military and religious terminology, occasional calques, as well as Hellenisms and Ukrainian Church Slavonicisms (Лазаренко, 2005, pp. 10–11).

Lazarenko also describes in detail the Church Slavonic quotations and inserts in Latin script in his Polish-language publications. It is rather difficult to agree with her view that they are a “peculiar stylistic device”, an inlay, a decoration of the text (Лазаренко, 2005, p. 11). On the contrary, by describing the actual Ukrainian interludes in this Slavic language, the scholar shows the natural transition from one language to another in the practice of a multilingual person. She notes such phenomena as the substitution of the letter *i* for *ѣ* rendering the corresponding Ukrainian pronunciation; the use of *h* in place of the Cyrillic *r*, which indicates fricative pronunciation; the confusion of the letters *i* and *y*, reflecting the parallel phenomenon in Cyrillic (the confusion of *и* and *ѣ*); truncated 3rd sg. verbal forms; and past tense forms in *-в* (Лазаренко, 2005, pp. 11–12). We deal here with script-switching as described by Danylenko (2007a).

The phenomenon of polyscriptality, typical of some multilingual societies, has so far been studied fragmentarily (see Bunčić et al., 2016). Nataliia Malinevska describes the means of conveying Ukrainian phonemes and phonetic phenomena in Latin script records of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries (Маліневська, 2005). Andrii Danylenko argues that the so-called Supraśl Lexicon of 1722 was a continuation of the tradition of script- and language-switching (Danylenko, 2007a). If Jakub Niedźwiedz asks whether the choice of alphabet in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania can be considered a factor of articulation of one's cultural belonging, or even

identity in general (Niedźwiedź, 2019, p. 13), Sergejus Temčinas in his study of the Ruthenian culture of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth answers these questions in the affirmative (Temčinas, 2017).

One striking example of the use of Polish script to convey a Church Slavonic text are the quotations in Baranovych's treatise *Notiy pięć ran Chrystusowych pięć* [Five Marks: The Five Wounds of Christ] (Chernihiv, 1680). They have been analyzed by Olha Herashchenko and Anton Shtefan (Геращенко & Штефан, 2021–2022). In their discussion of a number of phonetic and graphic phenomena that testify to the transmission of certain features of the northern (Polissian) dialect, the scholars put forward contradictory arguments. In their opinion, these graphic features “reflect the trends in the pronunciation of Slavic texts by speakers of Northern Ukrainian (Eastern Polissian) dialects of the time. The question of how these texts were pronounced by other churchmen, representatives of other dialects, seems to be interesting and worth pursuing in further research” (Геращенко & Штефан, 2021–2022, p. 58).

It is unlikely that Baranovych used phonetic principles of spelling in an effort to record his own pronunciation. I am convinced that the features found are essential characteristic features of the Ukrainian version of Church Slavonic, which incorporated phonetic and grammatical elements of the local Ukrainian dialect (of authors and printers).

4. The Ukrainian redaction of Church Slavonic – phonetic, phonological, and morphological features

The Ukrainian redaction of the Church Slavonic language had a long history, which can be traced, among other sources, in texts from the cultural centers of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Its features are easily recognizable, for example, in *Діоніпа* [Dioptra, or The Mirror of Human Living in the World] (1612), a collection of philosophical sermons published in Vievis (Naienko, 2021).

The interference effects of the Ukrainian language on Church Slavonic can be identified by tracing their reflection in texts in different graphics and in different languages. Apart from the Church Slavonic texts in Baranovych's *Notiy pięć ran Chrystusowych pięć* (1680) and the preface and text of his collection *Трубы на дни нарочитых праздниковъ* (Баранович, 1674), I have used for comparison a Ruthenian text from the same period: *Выкладъ о церкви* [Treatise on the Church] by Teodosii Sofonovych, published in the Kyiv Monastery of the Caves (Pecherska Lavra) in 1667 (Наєнко, 2018, 2019). A summary of the results is presented in the table below.

Table 1. Ukrainian features in Church Slavonic and Ruthenian texts

Phenomenon	Church Slavonic of the collection <i>Діонісія</i> by Vitalii (1612)	Church Slavonic inserts in Polish graphics in the treatise <i>Notiy pięć ran Chrystusowych</i> by Lazar Baranovych (1680) ⁵	Church Slavonic of the collection <i>Трубы на дни нарочитыхъ праздниковъ</i> by Lazar Baranovych (1674)	Ruthenian of the treatise <i>Выкладъ о церкви</i> by Teodosii Sofonovych (1667)
Reflexes of the etymological *ǝ: the use of і , confusion of the letters и and ѣ	познаніе самѣх(ъ) себѣ, ра(з)смотрѣлъ, процвите	wik, Swit, Hrich	Свѣтилникъ	в(ъ) Олтари, при той ѡфѣри, где ѡ Сѣрари, в(ъ) ѡлтари, ѡ(т)творѣти
Palatalization of velars: combinations of г, к, х with и, ї, е	хитрости, погибаеѣтъ, великій, блѣихъ	hiblufzczym, Welikija, ruki, Pohibnet, mnovich, Wetchiy	языки, рѣки, на сіа праздники, грѣхи, Великій, аки, кїевскій	Оуслуги, Гисторїа, многїа, на Цр(с)ки(х) врата(х)
Pronunciation of the sound of high-mid elevation [j]: the confusion of the graphemes и and ѣ	похвалаеми, агѣли, зиблющеесѣ, обы(ѣ)деши	izhnanyi, żelanyie, Rymkaho, mnozy	орлими крилы, крилѣ, агѣли, о сихъ крилѣхъ	
Dispatalization of [r']	ѡ(л)тарѣ, Лазарѣ, рагуеѣтъ душу, чтыро(х)	prybihaiem, pryżžno, nepryiemlu, Welikomu Hofudaru caru	Црѣ, Лазарѣ, ратоватисѣ, вепрѣ	Сѣрарѣ, от того жѣ Олтара, чотыро(х)
Dispalatalization of hushing (post-dental) consonants	Приходящѣй, множа(ѣ)шѣмѣ, мачѣсѣ, божѣй, тощѣ, нищѣ	Bożyieiu, hiblufzczym, prebywaiufzczym, żywot, oczyma, proświfczaiefzy, boiafzczychśia, pomofzcz	Нощѣ, вашѣ, на помощѣ, вѣ помощѣ, вѣ Гѣѣ Бѣѣмѣ	прагнучѣмѣ, Чѣмѣ, мовачѣѣмѣ, справуючѣмѣ, Дѣла чѣѣмѣ, Хѣ Возноса чѣѣмѣ

⁵ According to O. Herashchenko and A. Shtefan (Геращенко & Штефан, 2021–2022).

Dispalatalization of [c']	въ ср(д)цы, конецъ, вол(ъ)чець, бѣць	Otca, Otcu, BohoOtec, Mladenca	Горлице(а), помощницу, ѡалмопѣвецъ, Вѣнцы	вѣнецъ, моць, Агнецъ, Конецъ, выгнанцы
Hardening of consonants in word-final positions	червѣ, удобѣ, скорбѣ, црѣковѣ		Голубѣ, вѣтвѣ	Любовѣ, кровѣ
Assimilative processes in the consonant system	ни збирають, по(д) сѣню древа		з Мечемъ, з мѣтвами, з ножемъ	з(ѣ) которыхъ, з двохъ частей, з(ѣ) дѣшѣ и з(ѣ) тѣла, з(ѣ) Нѣа, з(ѣ) себе
Simplification in consonant clusters	въ празности, праз(ѣ)никъ, празнують		Упразнѣтеса, Празничным(ѣ)	щасливе, щасливый, ѡ Празника(х)
Labiovelarization of [l]		Mowczanka ne pufzyt, a proworchawfzy wadit		мови(т), мовлю

In the Church Slavonic text of Baranovych's *Трубы*, one comes across distinct Ukrainian features: specific forms of the vocative case (e.g. *црѣю*), vocalized forms of pronouns (e.g. *той*), preservation of the dual (e.g. *двѣ криль*), reflexes of the second palatalization (e.g. *въ мѣацѣ, на Розѣ, Блази*). We also see the use of vernacular lexemes (especially of Polish origin), such as *црѣвичи плывають*, also as part of glosses: *Вѣси, или Ваги*. The grammatical and lexical traits of the Ukrainian recension of Church Slavonic require further analysis.

Conclusions

Despite the fact that multilingualism is now becoming a global issue in linguistics, the reconstruction of its mechanisms and results, especially in pre-modern Ukraine, has so far been in the focus of literary studies.

The dramatic transformations in the political landscape of Eastern Europe in the mid-seventeenth century involved the transfer of the Ukrainian lands from the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth to Russian rule, which changed the sociolinguistic situation and the status of languages and cultures in these lands. Although the choice of language was discursively determined, that is, it depended on the religious and cultural status of the authors, their situation, and priorities, it was ultimately

determined by how an individual sought socioeconomic or political gain. Therefore, language switching and the ensuing results of language contact proved fluid and dynamic.

Lazar Baranovych was one of the most educated intellectuals of his time. In his works, he used Latin, Polish, and Ruthenian (*prosta mova*), as well as Church Slavonic. The choice of language, which depended on a combination of factors, was not limited by strict and rigorous rules for the use of each of them: the effects of contact can be traced both in the examples of script-switching from Cyrillic to Latin and in the results of code-mixing at different levels of the language system.

The Ukrainian recension of Church Slavonic reflects the influence of vernacular Ukrainian, which can be traced in texts from the cultural centers in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and later the Russian Empire. When it came to the publication of Ukrainian authors in Russia, the difference between Kyivan texts and Moscow texts was quite distinctive. Church Slavonic and vernacular (irrespective of whether the Latin or Cyrillic script was used) had similar graphic means for displaying the systemic features of the Ukrainian language.

Bibliography

- Aronin, L., & Singleton, D. (2012). *Multilingualism*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/impact.30>
- Berlejung, A. (2021). Aramaic or no Aramaic? Multilingualism and the strategy of language choice in the written sources from the Ancient Near East. In L. C. Jonker, A. Berlejung, & I. Cornelius (Eds.), *Multilingualism in Ancient contexts: Perspectives from Ancient Near Eastern and early Christian contexts* (pp. 6–23). Sun Press. <https://doi.org/10.52779/9781991201171/02>
- Besters-Dilger, J. (2005). Die Akademie und Druckerei von Ostroh (1576/77–1636). In M. Moser (Ed.), *Das Ukrainische als Kirchensprache* (pp. 65–150). Lit.
- Braunmüller, K., & Ferraresi, F. (2003). *Aspects of multilingualism in European language history*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/hsm.2>
- Bunčić, D., Lippert, S. L., & Rabus, A. (Eds.). (2016). *Biscriptality: A sociolinguistic typology*. Universitätsverlag Winter.
- Danylenko, A. (2007a). The Uniate *Leksikon* of 1722: A case of regional relapse from script- to language-switching. *Slavia Orientalis*, 56(4), 543–557.
- Danylenko, A. (2007b). “With a dispatch of seven cucumbers fresh...”: Mykola Xanenko as a case study of linguistic mentality in the eighteenth-century Hetmanate. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 29(1–4), 225–256.
- Danylenko, A. (2012). “...[I]s farsijskōhō i s tureckōhō jazika na rušk'ij jezik perelōžil”: Script and language choice in medieval Ruthenia. In V. Izmirlijeva & B. Gasparov (Eds.), *Translation and tradition in “Slavia Orthodoxa”* (pp. 86–105). LIT Verlag.

- Edwards, J. (1994). *Multilingualism*. Routledge.
- Fellerer, J. (2020). *Urban multilingualism in East-Central Europe: The Polish dialect of late-Habsburg Lviv*. Lexington Books.
- Frick, D. A. (2003). Lazar Baranovych, 1680: The Union of Lech and Rus. In A. Kappeler, Z. E. Kohut, F. E. Sysyn, & M. von Hagen (Eds.), *Culture, nation, and identity: The Ukrainian-Russian encounter, 1600–1945* (pp. 19–56). Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Levchuk, P. (2020). *Trójjęzyczność ukraińsko-rosyjsko-polska Ukraińców niepolskiego pochodzenia*. Księgarnia Akademicka. <https://doi.org/10.12797/9788381382854>
- Ligara, B. (2018). Badania bilingwizmu (i wielojęzyczności) wybitnych nosicieli języka w przestrzeni języka polskiego: Nowa subdomena historii języka? In M. Pastuch & M. Siuciak (Eds.), *Historia języka w XXI wieku: Stan i perspektywy* (pp. 97–108). Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Madiba, M. (2021). Beyond multilingualism in Ancient contexts. In L. C. Jonker, A. Berlejung, & I. Cornelius (Eds.), *Multilingualism in Ancient contexts: Perspectives from Ancient Near Eastern and early Christian contexts* (pp. 314–332). Sun Press. <https://doi.org/10.52779/9781991201171/16>
- Naienko, H. (2021). The philosophical ideas in *Dioptra or The Mirror of human living in the world*, and the language of the scientific discourse in the 17th–18th centuries. *Logos*, 108, 22–30. <https://doi.org/10.24101/logos.2021.50>
- Niedźwiedź, J. (2019). Multiscriptuality in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania: New research approaches (D. Frick, Trans.). *East European Politics and Societies and Cultures*, 33(1), 3–16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0888325418807284>
- Rolland, P. (1992). “Nieskoro” prawi “monsztuk do tych trąb otrzymanie”: On Lazar Baranovych’s *Truby sloves propovıdnyx* and their non-publication in Moscow. *Journal of Ukrainian Studies*, 17(1–2), 205–216.
- Ševčenko, I. (1996). Poland in Ukrainian history. In I. Ševčenko, *Ukraine between East and West: Essays on cultural history to the early eighteenth century* (pp. 112–130). Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Shevelov, G. Y. (1971). L’ukrainien littéraire. In G. Y. Shevelov, *Teasers and appeasers: Essays and studies on themes of Slavic philology* (pp. 245–260). Wilhelm Fink Verlag.
- Shevelov, G. Y. (1979). *A historical phonology of the Ukrainian language*. Carl Winter.
- Sobol, W. (2021). *Filip Orlik (1672–1742) i jego “Diariusz”*. Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego. <https://doi.org/10.31338/uw.9788323552383>
- Sysyn, F. (2023). The Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth and the birth of modern Ukraine: A reappraisal of the Khmelnytsky “revolution”. In M. Hanusiewicz-Lavallee & R. A. Maryks (Eds.), *Defining the identity of the Younger Europe* (pp. 13–30). Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004547278_003
- Temčinas, S. (2017). Języki kultury ruskiej w Pierwszej Rzeczypospolitej. In M. Kuczyńska (Ed.), *Między Wschodem a Zachodem: Prawosławie i unia* (pp. 81–120). Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego. <https://doi.org/10.31338/uw.9788323528289.pp.81-120>

- Баранович, Л. (1674). *Трубы на дни нарочитых праздниковъ*. Друкарня Києво-Печерської лаври.
- Броджі, Д. (2022). *Культурний поліморфізм українського світу* (О. Прокопович, Trans.). Дух і літера.
- Броджі-Беркофф, Д. (2008). Барокова гомілетика у східнослов'янському культурному просторі. In A. Alberti (Ed.), *Contributi italiani al XIV Congresso internazionale degli Slavisti* (pp. 179–200). Firenze University Press.
- Броджі-Беркофф, Д. (2012). Чи існує канон українського літературного бароко? (О. Федорко, Trans.). *Український гуманітарний огляд*, 16–17, 9–54.
- Броджі-Беркофф, Д. (2014–2015). Вибір мови та вибір культури в Україні XVII століття. *Київська Академія*, 12, 33–45.
- Геращенко, О., & Штефан, А. (2021–2022). “Jazyk Moę Pouczytsia Prawdi Twoiey”: Слов'яно-руські вставки польською графікою у трактаті Лазаря Барановича. *Slavia Occidentalis*, 78–79(1), 51–60. <https://doi.org/10.14746/so.2021/2022.78-79.5>
- Гнатюк, Л. П. (2010). *Мовний феномен Григорія Сковороди в контексті староукраїнської книжної традиції*. ВПЦ “Київський університет”.
- Ісаєвич, Я. Д. (2001). Мовний код культури. In *Історія української культури: Vol. 2. Українська культура XIII – першої половини XVII століть* (pp. 189–203). Наукова думка.
- Лазаренко, О. М. (2005). *Особливості функціонування польської мови в Україні у XVII ст. (на матеріалі творів Лазаря Барановича)* [Summary of unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Інститут мовознавства імені О. О. Потебні НАН України.
- Лямпрехт, О. В. (2016). *Польськомовна українська проза гуртка Лазаря Барановича* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Харківський національний педагогічний університет імені Григорія Сковороди.
- Маліневська, Н. (2005). *Фонетична система української мови XVII ст. – початку XVIII ст. і латинська графіка*. Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci.
- Миронова, В., Гриценко, С., Корольова, Н. В., Косіцька, О. М., Кошій, О. М., & Щербина, Р. А. (2014). *Латинська мова в Україні XV – початку XVIII століття*. ВПЦ “Київський університет”.
- Мойсієнко, В. (2016). *Історична діалектологія української мови: Північне (поліське) наріччя*. ВЦ “Академія”.
- Наєнко, Г. (2018). Фонетико-фонологічна й графіко-правописна системи української мови II половини XVII століття (на матеріалі “Викладу о церкви Теодосія Софоновича”). *Rozprawy Komisji Językowej*, 66, 333–350. <https://doi.org/10.26485/RKJ/2018/66/20>
- Наєнко, Г. (2019). Праця Теодосія Софоновича “Викладъ ѿ църкв(и) с(т) и ѿ църковныхъ речахъ. ѿ службъ Божой и ѿ Вечерни” 1667 року. In П. Гриценко & Н. Хобзей (Eds.), *Діалектологічні студії: Діалект і пам'ятка* (Vol. 12, pp. 382–418). Інститут українознавства ім. І. Крип'якевича НАН України.
- Німчук, В. В. (1980). *Староукраїнська лексикографія в її зв'язках з російською та білоруською*. Наукова думка.

- Сумцов, М. (1885). *К истории южнорусской литературы 17 столетия: Вып. 1. Лазарь Баранович*. Типография М. Ф. Зильберберга.
- Шамрай, М. (2001). Невідомі записи Лазаря Барановича. *Бібліотечний вісник*, 3, 29–32.
- Шамрай, М. (2005). *Маргіналії в стародруках кириличного шрифту 15–17 ст. з фондів Національної бібліотеки України ім. В. І. Вернадського*. НБУВ.
- Шерех, Ю. (1949). Польська мова в Україні (пам'яті Антуана Мартеля). In *Україна: Українознавство і французьке культурне життя* (Vol. 2, pp. 99–107). "L'UKRAINE".
- Шерех, Ю. (1954). Москва, Маросейка. *Нові дні*, 50, 8–10.
- Шерех, Ю. (1978). Меч, труби, люття. In Ю. Шерех, *Друга черга: Література, театр, ідеології* (pp. 15–26). Сучасність.

Bibliography (Transliteration)

- Aronin, L., & Singleton, D. (2012). *Multilingualism*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/impact.30>
- Baranovych, L. (1674). *Truby na dni narochytyia prazdnikov'*. Drukarnia Kyievo-Pechers'koï lavry.
- Berlejung, A. (2021). Aramaic or no Aramaic? Multilingualism and the strategy of language choice in the written sources from the Ancient Near East. In L. C. Jonker, A. Berlejung, & I. Cornelius (Eds.), *Multilingualism in Ancient contexts: Perspectives from Ancient Near Eastern and early Christian contexts* (pp. 6–23). Sun Press. <https://doi.org/10.52779/9781991201171/02>
- Besters-Dilger, J. (2005). Die Akademie und Druckerei von Ostroh (1576/77–1636). In M. Moser (Ed.), *Das Ukrainische als Kirchensprache* (pp. 65–150). Lit.
- Braunmüller, K., & Ferraresi, F. (2003). *Aspects of multilingualism in European language history*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/hsm.2>
- Brodzhi, D. (2022). *Kul'turnyi polimorfizm ukraïns'koho svitu* (O. Prokopovych, Trans.). Dukh i litera.
- Brodzhi-Berkoff, D. (2008). Barokova homiletyka u skhidnoslov'ians'komu kul'turnomu prostori. In A. Alberti (Ed.), *Contributi italiani al XIV Congresso internazionale degli Slavisti* (pp. 179–200). Firenze University Press.
- Brodzhi-Berkoff, D. (2012). Chy isnuie kanon ukraïns'koho literaturnoho baroko? (O. Fedorko, Trans.). *Ukraïns'kyi humanitarnyi ohliad*, 16–17, 9–54.
- Brodzhi-Berkoff, D. (2014–2015). Vybir movy ta vybir kul'tury v Ukraïni XVII stolittia. *Kyïvs'ka Akademiia*, 12, 33–45.
- Bunčić, D., Lippert, S. L., & Rabus, A. (Eds.). (2016). *Biscriptality: A sociolinguistic typology*. Universitätsverlag Winter.
- Danylenko, A. (2007a). The Uniate *Leksikon* of 1722: A case of regional relapse from script- to language-switching. *Slavia Orientalis*, 56(4), 543–557.
- Danylenko, A. (2007b). "With a dispatch of seven cucumbers fresh...": Mykola Xanenko as a case study of linguistic mentality in the eighteenth-century Hetmanate. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 29(1–4), 225–256.

- Danylenko, A. (2012). "...[I]s farsijskôhō i s tureckôhō jazika na rušk'ij jezik perelôžil": Script and language choice in medieval Ruthenia. In V. Izmirlieva & B. Gasparov (Eds.), *Translation and tradition in "Slavia Orthodoxa"* (pp. 86–105). LIT Verlag.
- Edwards, J. (1994). *Multilingualism*. Routledge.
- Fellerer, J. (2020). *Urban multilingualism in East-Central Europe: The Polish dialect of late-Habsburg Lviv*. Lexington Books.
- Frick, D. A. (2003). Lazar Baranovych, 1680: The Union of Lech and Rus. In A. Kappeler, Z. E. Kohut, F. E. Sysyn, & M. von Hagen (Eds.), *Culture, nation, and identity: The Ukrainian-Russian encounter, 1600–1945* (pp. 19–56). Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Herashchenko, O., & Shtefan, A. (2021–2022). "Iazyk Moy Pouczytsia Prawdi Twoiey": Slov'ianorus'ki vstavky pol's'koiu hrafikoiu u traktati Lazaria Baranovycha. *Slavia Occidentalis*, 78–79(1), 51–60. <https://doi.org/10.14746/so.2021/2022.78-79.5>
- Hnatiuk, L. P. (2010). *Movnyi fenomen Hryhoriia Skovorody v konteksti staroukraïns'koï knyzhnoi tradytsii*. VPTS "Kyïvs'kyi universytet".
- Isaievych, I. A. D. (2001). Movnyi kod kul'tury. In *Istoriia ukraïns'koï kul'tury: Vol. 2. Ukraïns'ka kul'tura XIII – pershoï polovyny XVII stolit'* (pp. 189–203). Naukova dumka.
- Lazarenko, O. M. (2005). *Osoblyvosti funktsionuvannia pol's'koï movy v Ukraïni u XVII st. (na materiali tvoriv Lazaria Baranovycha)* [Summary of unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Instytut movoznavstva imeni O. O. Potebni NAN Ukraïny.
- Levchuk, P. (2020). *Trójjęzyczność ukraińsko-rosyjsko-polska Ukraińców niepolskiego pochodzenia*. Księgarnia Akademicka. <https://doi.org/10.12797/9788381382854>
- Liamprekht, O. V. (2016). *Pol's'komovna ukraïns'ka proza hurtka Lazaria Baranovycha* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Kharkivs'kyi natsional'nyi pedahohichnyi universytet imeni Hryhoriia Skovorody.
- Ligara, B. (2018). Badania bilingwizmu (i wielojęzyczności) wybitnych nosicieli języka w przestrzeni języka polskiego: Nowa subdomena historii języka? In M. Pastuch & M. Siuciak (Eds.), *Historia języka w XXI wieku: Stan i perspektywy* (pp. 97–108). Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Madiba, M. (2021). Beyond multilingualism in Ancient contexts. In L. C. Jonker, A. Berlejung, & I. Cornelius (Eds.), *Multilingualism in Ancient contexts: Perspectives from Ancient Near Eastern and early Christian contexts* (pp. 314–332). Sun Press. <https://doi.org/10.52779/9781991201171/16>
- Malinevs'ka, N. (2005). *Fonetyczna systema ukraïns'koï movy XVII st. – pochatku XVIII st. i latyns'ka hrafika*. Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci.
- Moïsiienko, V. (2016). *Istorychna dialektolohiia ukraïns'koï movy: Pivnichne (poli's'ke) narichchia*. VTS "Akademia".
- Myronova, V., Hrytsenko, S., Korol'ova, N. V., Kosits'ka, O. M., Koshchiï, O. M., & Shcherbyna, R. A. (2014). *Latyns'ka mova v Ukraïni XV – pochatku XVIII stolittia*. VPTS "Kyïvs'kyi universytet".

- Naïenko, H. (2018). Fonetyko-fonolohichna i hrafiko-pravopysna systemy ukraïns'koï movy II polovyny XVII stolittia (na materiali "Vykladu o tserkvy Teodosiia Sofonovycha"). *Rozprawy Komisji Językowej*, 66, 333–350. <https://doi.org/10.26485/RKJ/2018/66/20>
- Naïenko, H. (2019). Pratsia Teodosiia Sofonovycha "Vyklad" o tsrkv(y) s(t) y o tsrkovnykh" rechakh". o sluzhbb Bozhoï y o Vecherny" 1667 roku. In P. Hrytsenko & N. Khobzei (Eds.), *Dialektolohichni studii: Dialekt i pam'iatka* (Vol. 12, pp. 382–418). Instytut ukraïnoznavstva im. I. Kryp'iakevycha NAN Ukraïny.
- Naïenko, H. (2021). The philosophical ideas in *Dioptra or The Mirror of human living in the world*, and the language of the scientific discourse in the 17th–18th centuries. *Logos*, 108, 22–30. <https://doi.org/10.24101/logos.2021.50>
- Niedzwiedz, J. (2019). Multiscripturality in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania: New research approaches (D. Frick, Trans.). *East European Politics and Societies and Cultures*, 33(1), 3–16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0888325418807284>
- Nimchuk, V. V. (1980). *Staroukraïns'ka leksykohrafiia v ii zv'iazkakh z rosiïskoiu ta bilorus'koiu*. Naukova dumka.
- Rolland, P. (1992). "Nieskoro" prawi "monsztuk do tych trąb otrzymacie": On Lazar Baranovyč's *Truby sloves propovidnyx* and their non-publication in Moscow. *Journal of Ukrainian Studies*, 17(1–2), 205–216.
- Ševčenko, I. (1996). Poland in Ukrainian history. In I. Ševčenko, *Ukraine between East and West: Essays on cultural history to the early eighteenth century* (pp. 112–130). Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press.
- Shamrai, M. (2001). Nevidomi zapysy Lazaria Baranovycha. *Bibliotechnyi visnyk*, 3, 29–32.
- Shamrai, M. (2005). *Marhinalii v starodrukakh kyrylychnoho shryftu 15–17 st. z fondiv Natsional'noi biblioteky Ukraïny im. V. I. Vernad'skoho*. NBUV.
- Sherekh, IU. (1949). Pol's'ka mova v Ukraïni (pam'iaty Antuana Martelia). In *Ukraïna: Ukraïnoznavstvo i frantsuz'ke kul'turne zhyttia* (Vol. 2, pp. 99–107). "L'UKRAINE".
- Sherekh, IU. (1954). Moskva, Marosieika. *Novi dni*, 50, 8–10.
- Sherekh, IU. (1978). Mech, truby, liutnia. In IU. Sherekh, *Druha cherha: Literatura, teatr, ideolohii* (pp. 15–26). Suchasnist'.
- Shevelov, G. Y. (1971). L'ukrainien littéraire. In G. Y. Shevelov, *Teasers and appeasers: Essays and studies on themes of Slavic philology* (pp. 245–260). Wilhelm Fink Verlag.
- Shevelov, G. Y. (1979). *A historical phonology of the Ukrainian language*. Carl Winter.
- Sobol, W. (2021). *Filip Orlik (1672–1742) i jego "Diariusz"*. Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego. <https://doi.org/10.31338/uw.9788323552383>
- Sumtsov, M. (1885). *K istorii iuzhnorusskoï literatury 17 stoletii: Vyp. 1. Lazar' Baranovich*. Tipografiia M. F. Zil'berberga.
- Sysyn, F. (2023). The Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth and the birth of modern Ukraine: A reappraisal of the Khmelnytsky "revolution". In M. Hanusiewicz-Lavallee & R. A. Maryks (Eds.), *Defining the identity of the Younger Europe* (pp. 13–30). Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004547278_003

Temčinas, S. (2017). Języki kultury ruskiej w Pierwszej Rzeczypospolitej. In M. Kuczyńska (Ed.), *Między Wschodem a Zachodem: Prawosławie i unia* (pp. 81–120). Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego. <https://doi.org/10.31338/uw.9788323528289.pp.81-120>

Multilingualism of Ukrainian Elites in the Seventeenth Century: The Case of Lazar Baranovych

Abstract

The article examines the multilingual practice of Lazar Baranovych in the context of the sociolinguistic situation of Ukraine in the early modern period. Multilingualism is inherent in border societies, including Ukrainian society in the seventeenth century, and the choice of language in each case depends on a combination of factors – religious, pragmatic, communicative, cultural, and artistic/stylistic. The study analyzes the phenomenon of code-switching on the example of Baranovych's own marginal notes, made in Polish, Ruthenian (*prosta mova*) and Church Slavonic. The Ukrainian recension of Church Slavonic reflects the influence of spoken Ukrainian, which can be traced in texts from the cultural centers in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and later the Russian Empire. This is illustrated by the language of the collection of sermons *Трубы на дни нарочитыя праздниковъ* [Trumpets for Major Feast Days] (1674), which Lazar Baranovych could not publish in Moscow not only for political reasons but also because of the peculiarity of the language.

Keywords: Slavic languages; history of the Ukrainian language; Church Slavonic; multilingualism; Lazar Baranovych

Wielojęzyczność ukraińskich elit XVII wieku: studium przypadku Łazarza Baranowicza

Streszczenie

W artykule podjęto próbę analizy praktyki wielojęzycznej Łazarza Baranowicza w kontekście sytuacji socjolingwistycznej Ukrainy w epoce wczesnonowżytnej. Wielojęzyczność jest nieodłącznym elementem społeczeństw pogranicznych, do których w XVII wieku należało też społeczeństwo ukraińskie, a wybór języka w każdym konkretnym przypadku zależy od wielu czynników – religijnych, pragmatycznych, komunikacyjnych, kulturowych i artystyczno-stylistycznych. Autorka analizuje przenikanie kodów językowych w marginaliach zapisanych przez

Baranowicza w języku polskim, w „prostej mowie” i w cerkiewnosłowiańskim. Ukraińska redakcja języka cerkiewnosłowiańskiego odzwierciedla wpływ mówionego języka ukraińskiego, który można prześledzić w tekstach z ośrodków kulturalnych Rzeczypospolitej Obojga Narodów, a później Cesarstwa Rosyjskiego. Ilustruje to język kazań w zbiorze *Трубы на дни нарочитыя праздникоѡвъ* [Trąby na szczególne dni świąteczne] (1674), którego Baranowicz nie mógł opublikować w Moskwie nie tylko z powodów politycznych, ale także ze względu na specyfikę języka.

Słowa kluczowe: języki słowiańskie; historia języka ukraińskiego; język cerkiewnosłowiański; wielojęzyczność; Łazarz Baranowicz

Prof. Halyna Naienko, Doctor of Philology, Professor at the Department of Ukrainian Language and Applied Linguistics, Educational and Research Institute of Philology, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv; PhD – 1994, habilitation in Philology (Ukrainian) – 2015, (Full) Professor – 2022, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Dr. hab. – 2023, University of Lodz. Her research interests cover a number of linguistic and cultural areas, including history of the Ukrainian language, Church Slavonic, history of Ukrainian scientific text/discourse, history of Ukrainian linguistics, and language contact. She participated in several research projects dealing with the modern Ukrainian language, such as “Ecolinguistic Modes of the Ukrainian Discursive Space in the European Multicultural Continuum” (2020–2021, Kyiv). Since the outbreak of the Russo-Ukrainian war in 2022, she has been working on the international project “Orthodox Slavic Linguistic Varieties at the Threshold of Modernity: Continuity and Innovation. A Mixed-Methods Approach” (2022–2025, University of Lodz, Poland, National Science Centre, Poland). She has authored more than 120 scholarly publications, which appeared in Ukraine and abroad, including an authored book, a co-authored book, six academic/didactic publications (three of them in co-authorship), and over 90 articles, reviews, and chapters in edited books.

Bibliography (selected): *Науковий текст середньоукраїнського періоду в лінгвістичному, текстолінгвістичному й функціонально-комунікативному висвітленні* [Scientific text of the Middle Ukrainian period in the linguistic-stylistic, textual-linguistic, and communicative-functional context], Київ (Kyiv) 2013; (with A. Danylenko), Linguistic Russification in Russian Ukraine: Languages, imperial models, and policies, *Russian Linguistics* 43(1), Germany 2019, 19–39; Українська редакція церковнослов'янської мови в парадигмі сучасної лінгвістики [Ukrainian redaction of the Church Slavonic language from the perspective of modern linguistics], *Slavia Orientalis* 71(4), Warszawa (Warsaw) 2022, 779–795;

Історико-мовознавча школа Київського національного університету: постаті, напрями, періоди [The school of historical linguistics at the University of Kyiv: Personalities, approaches, periods], *Slavia* 92(1), Praha (Prague) 2023, 82–105.

Correspondence: Halyna Naienko, Department of the Ukrainian Language and Applied Linguistics, Educational and Scientific Institute of Philology, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Kyiv, Ukraine, e-mail: h.naienko@knu.ua

Department of Slavic Philology, Faculty of Philology, University of Lodz, Łódź, Poland, e-mail: halyna.naienko@filologia.uni.lodz.pl

Support of the work: This article has been written as part of the research project “Orthodox Slavic Linguistic Varieties at the Threshold of Modernity: Continuity and Innovation. A Mixed-Methods Approach”, financed by the National Science Centre, Poland, Decision No. DEC-2020/39/G/HS2/01652.

Competing interests: The author declares that she has no competing interests.

Publication history: Received: 2024-04-06; Accepted: 2024-06-13; Published: 2024-12-31.



INSTITUTE OF SLAVIC STUDIES
POLISH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
1954–2024