THE LANGUAGE AND CULTURAL CONTACTS IN THE 17th CENTURY AND THE SERMON DISCOURSE OF ANTONII RADYVYLOVSKYI

Oksana Nika[1]

DOI: https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-001-8-1-13

Abstract. The study examines the sermon discourse as a new discourse practice brought about by the language and cultural contacts in the XVII century in the Polish-Lithuanian State. The Polish texts by Piotr Skarga, Tomasz Młodzianowski, Franciczek Dzielowski and others exerted an impact on the lexis, type of text creation, communicative and stylistic features in the Ruthenian sermon in the XVII century. That impact prompted Antonii Radyvylovskyi to employ some Polonisms and Latinisms in diffeent parts of his sermons.

The article traces lexical variability and its language and cultural 'functionality' in the early book by A. Radyvylovskyi, one of the most famous preachers of the XVII century. The paper compares functioning of Polish and Latin (through Polish transmission) lexemes characterizing the discourse dimension of the XVII century language and cultural interference in the manuscript, the edited text, and the published book *Vinets Khrystov* (The Wreath of Christ). The number of such lexemes turns out to be the biggest in the manuscript by A. Radyvylovskyi, which demonstrates the level of language interference in the sermon discourse.

The study analyzes the substitutions of Latinisms and Polonisms introduced by the editor of the collection *Vinets Khrystov* (The Wreath of Christ) who offered his corrections and amendments to the text. The substitutions made by the editor were taken into account in the printed book that was a prerequisite for its appearance in 1688. On the editor's recommendations found in the manuscript, the published book retained substitutions of some Latin and Polish words with Church Slavonic ones. Such substitutions were caused by the change of the socio-cultural situation

[1] Doctor of Philological Sciences,
Professor of the Department of the Ukrainian Language and Applied Linguistics,
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Institute of Philology, Ukraine

© Oksana Nika

in the 1680s; however, those substitutions were just few apparent elements, which, actually, did not change the language of the sermon (kazanie), used in the XVII century.

The language and cultural intersections of Polish and Ruthenian preaching practices increased the spatial (the Polish-Lithuanian State) and temporal (XVII and XVIII centuries) spread of the collection of sermons by Antonii Radyvylovskyi. In the XVII and XVIII centuries, his books were actively spread and became popular readings for those speaking the Ruthenian language, which is proven by the availability of his books in the library of the Holy Trinity Monastery in Vilnius, the library of Wroclaw and others.

1. Introduction

Preaching as a historical, cultural, and linguistic phenomenon in the late 16th and XVII centuries has often captured the attention of scholars: e.g. the study on P. Skarga's Polish sermons [4], Polish and Lithuanian *Punktai sakymų* (Points of sermons) by K. Sirvydas [13].

The Ruthenian sermons of the Early Modern period are currently being more intensively explored from historical, philosophical, and literary perspectives [2; 7; 15]. They reveal the system of values of the second half of the17th century based on the published book of sermons by A. Radyvylovskyi [2], ways of citing Latin texts in the sermons by Y. Galiatovskyi [15].

Adopting the linguistic perspective, scholars have looked at the stylistic and cultural peculiarities of the Baroque Ruthenian sermon in the XVII century [11; 16]. In their papers, A. Radyvylovskyi's legacy was discussed only in the context of sermon development in general.

A separate study on A. Radyvylovskyi was published by M. Markovskyi in the 1890s [5]. The author demonstrated the Polish influence on the sermons of the Ukrainian preacher, analysed the language features of Radyvylovskyi's texts, and appended some previously unpublished sermons to his study.

The published books of A. Radyvylovskyi *Ohorodok Marii Bohorodytsi* (The Garden of Virgin Mary) (1676) and *Vinets Khrystov* (The Wreath of Christ) (1688) have been carefully examined from a linguistic perspective. Meanwhile, A. Radyvylovskyi's manuscripts have failed to receive

any special attention of linguists and have not been compared with the published books of the author. Yu. Sheveliov, referring to the works of A. Radyvylovskyi in his review of the written monuments of the Middle Ukrainian period, drew attention to the fact that "the preserved manuscript of his sermons from the *Ohorodok*, dating back to 1671, retained more Ukrainian features" [14, p. 728].

In the previous studies, we discussed such issues as development of the genre of sermon in the history of literary language, influence of Polish language and Polish sources on the composition of A. Radyvylovsky's sermon [8; 9]. The book *Radyvylovskyi Antonii. Barokovi propovidi 17 stolittia* (Radyvylovskyi Antonii. Baroque sermons of the XVII century) was published in 2019 [12]. The edition offers a piece of scholarly research, A. Radyvylovskyi's texts, as well as an index of words and their forms. The book reproduces the sermons from two printed and handwritten collections by A. Radyvylovski in modern typeset.

Lexical substitution of Latinisms and Polonisms in these sermons has not been thoroughly studied yet, just as the preaching discourse of the language and cultural space of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth has not been fully discussed.

The scope of the present article is to analyse the preaching discourse of A. Radyvylovskyi in the light of language and cultural contacts of the Early Modern period.

This presupposes the following tasks:

– characterizing A. Radyvyloski's sermons as a new discursive practice in the polycultural and polylingual continuum;

– specifying the discursive situation of publishing the collection *Vinets Khrystov* (The Wreath of Christ) that prompted the selection of lexical devices;

– comparing the functioning of Polish and Latin lexemes in the manuscript and their substitutions in the edited text and the early printed book *Vinets Khrystov* (The Wreath of Christ);

– discussing the textual realisation of Latinisms and Polonisms along with their lexicographic registration in the dictionaries of the XVII century, as well as the contemporary historical dictionaries.

The study employs the method of linguocultural interpretation, context and interpretation method, historical and comparative study methods.

The analysis methodology lies in the comparison of the sermons by A. Radyvylovskyi based on his manuscript as well as the published book and identifying the meaning of the Latinisms and Polonisms the editor suggested substituting. The lexical substitutes were compared with the lexicographical sources of the XVII century and contemporary historical dictionaries. This allows determining the coincidences and differences between the meanings the analysed lexical units have in the text and in the dictionaries, as well as singling out specific meanings that were not recorded in the dictionaries of that time. Lexical variability in the manuscript and the book is interpreted in the context of linguoculturology.

2. The XVII Century Sermon Discourse in the Polylingual and Polycultural Continuum

The objective of the study is to describe the peculiarities of creating and spreading Cyrillic texts as processes integrating the language and intellectual life in the XVII century, to explore the resulting lexical variability in the sermons (kazania), which were popular at that time.

The XVII century is characterized by such features as polylinguality and polyculture, language interference, and existing language standard requirements. Lexical va-riability in the sermons is the reflection of the mentioned processes that characterize the Ruthenian language functioning among the Polish, Latin, and Church Slavonic languages. In general, the sermons were often influenced by the Polish patterns, which as well as using ‘patterns’ in narratives prompted lexical interference. Contemporary research proves that texts from the Kyiv circle and, in particular, sermons by A. Radyvylovskyi, were popular in Vilnius.

Thus, I. Almes analyzed the stock in the library of the Holy Trinity Monastery in Vilnius where the preaching materials occupied a significant place: ‘these are primarily Polish books by the famous authors of the Baroque epoch from the Polish-Lithuanian State: Piotr Skarga, Fabian Birkowski, Antoni Węgrzynowicz, Jan Wolski, Jan Ignacy Krosnowski, Iwan (Olszewski) et al. This list also includes the texts that came from the Kyiv circle of scholars of the second half of the XVII century, for instance, Sunday sermons *Vinets Khrystov* (The Wreath of Christ) by Antonii (Radyvylovskyi) in Ruthenian” [1, p. 299]. Incidentally, the list also comprises “30 catalogues of the European libraries, including the public library in Wroclaw” [1, p. 300].

3. Antonii Radyvylovskyi and the discourse situation of publishing his collection of sermons

A. Radyvylovskyi as a preacher is known for the Kyiv period of his life, when he wrote two collections of sermons, which were subsequently published in Kyiv, both in the printing house of the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra. Huge in volume, these collections of sermons constitute all his written heritage, which demonstrates the Polish influence [5].

Little information about the preacher has been preserved: he is known to have studied at the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy in the 1640s, thereafter he became a monk and was an archdeacon in Chernihiv until 1656, the hegumen of the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra (since 1671), the head of the Desert-Nicholas Monastery in Kyiv (1683–1688). He signed the manuscript as a hieromonk, the hegumen of the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra; therefore, the text was created before 1671. In the preface of 1688, the author introduced himself as "hieromonk Antonii Radyvylovskyi, the head of the Desert-Nicholas Monastery in Kyiv".

The manuscript was prepared for publication by the editor, who introduced numerous amendments. Such modifications are insignificant in the first collection of sermons, *Ohorodok Marii Bohorodytsi* (The Garden of Virgin Mary) (published in 1676); however, the work on preparing the second book, *Vinets Khrystov* (The Wreath of Christ), lasted longer and brougnt about more changes.

The comparison of the manuscript with the book *Vinets Khrystov* (The Wreath of Christ) by A. Radyvylovskyi and spotting the differences between them, mainly the lexical ones, reflect changes in the literary language at the end of the XVII century and complement the analysis of the lexical composition of the Ukrainian language in historical dimension [10].

While analyzing *Synonima*, P. Zhytetskyi noticed that some lexical changes occurring when the unknown lexicographer replaced the abstract words, "which came to the bookish Ukrainian language mainly from the Polish language", were aimed at "supplanting Polish words by synonymous Slavonic ones" [17, p. 5].

Both texts – the manuscript and the book – are stored in the Institute of Manuscripts and the Department of Early and Rare Books in the Institute of Bibliology at the Vernadskyi National Library of Ukraine (VNLU). Most edits are included in the manuscript of *Vinets Khrystov* (The Wreath of

Christ) with the full name *ВѢНЕЦЪ ХВ҃Ъ. З Проповѣдїй неделныхъ аки з(ъ) цвѣтѡ(в) рожаны(х) на оукрашенїе правосла(в)но каѳолическо(й) восто(ч)но(й) цр҃кви исплетенный Или КАЗАН(Ь)А НЕДѢ(Л)НЫЕ На весь Годъ з(ъ) Писма Ст҃го з(ъ) ОУчителей Цр҃ковны(х), и з(ъ) розны(х) Авторѡ(в) собраныє и написаныє. Пре(з) недостоина(г)[о] Іеромонаха Антонїа Радивилѡвского Намѣсника Ст҃ѡй Чудотворной Обители Печерской Кїевской* (THE WREATH OF CHRIST. Of Sunday sermons like of rose flowers to decorate Orthodox Eastern church writhen, or Sunday sermons for a full year from the Holy Scripture, Church Fathers, and different authors collected and written by the unworthy hieromonk Antonii Radyvylovskyi, the hegumen of the Holy Miraculous Kyiv Pechersk Monastery) (V. Manuscr., p. 1).

The title of the early book contains a changed annotated name; the name of the author is not given, and the sources are reworded: *з(ъ) Писма Ст҃огѡ, и з(ъ) розныхъ оуч҃телей, на ползу душевную Православныхъ, собраный* (of the Holy Scripture, different Church Fathers, for the spiritual benefit of the Orthodox, collected) (V., tit.).

The back of the first unnumbered page of the manuscript includes information about the already issued collection of sermons *з(ъ) значною поправою и ѡ(т)мѣною: Сїй Казаня за помощію Бж҃іє(й), и прест҃ои Б(д҃)цы а мл҃твами Ст҃ителя Чудотво(р)ца Хв҃а Николаю выдруковалися з(ъ) значною поправою и ѡ(т)мѣною. и ѡ(т)писалъ сію книгу авто(р) онои, превелебны(й) бл҃женнои памяти ѡ(т)цъ Антони(й) Радивиловски(й) Ігуме(н) мн(с҃)тра Ст҃ителю Х(с҃)ва Ніколая Пусты(н) но(г)[о] Кіе(в)ско(г)[о] до того жъ мн(с҃)тра Ст҃о Ніко(л)ско(г)[о], в которо(м) и пре(с)стави(л)ся роки ах҃пи. м(с҃)ца деке(м)вріа, дня і҃. бг҃оуго(д)не. а погребе(н) в Пече(р)ско(м) дня еі҃. того (ж) м(с҃)ца и року. Да помяне(т) єго Г(с҃)дь Бг҃ъ во Цр҃ствіи своє(м) нб(с҃)но(м), и да напише(т) в книги живота вѣчно(г)о* (with significant amendments and changes: These sermons with the help of God, Holy Mother of God, and the prayers of Holy Wonderworker of Christ Nicholas have been printed with significant amendments and changes. And the author of the book, Father Antonii Radyvylovskyi of Blessed Memory, the hegumen of the Desert-Nicholas Monastery in Kyiv, earlier the Monastery of St. Nicholas, where he died on 11 December 1688, and was buried in the Pechersk Monastery on the 15th of the same month and year. May the Lord God remember him

in His heavenly kingdom and write his name in the book of eternal life) (V. Manuscr., p. 1a).

The manuscript has two prefaces: the first one is to Jesus Christ (V. Manuscr., pp. 3–13), while the second one is to the reader (V. Manuscr., pp. 15–20). In the second preface, the author articulates the purpose of his collection of sermons: *оучинилемъ тоє напере(д) длѧ того, абыс(ъ) оные себѣ читаючи, албо [еслис(ъ) естъ дх҃овнаѧ ѡсоба] людемъ в(ъ) цр҃кви ст҃ой проповѣдаючи; оуважалъ тое, же Хс҃ Сп҃ситль…* (I have done that primarily for those to read it for themselves or for a spiritual person to read it in the holy church while preaching; to recognize Christ as the Sa-vior) (V. Manuscr., p. 15). The early book also contains the preface "*Въ славоу и че(ст) цр҃а цр(с҃)твоующи(х) и Г(с҃)да г(с҃)дтвоующихъ*" ("To the glory and honor of the King of the Kings and Lord of the Lords"), which characterizes the social and linguistic changes of the end of XVII century.

The ecclesiastical censorship banned the publication of the collection of sermons *Vinets Khrystov* (The Wreath of Christ) by A. Radyvylovskyi, but the collection was published with the support of the Kyiv elite.

K.V. Kharlampovych claims that since the late 1670s and in the 1680s, the influence of ecclesiastical censorship on book publishing had been increasing. He refers to the fact that when in 1688 Patriarch Joachim got to know the book *Vinets Khrystov* (The Wreath of Christ) was prepared for publishing in Kyiv, he "forbade printing it without his endorsement. And when it was nonetheless printed, the more so mentioning his blessing, he rebuked both Archimandrite Varlaam and Metropolitan Gedeon" [3, p. 446]. In the same year, the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra sent the book to the tsar with the hegumen Isaakii Kokorovych and the elder Antonii Pocheka; the cover letter written by A. Radyvylovskyi was added to the book [3, pp. 446–447].

The early book preface also mentions Patriarch Joachim's blessing for printing. Besides, it gives credit to the Kyiv clergy, the persons who actually contributed to the publication of the book: Metropolitan of Kyiv, Galicia and All Little Russia Gedeon, Archimandrite of the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra Varlaam.

This explains the presence of handwritten edits in the manuscript, reflecting a change in the language standard in the last quarter of the XVII century. The manuscript is marked up in another handwriting and ink. A word in the text is stricken through, and the editor's recommended version is handwritten on top of it or – less often – in the margin of the manuscript.

The manuscript *Vinets Khrystov* (The Wreath of Christ) is larger than the volume of the printed book, and not all manuscript sermons are edited, likewise they all contain a different number of edits. War manuscript sermons from this collection have few edits perhaps because they were not intended to be published.

4. Polonisms and latinisms in the discourse dimension of the language and cultural contacts

The article analyzes Latin and Polish lexical units that freely functioned in the manuscript, but the editor, preparing the text for printing, considered the socio-cultural changes in the 1670–1680s, therefore he changed the specific lexical units of such origin into the Church Slavonic and rarely into the bookish Ukrainian ones.

As a rule, the manuscript substitutions were taken into account in the published book. In some cases, the book has an alternative, which is different from the one proposed in the manuscript: the word *шлѧхе(т)но(ст)* (*воли чл҃вческои шлѧхе(т)но(ст))* (virtue (virtue of human will) was substituted by *зацно(ст)* (virtue), although the edit was disregarded in the published book.: *Але абы и волѧ члч(с҃)каѧ єще при самом(ъ) створен(ъ)ю чл҃вѣку данаѧ* (And if the human will is given at creation) (V., p. 145).

The omission of such words as *шлѧхе(т)но(ст)*, *зацно(ст)* leads to the following restructuring: *воли чл҃вческои шлѧхе(т)но(ст) – волѧ члч(с҃)каѧ* (virtue of human will – human will). In *Materials to the Dictionary...* by Ye. Tymchenko, these words are given with the Polish equivalent: *зацность* (pl. *zacność*) (Tymch. 1, p. 297), *шляхетность* (pl. *szlachetność*) (Tymch. 2, p. 499).

In the manuscript text, Latinisms were replaced (e.g., *аффектъ* → *оумыслъ* (affect → intent)) or even skipped, which resulted in the reorganization of the sentence: *Пойдѣмо (ж) до сен(ъ)су дх҃овна(г)* → *(ОУ)важмѡ тоє дх҃овне* (Let us go to the spiritual sense → Let us consider it spiritually).Substitutions

In the Synonima, there is an entry аффектъ (affect), and its translation section provides the following lexemes and word-combinations: страсть, причастїе, движенїе сердечное (passion, involvement, movement of the heart) (Synonima).

In the *Synonima*, there is an entry *аффектъ* (affect), and its translation section provides the following lexemes and word-combinations: *страсть,*

Substitutions	Manuscript	Edit in the Manuscript	Published Book
аффектъ → ***оумыслъ*** (affect → intent)	***аффектъ*** *свой ѡразъ до нб(с҃) ны(х) и зем-ны(х) ѡборочаютъ рѣче(й)* (Their affect is directed to earthly and heavenly things) (V. Manuscr.., p. 351).	***аффектъ*** (this word is underlined in the manuscript and the margin contains a gloss – *умыс(л)) свой ѡразъ до нб(с҃) ны(х) и зем-ны(х) ѡборочаютъ рѣче(й)* (Their intent is directed to earthly and heavenly things) (V. Manuscr., p. 351).	***оумыслъ*** *свой оразъ до нб(с҃)ны(х) и зе(м)ны(х) ѡборачаю(т) рѣче(й)* (Their intent is directed to earthly and heavenly things) (V., p. 121 zv.)
до сен(ъ)су дх҃овна(г) → ***дх҃овне*** (to spiritual sense → spiritually)	*Пойдѣмо (же) до* ***сен(ъ)су дх҃овна(г)*** (Let us go to the spiritual sense) (V. Manuscr.., p. 351).	*Пойдѣмо (же)* ***до сен(ъ)су дх҃ов-на(г)*** (Let us go to the spiritual sen-se) – is crossed out and the margin contains a gloss *уважмо (ж) тоє дх҃овне)* (Let us consider it spiritually)	*(ОУ)важмѡ тоє* ***дх҃овне*** (Let us consider it spiritually) (V., p. 123)
Тутъ ***з(ъ) ѡкказїи*** *пытаю ва(с) слихачу? Тутъ можетсѧ запытати* (On this occasion, here I am asking you, the listener → Here one may ask) ***таєм(ъ)ница*** → ***таина*** (mystery → mystery)	*Тутъ* ***з(ъ) ѡкказїи*** *пытаю ва(с) слихачу? чтѡ бы в(ъ) томъ была* ***за таєм(ъ) ница*** (On this occasion, here I am asking you, the listener? What was the mystery therein?) (V. Manuscr., p. 481).	No edit	*Тутъ можетсѧ запытати: что бы в(ъ) то(м) бы-ла* ***за таина*** (Here one may ask: what was the mystery therein?) (V., p. 161 zv.)

причастїе, движенїе сердечное (passion, involvement, movement of the heart) (*Synonima*).

In the *Lexis* by L. Zyzanii, the word *афектъ* (affect) is given in the translation section of the entry *бе(з)страстїе* (dispassion), which is

interpreted as *нетер-плен(ъ)е, не(з)неволен(ъ)е ѡ(т) афе(к)то(в)* (intolerance of, disinclination to affects) (*Synonima,* p.29). This work, as well as the *Lexicon* by P. Berynda, does not record the word *оумыслъ* (intent). Similar to *Synonima*, the *Lexicon* by E. Slavynetskyi included the Latin word *affectus* translated as *стра(ст)*, *движенїе* (passion, movement) (L., p. 74), the *Slavonic-Latin Lexicon* interprets: *Страсть* (passion). *Passio. Affectus* (CL., p. 512). This translation differs from the text substitution in *Vinets Khrystov* (The Wreath of Christ): *аффектъ → оумыслъ* (affect → intent). *The Dictionary of the Ukrainian language of the 16th to the first half of the XVII century* mentions *афектъ, аффектъ* 'intent, desire, idea, treatment of smb' (SlUM, 1, pp. 146–147), as well as *афектовати, афектация* (SlUM 1, pp. 147–148). The *Latin Lexicon* contains a dictionary entry *sensus us. чувство, сми(с)лъ* (sense) (L., p. 368). The absence of this substitution in the manuscript results from using different verbs *(пойдѣмо →(оу)важмѡ* (Let us go → Let us consider)*)* and their collocations.

Originally, the manuscript included the word *ѡказїя* (occasion), which the editor skipped after sentence restructuring. In the *Latin Lexicon*, the translation *occasio* has equivalents: *бл҃говременіе*, *вина, причина, повод* (propitiousness, cause, reason, event) (L., p. 288). The word *оказїя* is registered in *Synonima*: *Оказїя извѣтъ, явленїе киченїє* (Synonima). *Occasio 'przyczyna, powod, tytuł'* (SL 6.6(50), p. 934).

The editor did not offer any corresponding lexemes to *ѡказїя*, changing the modality and communicative parameters of the utterance. The omission of this word affected the reорganization of the sentence-statement: *Тутъ з(ъ) ѡкказїи пытаю ва(с) слухачу?* (On this occasion, here I am asking you, listeners?) → *Тутъ можетсѧ запытати* (Here one may ask) (V., p. 161 zv.). The interrogative sentence was transformed into the declarative one, the first person singular verb form *пытаю* (am asking), which represented the speaker (the preacher), was changed into *можетсѧ запытати* (may ask); thus, the addressee is no longer mentioned.

The lexemes *аффектъ, сенсъ*, as well as *оумыслъ* are cited in the *Materials…* by Ye. Tymchenko: Аффектъ (lat. affectus) 1. 'Симпатия, расположение' (sympathy, disposition) (Tymch. 1, p. 38); Умыслъ (pl. umysł) 1. 'Дух, ум, разум… (mind) 2. Намерение, цель… (intent, goal) 3. Мысль (thought)' (Tymch. 2, p. 429); Сенсъ (lat. sensus). 'Смысл' (sense) (Tymch. 2, p. 317).

In the manuscript *Vinets Khrystov* (The Wreath of Christ) by A. Radyvylovskyi, several Latinisms were crossed out, and another element (Old-Ukrainian, Church Slavonic, or Polish word) was given in the margin.

First, we quote a text replacement in the manuscript *Vinets Khrystov* (The Wreath of Christ), and then check on these lexemes in the contemporary dictionaries:

– *арґументъ → дово(д)* (argument → reason): *Другїй* ***арґументъ*** (substitution – ***доводъ***), *збїаючи старан(ь)е, збыт(ъ)неє ѡ пищи, и ѡ одеждѣ* (these three words were crossed out in the manuscript), *наводитъ ѡ(т) пти(ц) мовѧчи* (V., p. 342) (Another argument, taking no thought of food and clothes, gives fowls of the air). In contemporary dictionaries: Доводъ указанїє умышлєнїє извѣтъ (Synonima); argumentum. и(з)вѣтъ, дово(д) (L., p. 94); доводъ. Argumentum (LSL, p. 433). In historical dictionaries *аргумент (арґумент)* (SlUM, 1, p. 121), *доводъ* 'аргумент, доказ' (SlUM, 8, p. 75), argument 'dowod, uzasadnienie, racja' (SP, 1, p. 214), argumentum 'dowod, znak, świadectwo' (SL, 1.5, p. 742).

– *делѣката → роскошника* (sensualist → sybarite): *можем(ъ) сѧ дорозумѣти* (syllable *-ва-* is written above) *ижъ не длѧ чого иншого тыл(ь)ко абы выразилъ, же та(к) цр҃ѧ в(ъ) коронѣ, воина в(ъ) пан(ъ) цыри,* ***ѡратора*** (gloss in the margin – ***красомо(в)цу***). *при сла(д) ко(й) вымовѣ,* ***делѣката*** (gloss in the margin – ***роскошника***) *при вышменѣны(х) потравахъ и напоѧх* (We might comprehend that a king has his crown, a warrior has his armor, an orator has his sweet speech, a sen-sualist has his fine food and drinks) (V., p. 359). All the given fragment of the text is crossed out in the manuscript. Дєлѣкатъ прєнасищникъ (Synonima); делѣкатъ слад-копищнѣ (L., p. 156).

– *ѡратора → красомо(в)цъ* (orator → rhetorician) (see the previous example) (V., p. 359). In dictionaries, ораторъ вѣти/й/, рито/р/ хитрословєцъ, рѣчєтв/о/рєцъ (Synonima); Красо/мо/вца вѣтий рито/р/, хитрословъ хитрословъ рѣчотворєцъ (Synonima); orator, рито(р), орато(р), вѣтий хи(т)рослове(ц), рѣчеточе(ц) (L., p. 294); Риторъ Phetor. Orator (CL., p. 501). Orator 'I. mówca (przemawiający w sądzie lub na zgromadzeniu); locutor, qui dicit (coram iudicio vel in contione). 1. krasomówca; rhetor, eloquens, dicendi, peritus (saec. XVI)' (SL).

– *диспутуючому → научаючему* (disputing → teaching) (V., p. 453). На-учаю поучаю вразумляю мл҃ю ѡглашаю (Synonima); disputatio,

стязанїє, любопрѣнїє (L., p. 168); стязанїє… Disputatio (CL, p. 511). In historical dictionaries, *диспутовати* has the meaning of ‘dispute, argue’ (SlUM, 8, p. 25).

– *императора → властелина* (emperor → lord): *Цр҃ѧ и нищагѡ, богатагѡ и оубогагѡ, раба и г(с҃)пдина, пїенкного и непїен(ь)кногѡ, мудрагѡ и немудрагѡ, шлѧхетнагѡ и нешлѧхетнагѡ, воина и ролника, преложеногѡ и по(д)данагѡ,* ***властелина*** (in manuscript – ***императора***) *и калѣки, з(ъ) еднои оучини(л) матерїи, земли* (The king and the beggar, the rich and the poor, the slave and the master, the beautiful and the ugly, the wise and the silly, the noble and the simpleton, the warrior and the farmer, the overlord and the vassal, the lord (emperor) and the cripple, from the same matter, earth, are created (V., p. 200 zv.).

In contemporary dictionaries: Властели(н), вла(д)ца, влада(р) (lord) (Synonima, p. 39), властелинъ: владзца, панъ (overlord) (Berynda, p. к҃г); повелите(л), ке-са(р) (L., p. 227); властелинъ (master) (LSL, p. 433).

– *лупы → користи* (loot → goods): *даетъ еми ца(р) содомскїй* ***лупы*** (substi-tution - ***корысти****) которые непрїателемъ ѡдобралъ, а ѡ(н) на тое что?* (the King of Sodom gives him loot (goods) which the foe has taken away, and what does he do?) (V., p. 324). In dictionaries: лупъ користь ѡбраща (Synonima). Корысть: лупъ (Berynda, p. р҃а).

– *помпы → спанѧлости* (pomp → luxury): *который такои* ***помпы*** (substitution – ***спанѧлости****) и славы и людей заживаешъ. Которы(й) на кожды(й) дн҃ь коштовными сѧ потравами кормишъ, в(ъ) свѣтлы(х) шата(х) ходишъ, въ вшелѧкихъ роскоша(х) ѡплываешъ!* (the one who finds pomp and glory with people. The one who every day partakes of costly dishes, wears fine attire, and indulges in great luxury!) (V. Manuscr., p. 325).

In contemporary dictionaries: Помпа гордость, кичєнїє явлєнїє, напищєнїє гор-дѣнїє, щапство (Synonima); помра, позо(р), многолѣпиє, преизобилиє, красота (L., p. 321). Pompa ‘1. wielka ilość, obfitość; copia, series variarum rerum. 2. Przepych, wystawność, zbytek; luxuria, lautitia, abundantia’ (SL).

From the above lexical replacements in the manuscript, one is reflected in the *Lexicon* by P. Berynda and *Synonima*: лупъ користь and, correspondingly, корысть : лупъ (loot, goods). The explanation is also in the selection of the entries in the dictionary, and in the text itself – especially when it comes to contextual replacements or the suggestion to replace them with Polonisms, which are usually included in the Old-Ukrainian texts.

The lexicons by Ye. Slavynetskyi and A. Koretskyi-Satanovskyi provide the translation of Latin words, which may be different in the manuscript: *помпы → спанѧлости* (pomp → luxury), *диспутуючому → научаючему* (disputing → tea-ching), *дѹлѣката → роскошника*/ (sensualist → sybarite). These are contextual substitutions that did not exclude Polonisms.

In the war manuscript sermons by A. Radyvylovskyi, such words as *ѡкказїя* (occasion), *императоръ* (emperor) remained unchanged; the editor did not replace them, obviously, because they were not supposed to be published: *бо такїй и добрымъ моло(д)цѡмъ ср(д҃)це псуютъ, и гетманѡмъ до ѡде(р)жанѧ з(ъ)вѣтѧ(з)ства на(д) непрїѧтелемъ, поданую ѡ(т)ймуютъ* ***ѡказїю*** (because they spoil the heart of good fellows and will intercept the hetman's occasion to win) (V. Manuscr., p. 1586). *Пише(т) Светонїй же на Боноса* ***и(м)пературa*** *палцемъ указавши мо(в)лено (тое) длѧ его великѡй розрутности и ѡпилства* (Suetonius writes pointing at Bonos the emperor notorious for his great profligacy and inebriety); gloss in the margin – *В(ъ) животахъ* ***имперѧторо(в)*** (In the lives of empe-ror(s)) (V. Manuscr., p. 1591).

Instead of Latinisms, Church Slavonic elements were introduced; the editor substituted *гуморъ* (humor) with *нравъ* (nature). Use of these words together with adjectives *добрий – злий* (good – evil) comprises the antithesis:

Manuscript	Printed Book
Хс҃ естъ ***гумору*** (in the manuscript, this word is underlined and some letters are highlighted with the superscript symbols, and in the margin of the manuscript, *нраву* is written with superscript symbols) *доброѡ(г), якѡ мовитъ то(й) же ѱалмиста* (gloss in the margin – *Ѱа(л): рм҃д): Бл҃гъ Г(с҃)дь всѧческимъ, и щедроты егѡ на всѣ(х) дѣлехъ егѡ. дїаволъ зась* ***гумору*** (in the manuscript, this word is underlined and some letters are highlighted with the superscript symbols, and in the margin of the manuscript, *нраву* is written with superscript symbols) ***нраву*** *злого* (V. Manuscr., p. 348).	*Хс҃ естъ* ***нраву*** *доброго, якъ мовитъ то(й) же ѱалмиста: Бл҃гъ Г(с҃)дь всѧческимъ, и щедроты егѡ на всѣхъ дѣлехъ егѡ. дїаволъ зась* ***нраву*** *злого* (Christ has good nature, as Psalmist says: The Lord is good to all, and his mercy is over all that he has made. the devil again has evil nature) (V., p. 120 zv.).

P. Berynda mentions a Church Slavonic word *нравъ*: Нравъ: норовъ, обычай, или звыкло(ст), образъ (Berynda, p. рм҃и).

In the following utterance, the word *гумор* was used twice. Nevertheless, the ma-nuscript editor crossed out this word in one case; accordingly, it is

absent in the printed book. As for the second one, he suggested a substitution: *гуморѡвъ – обычае(в)* (humors – customs).

Manuscript	Printed Book
А такъ при ѧкомъ кто зостаетъ г(с̃)пдини, того сѧ ***гуморѡвъ*** (in the manuscript, this word is crossed out) *и ѡбычаевъ набираетъ. Если при Х̃ѣ, набирает(ъ)сѧ и* ***гуморѡ(в)*** (in the manuscript, this word is underlined, and in the margin, there is the word ***обычае(в))*** *Хв̃ых(ъ)* (He who stays with his master takes over the master's humors and customs. When staying with Christ, he takes over the humors and customs of Christ) (V. Manuscr., p. 350).	*А такъ при ѧкомъ ктѡ зостаетъ г(с̃)дини, того сѧ и* ***ѡбычаевъ*** *набираетъ; если при Хр(с̃)тѣ, набираетсѧ* ***ѡбычаевъ*** *Хв̃ых(ъ)* (He who stays with his master takes over the master's customs. When staying with Christ, he takes over the customs of Christ) (V., p. 121).

Omission of the word *гуморѡвъ* in this utterance is aimed at avoiding repetition *(гуморѡвъ и ѡбычаевъ)*. In the manuscript preface to the *Vinets Khrystov*, a word *гуморы* was not replaced*: Рожа ѕлые* ***гуморы*** *в(ъ) чл̃вѣку розганѧетъ и вычитаетъ* (The rose dispels and cleans out evil humors in a person) (V. Manuscr., p. 9).

According to the text substitutions, *гуморъ – нравъ, гуморъ – обычай* are synonyms, where *нравъ* – a Church Slavonic element, and the word *обычай* is provided in the translated part of Berynda's dictionary *нравъ – обычай*. In *Synonima*, the entry *обычай* also corresponds to the Church Slavonic *нравъ*: Обычай законъ правило нравъ заповѣдь прєдприятїє устроєнїє съустроєнїє (Synonima), just as: Норовъ нравъ (Synonima). Notably, the word *гуморъ* is mentioned in the *Latin Lexicon* with a different meaning: humor влага, мокрота (humidity) (L., p. 220).

While citing this 'example', A. Radyvylovskyi uses the following gloss to the Latinism: *и(н)флюе(н)цїи а(л)бо и(з)лїѧнїй, инфлюе(н)цїа а(л)бо и(з)лїѧнїе* (outpouring). The Latinism, through Polish (influencya 'influence'), penetrates into the bookish Ukrainian language. In the text, the preacher translates it as *и(з)лїѧнїєе* 'influence' along with this Latinism, and not instead of it. The editor crosses out the word form *и(з)лїѧнїй, и(з)лїѧнїе* in the manuscript and offers an alternative for the replacement: *дѣйствъ, дѣ(й)ство* (act). In the printed book, only the first edit was taken into account; the second one is different both from the author's and the editor's variant, дѣйствїе 'act'. Based on comparison of the manuscript and the printed book, a synonymic row includes the following items: *инфлюе(н)*

ціа – и(з)ліѧніе – дѣ(й)ство – дѣйствіе (influence – outpouring – act – action).

– in the manuscript: Наприкла(д), до оуроженѧ пшеници, а(л)бо которо(г)[о] ко(л)векъ збожа, потреба и(н)флюе(н)ціи а(л)бо ***и(з)ліѧніи*** (crossed out in the manuscript, and in the margin, there is ***дѣйствъ***) *нб(с҃)ны(х), ѡсобливе и(н)флюе(н)-ціи слонечнои; потреба те(ж) и зерна на выправлению ролю вкиненаго. Ту(т) же пытаю: если г(с҃)дръ зерна в(ъ) выправленую зе(м)лю не вкине(т), и зали самаѧ инфлюе(н) ціа а(л)бо* ***и(з)ліѧніе*** (this word is crossed out, and in the margin is ***дѣ(й)ство***) *нб(с҃)но(е) оуроди(т) пшеници а(л)бо якое и(н)шое збоже?* (For instance, for wheat or any other crop to yield, the influence or outpouring of heaven, especially the one of the sun is needed, as well as grain put in the soil. I enquire if a seedsman puts no grain in the soil, will the influence or outpouring of heaven yield wheat or any other crop?) (V. Manuscr., p. 432).

– the printed book: Наприклад(ъ): до оуроженѧ пшеници, албо которого кѡлвекъ збожа, потреба ин(ъ)флюенціи албѡ ***дѣйствъ*** *нб(с҃)ных(ъ), ѡсобливе инфлюенціи сл҃нечной; потреба тежъ и зерна на выправленую ролю вкиненогѡ. Тут(ъ) же спытаймѡ: если г(с҃) подар(ъ) зерна в(ъ) выправленую землю не вки-нетъ, и зали самаѧ инфлюенціа, албѡ* ***дѣйствіе*** *нб(с҃)ное оуродитъ пшеници, албѡ якое иншое збоже?* (V., p. 146). P. Berynda's dictionary translates the word *дѣйство* as *дѣлность* (Berynda, ѝѳ). According to Ye. Tymchenko's dictionary, *дѣйство* 'действие, деяние' (Tymch. 1, p. 239).

In A. Radyvylovskyi's manuscript, the Latinism *декретъ* (lat. decretum – постанова) in the collocation with the adjective *(з декрету Бз҃кого)* is edited as *з волѣ Бж҃ей: Не хиби(т) доткниласѧ болезнь з* ***декрету*** *Бз҃кого* (gloss in the margin – *з* ***волѣ*** *Бж҃ей)* (V. Manuscr., p. 359) (Is he not afflicted with ailment by will of God). A synonymic replacement *декретъ – волѧ* is made in the text. The entry and the translated sections of Berynda's dictionary contain the word *волѧ* (Berynda, p. к҃е).

The editing covered Latinisms, which were substituted by Church Slavonic or bookish Ukrainian lexemes, rarely by Polonisms: *помпы → спанѧлости.* The editor suggested substituting Polonisms to avoid word repetition while interpreting a previous utterance. For instance, a Polonism *цнѡты* was replaced by *дѣла* (deeds). A word *цнѡты* is crossed out in the manuscript, and *за дѣла свои* (according to their deeds) is written above,

which was taken into account in the printed book: *за дѣла своѝ* (V., p. 123) (according to their deeds).

– *in the manuscript: Многѡ естъ, чтѡ я(ко)* (in this word, a syllable ***-ко*** was written above the line) *за сн҃ы своѝ* ***цнѡты*** *мовлю* (these two words were crossed out, and above the line there comes ***за дѣла*** *свои) берутъ дщеры ихъ власные* (Many are those who marry their sons, virtues, to their daughters) (V. Manuscr., p. 356).

– *in the printed book: Але ѡ як(ъ) многѡ естъ межи хр(с҃)тїаны такѡвы(х), чтѡ як(ъ) дщеры свои,* ***цнѡты*** *за сынѡвъ ты(х) проклѧты(х) непрїѧтелей выдаютъ! Бг҃у якобы служатъ. а з(ъ) ними сва(т)ства заводѧ(т). многѡ естъ, чтѡ якъ за сыны своѝ,* ***за дѣла*** *своѝ берутъ дщеры ихъ власные* (There are so many Christians who their daughters, virtues, marry to those damned foes! As if they serve God, but intercourse with them. Many of them marry their sons, their deeds, to their own daughters) (V., p. 123). The adverbial position of the evidential marker *мовлю* was disregarded in the book. The contextual substitution *цнѡты – дѣла* (virtues – deeds) is not reflected in the contemporary dictionaries: Цнота добродѣтєль, бл҃гость, святаа сила (Synonima); дѣло, оучино(к) (Synonima, p. 44); дѣло: оучинокъ, спра-ва, робота, скитокъ (Berynda, p. к҃).

The manuscript *Vinets Khrystov* (The Wreath of Christ) by A. Radyvylovskyi contains one lexical substitution of the word *посполитаѧ (посполитаѧ людей мова).* The editor wrote the word *нѣкоторы(х)* above the line, and this substitution is also found in the book:

– *in the manuscript: Естъ* ***посполитаѧ*** у (above this word comes the word – ***нѣкоторы(х))*** *людей мова…* (Some people have a common language) (V. Manuscr., p. 350).

– *in the printed book: Естъ оу* ***нѣкоторыхъ*** *людей мова:* (Some people have their language) (V., p. 121).

Instead of the adjective *посполитаѧ*, which agrees with the noun *мова,* the pronominal adjective *у нѣкоторыхъ* (some) functions and relates to a noun with the preposition *оу людей.* The pronoun *у нѣкоторыхъ* adds the meaning of indefiniteness, partiality, opposes part to the whole and results in grammatical changes (nonprepositional/prepositional combination). *Synonima slavenorosskaia* translates the entry *посполитый* as ‘общи/й/, собранный, ѡбичный’ (common) (Synonima).

The word combinations *посполитаѧ мова, посполите люде* (V., p. 121), which are used in "*Слові в҃ на неделю г҃ по Сошествіи Ст҃ѡ Дх҃а"* ("The second sermon on the third Sunday after the descent of the Holy Spirit"), are usual for the second half of XVII century. The editor suggested replacing *посполитаѧ людей мова… – оу нѣкоторыхъ людей мова,* which was taken heed of in the printed book. Notably, the combination *посполите люде* was left on the same page with no editing: *и не дивъ, якій панъ, такій и крамъ,* ***посполите люде*** *мовѧтъ* (Like merchant, like his goods, as the common people say) (V., p. 121).

The Prypovisti pospolyti (Ordinary Proverbs), which K. Zinoviiv collected, contain the samples of the vernacular Ukrainian language: proverbs and folk aphorisms. In this collection, there is the following proverb: Яки(и) па́нъ, таки(и) єго и кра́мъ (ZK).

In this context, *посполитий* is synonymous to *common*. Concerning *посполитаѧ мова,* as M. Moser argues, "common language … in fact means *pospolyta mova*" [6, p. 131). The manuscript gives a contextual meaning of *посполитаѧ мова* as a "common language", different from Church Slavonic. After the example in "common language" *и не дивъ, якій панъ, такій и крамъ*, comes an utterance: *Бг҃у служи, а дїавола не гнѣви и длѧ тогѡ единъ чл҃вкъ приходѧчи до цркв҃и мл҃итисѧ, завше едину свѣчку засвѣчова(л) ст҃му Антѡнїю, а другую дїаволу при образѣ егѡ маліованому* (Serve God and do not anger the devil; hence, one man who came to the church always lit a candle in front of the icon of Saint Anthony and another one in front of the devil) (V., p. 121), thereafter in the margin of the page, the reference is given: *Кни(г): свѣт(ъ): Ev(г҃)скїй: Слово на н(д҃)лю дї҃ по соше(ст): С(т): Дх҃а* ("The Book of Gospel: Sermon on the fourteenth Sunday after the descent of the Holy Spirit").

5. Conclusions

Thus, the analyzed changes, determined on the basis of the comparison of the versions of the same text in its different variants –the manuscript, the edited and printed versions – demonstrate some changes in the standard of the Ruthenian language. In the period of the Polish-Lithuanian State, the influence of Latinisms and Polonisms on the Ruthenian language of that time was greatly increased; these Latinisms and Polonisms often became

an integral part of the language. These tendencies were continued in the sermons of the 1670s, but at the end of the 1680s, the usage of Latin and Polish lexical units in the text was limited due to the dependence on the language standard which was partially planned to be brought closer to the Church Slavonic one. The manuscripts contain these foreign language units and it characterizes the tradition of developing the sermon in the first half and in the middle of the XVII century.

Polish and Latin books, along with the books from the 'Kyiv circle of scholars', were popular in the XVII and XVIII centuries not only in Kyiv, where the book *Vinets Khrystov* (The Wreath of Christ) by A. Radyvylovskyi was published, but also in Lithuania, both in the libraries of Orthodox and Greek-Catholic monasteries.

The article analyzes publishing and spreading the Cyrillic book in the XVII century, manifested in Ruthenian books published by printers who started their activities in Lviv and Ostroh in the late 16th century, then went on to work in Vilnius, Vievis, and other places; it also explores some popular readings made available in Lithuania by Kyiv printers. Lavrentii and Stefan Zyzanii, Meletius Smotrytsky et al. continued developing the Ruthenian language by printing their books in Vilnius and Vievis in the early XVII century. A new type of sermon (kazanie) is formed in the sermons of Meletius Smotrytsky and his mentor – Leontii Karpovych.

The language and cultural space of the Cyrillic book is also linked to maintaining the traditions of the Ruthenian language. The spread of the Cyrillic books published by printers belonging to the Kyiv circle of printers in the second part of the XVII century demonstrated the common intellectual, language, and cultural environment.

References:

1. Almes I. (2019). Biblioteka [Library]. *Na perekhresti kultur: Monastyr i khram Presviatoi Triitsi u Vilniusi*: Kolektyvna monohrafiia za red. Alfredasa Bumblauskasa, Salviiusa Kuliavichiusa ta Ihoria Skochyliasa / 2-he vypravl. i dopovn. vydannia. Lviv: Ukrainskyi katolytskyi universytet, s. 291–300. (Seriia "Kyivske khystyyanstvo", t. 16). (in Ukrainian)

2. Dovha L. (2012). Systema tsinnostei v ukrainskii kulturi 17 stolittia (na prykladi teoretychnoi spadshchyny Inokentiia Gizelia) [The System of Values in the Ukrainian Culture of the XVII Century (on the Example of the Theoretical Heritage of Inokentii Gizel)]. Kyiv-Lviv: Svichado. (in Ukrainian)

3. Kharlampovich K.V. (1914). Malorossiyskoye vliyaniye na velikorusskuyu tserkovnuyu zhyzn. [Malorossiian Influence on the Great Russian Church Life], vol. 1. Kazan: Izd. kn. mag. M.A. Golubeva. (in Russian)

4. Kuran M. (2013). Struktura i problematyka kazań triumfalnych Piotra Skargi wygłaszanych z okazji zwycięstw wojennych. *Folia Litteraria Polonica.* Łódz: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, no. 21, ss. 209–224.

5. Markovskii M.N. (1894). Antonii Radivilovskii, yuzhno-russkii propovednik 17 veka [Antonii Radivilovskii, a XVII Century South Russian Preacher]. Kiev: tip. Imp. Universiteta sv. Vladimira V.I. Zavadskogo. (in Russian)

6. Moser M. (2011). Zrazkova "prosta mova" ta yii syntaksa [Exemplary "Simple Language" and its Syntax]. *Prychynky do istoriyi ukrayinskoyi movy*. Za zah. red. S. Vakulenka. Vinnytsya: Nova Knyha, pp. 112–131. (in Ukrainian)

7. Matushek O. (2014). Propovidi Lazaria Baranovycha v dyskursi ukrainskoho baroko [Lazar Baranovich's Sermons in the Ukrainian Baroque Discourse]. PhD dyss. abstr., NAN Ukrainy, In-t l-ry im. T.H. Shevchenka. (in Ukrainian)

8. Nika O.I. (2012). Antonii Radyvylovskyi i rozvytok ukrainskykh kazan 17 st. [Antonii Radyvylovskyi and Development of the Ukrainian Preachings of the XVII century]. *Rozprawy komisiji językowej.* Łodż. T. LVIII. S. 223–234. (in Ukrainian)

9. Nika O.I. (2013). Barokovyy kontsept u staroukrayinskiy propovidi [The Baroque Concept in the Old Ukrainian Sermon]. *Movni i kontseptualni kartyny svitu.* Kyiv, vol. 43, no. 3, s. 135–141. (in Ukrainian)

10. Nika O., Hrytsyna S. (2019). Frequency Dictionary of 16th century Cyrillic Written Monument. *Jazykovedný časopis*, roč. 70, č. 2, pp. 276–288.

11. Oleshko Yu.L. (2017). Staroukrayinska propovid 17 st. u komunikatyvno-kohnityvnomu vymiri [Old Ukrainian sermon of the XVII century in communicative and cognitive dimension]. Dissertation abstract. KNU im. Tarasa Shevchenka. Kyiv. (in Ukrainian)

12. Radyvylovskyi A. (2019). Barokovi propovidi 17 stolittia [Radyvylovskyi Antonii. Baroque sermons of the XVII century]. Doslidzh., tekst, slovopo-kazhchyk Oksana Nika, Yuliya Oleshko. Kyiv. (in Ukrainian)

13. Rutkovska K. (2016). Konstantino Sirvydo "Punktai sakymų"– XVII amžiaus pirmosios pusės lietuvių ir lenkų kultūros paminklas = "Punkty kazań" Konstantego Szyrwida – zabytek piśmiennictwa litewskiego i polskiego z pierwszej połowy XVII wieku. Vilnius: LKI.

14. Sheveliov Yu. (2002). Istorychna fonolohiya ukrayinskoyi movy [A Historical Phonology of the Ukrainian Language]. Trans. from Englishby Serhii Vakulenko and Andrii Danylenko. Kharkiv: Akta. (in Ukrainian)

15. Yakovenko N. (2017). U poshukakh Novoho neba: zhyttia i teksty Yoanykiia Galiatovskoho [In Search of the New Heavens: The Life and Texts of Yoanykii Galiatovskyi]. Kyiv: Laurus – Krytyka. (in Ukrainian)

16. Zelinska O.Yu. (2013). Ukrayinska barokova propovid: movnyi svit i kulturni vytoky [Ukrainian Baroque Sermon: the Linguistic World and Cultural Origins]. Kyiv: Vydavnychyi Dim Dmytra Buraho. (in Ukrainian)

17. Zhytetskii P. (1888). Slovar knizhnoi malorusskoi rechi po rukopisi 17 veka [Malorossiian Speech Dictionary on the Manuscript of the XVII century]. Kiev: Tip. G.T. Korchak-Novitskogo. (in Russian)

List of Abbreviations, Initialisms, and Symbols

Berynda – Leksykon slovenoroskyi Pamva Beryndy (1961). Edited by Vasyl Nimchuk. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, Pamiatky ukrainskoi movy 17 st. Seriia naukovoi literatury.

V. – Radyvylovskyi Antonii (1688). Vinets Khrystov [The Wreath of Christ]. Kyiv: Typohrafiia Kyievo-Pecherskoi Lavry, Early book. TsNBV, Sh. Kyr. 59. (in Ukrainian)

V. Manuscr. – Radyvylovskyi Antonii. Vinets Khrystov [The Wreath of Christ]. Ma-nuscript TsNBV, Sh. F. 308. (in Ukrainian)

ZK – Zinoviiv Klymentii (1971). Virshi. Prypovisti pospolyti [Poems. Ordinary Pro-verbs]. Edited by Inna Chepiha. Kyiv: Naukova dumka. (in Ukrainian)

L. – Leksykon latynskyi Ye. Slavynetskoho (1973). *Leksykony Ye. Slavynetskoho ta A. Koretskoho-Satanovskoho*, edited by Vasyl Nimchuk, pp. 61–420. Kyiv: Naukova dumka. Pamiatky ukrainskoi movy 17 st. Seriia naukovoi literatury.

LSL – Leksykon sloveno-latynskyi Ye. Slavynetskoho ta A. Koretskoho-Satanovskoho (1973). *Leksykony Ye. Slavynetskoho ta A. Koretskoho-Satanovskoho*, edited by Vasyl Nimchuk, pp. 423–540. Kyiv: Naukova dumka. Pamiatky ukrainskoi movy 17 st. Seriia naukovoi literatury.

Synonima – Leksys Lavrentiia Zyzaniia. Synonima slavenorosskaia (1964). Edited by Vasyl Nimchuk. Kyiv: Naukova dumka. Pamiatky ukrainskoi movy 16-17 st. Seriia naukovoi literatury.

SlUM – Slovnyk ukrainskoi movy XVI – pershoi polovyny 17 st. (1994–2013). [Ukrainian Language Dictionary of the 16th – the First Half of the 17th Century], 28 vol. Edited by Dmytro Hrynchyshyn, et al. Lviv: Instytut ukrainoznavstva imeni I. Krypiakevycha NAN Ukrainy, vol. 1–16. (in Ukrainian)

Tymch. – Tymchenko Yevhen. Materialy do slovnyka pysemnoi ta knyzhnoi ukrainskoi movy 15–18 st. (2002). [Materials for the Dictionary of Written and Literary Ukrainian Language of the 15-18 Centuries], 2 vol. Edited by Vasyl Nimchuk, and Halyna Lysa. Kyiv-New York: Presa Ukrainy. Pamiatky ukrainskoi movy. Seriia slovnykiv. (in Ukrainian)

SP – Slownik polszczyzny XVI wieku. (1966). Wroclaw-Warszawa-Krakow: Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 1966. Vol. 1.

SL – Słownik łaciny średniowiecznej w Polsce. Retrieved from: http://scriptores.pl/elexicon/pl/ (12.09.2020).