Pobrane z czasopisma Studia Bia?orutenistyczne **http://bialorutenistyka.umcs.pl**
Data: 14/09/2026 13:12:12

DOI:10.17951/sb.2019.13.343-363
Studia Białorutenistyczne 13/2019 Linguistics

Siarhiej Zaprudski

Belarusian State University, Minsk (Belarus)
Email: zaprudskiSM@bsu.by
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9364-1322

Language of Ciška Hartny's Works as Reviewed in Belarusian Philological Research

Język utworów Ciszki Hartnego w świetle białoruskich nauk filologicznych

Мова твораў Цішкі Гартнага ў асвятленні беларускай філалагічнай навукі

Abstract

The studies of the language of Ciška Hartny, a writer and a public figure (1887–1937), have a long tradition in Belarusian humanities. However, different circumstances have made these linguistic studies ambiguous.

On the one hand, in the 1920s Ciška Hartny was a writer whose language was studied most intensively. Between the 1920s and 2010s several articles were published about the language used in his works. A big corpus was scientifically adopted. Some remarks on Ciška Hartny's language was included in the academic *History of the Belarusian Literary Language* (1968) and in two editions of the University handbook on the history of the Belarusian literary language (1963 and 1984). A few years ago an ambitious publication by Alieś Kaŭrus made an attempt to revise modern opinions that stem from 1950s and 1960s.

On the other hand, the studies of Ciška Hartny's linguistic heritage have not been consistent and are quite fragmented. During the mid-1930s and 1950s no studies were conducted on the writer's language. This is common practice when researches do not consider the findings of predecessors. Until the present day there has been no incorporation into Belarusian linguistics of Jazep Liosik's fundamental study of the late 1920s. The relevant methodology to study Hartny's language as a part of the history of the Belarusian literary language is still absent. We observe a tendency to this day to evaluate Ciška Hartny's language as a (potential) part of the modern literary language rather than from the viewpoint of the Belarusian literary language's history.

Keywords: Ciška Hartny, language of belles lettres, history of the Belarusian literary language

Pobrane z czasopisma Studia Bia?orutenistyczne **http://bialorutenistyka.umcs.pl**
Data: 14/09/2026 13:12:12

Abstrakt

Studia nad językiem publikacji pisarza, działacza społecznego i państwowego Ciszki Hartnego (1887–1937) w obrębie nauk filologicznych na Białorusi trwają od dawna, jednak zawierają wiele sądów polemicznych, żeby nie stwierdzić sprzecznych. Z jednej strony jest to pisarz, który aktywnie tworzył w latach 20. XX w., a język jego utworów poddawano bardzo intensywnym badaniom. W okresie 1920–2010 na ten temat opublikowano kilka artykułów. W obiegu naukowym znajduje się bogaty materiał faktograficzny. Językowi Hartnego poświęcono też fragment monografii pt. *Historia białoruskiego języka literackiego* z 1968 r. oraz rozdziały podręcznika akademickiego z zakresu historii literatury białoruskiej (1963 i 1984 r.). Kilka lat temu ukazała się monografia Alesia Kaurusa, który dokonał próby ponownej oceny publikacji od końca lat 50. do lat 60. XX w. Z drugiej strony opracowywanie dziedzictwa językowego Hartnego charakteryzuje brak ciągłości. W okresie połowa lat 30. – koniec lat 50. XX w. lat nikt nie zgłębiał języka Hartnego. Przyjęła się tradycja niebrania pod uwagę wcześniejszych prac, np. do dziś w badaniach nie znalazło oddźwięku solidne opracowanie Jazepa Losika powstałe pod koniec lat 20. XX w. Brakuje należytej metodologii opisu języka Hartnego jako części składowej historii białoruskiego języka literackiego. Do dziś język Hartnego jest oceniany nie z perspektywy historycznej, tylko jako potencjalna realizacji współczesnego języka literackiego.

Słowa kluczowe: Ciszka Hartny, język artystyczny, historia białoruskiego języka literackiego

Анатацыя

Вывучэнне мовы твораў пісьменніка, грамадскага і дзяржаўнага дзеяча Цішкі Гартнага (1887–1937) мае ў беларускай філалогіі даўнюю традыцыю, але розныя акалічнасці зрабілі гэтую частку беларускай лінгвістыкі неадназначнай. З аднаго боку, у 1920-я гг. Ц. Гартны быў пісьменнікам, мова твораў якога вывучалася найбольш інтэнсіўна. На працягу 1920–2010 гг. было апублікавана некалькі артыкулаў на даную тэму. У навуковы ўжытак уведзены вялікі фактычны матэрыял. Мова твораў Ц. Гартнага не была абойдзена ўвагай у акадэмічнай *Гісторыі беларускай літаратурнай мовы* 1968 г. і ў двух выданнях універсітэцкага падручніка па гісторыі беларускай літаратурнай мовы 1963 і 1984 гг. Некалькі гадоў таму з'явілася амбіцыйная публікацыя Алеся Каўруса, у якой была здзейснена спроба перагледзець ацэнкі, якія сягаюць сваімі вытокамі ў канец 1950–1960 гг. З другога боку, вывучэнню моўнай спадчыны Ц. Гартнага ўласціва перарывістасць і адсутнасць пераемнасці. На працягу сярэдзіны 1930 – канца 1950-х гг. мова твораў пісьменніка зусім не вывучалася. Звычайнай з'яўляецца практыка, калі даследчыкі не ўлічваюць здабыткаў сваіх папярэднікаў. Да сённяшняга дня не знайшоў водгуку ў беларускай лінгвістыцы грунтоўны артыкул Язэпа Лёсіка канца 1920-х гг. Адсутнічае належная метадалогія для вывучэння мовы Ц. Гартнага як складовай часткі гісторыі беларускай літаратурнай мовы. Уключна да самага апошняга часу існуе тэндэнцыя ацэньваць мову твораў Ц. Гартнага не праз прызму гісторыі беларускай мовы, а трактаваць яе як (патэнцыяльную) частку сучаснай літаратурнай мовы.

Ключавыя словы: Цішка Гартны, мова мастацкай літаратуры, гісторыя беларускай літаратурнай мовы

Introduction

Pobrane z czasopisma Studia Bia?orutenistyczne **http://bialorutenistyka.umcs.pl**
Data: 14/09/2026 13:12:12

Ciška Hartny (real name Zmicier Žylunovič, 1887–1937) left a mark on the Belarusian history as a writer, publicist, public figure and a statesman. He published the first reports in the Belarusian language in 1908 in the newspaper *Naša Niva*, his last works (articles) were issued in 1936. During 1914–1932, he published 25 books (along with reprints), which included poetry collections, collections of short stories and essays, and a collection of literary and critical articles. He authored the first Belarusian novel (1914–1929). He wrote two novels and four plays. He published more than 300 journalistic articles.

From the late 1910s, Z. Žylunovič was at the centre of various initiatives related to the problems of public, state and literary life in Belarus. One of the leaders of the Belarusian socialist party (hramada) (1917). From October 1918, he was a member of the RCP (b). In 1919, he became the first Chairman of the provisional government of the SSRB (BSSR), over the years 1920–1931 , he was a member of the Central Executive Committee of the BSSR. Editor of the newspapers *Дзянніца* / *Dziannica*, *Савецкая Беларусь* / *Soviet Belarus* and magazine *Полымя* / *Polymia* / *Fire*. In 1922, he organized the publication of Belarusian-language books in Berlin as the Director of the publishing houses *Адраджэнне* / *Adradžennie* / *Revival* (1922), *Савецкая Беларусь* / *Soviet Belarus* (1922–1924), *the Belarusian state publishing house* (1924–1929). In 1923, the Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPB (b) adopted a resolution on awarding C. Hartny the title of the people's poet of Belarus, but the resolution was not implemented. Hartny was also an academician of the National Academy of Sciences of Belarus (1929).

He influenced the formation of the Belarusian literary language in the 1910s–1920s as a public figure and a statesman, as well as a productive writer and a journalist.

The peak of his career was in 1928, when he celebrated the 20th anniversary of his literary activity. In 1929, however, he received party penalties and was removed from all positions. In 1931, he was expelled from the party. During the creation of the structures of the Union of Writers of the BSSR and the Union of Writers of the USSR in 1932, he was not part of their governing bodies. In 1934, he was not elected a delegate to the First All-Union Congress of Soviet Writers.

He was arrested in November 1936 and placed in the Mahiloŭ psychiatric hospital in April 1937, where he died eventually. Rehabilitated in civil-legal relations in 1955, he was completely politically rehabilitated in 1987–1988.

In connection with the reassessment of his political career in the late 1950s, his literary activity was also rehabilitated and re-introduced to the public life. Since that time, the literature regarding his figure began to appear and his works were republished.

The discussion on the creators of the first third of the 20th century raises the following fundamental questions: What importance did the linguistic and literary practice of a particular writer have in the formation of the Belarusian literary language of that time? How is his linguistic heritage assessed from the perspective of the norms of the modern Belarusian language?

Pobrane z czasopisma Studia Bia?orutenistyczne **http://bialorutenistyka.umcs.pl**
Data: 14/09/2026 13:12:12

While the answer to the second question is relatively simple, the first proves to be much more complicated. A point of correlation in this case should be the poorly studied speech usage, codification practice and language ideals of the 1910s – mid-1930s.

The aim of the article is to comprehend the assessments and reflections on the language of the works by Ciška Hartny made by Belarusian philologists over almost a century (since the early 1920s).

1. Viewpoints on the language of C. Hartny's works began to appear in the early 1920s.

In 1922, the reflections of a literary critic and publicist Pavieł Liubiecki were published. The critic argued that the language of the author of the first book *Сокі цаліны* / *Virgin Land Juice* 1922 resembles 'нейкая малавядомая... Такою моваю, як Цішка Гартны, не піша ніводзін з іншых беларускіх паэтаў і пісьменнікаў'[1]. P. Liubiecki expressed the opinion that for a proper understanding of the language of C. Hartny 'трэба брацца за слоўнік'[2], yet a dictionary of the works of the writer 'яшчэ не выдана, а слоўнік Насовіча занадта малы'[3] (quote by: Bajkoŭ, 1928, p. 209).

In the second half of the 1920s, three special publications dedicated to the language of C. Hartny appeared (Buzuk, 1926, 1928; Losik, 2003, pp. 307–343).

In his articles, the dialectologist named Piotr Buzuk analysed how the dialect features of Hartny's homeland – Kapyl region –were reflected in various editions of C. Hartny's works. P. Buzuk selected the first part of the novel *Сокі цаліны* / *Virgin Soil Juice* as a book in which 'арыгінальнасць і самабытнасць' / 'originality and individuality', 'цаліннасць' / 'calinnaść *or virginity*' of the writer's language were manifested the most. The scholar analysed a number of phonetic, morphological, syntactic and lexical phenomena and compared the words selected from the works of C. Hartny with the data of *Слоўнік беларускай мовы*[4] by Ivan Nasovič and *Беларуска-расійскі слоўнік*[5] of 1926 (Buzuk, 1926, 1928).

The author's interpretations were profound and original. For example, such a feature as the 3rd person singular forms of the verbs of II conjugation without the *-ць* ending (like *мусе, загавора, выходзе, гавора, носе*) were not associated with the influence of Kapyl dialect. As to C. Hartny's lexicon, the researcher listed 56 dialectisms, noting that their number is actually much larger. P. Buzuk noticed that some of the words listed by him (*хэнць, плён*) are 'відавочныя паланізмы' / 'obvious polonisms', while others are lituanisms. Upon estimating the vocabulary used in the works by C. Hartny, the author came to the conclusion that it was very 'яскравая' / 'bright':

[1] 'something little-known ... None of the other Belarusian poets and writers writes in such language as Ciška Hartny'

[2] 'it is necessary to take up a dictionary'

[3] 'has not yet been issued, and the dictionary of Nasovič is too small'

[4] 'The Dictionary of the Belarusian Language'

[5] 'The Belarusian-Russian Dictionary'

Pobrane z czasopisma Studia Bia?orutenistyczne **http://bialorutenistyka.umcs.pl**
Data: 14/09/2026 13:12:12

the writer, in his opinion, expanded the scopes of the lexical stock of the Belarusian literary language (Buzuk, 1928).

In his article *Граматычны склад мовы Ц. Гартнага*[6], Jazep Liosik also drew attention, among other things, to the lexical features and, in particular, commented on the qualification of P. Buzuk of a number of words as dialectisms. The author refuted the fact that the words *аскабалак, бадзяцца, бізунец, вымерхацца, кацёлка, кпіць, скрэмзаны, ласне, луста, машастовы, наўда* and others were dialectisms[7]. J. Liosik qualified them not as dialectisms, but as 'звычайныя літаратурныя словы'[8] (Lësìk, 2003, p. 307). The author of the article enumerated words of C. Hartny which 'зварачалі ўвагу'[9] or were 'рэдкімі і так ці іначай цікавымі'[10], a total of 266 lexemes (Lësìk, 2003, pp. 321–322, 325–326, 328–330). Like Buzuk, J. Liosik pointed out that some of the words he mentioned were polonisms that entered the language of C. Hartny's works directly from his native dialect. Within the vocabulary of the writer, the researcher identified 76 words borrowed from the Russian language, and 'без канечнай патрэбы'[11] (Lësìk, 2003, pp. 322, 326–327, 329–330). In his article, J. Liosik also presented lists of newly-formed words, characteristic mainly or only for the language of C. Hartny, a total of 105 lexemes (Lësìk, 2003, pp. 327, 329–331).

In addition to special articles, the issue of C. Hartny's language was touched upon in other publications. Thus, at the beginning of 1926, 39 words recorded in the first part of C. Hartny's novel *Сокі цаліны* / *Virgin Land Juice* were included in *Беларуска-расійскі слоўнік*[12] by Sciapan Niekraševič and Mikalaj Bajkoŭ. The compilers did not aim to 'дакладна прааналізаваць кожнага пісьменніка'[13] and limited themselves to citing 'толькі некаторыя характэрныя словы'[14] (Bajkoŭ and Nekrašèvìč, 1926, p. 4). The references to the works of Janka Kupala, Jakub Kolas, Ciška Hartny and other writers found in the dictionary were the result of an initial study of their language and were intended to show that the dictionary was created on the basis of authoritative sources.

Defined as 'гартнаўскія' / 'hartny's' in the dictionary, the lexemes were identified as used specifically by Hartny (lexemes *адваротны* 'агідны, гадкі/ abominable', *гардаваць* 'гартнаўскія' / 'proud', *незмігутна* 'не міргаючы/ without blinking', *пітнік* 'збан' / 'a jug', *праназаваты* 'пранізлівы' / 'shrill' etc.)[15], similarly to some applications which were common words then.

---

6 'The Grammatical Composition of the Language of C. Hartny'

7 Here and below, modern spelling is used to illustrate works published before 1933.

8 'ordinary literary words'

9 'were worth to be noticed'

10 'rare and somehow interesting'

11 'without any needs'

12 'The Belarusian-Russian Dictionary'

13 'carefully analyze each writer'

14 'only some characteristic words'

15 Here and below the meanings of certain words or phrases are provided in accordance with the author's fixations of the 1920s–1930s.

Pobrane z czasopisma Studia Bia?orutenistyczne **http://bialorutenistyka.umcs.pl**
Data: 14/09/2026 13:12:12

In Ihnat Dvarčanin's anthology on Belarusian Literature 1927 for schoolchildren, the compiler mainly reprinted the poetic works of C. Hartny, accompanied with 94 linguistic footnotes-comments. Commenting on the works, in a half the cases, the compiler explained those or other (rare or probably hardly understood by schoolchildren) words (*адрода* 'адраджэнне' / 'revival', *букса* 'axle box', *восці* 'spear', *зрашаючы* 'вырашальны' / 'decisive', *клыпаць* 'to limp', *мудрагельны* 'tricky', *мэрам* 'нібы' / 'as if', *надаў* – a noun derived from *надавіць* / 'push', *павекі* 'вечна' / 'forever', etc.) or forms. In every fifth case, Ihnat Dvarčanin commented on polonisms or the words he interpreted as polonisms (*гарды*, *дрэва*, *кавадла*, *змардаваць*, *крок*, *лякаць*, *нашчэнт*, *нэндза*, *пекнасць*, *пэнт*, *сродзь*, *хэнця*, *шарэнга*). In seven cases, his attention was attracted by russicisms or words perceived as russicisms: *абхвачаны*, *барба*, *дзвер*, *за* (preposition at the construction *прыехаць за*), *зазываць*, *луч*, *труд* (Dvarčanìn, 1927, pp. 348–372).

Studied by a number of authors in the 1920s, the language of C. Hartny's works was highly evaluated. In the article *Our Prose in 1926* about the folk character of the language of the writer Maksim Harecki, the linguist and literary critic M. Bajkoŭ compared it with the language of C. Hartny. M. Bajkoŭ considered the value of the style of the works of C. Hartny in their 'жорсткасць' / 'hardness'; the writer, according to the critic, 'адрэзваў словы; у яго няма мяшчанскай закругленасці фразы'[16] (Kryvič (Bajkoŭ), 1927, p. 205). In another publication, M. Bajkoŭ disproved the views of P. Lubiecki regarding the singularity of the language of C. Hartny's works – one that would go beyond the existing literary language[17]. According to the critic, the lexicon of C. Hartny was very close to the 'жывая народная мова, чым яго мова выгадна адрозніваецца ад мовы некаторых іншых пісьменнікаў'[18] (Bajkoŭ, 1928, pp. 209–210). M. Bajkoŭ recognized the language practice of C. Hartny as an important factor in the formation of the Belarusian literary language of that time; according to the critic and lexicographer, the lexical stock of the author of the book *Сокі цаліны* / *Virgin Soil Juice* was the richest among the lexicons of all Belarusian writers of that time (Bajkoŭ, 1928, p. 206).

Siarhiej Zambržycki believed that C. Hartny, unlike many other writers of that time, successfully individualized the language of his characters. Individualization in the first part of the novel *Сокі цаліны* / *Virgin Soil Juice* was achieved through the use of a large number of dialectisms. The author rejected the criticism of C. Hartny in the excessive use of dialectisms. The originality of the figures of speech in the work, according to S. Zambržycki, made the language of the characters natural and generally contributed to a high artistic effect. However, the author's language, especially in his

[16] 'cuts off the words; he has no bourgeois rounded phrase'

[17] Unfortunately, P. Lubiecki's article was not available to us. It is not possible to establish exactly the modality of his statements. They could be critical (as M. Bajkoŭ interprets them in his article), but they could also be neutral.

[18] 'living folk language, in which his language compares favorably with the language of some other writers'

Pobrane z czasopisma Studia Bia?orutenistyczne **http://bialorutenistyka.umcs.pl**
Data: 14/09/2026 13:12:12

early works, was considered to be 'перыядычнай, нягібкай' / 'periodic, inflexible' by S. Zambržycki (Zambržyckì, 1928, p. 170).

Analysing the dramatic works of the writer, Ivan Zamocin always emphasised their naturalness, lexical and phraseological richness of the speech of the heroes, as well as its realism (Zamocin, 1928).

In the 1920s, C. Hartny was the author whose language was studied to a greater extent than the language of any other Belarusian writer. Linguists used the language of C. Hartny to study the features of the history and modernity of the Belarusian literary language, its relationship with dialect speech, and regarded it as a part of the literary language of that time. The authors of the 1920s noted the richness and original character of the vocabulary of C. Hartny's works and how close it was to the folk culture. In the lexical parts of his article, J. Liosik made references to almost 450 words from the works of the writer.

In their articles, P. Buzuk and J. Liosik interpreted the issue of polonisms vs russicisms differently. Much as the polonisms in the works of C. Hartny were considered by both authors practically only as a dialect inheritance, their positions differed with regard to the phenomena caused by the Russian influence. In the article by P. Buzuk some elements which were dependent on the influence of the Russian language were analysed in an academic manner, without evaluation. In the article by J. Liosik, Russian influences were considered critically in the context of 'культуры мовы' / 'culture of speech'. In the same work, he partly criticized some newly-formed words.

2. Changes in the socio-political situation in Belarus in 1929–1935 and the reforms in Belarusian linguistics associated with it (see: Zaprudskì, 2013), as well as changes in the biography of C. Hartny influenced the fact that the language of his works began to be re-evaluated at that time. Published in 1930, the third edition of the collection *Прысады / Alleys*, as well as collections of the same year, *Гаспадар / The Landlord* and *На новым месцы / At a New Place* were accompanied by an introduction made by a literary critic Michail Piatuchovič, in which the writer's language was characterised by means of a single, short but critical note, claiming that it had 'many provincialisms' (Pìâtuhovìč, 1930, p.7).

Criticism of the language of C. Hartny's works reahed an advanced level in 1934. In summer 1934, the Plenum of the Union of writers of the BSSR, the head of the editorial office of the magazine *Полымя рэвалюцыі* / *Fire of Revolution*, and the future academician Kandrat Krapiva read the report *Пра перабудову і 'недабудову'*[19] (Krapìva, 1934). The language part of the report was extremely critical.

According to K. Krapiva, C. Hartny's language 'павявае глыбокай правінцыяльнасцю'[20], in his vocabulary 'шмат правінцыялізмаў'[21]. In the works of C. Hartny, there

[19] 'On the Reconstruction and the Underconsruction'

[20] 'breathes deep provincialism'

[21] 'there are many provincialisms'

Pobrane z czasopisma Studia Bia?orutenistyczne **http://bialorutenistyka.umcs.pl**
Data: 14/09/2026 13:12:12

were also russicisms (specific examples were given) and polonisms (only the fact itself was mentioned). But the greatest criticism was caused by the words that were 'утвораны самім аўтарам ад самых звычайных, вядомых усім слоў, але ўтвораныя, не гледзячы ні на якія моўныя законы (...). Сюды я залічваю і звычайныя словы, але ўжытыя не ў тым сэнсе, у якім яны ў мове бытуюць'[22]. These words were roughly called 'цішкізмы' / 'tsishkisms' (Krapìva, 1934, pp. 130–131).

To support the last argument, the critic provided a list of 30 vocabulary items selected from the works of C. Hartny, among which only a small part was really unsuccessful (*заўвага* 'увага' / 'attention' *да жалеза*, *гаспадарня* (гаспадараннe / 'management'), *гаручыя вочы*, *лірычная марнасць* ('мары, летуценні' / 'dreams'), *падлёг сабе навуку* 'авалодаў навукай' / 'mastered science'), but some of them were common applications in the spirit of the 1920s (*рог вуглавога дома*, *выгінастая стужка*, *зыск* 'exploitation', *узнёскі* 'share' and etc.)[23].

The largest number of examples was ambivalent, which, taking into account the ambiguous nature of artistic expression, freedom of creative expression and the state of the Belarusian literary language of that time, should not have been interpreted unambiguously negatively. In the situation where the Belarusian language had a significant word creative variability and many resources were still being developed, unconditional criticism of the calqued phrase *зацягнуцца ў працу*[24] (compare. rus. *втянуться в работу*)[25] seems unreasonable.

In the Belarusian language, the search for the best stable epithet for unrestrained laughter was still in progress. In the *Беларуска-расійскім слоўніку*[26] by M. Bajkoŭ and S. Niekraševič two adjectives were placed for the corresponding meaning – *закатны* and *покатны*, both cases provided with references to the authors, J. Kolas and C. Hartny (Bajkoŭ and Nekrašèvìč, 1926, pp. 109, 241). The question of which adjective was to be used as a fixed collocation with the noun *смех* / 'laughter' was still open, so the application of C. Hartny *заліўны* / 'shrill' (modern: *залівісты*) *смех* / 'laughter' could be perceived as acceptable.

In the situation when in the Belarusian language the word '*дастаць* / get' was still very often combined with the nouns *ліст* / 'letter', *работа* / 'work', *адукацыя* / 'education', etc., it was hardly necessary to criticize definitely the phrase *дастаны ліст* / 'received letter'.

The remarks in the article by K. Krapiva were also caused by the practice of clunky construction of sentences, partly peculiar to the works of C. Hartny in 1932. The criticism was also caused by the fact that when describing various intellectual states and

[22] 'created by the author himself from the most common, known to all words, but newly-formed, regardless of any language laws. (…) Here I include ordinary words, but which were not used in the literal sense, not in the way in which they are usually used in the language'.

[23] Here and below in some cases, in brackets, some remarks-explanations by K. Krapiva are used.

[24] 'to get involved in work'

[25] 'to get involved in work'

[26] 'Belarusian-Russian dictionary'

Pobrane z czasopisma Studia Bia?orutenistyczne **http://bialorutenistyka.umcs.pl**
Data: 14/09/2026 13:12:12

concepts, the writer sometimes used everyday words, giving them figurative meanings (Krapìva, 1934, pp. 131–132).

3. The article by K. Krapiva put an end to the lifetime review of the language of C. Hartny's works. The analysis of the language of the writer was resumed twenty years after his death because of the changes in the socio-political situation. The first assessments of his language in the postwar years were made by literary critics**.**

Studying the specifics of the development of the Belarusian prose of 1920s–1930s, in two of his books (1958 and 1959) Aleś Adamovič made casual remarks regarding the language of the works of C. Hartny. He noted that the language of his prose works was characterised by 'злоўжыванне дыялектызмамі'[27], 'бытавізм'[28], кніжнасць[29], 'цяжкі', *празмерна кніжны* сінтаксіс'[30], inattention to the 'жывая граматыка народнай мовы… сухасць, нягнуткасць, беднасць экспрэсіяй'[31] (Pìs′mennìk ì mova, 1962, pp. 167–169). The remarks about dryness, inflexibility, poverty of expression, perhaps do not necessarily qualify as literary criticism. It was rather meant as important for literature presentation and narration than as a critique of the 'мова' / 'language' of the writer in linguistic meaning.

It is more difficult to understand what A. Adamovič understood under the concept of 'кніжнасць' / 'bookishness'. In the literary aspect, there is little justification for calling C. Hartny's works 'bookish'. In a situation where the aim of literary critics of the late 1950s was the literary rehabilitation of C. Hartny, A. Adamovič's 'кніжнасць' / 'bookishness' was probably to euphemistically indicate obsolete language in the works of C. Hartny. By the end of the 1950s, many of the language resources used in the 1920s by C. Hartny and in the literary language in the whole, became a historical legacy to a large extent.

Similarly, the literary critic Ivan Navumienka spoke about the language of C. Hartny, who found in the works of the writer to be 'безліч дыялектызмаў, вульгарызмаў, і проста малазразумелых слоў'[32]. Qualifying the language of C. Hartny from the height of knowledge about the literary norms of the early 1960s, I. Navumienka nevertheless specifically noted that 'нельга вінаваціць за ўсё гэта Ц. Гартнага'[33], the writer 'гатовых узораў перад сабой не меў'[34] (Navumenka, 1960, p. 168).

A deep understanding of the language of C. Hartny is presented in the afterword by Aliaksiej Klačko in the collection *Выбраныя апавяданні* / *Selected Stories* by C. Hartny, 1962. The author paid tribute to the fact that the time when C. Hartny wrote

[27] 'the overuse of dialecticisms'
[28] 'naturalism'
[29] 'bookishness'
[30] 'heavy, excessively bookish syntax'
[31] 'living grammar of the popular language ... dryness, inflexibility, poverty of expression'
[32] 'a lot of dialectisms, vulgarisms and simply obscure words'
[33] 'you can not blame C. Hartny for all this'
[34] 'had no ready samples'

Pobrane z czasopisma Studia Bia?orutenistyczne **http://bialorutenistyka.umcs.pl**
Data: 14/09/2026 13:12:12

his works was ‘перыядам станаўлення і развіцця беларускай літаратурнай мовы. Тады не былі яшчэ ўсталяванымі словаўтваральныя сродкі’[35] (Klačko, 1962, p. 273). This, according to the author, explains the circumstances that the word-formed and other features of the vocabulary of C. Hartny’s works of the 1920s did not correspond to the norms of the literary language of the early 1960s. The vocabulary and phraseology of C. Hartny’s stories were assessed by A. Klačko as ‘багаты і цікавы’[36] (Klačko, 1962, p. 274).

In 1965, the first volume of *Гісторыя беларускай савецкай літаратуры*[37] included a monographic section dedicated to C. Hartny. Among the positive characteristics of the writer, it was noted that he was able to use ‘бытавая лексіка з выразным дыялектным каларытам’[38], conveyed the individual characteristics of the language of the characters quite well. At the same time, the novel *Сокі цаліны* / *Virgin Soil Juice* exhibited a lack of ‘высокая моўная культура’[39]. The work was allegedly overweight with the ‘дыялектызмы вузкага ўжывання’[40] (Aleksandrovič, 1965, p. 274, 269, 262, 267).

4. In the early 1960s, some features of C. Hartny’s vocabulary came to the attention of Ivan Hiermanovič.

Thus, the linguist examined the history of the use in the literary language of a number of words interpreted as polonisms: *гарбата*, *атрамант*, *загарак*, *цёнгля*, *мосенж*, *варунак*, *дэсань*, *мапа*, *нэндза*, etc. Among other things, I. Hiermanovič found that almost all of these words were used in the works of C. Hartny, sometimes very actively, but they gradually fell out of use. Describing in 1963 dialectisms and newly-formed words, I. Hiermanovič noted that C. Hartny ‘меў схільнасць перагружаць свае творы рознымі дыялектызмамі Случчыны’[41]; the researcher also gave a list of ‘штучных наватвораў’[42] of the writer: *адлік*, *адрахунак*, *абдымы* ‘embrace’, *вокагляд* ‘vision’, *вымаў* ‘pronunciation’, *гардаваць* ‘ганарыцца/ proud’, *гатоўка* ‘падрыхтоўка/preparation’, *да ўбачэння* ‘goodbye’, *дзіцяцтва* ‘childhood’, *здавольства* ‘satisfaction’, *здром*, *злука* ‘connection’, *завіды* ‘envy’, *засуцэльваць*, *мінучасць* ‘past’, *мус*, *надаў* ‘noun from *надавіць*’, *намекліва* ‘з намёкам/ with hint’, *недавум* ‘неўразуменне’ / ‘confusion’, *недасцерп* ‘impatience’, *пазем* ‘horizon’, etc. (Germanovič, 1963, p. 113, 118). On the one hand, I. Hiermanovič demonstrated a deep and detailed knowledge of the history of a number of words he analysed. On the other hand, he gave the list of the words newly-formed by C. Hartny, which included some literary (*адрахунак*,

[35] ‘the period of formation and development of the Belarusian literary language. Then there were no established word-formed means’
[36] ‘rich and interesting’
[37] ‘The History of Belarusian Soviet Literature’
[38] ‘everyday vocabulary with a clear dialect colour’
[39] ‘high language culture’
[40] ‘dialectisms of narrow application’
[41] ‘had a tendency to overload his works with various dialectisms of the Sluck region’
[42] ‘artificial newly-formed words’

Pobrane z czasopisma Studia Bia?orutenistyczne **http://bialorutenistyka.umcs.pl**
Data: 14/09/2026 13:12:12

пазем, *рахавальнік*, *самахоць*) and dialectal vocabulary items of that time (*гардаваць*, *да ўбачэння*, *завіда*, *псута*, *святошня*, *уператоч*, *цём*).

A. Adamovič's opinions were completely ignored in the manual for students *Essays on the History of the Belarusian Literary Language* by Leŭ Šakun, 1960. Mentioning the writers the language of whose works was strongly packed with local vocabulary, the author pointed at Kuźma Čorny, Platon Halavač, and Michaś Lyńkoŭ as examples and stated, that 'у творах пісьменнікаў 20-х – 30-х гадоў розныя дыялектныя з'явы сустракаюцца не так ужо і часта'[43] (Šakun, 1960, p. 187). L. Šakun referred to the works of Chviados Šynklier and Maksim Lužanin, criticizing the authors, who had overused the dialectisms (Šakun, 1960, p. 210).

The language practice of C. Hartny, however, was mentioned in the revised edition of L. Šakun's manual in 1963. The author of the *Сокі цаліны* / *Virgin Soil Juice* was described as somehone reproached by his some contemporaries for the overuse of dialectisms, along with M. Lyńkoŭ, M. Harecki and other writers. He did, however, praise and some othe authors (Šakun, 1963, p. 237). It was also noted that the synthetic form of future tense verbs such as *вісецьме*, often used in the works of Ciška Hartny, Aleś Dudar, Aleś Hurlo, did not become the literary norm (Šakun, 1963, p. 249).

5. If in the works of the late 1950s – mid 1960s the dialectisms in the works of C. Hartny were paid relatively little attention, in the collective *Гісторыі беларускай літаратурнай мовы*[44], 1968, C. Hartny was given, perhaps, as the author, whose mission was to illustrate that in the Belarusian literature of the 1920's–1930's there were writers who overused narrow dialectisms. In the monograph there was a large list of 62 dialectisms from the novel *Сокі цаліны* / *Virgin Soil Juice: выжануць*, *нырпаліцца*, *пяроймы*, *налпам*, *нашарохацца*, *стрыгуншчык*, *сопуха*, *пацвільвацца*, *спугны*, *перацюк*, *муля*, *тувальня*, *наўда*, *труплявы* (need: *трупцявы*), *пастаца*, *балхвіць*, *кіпка*, *бухоны*, *несхаць*, *неўдаль*, *уталопіцца*, *залядзецца*, *схямліць*, *вагкасць*, *жваласць*, *памка* etc. Then, the authors referred to the 'аналагічны' / 'same' language practice of nine writers, citing specific examples from their works. In the monograph with reference to the famous article by J. Kołas, 1934, 36 'вузкіх правінцыялізмаў і вульгарызмаў'[45] from the novel *На чырвоных лядах* / *On the Red Clearings* by M. Lyńkoŭ (Kramko, 1968, pp. 238–239) were also listed.

From the point of view of the presentation in the chapter of the monograph dedicated to the literary dialectisms of the language practice of Ciška Hartny, it is very important that it was given to the first place and it was best illustrated by the examples, that there was the reference to the publication of K. Krapiva 1934, it is also significant that the authors have just limited to only the first book of the novel *Сокі цаліны* / *Virgin Soil Juice*, 1922, which is atypical in the sense that from the point of view of the con-

[43] 'in the works of the writers of 20's–30's various dialect phenomena occur not so often'
[44] 'History of the Belarusian Literary Language'
[45] 'narrow provincialisms and vulgarisms'

Pobrane z czasopisma Studia Bia?orutenistyczne **http://bialorutenistyka.umcs.pl**
Data: 14/09/2026 13:12:12

centration of the dialectisms that was a very specific work. In addition, when the book was reprinted in 1932, some dialectisms of 1922 were edited (the word *пастаца* was replaced by the lexeme *постаць*, *балхвіць – гутарыць*, *памка – памяць*, *швыдка – порстка*, *неспадзіву – неспадзеўку*) or were not included in the text of 1932 due to the fact that the corresponding fragments of the 1922 edition were removed from it.

As for the list of the given dialectisms, it includes some words used commonly in the 1920s (*выжануць*, *пяроймы*, *нашарохацца*, *сопуха*, *пацвільвацца*, *наўда*, *уталопіцца*, *мэрам*, *нядушлы*) and a separate author, newly-formed words of the writer (*вагкасць*, *нагальнарупны*, *спугны*, *незмігутна*, *іначасць*).

Considerable attention was drawn to the language practice of C. Hartny in the monograph, 1968, also in the presentation of the writer's word-making. In the list of the writers who used authorial word-formations, C. Hartny was given after Uladzimir Chadyka and Uladzimir Duboŭka with 14 examples: *вокагляд*, *ашыфлёваны*, *пэнтам*, *паралез*, *бесперасціханьку*, *звячорак*, *сціш*, *спеўчы*, *разувага*, *вятрыска*, *часцінна*, *прадлюдня*, *бяссціхання*, *нямерна* (Kramko, 1968, pp. 247–248). At least some words (*ашыфлёваны*, *пэнтам*, *паралез*, *вятрыска*, *прадлюдня*) in this list were unnecessary, however, the number of the words newly-formed by the writer, enumerated in the monograph, was impressive, especially that it was followed by the abovementioned quote from the article by K. Krapiva from 1934, in full volume, together with the material, concerning 'цішкізмы' / 'tsishkisms' (Kramko, 1968, pp. 248–249).

A notable element of the collective monograph was the language practice of C. Hartny and at the presentation of those borrowings from the Polish language which 'дубліравалі агульнавядомыя беларускія словы'[46] in the works of the authors. C. Hartny opened the list of writers who used such words. 12 lexemes were provided as examples extracted from his works: *гранатовы*, *атрамант*, *ходзь*, *квадранец*, *кламяць*, *турбацыя*, *спацар*, *магнэс*, *купэрт*, *выракаваць*, *хэнць*, *гвязда* (Kramko, 1968, pp. 251–252). It seems that, as in the case of dialectisms, the authors of the collective monograph did not take into account the fact that C. Hartny did not necessarily use the words which he had used in the first edition of the first book *Сокі цаліны* / *Virgin Soil Juice* in his later works.

Widely discussing the 'дыялектызмы' / 'dialectisms', 'наватворы' / 'newly-formed words' and 'паланізмы' / 'polonisms' in the works of the writers of the 1920s, the authors of the collective monograph of 1968 were, probably, seeking to understand the role and place of the dialectisms, of the newly-formed words, and other elements of the works authored by the writers of the 1920s, as seen indirectly from their reaction to a linguistic Belarusian 'парадак дня'/ 'agenda'. They participated in the 'перацягванні каната' / 'tug of war' between linguists and writers, with the latter becoming increasingly uncontrollable and independent from linguistic prescriptions in the second half of the 1960s. The approach used in the monograph *Гісторыя*

[46] 'duplicated the well-known Belarusian words'

Pobrane z czasopisma Studia Bia?orutenistyczne **http://bialorutenistyka.umcs.pl**
Data: 14/09/2026 13:12:12

беларускай літаратурнай мовы[47], according to which the language applications of the 1920s were qualified mainly through the prism of literary norms established in the 1950s and 1960s, led to the fact that the language practice of the 1920s was evaluated by reverse projection and, as a consequence, was excessively critical. The phenomena peculiar to the literary language of the 1920s in general were unreasonably interpreted in the monograph, as a mere kind of 'пісьменніцкія' / 'writer's' deviations from the normative language'. In the monograph, 1968, in fact, for the first time in the postwar years, a significant linguistic material from the works of the writer was given, but only the 'адмоўныя' / 'negative' aspects of his language practice were tendentiously emphasized in it.

6. In 1971, Mikałaj Ababurka devoted a special work to dialectisms in the works of C. Hartny (Ababurka, 1971). The author of the article did not entirely agree with the opinions of his predecessors, whereby the language of C. Hartny was characterised by 'злоўжыванне дыялектызмамі'[48]. According to M. Ababurka, the principal aspect for evaluation of C. Hartny's application of the dialect vocabulary was that the writer's usage of colloquial speech at the time was a positive phenomenon: '…гэтым самым стваралася магчымасць адбору найлепшага з усяго моўнага запасу народа'[49] (Ababurka, 1971, p. 3). Relying on various dictionaries, the evidence of dialect and other sources, M. Ababurka described such words singled out from the works of C. Hartny as *абсац*, *адаля*, *ацяты*, *божкаць*, *выстарчаць*, *гарашэнне*, *гзымс*, *гэттака*, *загібаць*, *зажухацець*, *заздрочыць*, *займаздароў*, *залядзецца* etc. (47 words in total). Among other things, the author made a valuable observation that the material of the language of works of C. Hartny makes it possible to distinguish separate synonymous rows of duplicates: *абрус – сурвэта – скацерка*, *вартаўнічы – вартаўнік – стораж*, *наглядач – наглядальнік – надзірацель*, *падавальнік – падавач – кельнер*, *харчоўка – харчэўня – сталовая*, *праўцом – прасцяком – цярэспаля – нацянькі*, *ласне – уласна*, *цемер – цемень – цемрыва – цем* etc. Similarly to the 1920s authors, P. Buzuk and J. Liosik (but independently from them), M. Ababurka came to the conclusion that the writer's use of dialectisms contributed to the expansion of the lexicon of the Belarusian literary language. According to the author of the article, this practice, in general, 'паклала пачатак прагрэсіўнай з'яве – узбагачэнню слоўніка агульнанацыянальнай мовы'[50] (Ababurka, 1971, p. 11).

Almost fifty words with illustrations from the works of C. Hartny in 1979 were included in the short *Дыялектызмы ў творах беларускіх савецкіх пісьменнікаў*[51] by M. V. Ababurka (Ababurka, 1979). In 1987, M. Ababurka concluded that in the 1920s–

[47] 'The History of the Belarusian Literary Language'
[48] 'overuse of dialectisms'
[49] '... this created the possibility of selecting the best from the entire language stock of the people'
[50] 'marked the beginning of a progressive phenomenon – the enrichment of the lexical stock of the national language'
[51] 'Dictionary-directory of Dialectisms in the Works of Belarusian Soviet Writers'

Pobrane z czasopisma Studia Bia?orutenistyczne **http://bialorutenistyka.umcs.pl**
Data: 14/09/2026 13:12:12

–1930s C. Hartny was among those Belarusian writers whose language practice contributed to the fact that the former relative balance of the book-like and spoken elements in Belarusian works of art changed dramatically in favour of increased bookishness (Ababurka, 1987, p. 174).

As for the perception of the language of C. Hartny's works in the literary environment, it might be incited by the idea where the language of the novel *Сокі цаліны* / *Virgin Soil Juice* is completely outdated. In a critique of the writers who 'засмечвалі' / 'littered' the Belarusian language with dialectics, prepared in 1982, the first Secretary of the Board of the Union of writers of the BSSR Nil Hilevič assessed this practice as 'вяртанне гадоў на шэсцьдзесят назад, да мовы *Сокаў цаліны*... да мовы часоў *Нашай нівы*'[52] (Gìlevìč, 1983, p. 223). According to him, C. Hartny 'безаглядна шчодра карыстаўся дыялектызмамі, што нават па тым часе раздражняла культурнага чытача, бо ўжо і тады былі пісьменнікі, якія не дазвалялі сабе такога (Колас, Гарэцкі, Чорны, Зарэцкі і іншыя)'[53] (Gìlevìč, 1983, p. 223). In this statement, it is possible to observe the use of the stereotype which had formed about C. Hartny's overuse of dialectisms in the current literary polemic. In fact, the attitude to dialect vocabulary in the 1920s, expressed by the example of the works of J. Kolas, K. Čorny, M. Zarecki, and especially M. Harecki, was not significantly different from the attitude to the dialectisms of C. Hartny.

In 1989, in the afterword to the novel *Сокі цаліны* / *Virgin Soil Juice*, posted in the third volume of the four-volume collected works of C. Hartny, Aliaksiej Klačko briefly explained why the work often was often claimed to be 'шурпатасць мовы'[54] and 'празмернае напластаванне дыялектызмаў і архаізмаў'[55]. The author stressed that the socio-political and industrial vocabulary in the Belarusian language at the time of writing the novel was still being formed. According to A. Klačko, along with other writers, C. Hartny was considered to be the creator of the Belarusian literary language. Widespread use of folk vocabulary and phraseology in literary works of 1920s, according to A. Klačko, is a natural and logical phenomenon, and a significant part of the lexical elements specific for today was introduced into the novel in order to individualize the language of the characters. According to the author of the afterword, the language of the novel is complicated not so much by dialect vocabulary as by 'своеасаблівымі словаўтваральнымі элементамі і кніжным сінтаксісам'[56] (Klačko, 1989, p. 509).

By the time of the proclamation of the independent Republic of Belarus, the development stage of the studies on C. Hartny's language was quite controversial in the

[52] 'a return to sixty years ago, to the language of the *Сокі цаліны* / *Virgin Soil Juice*... to the language of the times of *Naša Niva*'

[53] 'recklessly generously used dialectisms, which even at that time irritated the cultural reader, since even then there were writers who did not allow themselves such things (Kolas, Harecki, Čorny, Zarecki and others)'

[54] 'roughness of language'

[55] 'excessive layering of dialectisms and archaisms'

[56] 'peculiar word-formed elements and bookish syntax'

Pobrane z czasopisma Studia Bia?orutenistyczne **http://bialorutenistyka.umcs.pl**
Data: 14/09/2026 13:12:12

Belarusian humanities. On the one hand, several articles dedicated to the language of C. Hartny's works were published during the 1920s–1980s, along with a significant number of short reviews. A substantial factual material was introduced into scientific use.

On the other hand, there were annoying gaps in the coverage of C. Hartny's language at the same time. For some time, the works on the language of his works printed in the 1920s were eliminated from the scientific circulation. In the mid-1930s, the assessment of C. Hartny's language was categorically revised, and from the mid-1930s until the end of the 1950s his linguistic heritage could not be studied at all. The first post-war, largely critical assessments of the language of C. Hartny were formulated casually by literary critics. In the academic work *Гісторыя... / History...*, of 1968, the language of the writer's works was covered fragmentarily and in largely tendentious manner, whereas the university textbook by L. Šakun contained short private remarks. There is almost no continuity in the study of the language of C. Hartny's works: not only did the authors of the late 1950s – early 1960s but also the researchers of later periods did not refer to the works of P. Buzuk and J. Liosik.

7. Unfortunately, in the linguistics of the Republic of Belarus, the language of C. Hartny's works is not studied within the framework of the planned tasks of scientific institutions. In 1993, an article published by a literary critic Aliaksiej Majsiejčyk in the magazine *Роднае слова*[57] pertained to the study of the novel *Сокі цаліны* / *Virgin Soil Juice*... at school. In agreement with some previous assessments, the author noted that C. Hartny used dialect words, while the language of the novel was filled with obscure words and 'is overweight by a kind of the author's word formation and bookish syntax' (Majsejčyk, 1993b, p. 39, cf. also: Majsejčyk, 1993a).

In the monograph of 2000, Mikalaj Ababurka suggested that the absence of 'harmony of the author's narration' in the works of C. Hartny should be explained by the fact that the writer combined dialect-colloquial vocabulary with 'excessively bookish syntax' in his works. The author also made a remark that C. Hartny treated his own author's speech and 'in general, the whole narrative speech' much less attentively in comparison with M. Harecki (Ababurka, 2000, p. 180, 142).

In 2012–2014, a well-known specialist in the field of speech culture, Aleś Kaŭrus, made an ambitious attempt at revising some previous views on the language of the novel *Сокі цаліны* / *Virgin Soil Juice* (Kaŭrus, 2014). The author argued that the non-objective approach to the language of C. Hartny's works has not been overcome yet. According to the researcher, the reason for this is that the language of C. Hartny's works, among other things, is not given enough attention, and its modern (superficial) assessments are largely based on the views formed in the works of the first post-war researchers. On the fair side of A. Kaŭrus, the probable reason for the absence of 'Ciška Hartny' from the *Belarusian Language* encyclopedia of 1994 is due to an 'established stereotype' with regard to his language (Kaŭrus, 2014, p. 179). A. Kaŭrus distinguishes the four elements of this stereotype (the presence of obscure words, the use of dialect

[57] 'Native Word'

Pobrane z czasopisma Studia Bia?orutenistyczne **http://bialorutenistyka.umcs.pl**
Data: 14/09/2026 13:12:12

vocabulary, author's own kind of word formation, and bookish syntax) and reacts to all these points consistently.

Unfortunately, the author does not refer to the works of the linguists P. Buzuk, J. Liosik, I. Hiermanovič, the authors of the 1968 monograph, or M. Ababurka. The aim of A. Kaŭrus is to challenge virtually every critical opinion about the language of C. Hartny. For example, he does not even agree with the fact that there are many obscure words in the novel *Сокі цаліны* / *Virgin Soil Juice*. If such incomprehensibility were to be present, A. Kaŭrus insists, then the reason for it is not the outdatedness of some words, their dialect character or their specific formation, but rather 'пэўная недааформленасць, недавыказанасць думкі, у тым ліку пры ўжыванні кніжнай лексікі'[58] (Kaŭrus, 2014 , pp. 179–180).

Writing about dialectisms, the author identifies four groups of them: 1) assimilated by fiction and recorded in the explanatory dictionary, 2) assimilated by fiction, but not recorded in the explanatory dictionary, 3) dialectisms which coincide with the corresponding literary words, 4) dialectisms which are not specified in dictionaries and 'практычна не сустракаюцца ў сучасных мастацкіх тэкстах'[59] (Kaŭrus, 2014, p. 182). Illustrating the fourth group, A. Kaŭrus lists mere 12 words, among which there is not a single noun. The author reconciled the factual material with his own far-fetched conclusions and optionally stated that there were no incomprehensible dialectisms in the novel by C. Hartny (Kaŭrus, 2014, p. 183).

Analysing the 'author's alleged own neologisms', A. Kaŭrus lists 64 words (Kaŭrus, 2014, pp. 188–194) he believes have a 'special dignity': '…здаецца, бяры іх, бы тое насенне, і высявай – кладзі ў рукапісны ці камп'ютарны радок'[60] (Kaŭrus, 2014, p. 188). The calque words are analysed separately (45 of them are provided) and considered as part of loan words. Among the 'author's alleged own neologisms', which, according to A. Kaŭrus, are completely devoid of the influence of calquing, there are some calque words as a matter of fact. These include, for example, *двухмясцовы / double* (a calque from Russian *двухместный* or Polish *dwumiejscowy*), *запаўдзённы / afternoon* (a calque from Russian *послеобеденный*), *мілавыглядны/pretty* (a calque from Russian *миловидный*), *многасотны / many hundreds of* (a calque from Russian *многосотенный*), *неадходна / persistently* (a calque from Russian *неотступно)* etc. As for the calque words of Hartny, A. Kaŭrus reports that they have not been preserved in the language, but again considers the writer's word formation experience to be 'relevant' (Kaŭrus, 2014, pp. 187–188).

A. Kaŭrus is interested in the words formed by C. Hartny primarily as 'lost opportunities' of a kind. At the same time, the author of the article does not provide a single example where the writer's neologisms would enter the literary language. A. Kaŭrus disproves that C. Hartny's word formation was specific: his newly-formed words were

[58] 'certain inchoate, unspoken thoughts, including in the application of book vocabulary'
[59] 'practically do not occur in modern literary texts'
[60] '... it seems, take them, like those seeds, and sow – put in a handwritten or computer file'

Pobrane z czasopisma Studia Bia?orutenistyczne **http://bialorutenistyka.umcs.pl**
Data: 14/09/2026 13:12:12

'ў поўнай згодзе з правіламі беларускага словаўтварэння, семантычна выяўныя, зразумелыя часта нават без кантэксту'[61] (Kaŭrus, 2014, p. 188).

In reality, there were thousands of new words formed in the history of the Belarusian literary language of the 1920s within the framework of the accepted models of word formation which were not estabnlished in the modern language. A. Kaŭrus does not make the slightest attempt to show that the words created by C. Hartny are in any way better than such historical neologisms.

As for the 'bookishness' of the syntax, the author of the article is fair in his claim that the reader will find not only bookish words in the works of C. Hartny, but also many examples of dialects. In addition, the bookishness of the language is not a defect in itself, as it may be required to solve artistic problems and may correspond to the trends of developing an artistic style (Kaŭrus, 2014, pp. 180–181).

Relatively new and original thought found in the deliberations of A. Kaŭrus is that he identified the loanwords from neighboring Slavic languages separately among the sources and components of the writer's dictionary of C. Hartny, dividing them further into polonisms, ukrainisms and rusisms for the purpose of the analysis (Kaŭrus, 2014, pp. 181, 184–188). This approach, however, cannot be considered objective and strictly scientific.

Thus, his desire to identify borrowed elements in the artistic language of the 1920s on the basis of the modern criteria of their allocation leads to a disagreement. As A. Kaŭrus rightly noted on another occasion, 'it is hardly correct to approach the language of works written seven, eight decades ago, with measures that determine the degree of perfection of the contemporary language' (Kaŭrus, 2014, pp. 179–180). Therefore, it is impossible to correctly allocate loanwords in the language of an author who wrote the 1920s on the basis of the criteria that were formed in the 1950s and 1960s. In 1920s, such criteria did not exist yet or were approached with apprehension. Many words of Polish origin were not yet considered to be unacceptable 'polonisms', and they appeared in the language of the novel *Сокі цаліны* / *Virgin Soil Juice* not as a result of contacts with the Polish language, but as a reflection of the Kapyl town dialect in the art work. This was sufficiently accepted by the linguists of the 1920s, P. Buzuk and J. Liosik.

However, the attempt of A. Kaŭrus to distinguish among rusisms 'руска-беларускія словы'[62], which 'здаўна вядомы беларусам і бытуюць у іх вусным нелітаратурным маўленні'[63], and 'рускія словы з беларускім фанетыка-арфаграфічным вымаўленнем'[64] is rather fruitful (Kaŭrus, 2014, pp. 186–187).

[61] 'in full agreement with the rules of Belarusian word formation, semantically explicit, understandable often even without context'

[62] 'Russian-Belarusian words'

[63] 'have long been known to Belarusians and exist in their oral non-literary speech'

[64] 'Russian words with Belarusian phonetic and orthographic pronunciation'

Pobrane z czasopisma Studia Bia?orutenistyczne **http://bialorutenistyka.umcs.pl**
Data: 14/09/2026 13:12:12

Conclusion

Despite the fact that the study of the language of C. Hartny's works has a deep tradition in the Belarusian Humanities, the vicissitudes of the writer's life and literary destiny, as well as the peculiarities of the development of Belarusian linguistics have made this part of Belarusian linguistic research rather ambiguous. On the one hand, several articles on the language of C. Hartny's works were published during the 1920s–2010s, along with a significant number of short reviews. For almost a century, substantial factual material has entered scientific circulation, including the academic monograph *History of the Belarusian Literary Language of* 1968, and the university textbook on the history of the Belarusian literary language (ed. 1963 and 1984). More recently, A. Kaŭrus produced an ambitious publication in which he made an attempt at revising the evaluation of the language of the writer's works.

On the other hand, the study of the linguistic heritage of C. Hartny is fragmentary and lacks continuity. From the mid-1930s to late 1950s, it was not studied at all. The post-war study of the writer's language began with the remarks of literary critics about this fact. To date, it is common practice that authors do not take the achievements of their predecessors into account. J. Liosik's thorough research of the late 1920s has not found a response in modern Belarusian linguistics yet. There is no proper methodology for studying the writer's heritage as part of the history of the literary language. In the academic monograph entitled *History of the Belarusian Literary Language* of 1968, the specifics of the author's language was considered not so much as a part of the history of the Belarusian literary language, but as a part of the modern literary language. Belarusian linguistics failed to acknowledge the moment when the language of literary texts written in the 1910s–1930s became a component of the history of the Belarusian literary language. Until recently, there has been a tendency to regard the language of C. Hartny as a (potential) part of the modern literary language.

Translated into English by Marharyta Svirydava

References

Ababurka, Mìkalaj. (1971). Dyâlektnaâ leksìka ŭ tvorah Cìškì Gartnaga. In: Adam Suprun, Âŭgen Kamaroŭskì, Ìvan Karaban′ (eds.). *Lìngvìstyčnyâ dasledavannì* (pp. 3–12). Mìnsk: Belaruskì dzâržaŭny ŭnìversìtèt ìmâ U. Ì. Lenìna. [Абабурка, Мікалай. (1971). Дыялектная лексіка ў творах Цішкі Гартнага. У: Адам Супрун, Яўген Камароўскі, Іван Карабань (рэд.). *Лінгвістычныя даследаванні* (с. 3–12). Мінск: Беларускі дзяржаўны ўніверсітэт імя У. І. Леніна].

Ababurka, Mìkalaj. (1979). *Dyâlektyzmy ŭ tvorah belaruskìh saveckìh pìs'mennìkaŭ. Karotkì sloŭnìk-davednìk*. Mìnsk: Vyšèjšaâ škola. [Абабурка, Мікалай. (1979). *Дыялектызмы*

Pobrane z czasopisma Studia Bia?orutenistyczne **http://bialorutenistyka.umcs.pl**
Data: 14/09/2026 13:12:12

ў творах беларускіх савецкіх пісьменнікаў. Кароткі слоўнік-даведнік. Мінск: Вышэйшая школа].

Ababurka, Mìkalaj. (1987). *Razvìccë movy belaruskaj mastackaj lìtaratury*. Mìnsk: Navuka ì tèhnìka. [Абабурка, Мікалай. (1987). *Развіццё мовы беларускай мастацкай літаратуры*. Мінск: Навука і тэхніка].

Ababurka, Mìkalaj. (2000). *Stanaŭlenne ì razvìccë movy belaruskaj mastackaj lìtaratury*. Magìlëŭ: MDU ìmâ Arkadzâ Kulâšova. [Абабурка, Мікалай. (2000). *Станаўленне і развіццё мовы беларускай мастацкай літаратуры*. Магілёў: МДУ імя Аркадзя Куляшова].

Aleksandrovìč, Scâpan. (1965). Cìška Gartny. In: Vasìl′ Barysenka, Vasìl′ Ìvašyn (eds.). *Gìstoryâ belaruskaj saveckaj lìtaratury*. Vol. 1. 1917–1941 gg. (pp. 256–279). Mìnsk: Navuka ì tèhnìka. [Александровіч, Сцяпан. (1965). Цішка Гартны. У: Васіль Барысенка, Васіль Івашын (рэд.). *Гісторыя беларускай савецкай літаратуры*. Том 1. 1917–1941 гг. (с. 256–279). Мінск: Навука і тэхніка].

Bajkoŭ, Mìkalaj; Nekrašèvìč, Scâpan. (1926). *Belaruska-rasìjskì sloŭnìk*. Mìnsk: Dzâržaŭnae vydavectva Belarusì. [Байкоў, Мікалай; Некрашэвіч, Сцяпан. (1926). *Беларуска-расійскі слоўнік*. Мінск: Дзяржаўнае выдавецтва Беларусі].

Bajkoŭ, Mìkola. (1929). *Na lìtaraturnyâ tèmy*. Mìnsk: Belaruskae dzâržaŭnae vydavectva. [Байкоў, Мікола. (1929). *На літаратурныя тэмы*. Мінск: Беларускае дзяржаўнае выдавецтва].

Buzuk, Pëtr. (1926). Galoŭnyâ asablìvascì movy Cìškì Gartnaga. *Polymâ*, 5, pp. 131–135. [Бузук, Пётр. (1926). Галоўныя асаблівасці мовы Цішкі Гартнага. *Полымя*, 5, с. 131–135].

Buzuk, Pëtr. (1928). Mova ì pravapìs Cìškì Gartnaga. In: Mìkalaj Bajkoŭ, Alâksandr Čarvâkoŭ (eds.). *Ciška Gartny ŭ lìtaraturnaj krytycy* (pp. 177–185). Mìnsk: Belaruskae dzâržaŭnae vydavectva. [Бузук, Пётр. (1928). Мова і правапіс Цішкі Гартнага. У: Мікалай Байкоў, Аляксандр Чарвякоў (рэд.). *Цішка Гартны ў літаратурнай крытыцы* (с. 177–185). Мінск: Беларускае дзяржаўнае выдавецтва].

Dvarčanìn, Ìgnat. (1927). *Hrèstamatyâ novaj belaruskaj lìtaratury (ad 1905 goda)*. Vìl′nâ: Belaruskae vydavectva. [Дварчанін, Ігнат. (1927). *Хрэстаматыя новай беларускай літаратуры (ад 1905 года)*. Вільня: Беларускае выдавецтва].

Germanovìč, Ìvan. (1961). Z gìstoryì narmalìzacyì belaruskaj lìtaraturnaj leksìkì. *Vescì AN BSSR. Seryâ gramadskìh navuk*, 3, pp. 87–96. [Германовіч, Іван. (1961). З гісторыі нармалізацыі беларускай літаратурнай лексікі. *Весці АН БССР. Серыя грамадскіх навук*, 3, с. 87–96].

Germanovìč, Ìvan. (1962). Palanìzmy ŭ belaruskaj lìtaraturnaj move 20-h – peršaj palove 30-h gadoŭ XX st. *Vescì AN BSSR. Seryâ gramadskìh navuk*, 2, pp. 86–97. [Германовіч, Іван. (1962). Паланізмы ў беларускай літаратурнай мове 20-х – першай палове 30-х гадоў XX ст. *Весці АН БССР. Серыя грамадскіх навук*, 2, с. 86–97].

Germanovìč, Ìvan. (1963). Leksìčnyâ dyâlektyzmy ì navatvory ŭ belaruskaj lìtaraturnaj move 20–30-h gadoŭ XX st. *Vescì AN BSSR. Seryâ gramadskìh navuk*, 1, pp. 110–120. [Германовіч, Іван. (1963). Лексічныя дыялектызмы і наватворы ў беларускай літаратурнай мове 20–30-х гадоў XX ст. *Весці АН БССР. Серыя грамадскіх навук*, 1, с. 110–120].

Pobrane z czasopisma Studia Bia?orutenistyczne **http://bialorutenistyka.umcs.pl**
Data: 14/09/2026 13:12:12

Gìlevìč, Nìl. (1983). *Poklìč žyccâ ì času*. Mìnsk: Belarus′. [Гілевіч, Ніл. (1983). *Покліч жыцця і часу*. Мінск: Беларусь].

Kaŭrus, Ales. (2014). *Slova: u sloŭnìku, u tèksce. Artykuly, apovedy*. Vìl′nâ: Logvìnaŭ. [Каўрус, Алесь (2014). *Слова: у слоўніку, у тэксце. Артыкулы, аповеды*. Вільня: Логвінаў].

Klačko, Alâksej. (1962). Kamentaryì ì zaŭvagì. In: Cìška Gartny. *Vybranyâ apavâdannì* (pp. 273–278). Mìnsk: Dzâržaŭnae vydavectva BSSR. [Клачко, Аляксей. (1962). Каментарыі і заўвагі. У: Цішка Гартны. *Выбраныя апавяданні* (с. 273–278). Мінск: Дзяржаўнае выдавецтва БССР].

Klačko, Alâksej. (1989). Pra raman Cìškì Gartnaga ‘Sokì calìny’. In: Cìška Gartny. *Zbor tvoraŭ*. Vol. 3 (pp. 507–509). Mìnsk: Mastackaâ lìtaratura. [Клачко, Аляксей. (1989). Пра раман Цішкі Гартнага “Сокі цаліны’. У: Цішка Гартны. *Збор твораў*. Т. 3 (с. 507–509). Мінск: Мастацкая літаратура].

Kramko, Ìvan; Ûrèvìč, Alena; Ânovìč, Alena. (1968). *Gìstoryâ belaruskaj lìtaraturnaj movy*. Vol. 2. Mìnsk: Navuka ì tèhnìka. [Крамко, Іван; Юрэвіч, Алена; Яновіч, Алена. (1968). *Гісторыя беларускай літаратурнай мовы*. Т. 2. Мінск: Навука і тэхніка].

Krapìva, Kandrat. (1934). Pra perabudovu ì ‘nedabudovu’. *Polymâ rèvalûcyì*, 9, pp. 124–134. [Крапіва, Кандрат. (1934). Пра перабудову і ‘недабудову’. *Полымя рэвалюцыі*, 9, с.124–134].

Kryvìč (Bajkoŭ), Mìkola. (1927). Naša proza za 1926 god. *Polymâ*, 4, pp. 202–211. [Крывіч (Байкоў), Мікола. (1927). Наша проза за 1926 год. *Полымя*, 4, с. 202–211].

Lësìk, Âzèp (2003). *1921–1930. Zbor tvoraŭ*. Mìnsk: Logvìnaŭ. [Лёсік, Язэп. (2003). *1921–1930. Збор твораў*. Мінск: Логвінаў].

Majsejčyk, Alâksej. (1993a). Goman ì zzânne zarnìc. Vyvučènne ramana Cìškì Gartnaga ‘Sokì calìny’ ŭ škole. *Rodnae slova*, 4, pp. 41–44. [Майсейчык, Аляксей. (1993a). Гоман і ззянне зарніц. Вывучэнне рамана Цішкі Гартнага ‘Сокі цаліны’ ў школе. *Роднае слова*, 4, с. 41–44].

Majsejčyk, Alâksej. (1993b). Goman ì zzânne zarnìc. Vyvučènne ramana Cìškì Gartnaga ‘Sokì calìny’ ŭ škole. *Rodnae slova*, 5, pp. 36–39. [Майсейчык, Аляксей. (1993b). Гоман і ззянне зарніц. Вывучэнне рамана Цішкі Гартнага “Сокі цаліны’ ў школе. *Роднае слова*, 5, с. 36–39].

Navumenka, Ìvan. (1960). *Z glybìn′ žyccâ: Krytyčnyâ ècûdy ab tvorčascì Âkuba Kolasa*. Mìnsk: Dzâržvydat. [Навуменка, Іван. (1960). *З глыбінь жыцця: Крытычныя эцюды аб творчасці Якуба Коласа*. Мінск : Дзяржвыдат].

Piâtuhovìč, Mihaìl. (1930). Cìška Gartny. In: Cìška Gartny. *Na novym mescy* (pp. 3–8). Mìnsk: Belaruskae dzâržaŭnae vydavectva. [Піятуховіч, Міхаіл. (1930). Цішка Гартны. У: Цішка Гартны. *На новым месцы* (с. 3–8). Мінск: Беларускае дзяржаўнае выдавецтва].

Pìs′mennìk ì mova. Hrèstamatyâ. (1962). Folded Uladzìmìr Anìčènka ì Arkadz′ Žuraŭskì. Mìnsk: Vydavectva Mìnìstèrstva vyšèjšaj, sârèdnâj specyâl′naj ì prafesìânal′naj adukacyì BSSR. [*Пісьменнік і мова. Хрэстаматыя*. (1962). Склалі Уладзімір Анічэнка і Аркадзь Жураўскі. Мінск: Выдавецтва Міністэрства вышэйшай, сярэдняй спецыяльнай і прафесіянальнай адукацыі БССР].

Pobrane z czasopisma Studia Bia?orutenistyczne **http://bialorutenistyka.umcs.pl**
Data: 14/09/2026 13:12:12

Šakun, Leŭ. (1960). *Narysy gìstoryì belaruskaj lìtaraturnaj movy*. Mìnsk: Dzâržaŭnae vučèbna-pedagagìčnae vydavectva Mìnìstèrstva asvety BSSR. [Шакун, Леў. (1960). *Нарысы гісторыі беларускай літаратурнай мовы*. Мінск: Дзяржаўнае вучэбна-педагагічнае выдавецтва Міністэрства асветы БССР].

Šakun, Leŭ. (1963). *Gìstoryâ belaruskaj lìtaraturnaj movy*. Mìnsk: Vydavectva Mìnìstèrstva vyšèjšaj, sârèdnâj specyâl′naj ì prafesìânal′naj adukacyì BSSR. [Шакун, Леў. (1963). *Гісторыя беларускай літаратурнай мовы*. Мінск: Выдавецтва Міністэрства вышэйшай, сярэдняй спецыяльнай і прафесіянальнай адукацыі БССР].

Zambržyckì, Sârgej. (1928). Tvorčasc′ Cìškì Gartnaga. *Maladnâk*, 12, pp. 153–174. [Замбржыцкі, Сяргей. (1928). Творчасць Цішкі Гартнага. *Маладняк*, 12, с. 153–174].

Zamocìn, Ìvan. (1928). Dramatyčnyâ tvory Cìškì Gartnaga. *Polymâ*, 9, pp. 151–167. [Замоцін, Іван. (1928). Драматычныя творы Цішкі Гартнага. *Полымя*, 9, с. 151–167].

Zaprudskì, Sârgej. (2013). *Belaruskae movaznaŭstva ì razvìccë belaruskaj lìtaraturnaj movy: 1920–1930-â gady*. Mìnsk: BDU. [Запрудскі, Сяргей. (2013). *Беларускае мовазнаўства і развіццё беларускай літаратурнай мовы: 1920–1930-я гады*. Мінск: БДУ].

Article submission date: 17 January 2019