Lilia Citko

University of Bialystok (Poland)
Email: l.citko@uwb.edu.pl
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8340-4814

Professor Ignacy Daniłowicz and His Palaeographic Legacy. Notes on the Margin of the Transliteration of *The Lithuanian Letopis and the Rus' Chronicle*

Profesor Ignacy Daniłowicz i jego spuścizna paleograficzna. Uwagi na marginesie transliteracji „Latopisca Litwy i Kroniki Ruskiej”

Прафесар Ігнат Даніловіч і яго палеаграфічная спадчына. Заўвагі на перыферы трансliteraцыы „Летапісца Літвы і Хронікі Рускай”

Abstract

Ignacy Daniłowicz, the 19th century scholar from Podlasie, a professor at the Vilnius University, then, successively, at the Kharkiv University, the Kiev University, and the Moscow University, left behind a rich and valuable scholarly legacy. A lawyer and historian by education, he also showed considerable linguistic and palaeographic skills and was fascinated with the language of Rus' documents pertaining to the history of Lithuania. His work with said files was undoubtedly facilitated by his knowledge of the dialect of Podlasie. The text focuses mainly on the methods of transposing the Supraśl letopis, written at the beginning of the 16th century in the Cyrillic script, into the Latin alphabet. The analysis of the solution used by Daniłowicz in terms of the transliteration of vowels and consonants reveals a good command of the palaeographer's toolkit in spite of the lack of linguistic training.

Keywords: palaeography, Cyrillic script, Latin script, transliteration of vowels and consonants, Supraśl letopis

---

Abstrakt

Pochodzący z Podlasia XIX-wieczny uczony, profesor Uniwersytetu Wileńskiego, a następnie kolejno Charkowskiego, Kijowskiego oraz Moskiewskiego, Ignacy Daniłowicz pozostawił po sobie bogatą i wartościową spuściznę naukową. Prawnik i historyk z wykształcenia, przejawiał też niemałe zdolności językoznawcy i paleografa zafascynowanego językiem ruskich dokumentów do dziejów Litwy. Pracę z nimi niewątpliwie ułatwiała mu znajomość podlaskiej mowy. Główna uwaga w tekście skupiona została na sposobach transponowania na alfabet łaciński Latopisu supraskiego, który powstał na początku XVI wieku jako tekst cyrylicki. Analiza zastosowanych przez Daniłowicza rozwiązań w zakresie transliterowania samogłosek i spółgłosek pokazała dobre opanowanie warsztatu paleografa mimo braku przygotowania językoznawczego.

Słowa kluczowe: paleografia, cyrylica, łacinka, transliteracja samogłosek i spółgłosek, Latopis supraski

Анатацыя

Вучоны XIX ст., прафесар Віленскага, а пазней Харкаўскага, Кіеўскага і Маскоўскага ўніверсітэтаў Ігнат Даніловіч, які паходзіў з Падляшша, пакінуў пасля сябе багатую і каштоўную навуковую спадчыну. Юрыст і гісторык па прафесіі, ён таксама праявіў значныя здольнасці лінгвіста і палеографа, захопленага мовай рускіх дакументаў па гісторыі Літвы. Працу з імі, несумненна, аблягчала веданне ім падляшскай гаворкі. Асноўная ўвага ў тэксце звернута на спосабы трансляцыі на лацінку Супрасльскага летапісу, напісанага ў пачатку XVI ст. кірыліцай. Аналіз прыёмаў, выкарыстаных Даніловічам у працэсе транслітарацыі галосных і зычных, паказаў, што, нягледзячы на адсутнасць мовазнаўчай падрыхтоўкі, даследчык добра валодаў палеаграфічнай методыкай.

Ключавыя словы: палеаграфія, кірыліца, лацінка, транслітарацыя галосных і зычных, Супрасльскі летапіс

The intention of the author of the article is to revive the memory of the figure of one of the great residents of Podlasie of the 19th century – Ignacy Daniłowicz – a highly valued by his contemporary scholars professor at the Vilnius University, then, successively, at the Kharkiv University, the Kiev University, and the Moscow University. A lawyer and historian by education, Daniłowicz also showed considerable linguistic and palaeographic skills and was fascinated with the language of Rus' documents pertaining to the history of Lithuania, the work with which was undoubtedly facilitated by his knowledge of the Podlasie dialect.

The text is dedicated to researchers who have associated their scholarly interests with Podlasie – its history, culture, language. One of them is Professor Michał Sajewicz – the author of numerous publications devoted to the local dialects and proper nouns

of the Polish-Belarusian-Ukrainian borderland. His works, recording and archiving the speech and proper names of the inhabitants of the lands crossed by the Narew (cf. i.a. Sajewicz, 2002, 2013), are at the same time a continuation of the work of the generation of Podlasie residents that already at the beginning of the 19th century made the effort of researching and describing the history of the nations of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth.

Main Facts from the Biography of Daniłowicz

Ignacy Daniłowicz was born on the 30th of July, 1787 in Hryniewicze Duże in the Bielsk County as the eldest of the seven children of the local Uniate priest Mikołaj and Domicela née Michniewicz (Turkowski, 1938, p. 412). Initially taught at home, he began his proper education in 1797 in the Łomża Piarists' school, thanks to the care of his uncle, the priest Michał Daniłowicz, a pedagogue, a mathematics and astronomy lecturer. In 1807 he began education in the gymnasium founded by the Prussian authorities in Białystok, which he graduated from in 1807, making particular progress in German and French. Three years later (in 1810) he began studies at the Department of Ethics and Politics at the Vilnius University and received the degree of the Master of Law in April 1812. In the summer of the same year, when the Napoleonic troops seized the lands of the Białystok oblast, Daniłowicz was given the function of the secretary to the French governor of the oblast. In 1814 he became a lecturer of national civil law at the Vilnius University, which enabled him to go on scholarly trips to libraries and visit archives in Warsaw, Saint Petersburg, and Moscow in search of documents related to the political system of early Lithuania. He continued the research work at the Vilnius University after his return from a scholarly journey in 1819, procuring in 1822 the post of an associate professor, and in 1824 – of a full professor at his alma mater (Turkowski, 1938, pp. 412–414). In this period, historical studies at the Vilnius University entered the time of their greatest splendour, which was related to the prominent historian Joachim Lelewel assuming the history department chairmanship. Inspired by this scholar, besides the legal issues, Daniłowicz was researching the history of the law in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, chiefly the sources pertaining to it. In 1824, following the discovery of the activity of the Vilnius Philomaths and Philarets, Daniłowicz, alongside a group of other professors at the University (which included Lelewel and Bobrowski), was expelled from Vilnius 'poza granice polskich guberni'[1] (Čamâryckì, 2005, p. 576). In the following year, he found himself at the Kharkiv University where he was appointed as the Professor of Diplomacy (Kijas, 1997, p. 28). This is how 'nasz Podlasianin' ('our Podlasianin' – Polish for an inhabitant of Podlasie), as Michał Bobrowski called him in his letters, found himself in the city which in time began to be considered the capital of the Ukrainian literary and national Romanticism. The stay in Kharkiv, which

---

[1] 'beyond the borders of the Polish governorates'.

lasted until 1830, and the close contact with the local Ukrainian intelligentsia resulted
for Daniłowicz in new scholarly interests. Next to further work on the elucidation of
issues of the legislation and history of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, he began to gather
source material with the intention of producing an outline of the history of Ukraine. In
his letters to Lelewel, written after meeting Daniłowicz in Podlasie where he stayed
in 1827, Bobrowski made a humorous remark: 'Podlasiak między kozakami zupełnie
się skozaczył'[2] (Hawryluk, 2002, p. 30). The years 1830–1834 Daniłowicz spent in
the country on the Neva as a specialist in the legislation of Lithuania and the Rus' in
the Second Section of the Imperial Chancellery (at the same time being a professor at
the Kharkiv University), involved in the codification work of Mikhail M. Speransky.
During his stay in Saint Petersburg, the object of his interest was also the material of
the Lithuanian Metrica which was stored there (he was then working with Franciszek
Malewski who would later work with the Metrica). In the following years (1835–1839)
he worked at the university in Kiev, from which he was then punitively transferred to
Moscow where he stayed until 1842, entering into a collaboration with an esteemed
publisher of sources, Prince Mikhail A. Obolensky (Turkowski 1938, pp. 412–414)
and together preparing for print the Księga poselska (Ambassador's Book) *of the
Lithuanian Metrica*. Moscow was the last site of Daniłowicz's scholarly work. Due to
his deteriorating physical and mental health, in 1842 he asked the university authorities
to be released from his responsibilities and returned to Kiev. In the following year,
he went to receive treatment in Frywałd in Lower Silesia (today Jeseník in the Czech
Republik), where he died on the 12th of July 1843.

The Scholarly Activity of Ignacy Daniłowicz

As a researcher, Daniłowicz was without a doubt shaped by the Vilnius University
which in the 19th century was the most important centre of research in the history of
Lithuania and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. 'Zgromadzeni w nim i wokół niego
uczeni dokonali fundamentalnych ustaleń źródłowych i sformułowali pierwsze
naukowe interpretacje litewskich dziejów'[3] (Błachowska, 2018, p. 26). From the
beginning of the 1820s, Daniłowicz (together with Lelewel and Bobrowski) worked
intensively on a full critical publication of the Casimir's Code. He found this document
in 1817 among the Saint Petersburg resources of Count Nikolay Rumyantsev's library.
In spite of the slowing down of the work, which resulted from the expulsion of the
three researchers from the university in Vilnius, in 1826 the relic was published in
print (Statut Kazimierza Jagiellończyka…, 1826). In the Vilnius period of his scholarly
activity, Daniłowicz also began, as was mentioned above, gathering documents for the

---

[2]   'Among the Cossacks, the Podlasiak got completely Cossack-cised'.
[3]   'The scholars gathered within and around it made fundamental source findings and formulated the
first scholarly interpretations of the Lithuanian history'

history of Lithuania and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, continuing his work also after the forced departure from Vilnius – in Kharkiv, Saint Petersburg, Kiev, and Moscow. The documents he gathered, essentially constituting a sort of *magnum opus* in the scholar's life's work, were published in print in the 1860s, so already posthumously, by Jan Sidorowicz (Daniłowicz, 1860–1862). Twenty years earlier, in 1841, Count Tytus Działyński published *Zbiór praw litewskich* (Collection of Lithuanian Laws) which included the 1529 Statute of Lithuania prepared by Daniłowicz and Lelewel, as well as Władysław Jagiełło's 1387 privilege found by Lelewel in 1828 in the Warsaw copies of the Lithuanian Metrica, and other documents (Zbiór praw litewskich…, 1841). In 1843 Daniłowicz and Prince Mikhail Obolensky published Księga poselska (Ambassador's Book) of the Metrica of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, which contained diplomatic documents form the times of the reign of Sigismund Augustus (Kniga posol′skaâ Metriki…, 1843). In the introduction, the authors completed the first description of the contents of the Lithuanian Metrica and the Crown Metrica since their transfer to Russia in 1795 (Błachowska, 2018, p. 37).

Apart from normative sources (documents), Daniłowicz was also interested in narrative sources (diaries, chronicles) pertaining to the history of Lithuania. While searching through the resources of libraries and archives, at the beginning of the 1820s, the young researcher together with his compatriot, the Uniate (later Orthodox) priest Michał Bobrowski who also came from Podlasie, found in the library of the Supraśl monastery a Rus' manuscript, dating from 1519, of the Lithuanian Chronicle written on the order of Prince Symeon Odyncewicz, edited in Smolensk. Daniłowicz published this source in transliteration into the Latin alphabet for the first time in *Dziennik Wileński* (The Vilnius Daily, 1823–1824), annotating it with numerous comments and supplements from the so-called *Kronika sofijska* (The Sofia Chronicle) and the Chronicle of M. Stryjkowski[4]. As a self-contained publication, the Chronicle, also called by its discoverer *latopis podlaski* (the Podlasie letopis), appeared in print in 1827 (Daniłowicz, 1827, p. 9)[5].

---

[4]   The first publication of the document was titled: *Latopisiec litewski na początku XV wieku, przez bezimiennego pisarza w ruskim języku ułożony, wyjęty z rękopismu r. 1520, obeymującego dzieje rusko-litewskie, po raz pierwszy dosłownie łacińskiemi literami do druku podany* (The Lithuanian Letopis at the Beginning of the 15th Century, Composed in the Rus' Language by an Anonymous Writer, Taken Out of the Manuscript of 1520, Containing the Rus'-Lithuanian History, for the First Time Published in Print, Word for Word in Latin Letters).

[5]   The full title of the publication is: *Latopisiec Litwy i kronika ruska: z rękopisu sławiańskiego przepisane; wypisami z wremiennika sofiyskiego pomnożone; przypisami i objaśnieniami, dla czytelników polskich potrzebnemi, opatrzone; staraniem i pracą Ignacego Daniłowicza, profesora zwyczaynego w Cesarskim Uniwersytecie Charkowskim, naprzód w Dzienniku Wileńskim roku 1824 częściami ogłaszane; a teraz w jedno zebrane, dokończone i przedrukowane* ['*The Lithuanian Letopis and the Rus' Chronicle: Copied from the Slavic Manuscript; Augmented by Extracts from the Wremmiennik Sofiyski; Provided with Annotations and Explanations Needed by Polish Readers; Through the Efforts and Work of Ignacy Daniłowicz, Full Professor at the Impe-*

The discovery of the manuscript carried a substantial significance for the research on the history of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Daniłowicz's letopis (this was how the relic was referred to by Polish researchers until its publication in the collection of Western-Rus' letopisi in the 17th volume of Polnogo sobranija russkih letopisej (Ptašickij and Šahmatov, 1907), when the text he discovered began to be called *supraslskij spisok* [Supraśl Register]), is, like every source of this kind, a compilation. It is a Smolensk version of the all-Rus' compilation from 1446 which contains traces of the Novgorod letopis, the Simeon letopis, and the Sofia letopis I. This letopis, however, is not just another link in the genealogical tree of Rus' letopis-writing. The source contains one of the oldest relics of Lithuanian-Rus' writing – *Latopisiec wielkich książąt litewskich* (The Letopis of the Grand Dukes of Lithuania) and the panegyrical *Pochwała Witolda* (The Praise of Vytautas). The content of the letopis includes much unique information relating to the history of Lithuania shortly before the Polish-Lithuanian Union of Krewo as well as in the first decades of its functioning.

Daniłowicz as a Palaeographer

The Supraśl letopis – as the main object of interest in this part of the text – will serve to formulate some reflections on the linguistic competencies of professor Daniłowicz, and specifically – his skills as a palaeographer. One of the problems which the author of the transliteration of the Cyrillic graphic system into the Latin script had to face is the variation in the representation of the phones of the Rus' language. Daniłowicz, having the experience of an expert researcher of Rus' writing, had full awareness of said difficulties and certainly would not have been able to propose consistent rules of transliteration had he not been in possession of the knowledge of the language system as well as of its history and orthography.

The following synoptic comparison of short fragments of the original Cyrillic version of the Supraśl letopis and its transliteration into the Latin script illustrates the solutions most typical of Daniłowicz's palaeographic toolkit.

Transliteration of vowels. The phone *yat'* [ě] represented in Western-Rus' letopisi by collateral forms *ѣ/e/je* in the transliterated text takes on the shape of *ie*, e.g. *крѣпко – kriepko*, *гнѣвомь – hniewot*, *лѣтописецъ – lietopisiec*, *лѣсь – lies*, *лѣта – lieta*, *лѣте – liete*, *невѣдаешь – newiedajesz*, *звѣри – zwieri*, meanwhile, the etymological and originating from the *soft yer* (ь) *e* is typically represented by *e*, cf. *день – den'*, *великого – welikoho*, *Витебъскъ – Witebsk*, *именемь – itenet*, *колесе – kolese*, *королевъ – korolew*, *земли – zemli*.

Iotified letters denoting the softness of the preceding consonant are consistently transposed throughout the entirety of the text. In his transliteration, Daniłowicz uses

––––––––––––––––

rial University in Kharkov, First in The Vilnius Daily of 1824 Announced in Instalments; and Now Assembled into One, Finished, and Reprinted*'*]. Vilnius 1827.

ЛѢтописець великыˣ князеⁱ литовъскыˣ	Lietopisiec Wielikich Kniazej Litowskich
Великого кнѕ̃а Кедмина литовъскоᵍ было с҃новъ ӟ҃: стареши Мон҆вид, потомь Наримонтъ, Ѡлигоръдъ, королевъ ѡт҆ць, потомь Евноутеи, потомь Кестоути, ѡт҆ць великого кнѕ̃а Витовта, потомь Кориятъ, седмыи Любортъ. Монтивидоу даль ѡт҆ць Корачевъ да Слонимь, Наримонтоу Пинескъ, Ѡлгирдоу, королеву ѡ҆цу, Крево; да к тому кнѕ̃ь витебъскыи с҃новъ не держаль, принꙗль его к дотьце, Витебъсьскъ взꙗти. Евноутия ѡсадиль во Вильни в̃ на великомь кнѕ̃жени, а Кестоутию Троки, Коръꙗтоу Новъгородокъ, а Люборта принꙗль володимеръскыи кнѕ̃ь к дотьце во Володимеръ и в Лоуцеськъ и во въсю землю Волыньскую.	Welikoho kniazia Kedmina Litowskoho było sinow VII stareszij Monwid, potom Narimont, Olihord Korolew otec', potom Jewnutej, potom Kestuti otec' welikoho kniazia Witowta, potom Koriat, sedmyj Liubort. Montiwidu dał otec' Koraczew da Słonim, Narimontu Pinesk, Olhirdu, Korolewu otcu, Krewo, da ktomu kniaz' Witebskyj sinow nederzał, priniał jeho kdotce, Witebsk wziati. Jewnutija osadił wo Wilni, W. na welikom kniażenii, a Kestutiu Troki, Koriatu Nowhorodok, a Liuborta priniał wołodimerskij kniaz' kdotce wo Wołodimer i w Łucesk i wo wsiu zemliu Wołynskuju.
(Ptašickij and Šahmatov, 1907, vol. 17)	(Daniłowicz, 1827)

the combinations *i* + the appropriate vowel: *Ляхове – Liachowe, Ляхи – Liachi, Лядского – Liadskoho, поляне – Poliane, глаголють – hłaholiut, королю – koroliu, Люборта – Liuborta, любъви – liubwi, люди – liudi, землю – zemliu, нелюбость – neliubost', Подолю – Podoliu, почювь – pocziuw.*

Daniłowicz is characterised by considerable awareness in his approach to such distinctive signs of the Cyrillic inventory as yers. Their presence in the writing system of 16th-century relics and those created later (accompanied by, one must add, a very unbalanced, from the etymological point of view, repartition) did not, as we know, have a phonetic nor a phonological justification and was sustained only by the requirements of the orthographic tradition. Daniłowicz, having full awareness of the conventionality of yers, consistently decides against representing them. Characteristic here are especially the instances of omitting the soft yer as a graphic sign not having any phonetic value (in such cases, an apostrophe is not used after vowels), e.g. *Лоуцеськъ - Łucesk, Волыньскую – Wołynskuju, не держаль – nederzał* and representing it by means of an apostrophe in the position of indicating the softness of vowels, e.g. *кнѕ̃ь – kniaz', мыслить – myslit'* (inf.), *начнеть – nacznet', опять – opiat', осень – osen', земль –zeml'.*

Transliteration of consonants. The system of transposing consonants into the Latin script is fairly clear in the letopis**.** In the writing system, Daniłowicz preserves with significant consistency the articulatory difference between the fricative [h] and the plosive [g]. The predominant Belarusian-Ukrainian realisation recorded in the spelling of the Cyrillic original is represented by h, e.g. *литовъского – Litowskoho, великого – welikoho, Новъгородокъ – Nowhorodok*, in exceptional cases by ch, cf. *всегда – wsechda*. The phone [g], similarly to what is the case in the Cyrillic text, is represented by the digraph kh, cf. *кглеитовныи – khlejtownyi, Долъкгирд – Dołkhird, Жикгимонт – Żikhimont*, vestigially, in the spelling of Lithuanian names, appears also *k*, e.g. *Кедмина – Kedmina,*

Лыквеня – Łykwenia. It has to be mentioned that the transliterated text preserves the characteristic of the original variety of the spelling of *кг / г* in Baltic anthroponyms, represented respectively with *kh / h*: *Жигимонт / Жигимонт – Żikhimont / Żihimont, Лыкгьвеневичь / Лыгвену – Łykhweniewicz /Łyhwenu*.

In line with the orthographic tradition of the original, functional soft consonants in the transliteration are indicated by following them with an *i*, although they underwent the process of depalatalisation, cf. *межи – teżi, оубежить – ubeżit, нашихъ – naszich, заложи – założy, мужи – miżi, слышавши – słyszawszi, моцию – mociju, немци – nemci, ко Орши – ko Orszi, велици – welici, ѿтъ – otec', гонець – honec', конець – konec'*. The palatalisation of [r] is preserved with great consistency as well, e.g. Б*ряъсловлю – Briasłowliu Брясловль – Brasłowl, царя – caria, царю – cariu, морю – moriu, кривыи – kriwyj, Наримонтъ – Narimont, наговорилъ – nahoworił, приходити – prichoditi, пригналъ – prihnał, принялъ – priniał, затворися – zatworisia, звѣри – zwieri*.

The predominant in the Cyrillic original uses of the combinations [ki], [gi], [xi] in place of the old [ky], [gy], [xy] are represented analogically in the transliterated text, e.g. *великии – welikij, враги – wrahi, княгини – kniahini, хитрь – chitr, руки – ruki, Подолски – Podolski, верхи – werchi, волохи – wołochi, згибоша – zhibosza*. Alongside them, it is also old groups that are preserved fairly often: пакы – paky, полоцкымь – połockym, великыи – welikyj, витебскыи – Witebskyj, рекы – reky, рукы – ruky, ярълыкы – jarłyky, другы - druhy, могыла – mohyła, верхы – werchy, в Ляхы – w Liachy. Also noted should be the cases of Daniłowicz changing the way of writing the combination *ky > ki*, cf. *володимеръскыи – wołodimerskij*.

Conclusions

The handful of above observations, regarded as an introduction to the issues relating to the palaeographic competencies of Daniłowicz, allows to find the Podlasie-born scholar a good specialist in Rus' writing and written language. Despite some inconsistencies in the applied graphic solutions, professor Daniłowicz managed excellently with the difficult art of transposing the 16th-century Cyrillic text into the Latin alphabet. This undoubtedly resulted from the scholar's innate linguistic intuition and considerable linguistic awareness, which is evidenced by the words included in the preface to *Latopis litewski* (*The Lithuanian Letopis*), in which he characterises the copyist of the relic as follows:

> Kopista ignorant był wielki: rozrywał w pisaniu wyrazy, znaki pisarskie dowolnie umieszczał, nazwiska właściwe przekształcał, opus[z]czał całe wyrazy i myśli, a może i wiersze, a że w znajomym sobie pisał języku, chętka poprawy łechtała miałki jego umysł, i nie raz anachronizmow stał się winnym. W zakończeniach też gramatycznych nie masz jednostaynóści: między formy starożytne, miesza nowsze zakończenia, i przypadkowanie

prowincyonalne łatwo odkryte bydź może. Porównanie jego pracy z innemi ruskiemi latopiscami dostatecznie o tem, co się rzekło, przekonało[6] (Daniłowicz, 1827, pp. 13–14).

Daniłowicz's competencies as a history researcher, but also as a language specialist, received recognition among his contemporary scholars. Let us allow the words of Ludwik Janowski, also a professor at the Vilnius University and a historian of this academy, to be the evidence of that:

Co zdziałał dla historyi Polski Lelewel, to dla dziejów Litwy podjął drugi profesor Ignacy Daniłowicz. Rozległej nauki i niemałych zdolności, Daniłowicz kochał swoje powołanie i był mu cały oddany. Lekcye jego były zajmujące, albowiem miał wielki dar słowa, a w wykładach nadewszystko przekładał gruntowność; jakikolwiek rozbierał Ignacy Daniłowicz przedmiot, starał się go zgłębić najdokładniej, poznać jego źródła i wskazać je słuchaczom swoim. Szczególniej lubował się w czytaniu i objaśnianiu starych zabytków prawa i litewsko–ruskich kronik, których dawny język w jego ustach przyjmował dźwięki gwary ludowej, suchy sposób pisania stawał się pełen jaskrawych i żywych barw i dawna przeszłość ożywała w całej swej starożytnej piękności[7] (Tur, 1903, p. 29).

Translated into English by Lingua Lab s.c.

List of sources

PSRL – Ptašickij,Stanislav; Šahmatov, Aleksej. (1907). *Polnoe sobranie russkih letopisej*. Vol. 17: *Zapadnorusskie letopisi*. Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografiâ M.A. Aleksandrova. [Пташицкий, Станислав; Шахматов, Алексей (1907). *Полное собрание русских*

---

[6] 'The copyist was a great ignoramus: he was tearing the written words apart, setting down characters as he fancied, transforming proper names, omitting entire words and thoughts, maybe even verses, and because he was writing in a language he was familiar with, the itch to make improvements was tickling his superficial mind, and often he became guilty of anachronisms. In the grammatical endings, there is no uniformity either: amongst ancient forms, he mixes in newer endings, and it is easy to detect provincial declination. The comparison of his work with other Rus' letopisi was enough to convince of the aforesaid.'

[7] 'What Lelewel did for the history of Poland, for the history of Lithuania was done by another professor, Ignacy Daniłowicz. Distinguished by his broad learning and considerable skills, Daniłowicz loved his calling and was devoted to it entirely. His classes were engrossing, for he had a great gift of the word, and in his lectures above all else he placed thoroughness; whatever subject Ignacy Daniłowicz was analysing, he sought to explore it as thoroughly as possible, to learn about its sources and show them to his students. He especially liked reading and explaining old relics of the law and Lithuanian-Rus' chronicles whose old language in his mouth took on the sounds of a folk dialect, a dry way of writing became full of vivid and rich colours, and the remote past came to life in all its ancient beauty.'

летописей. Т. XVII: *Западнорусские летописи*. Санкт-Петербург: Типография М.А. Александрова].

References

Daniłowicz, Ignacy. (1827). *Latopisiec Litwy i kronika ruska*. Wilno: nakładem i drukiem Antoniego Marcinowskiego.

Błachowska, Katarzyna. (2018). *Wiele historii jednego państwa. Obraz dziejów Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego do 1569 roku w ujęciu historyków polskich, rosyjskich, litewskich i białoruskich w XIX wieku*. Prace Instytutu Historycznego UW. Warszawa: Fundacja Naukowa Otwarte Historie, Wydawnictwo Neriton. Taken from: http://otwartehistorie.pl/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/Wiele-historii-jednego-państwa-K_Blachowska.pdf (accessed: 20.06.2019).

Čamâryckì,Vâčaslaǔ. (2005). Danilovič Ìgnat Mìkalaevič. In: Paškoǔ, Genadzʹ (ed.). *Vâlìkae knâstva Lìtoǔskae. Èncyklapedyâ*. (Vol. 1, p. 576). Minsk: Belaruskaâ Èncyklapedyâ. [Чамярыцкі, Вячаслаў. (2005). Даніловіч Ігнат Мікалаевіч. У: Пашкоў, Генадзь (гал. рэд.). (2005). *Вялікае княства Літоўскае. Энцыклапедыя*. (Т. 1, с. 576). Мінск: Беларуская Энцыклапедыя].

Grala, Hieronim. (2013). Polscy historycy i archiwiści w carskim Petersburgu. In: *Encyklopedia Polski Petersburg*. Kraków: Międzynarodowe Centrum Kultury. Taken from: http://www.polskipetersburg.pl/images/upload/biblioteka/Polscy_historycy_i_archiwisci_w_carskim_Petersburgu_Hieronim_Grala.pdf (accessed: 19.06.2019).

Grala, Marcin. (2014). *Ignacy Daniłowicz i jego latopis*. Taken from: https://historialomzy.pl/ignacy-danilowicz-i-jego-latopis/ (accessed: 19.06.2019).

Hawryluk, Jerzy. (2002). „Podlasianie ruskiego plemienia" w epoce narodowego romantyzmu, *Nad Buhom i Narwoju*, nr 5–6 (63–64), p. 30 (19.06.2019). Taken from: http://nadbuhom.pl/art_0782.html (accessed: 18.06.2019).

Kijas, Artur. (1997). Uczeni wileńscy na Uniwersytecie Charkowskim w pierwszej połowie XIX wieku. *Biuletyn Historii Wychowania*, 5–6, pp. 27–42.

Sajewicz, Michał. (2002), *Derywacja sufiksalna osobowych nazw subiektów w nadnarwiańskich gwarach białoruskich Białostocczyzny. Deverbativa, deadiectiva*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

Sajewicz, Michał. (2013). *Nazwiska patronimiczne z formantem -uk w powiecie hajnowskim na Białostocczyźnie na tle ogólnopolskim*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

Tur, Ludwik. (1903). *Uniwersytet Wileński i jego znaczenie*. Lwów: Wydawnictwo Macierzy Polskiej.

Turkowski, Tadeusz. (1938). Daniłowicz Ignacy (1787–1843). In: *Polski Słownik Biograficzny* (Vol. 4, pp. 412–414). Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności.