2026 PRACE JĘZYKOZNAWCZE XXVIII/3
ISSN 1509-5304 DOI 10.31648/pj.12930 73–85
eISSN 2450-0801

Henryk Jaroszewicz
Uniwersytet Wrocławski
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2840-355X
e-mail: henryk.jaroszewicz@uwr.edu.pl

Selected Grammatical Issues in the Silesian Translations of World Literary Classics*

Wybrane zagadnienia gramatyczne w śląskich przekładach klasyki literatury światowej

Abstract
This study analyses and discusses word-formation, inflectional, and syntactic differences in contemporary translations of world literature into Silesian. The analysis is based on a corpus of nine extensive literary texts translated by seven translators (G. Buchalik, J. Ciurlok, Z. Kadłubek, G. Kulik, M. Melon, M. Syniawa, R. Szyma). A comparison of the idiolects has led to the conclusion that the grammatical structure of Silesian translations is relatively consistent. The highest degree of consistency is observed within inflection. Particularly noteworthy is the presence of several grammatical features consistently implemented across all idiolects – namely, the instrumental case plural ending *-ami* (*autami*, *chustkami*); the first-person singular present-tense ending *-ã* (*widzã*, *rozumiã*); and the future-tense paradigm of the verb *być* (*bydã*, *bydziesz*, *bydymy*). The greatest degree of variation is observed in the syntactic layer. The identified differences (for instance, the scope of use of the *accusativus cum infinitivo* construction and *dlŏ* + present tense) arise from the tendency of some Silesian authors to incorporate features of their local dialects (G. Buchalik) and to widen the systemic distance from standard Polish through numerous innovations (G. Kulik).

Keywords: Silesian language, Silesian dialect, Polish language, inflection, word formation, syntax

* This article was written as part of an internal grant of the University of Wrocław entitled *The Language of Contemporary Translations of World Literature into the Upper Silesian Ethnolect: An Orthographic, Phonological, and Morphological Survey* (BPIDUB.27.2024), awarded under the "Excellence Initiative – Research University" (IDUB) programme in the fourth edition of the competition.

Abstrakt
Niniejsze opracowanie analizuje i omawia różnice słowotwórcze, fleksyjne i składniowe we współczesnych przekładach literatury światowej na język śląski. Analiza bazuje na korpusie dziewięciu obszernych tekstów literackich przetłumaczonych przez siedmiu tłumaczy (G. Buchalik, J. Ciurlok, Z. Kadłubek, G. Kulik, M. Melon, M. Syniawa, R. Szyma). Porównanie idiolektów prowadzi do wniosku, że struktura gramatyczna śląskich tłumaczeń jest stosunkowo spójna. Najwyższy stopień spójności występuje w obrębie fleksji. Szczególnie należy zwrócić uwagę na obecność kilku gramatycznych zgodnie implementowanych we wszystkich idiolektach – mowa o użyciu końcówki instrumentalis *-ami* (*autami*, *chustkami*), końcówki *-ã* w 1. os. l. poj. formach czasu teraźniejszego (*widzã*, *rozumiã*), odmianie czasownika *być* w czasie przyszłym według wzoru: *bydã*, *bydziesz*, *bydymy*. Najwięcej przykładów zróżnicowania odkryto w obrębie składni. Zidentyfikowane różnice (np. zakres użycia konstrukcji *accusativus cum infinitivo* i *dlõ* + *genitivus*) wynikają z tendencji niektórych śląskich autorów do włączania cech ich lokalnych dialektów (G. Buchalik) oraz do poszerzania systemowego dystansu wobec języka ogólnopolskiego poprzez liczne innowacje (G. Kulik).

Słowa kluczowe: język śląski, dialekt śląski, język polski, fleksja, słowotwórstwo, składnia

1. Introduction

The main objective of this study was to discuss the most significant inflectional, morphological, and syntactic differences found in contemporary translations of world literature into Silesian.[1] The analysis was also intended to describe the degree of grammatical cohesion of the literary Silesian used in these texts and to identify the writing strategies that contributed either to its homogenisation or to its heterogenisation.

To this end, the grammatical structures of the idiolects of seven Silesian translators – Grzegorz Buchalik, Jerzy Ciurlok, Zbigniew Kadłubek, Grzegorz Kulik, Marcin Melon, Mirosław Syniawa, and Rafał Szyma – were examined. These idiolects were represented by nine volumes of translations published between 2013 and 2023:

a) *Prōmytojs przibity* [Prometheus Bound] by Aeschylus (trans. Zbigniew Kadłubek),
b) *Wiersze i śpiywki. Spōmnijcie se Tamowã klaczkã* [Poems and Songs. Remember Tam o' Shanter's Mare] by Robert Burns (trans. Mirosław Syniawa),
c) *Aforyzmy* [Aphorisms] by Franz Kafka (trans. Jerzy Ciurlok),
d) *Mały Princ* [The Little Prince] by Antoine de SaintExupéry (trans. Grzegorz Kulik),

[1] Phonetic and orthographic differentiations are discussed in detail in a separate monograph: H. Jaroszewicz (2025).

e) *We Muminkowyj Dolinie* [In the Moomin Valley] by Tove Jansson (trans. Marcin Melon),
f) *Dante i inksi i jeszcze inksi* [Dante and Others and Yet More Others] by various authors (trans. Mirosław Syniawa),
g) *Pippi Långstrump* [Pippi Longstocking] by Astrid Lindgren (trans. Rafał Szyma),
h) *Mikołojek René Goscinny'ego* [Little Nicholas] by René Goscinny (trans. Grzegorz Buchalik),
i) *Hobit abo tam i nazŏd* [The Hobbit, or There and Back Again] by J. R.R. Tolkien (trans. Grzegorz Kulik).

The works listed above represent translations of texts from a variety of genres: prose, poetry, and drama. It is worth emphasising that these are full and legitimate translations, as all of them were rendered directly from their original languages (including Ancient Greek, Scots, English, German, French, and others). While the criteria for such evaluations are inevitably relative, it seems reasonable to regard all of the works cited as translations of texts belonging to the canon of world literature.

Since the study was limited to direct translations, it did not take into account the considerable body of Silesian renderings of foreign literature based on Polish versions (e.g. Szołtysek 2002; Szołtysek 2013; *Nowy Testamynt* 2017; SaintExupéry 2023). Also excluded were translations of works which – despite their unquestionable literary merit – are difficult to classify as timeless (e.g. Twardoch 2018; Kamusella 2019; Murjanka 2022). To avoid overrepresentation of individual idiolects, the corpus analysed included only two translations each by Kulik and Syniawa, leaving aside their other works (e.g. Dickens 2017; Milne 2020; Hauptmann 2024).

2. Results

The inflectional, derivational, and syntactic properties of the seven idiolects were examined using a matrix designed to assess the realisation of several dozen selected grammatical forms. The repertoire of linguistic features was established through a preliminary, authorial survey of contemporary Silesian translations. The analysis also benefited from the insights and findings found in *Zasady pisowni* języka *śląskiego* [Principles of Silesian Orthography] (Jaroszewicz 2022), as well as in earlier pilot studies of the grammaticalorthographic structure of modern literary Silesian (Jaroszewicz 2020a; Jaroszewicz 2020b). In addition, the study also consults older dialectological studies on the grammatical diversity of Silesian – most

notably Alfred Zaręba's *Atlas gwar śląskich* [Atlas of Silesian Dialects] (Zaręba 1969–1996) and Stanisław Bąk's comprehensive monograph *Mowa polska na* Śląsku [The Polish Speech in Silesia] (Bąk 1974). The analysis also relied on the few contemporary studies devoted to the grammatical – primarily syntactic – layer of modern Silesian literary texts (Czesak 2002; Czesak 2015; Jocz, Ruda and Wanot 2022; Wyderka 2018; Wyderka 2019).

The matrix verified the following grammatical features:

a) Derivational
   - Thematic suffixes *yw|a*, *ow|a / uw|a* in imperfective and iterative forms (*poruwać / porywać*, *zakopuwać / zakopować*)
   - Thematic suffixes *nō|n / ny* in the infinitive (*kopnyć / kopnōnć*, *ciepnyć / ciepnōnć*)
   - Stem levelling *nō → ny* in past tense forms (*kopnōł → kopnył*, *ciepnōł → ciepnył*)
   - Thematic suffixes *yrow|a / ow|a* in loanwords (*analizyrować / analizować*)
   - Comparative prefixes *noj / nej / nŏj* (*nojwiynkszy / nejwiynkszy / nŏjwiynkszy*)
   - Suffixes *ōny / ōty* in passive adjectival participles (*grzōny / grzŏty*, *wylōny / wylŏty*)
   - Suffixes *ty / yty* in passive adjectival participles (*tarty / trzyty*, *umarty / umrzyty*)
   - Suffixes *at|y / ast|y, it|y / ist|y* in denominal adjectives (*kamiynity / kamiynisty*, *jeglasty / jeglaty*)

b) Inflectional
   - Paradigm of the auxiliary verb *być* in the past tense (*był / bōł*, *była / bōła*)
   - Paradigm of the auxiliary verb *być* in the future tense (*bydã / bandã*, *bydzie / bandzie / baje*)
   - Presenttense firstperson singular endings *ã / ym* in verbs (*widzã / widzym*, *niesã / niesym*)
   - Feminine genitive and dative adjectival endings *ej / yj* (*szwarnej / szwarnyj*, *sztwŏrtej / sztwŏrtyj, tej / tyj*)
   - Neuter and masculinepersonal adjectival endings *i / e* (*drugi dziecko / druge dziecko*, *taki przikłady / take przikłady*)
   - Gerund endings *i / -e / -y* (*czytani / czytanie / czytaniy*)
   - Instrumental plural endings *-ōma / -ami* (*kōniōma / kōniami*, *polōma / polami*)
   - Nominative plural masculinepersonal endings *-ŏ / -y* (*ministranciŏ / ministranty*)

- Nominative plural masculinepersonal endings *-y /-i* (*chopy / chopi*, *poety / poeci*)
- Stem levelling in past tense forms of verbs such as *umrzyć* and *trzyć* (*umarty / umrzyty*)
- Past tense forms of verbs ending in *-ać, -ŏć, -eć* (*czytoł / czytōł*)

c) Syntactic

- Use of the present active adjectival participle (*czytajōncy*)
- Use of the present adverbial participle (*czytajōnc*)
- Use of the pluperfect (*byli my widzieli*)
- Use of the *accusativus cum infinitivo* construction (*widzã go iś*, *słyszã go śpiywać*)
- Use of the prepositional construction[2] *ôd* + *genitive*
- Use of the prepositional constructions *ku* + *dative* / *do* + *genitive*
- Use of the prepositional constructions *dlŏ* + *genitive* / *do* + *genitive*
- Use of the prepositions *skirz / skuli*
- Use of the prepositions *(ô)krōm / bez*.

2.1. The analysis indicates that, as regards the derivational features examined, the individual idiolects show a high degree of convergence. On this linguistic plane, broadly accepted conventions predominate, with only a few exceptions, usually in the works of Kadłubek and Ciurlok. Thus, apart from Ciurlok, who employs the thematic suffix *uw|a* (*poruwać*) in imperfective verb forms, the other translators make use exclusively of the suffix *yw|a* (*wyrywoł*) or *ow|a* (*kupować*). All the idiolects studied employ the thematic suffix *nō|n* in infinitival forms (*ciepnōnć*) and the comparative prefix *noj* (*nojlepij*), while only Kadłubek records forms with *ny* (*zgodnyć*) and the prefix *nŏj* (*nŏjlepszy*). In past tense forms, most idiolects show no stem levelling of *nō* → *ny*, hence the use of forms such as *bajsnōł* and *ciepnōł*. Only Kadłubek and Ciurlok record *ny* in such contexts (*sztopnył*, *furgnył*).

Because only a small number of borrowed verbs were found in the corpus for which the opposition between the thematic suffixes *ow|a* and *yrow|a* is relevant, it is difficult to draw firm conclusions about the use of verb pairs such as *sztudiować / sztudiyrować*. An examination of individual idiolects nevertheless shows that Kulik tends to favour forms containing *yrow|a* (*atakyrowli*, *dysputyrować*, *sztudiyrowoł*, *zazalutyrowali*), while Buchalik uses both suffixes interchangeably (*atakowali*, *skōmyntowoł* as well as

[2] Following B. Wyderka, I treat the use of prepositions and prepositional constructions as a syntactic category (Wyderka 2019: 411).

wydeklamiyruje, *sztudyrowali*), and Syniawa employs only verbs with *ow|a* (*sztudowoł*, *deklamowoł*).

Only a handful of participles were found for which the opposition *ōn|y / ŏt|y* was pertinent; and in every case the first suffix was used, notably in the works of Syniawa and Kulik (*rozgrzōny*, *ôdlōne*, *rozsiōny*, *ôkrōny*). Similar constraints make it difficult to assess the use of the competing adjectival suffixes *isty / ity*. There nevertheless appears to be a trend towards the lexicalisation of certain derivational forms, since in several idiolects (those of Kulik, Syniawa, Melon, and Szyma) forms such as *krasiaty*, *kulaty*, *spadzity* occur alongside *skalisty*, *świetlisty*, *złocisty*.

2.2. Differences in the realisation of inflectional features appear to be somewhat less pronounced than in derivational features. Particularly noteworthy is the consistent implementation across all idiolects of four grammatical features: the instrumental case plural ending *ami* (*autami*, *chustkami*, *tunelami*); the firstperson singular presenttense ending *ã* (*widzã*, *rozumiã*); the futuretense paradigm of the verb *być* (*bydã*, *bydziesz*, *bydymy*); and the use of nonmasculinepersonal endings for masculinepersonal nouns (*wojŏki*, *czarowniki*, *hobity*). In the last instance, it is worth noting that nonmasculine endings occur most frequently in the idiolects of Kulik and Syniawa, especially in forms ending in *k* or *s* (*te pijŏki*, *czarowniki*, *braciki*; *te karlusy*, *wandrusy*, *dzikusy*).

For the remaining inflectional features, as with many derivational ones, a broad convergence of forms is usually observed, disrupted only by practices characteristic of one, and occasionally two, idiolects. Thus, with the exception of Ciurlok, all authors consistently use the pasttense paradigm of *być* (*bōł*, *była*, *byli*), whereas Ciurlok uses *był*, *była*, *byli*. Similarly, all but Ciurlok avoid stem levelling in pasttense forms, preferring *umarty*, *tarta* to *umrzity*. Only Melon renders a morphonological alternation resulting in final *ōł* in pasttense forms such as *czytōł*, *widziōł*. Aside from a single instance in Syniawa (*braciŏ*), the nominative case ending *ŏ* is found exclusively in Kulik's idiolect.

Other features that clearly distinguish individual idiolects include Buchalik's use of the endings *ej* (*jednej*, *tej*, *paradnej*) in the feminine adjectival paradigm, and *i* in the neuter and nonmasculinepersonal paradigm (*drugi dziecko*, *wysoki dziołchy*). Most idiolects also feature infinitive variants *dojś*, *pōjś*, *ôdyjś* and corresponding presenttense forms *dojdã*, *pōjdã*, *ôdyjdã*. Only Buchalik and, inconsistently, Melon employ the alternative pattern *dońś*, *pōńś*, *ôdyńś* with presenttense forms *dońdã*, *pōńdã*, *ôdyńdã*. Divergence

is likewise observed in gerund forms: Melon uses the ending *y* (*spisywaniy*, *gwizdniynciy*), whereas Buchalik prefers *i* (*spisywani*, *gwizdniynci*), unlike the other translators.

2.3. The greatest degree of variation is observed in the syntactic layer. Here we find several grammatical features which are confined not only to individual idiolects but sometimes to the practice of only a few translators. Importantly, even those features which are present in every idiolect often differ markedly in frequency of occurrence. A characteristic example is the use of the *accusativus cum infinitivo* construction. It appears very frequently in Kulik's idiolect (over fifty instances), less often in those of Szyma, Melon, and Buchalik (seven to sixteen occurrences), only once in Syniawa, and not at all in Kadłubek or Ciurlok. A parallel distribution is seen with the pluperfect: it is employed relatively often by Buchalik (six occurrences), less so by Kulik and Syniawa (three in total), and absent in the remaining idiolects. Similar tendencies apply to the present active adjectival participle: it is very common in Kulik's idiolect (over thirty instances), appears a few times in those of Buchalik, Szyma, Syniawa, and Ciurlok, and only once in Melon and Kadłubek.

The use of prepositional constructions displays a similar pattern of variation. Both *do* + *genitive* (*przeszli do salōnu*) and its semantic equivalent *ku* + *dative* (*poszoł ku mamulce*) occur in all idiolects; however, the latter is especially frequent in Melon (111 occurrences) but merely incidental in Buchalik (two instances). Most translators employ both *dlŏ* + *genitive* (*wino dlŏ szmaterlŏkōw*) and *do* + *genitive* (*niyspodzianka do ministra*), though they generally show a preference for one of the two. The only exception is Syniawa, who restricts himself to the former. The possessive construction *ôd* + *genitive* (*golarka ôd taty*) is attested in all idiolects, with relatively minor differences in frequency. The preposition *skirz* occurs in every idiolect except those of Ciurlok and Kadłubek. The latter, together with Buchalik and Melon, also refrains from using *krōm* / *ôkrōm*, relying solely on *bez*. Finally, the present adverbial participle (*bãdōnc*, *wãdrujōnc*, *ôdcofujōnc*) is found only in Ciurlok's idiolect.

3. Discussion

The analysis of the corpus confirms that each idiolect examined contains distinctive grammatical features. These include both singular constructions confined to a single author and linguistic traits shared by several translators,

but particularly frequent in one idiolect. The findings suggest that the idiolects of Buchalik and Ciurlok exhibit the highest concentration of such original features, followed by those of Kadłubek, Kulik, and Melon, while Syniawa and Szyma display the fewest.

It would, however, be exceedingly difficult – if not impossible – to devise a scientifically verifiable methodology capable of unambiguously measuring the grammatical proximity of these written idiolects and thereby determining whether or not they constitute a grammatically homogeneous literary language. Acknowledging the natural relativity of such assessments, one may nevertheless adopt the position that the grammatical structures of the texts within the corpus exhibit more similarities than differences. This is chiefly due to the fact that many of the differences described earlier can indisputably be regarded as stylistic (for example, the extent of use of the pluperfect, the *accusativus cum infinitivo*, or *ku + dative*) or as idiosyncrasies specific to individual authors. It should also be stressed that the study deliberately excluded a number of features intrinsic to Silesian (e.g. the genitive gerund ending *ŏ*, as in *noszyniŏ, czytaniŏ*; or the ending *e* in softstem feminine nouns, as in *studnie, koszule*), whose use in Silesian texts is both common and selfevident.

3.1. On the basis of the analysis, it is possible to identify the main sources of the grammatical divergences observed. The most significant of these appears to be the translators' relationship to their local dialectal substratum. It is not difficult to see that some translators incorporate features of their native dialect into their literary idiolect, thereby elevating into the status of standard usage grammatical features characteristic of the everyday speech of their linguistic community. A case in point is Grzegorz Buchalik from Żory, who integrated into his idiolect grammatical features typical of the WestSouth Silesian dialect area: the feminine adjectival ending *ej* (*szwarnej*, *piōntej*, *waszej*); the neuter and nonmasculinepersonal adjectival ending *i* (*drugi dziecko*, *wysoki dziołchy*); and the nominal gerund ending *i* (*czytani*, *życi*; cf. Zaręba 1969–1996: m1392, m1399, m1403, m1375). Similarly, forms such as *furgnył* and *zgodnyć*, used by Zbigniew Kadłubek of Rybnik, may also be regarded as evidence of the penetration of WestSouth Silesian grammatical structures into the translator's idiolect.

In most cases, however, Silesian translators preferred grammatical conventions common to the majority of Silesian dialects – with a middleground form, widely used in contemporary Silesian writing and in normative works. One example is the marginal presence in the corpus of the thematic suffix

uw|a, despite its being characteristic of a broad dialectal area stretching from the northeastern border of Upper Silesia to Racibórz and Opole (Zaręba 1989: m1483–1484). In literary practice, however, the competing forms in *yw|a* (*urywać*, *wyrywŏ*) dominate. These are typical across the wider Silesian dialectal continuum and occur in the works of the most active contemporary Silesian authors, such as Grzegorz Kulik of Bytom, Mirosław Syniawa of Chorzów, and Marcin Melon of Katowice.

Another example of preference for supralocal solutions is the pasttense paradigm of the auxiliary verb *być* (*bōł*, *była*, *byli*). Dialectological research indicates that this paradigm is historically limited to a relatively small area of Upper Silesia, in a belt between Lubliniec, Opole, and Koźle (Zaręba 1989: m1442). It may be assumed, however, that it gained currency in literary practice as a "compromise" between the two principal Upper Silesian paradigms: *bōł*, *bōła*, *bōły* (central and northwestern Upper Silesia) and *był*, *była*, *były* (southeastern Upper Silesia). The popularity of *bōł*, *była*, *byli* was likely reinforced by its adoption in the first modern normative guide to Upper Silesian, *Gōrnoślōnski ślabikŏrz* (Adamus et al. 2010).

3.2. A second source of the grammatical divergences observed in the corpus can be attributed to the differing visions – espoused by individual Silesian authors – of the desired shape of the Silesian literary language. One may infer that some translators considered it justified to enhance the systemic distinctiveness of Silesian from standard Polish. They actualised this by promoting, within their idiolects, those Silesian linguistic features that lack direct equivalents in standard Polish. The outcome was a marked overrepresentation of certain inflectional features which, as dialectological and textological studies indicate, are objectively rare in Silesian, characteristic of earlier stages of development, and often confined to a handful of lexicalised forms.

Such differentiation strategies, designed to promote "purely" Silesian grammatical features, are particularly evident in Kulik's idiolect. In his translations, one frequently encounters the nominal ending *ŏ* (*gigańciŏ*, *heresztańciŏ*, *hobiciŏ*, *kamraciŏ*, *kōmedyjanciŏ*, *eksperciŏ*, *kuzyniŏ*), even though this form occurs on a larger scale mainly in older Silesian texts from the 1920s and 1930s and, in dialectal use, was realised only in two word forms: *braciŏ*, *ksiynżŏ* (Zaręba 1989: m1369; cf. also *Kocynder* 1921: 27; *Śląskie gawędy…* 2015 [1927]). Another such strategy is his frequent use of the *accusativus cum infinitivo*, which he employed even at the cost of producing stylistically awkward constructions (e.g. *Tak samo jŏch je rŏd*

widzieć cie pamiyntać coś ô mie).[3] The sharp increase in the frequency of this construction in Kulik's later translations (only five occurrences in *Mały Princ*, but as many as fifty in *The Hobbit*) provides strong evidence of a deliberate, selfconscious strategy.

Other authors also sought to foreground specific Silesian linguistic features, which – much as in the examples above – led to their overrepresentation in individual idiolects. A relevant example is Melon's use of the construction *ku* + *dative*, a form competing in Silesian with *do* + *genitive*. Although *ku* + *dative* has become increasingly rare in Silesian dialects (Wyderka 2019: 412) and in contemporary Silesian texts (with only two instances in Buchalik's *Mikołojek*, two in Kulik's *Mały Princ*, and seven in Syniawa's *Wiersze i śpiywki*), it occurs no fewer than 111 times in Melon's *We Muminkowyj Dolinie* – surpassing the *do* + *genitive* construction, which appears in just over seventy instances (on the high frequency of *ku*, see also Wyderka 2019: 412).

3.3. In certain cases, it is difficult to determine with certainty the causes of the grammatical divergences identified. It appears that such variation may often stem from the insufficient scholarly competence of some translators, who, perhaps inadvertently, introduced unnecessary grammatical innovations into their idiolects. One example is Kadłubek's use of the comparative prefix *nŏj*, whose spelling (with the grapheme *ŏ*) implies the presence of a diphthong, even though Silesian dialects lack prefixes of the type *[nou̯i̯], *[nau̯i̯], *[nåu̯i̯]* (cf. Zaręba 1989: m1410). Similarly, Melon's forms *godōł* (← *godać*), *miōł* (← *mieć*), and *drałowōł* (← *drałować*) must be regarded as erroneous analogical levelling to paradigms such as *nosić* → *nosiōł*, *smyczyć* → *smyczōł*, which involve the morphonological alternation [i], [y] : [ō]. The incorrectness of these forms stems from the fact that in Silesian dialects the morpheme *ōł* may occur only in past tense forms of verbs ending in *yć*, *ić*, *nōnć*, *nyć* (cf. Zaręba 1996: m1441, m1442, m1451, m1452).

By the same token, Kulik's frequent use of the present active adjectival participle, and Ciurlok's use of the contemporary adverbial participle, can also be interpreted as signs of inadequate linguistic knowledge. Dialectological research indicates that the former construction is very rare in Silesian dialects and used only in specific syntactic contexts, while the latter appears

[3] A cursory analysis suggests that the numerous stylistic and syntactic flaws found in Kulik's translations may stem from his use of an automatic translator (the bestknown of which is available on G. Kulik's website: silling.org).

only sporadically and, moreover, has a different morphological structure (Bąk 1974: 150–151; Zaręba 1989: m1496).

Another interpretation, however, cannot be excluded. The presence of nearly forty (!) forms in Kulik's idiolect (*ziywajōncŏ*, *wrzōncŏ*, *podskakujōncymi*, *wrzeszczōncych*, *gwiżdżôncyj*, *lecōncyj*, *migajōnce*, *wandrujōnce*) and of forms such as *bãdōnc*, *wãdrujōnc*, *ôdcofujōnc* in Ciurlok's writing may represent a conscious attempt to elevate obvious calques from standard Polish to the status of grammatically legitimate and communicatively useful elements of the modern Silesian literary language. The motivations behind such a hypothetical strategy, however, are difficult to discern.

4. Conclusions

The study, based on a relatively extensive literary corpus, has yielded several significant findings concerning the grammatical properties of contemporary Silesian texts. The analysis suggests that the seven idiolects examined share a common grammatical structure, albeit one characterised by individual variations. They also demonstrate that local dialectal elements have permeated certain literary idiolects, while some translators have consciously sought to widen the grammatical distance between Silesian and standard Polish. At the same time, a strong tendency can be observed among many authors to favour shared grammatical conventions: those typical of contemporary writing, middle-ground forms, and the most widely used across the dialect continuum of Silesian.

As is often the case in studies of this kind, the analyses not only provided answers to many key questions but also opened new research directions, offering an impetus for further investigations into the form and development of the Silesian language. There can be no doubt that the distinctive linguistic choices and innovations introduced by Buchalik, Kulik, and Ciurlok delay the consolidation of a grammatically uniform, homogeneous model of literary Silesian. Yet it may be that the development of Silesian will benefit less from a rigid, homogeneous standard than from a plural and flexible norm, rich in variants and doublets. Efforts to enhance the systemic autonomy of Silesian are also understandable; yet one may ask whether shaping Silesian "in opposition" to Polish will in fact strengthen the vitality of Silesian speech – or whether it will impede communicative fluency in such a reshaped form of the language.

What is beyond dispute is that every literary idiolect is the product of artistic selffashioning, and that this process unfolds at a time when the

norm of the Silesian language remains malleable and highly susceptible to modification. The question is therefore: to what extent, and at what pace, should one intervene in Silesian linguistic usage, long documented in dialectological research?

Regardless of the answers, the development of literary Silesian must be regarded as a process worthy of close scholarly attention. It is undeniably one of the most fascinating contemporary phenomena, not only in the Polish linguistic sphere but across the entire Slavic world. After all, this is a language spoken as a mother tongue by over half a million people, which in scarcely more than a decade has dramatically expanded its domains of use and developed a thematically rich and generically diverse body of literature.

Literature

Adamus et al. (2010): *Gōrnoślōnski ślabikŏrz*. Chorzów.

Bąk S. (1974): *Mowa polska na Śląsku*. Wrocław.

Czesak A. (2002): *O ku* w gwarach śląskich. "Język Polski" 82, no. 5, pp. 349–353.

Czesak A. (2015): *Współczesne teksty śląskie na tle procesów językotwórczych i standaryzacyjnych współczesnej Słowiańszczyzny*. Kraków.

Dickens Ch. (2017): *Godniŏ pieśń*. Trans. G. Kulik. Kotōrz Mały.

Hauptmann G. (2024): *Tkŏcze*. Trans. M. Syniawa. Kotōrz Mały.

Jaroszewicz H. (2020a): *Czy można mówić o istnieniu śląskiego języka literackiego? Współczesny uzus gramatyczno-ortograficzny literackiej odmiany etnolektu śląskiego.* [In:] *Area slavica 3. Jazyk na hranici – hranice v jazyku*. I. Bogoczova (ed.). Ostrawa, pp. 175–184.

Jaroszewicz H. (2020b): *Czasowniki współczesnego śląskiego języka literackiego (płaszczyzna semantyczna, etymologiczna i morfologiczna).* "Poznańskie Studia Polonistyczne. Seria Językoznawcza" 27, no. 2, pp. 53–64.

Jaroszewicz H. (2022): *Zasady pisowni języka śląskiego. Studium normatywne*. Siedlce.

Jaroszewicz H. (2025): *Wybrane zagadnienia ortograficzno-fonetyczne języka śląskich przekładów klasyki literatury światowej*. Kotórz Mały.

Jocz M., Ruda M., Wanot B. (2022): *Konstrukcje bezosobowe z podmiotem arbitralnym i generycznym w gramatyce kaszubskiej i śląskiej na tle gramatyki polskiej*. "Polonica" XLII, pp. 95–113.

Kamusella T. (2019): *Limits – Styknie*. Trans. M. Melon. Kotōrz Mały.

Kocynder. Wesołe Czasopismo Górnośląskie 1921, nr 17–28. Katowice.

Milne A.A. (2020): *Niedźwiodek Puch*. Trans. G. Kulik. Poznań.

Murjanka P. (2022): *Łymkowsko duszyczka*. Trans. B. Wanot. Warszawa.

Nowy Testamynt po ślonsku (2017). Trans. G. Tobor. Radzionków.

Pixa J. (ed.) (2015, [1927]): *Śląskie gawędy Stacha Kropiciela*. Opole.

Saint Exupéry de, A. (2023): *Mały Ksiónże po naszymu*. Trans. T. Sochacki. Cieszyn.

Szołtysek M. (2002): *Ślązoki nie gęsi*. Rybnik.

Szołtysek M. (2013): *Ewangelie śląskie*. Rybnik.

Twardoch S. (2018): *Drach. Edycyjŏ ślōnskŏ*. Trans. G. Kulik. Kraków.

Wyderka B. (2018): *O standaryzacji języka śląskiego*. "Kwartalnik Opolski" 1, pp. 3–18.

Wyderka B. (2019): *Kształtowanie się normy składniowej w pisanej odmianie etnolektu śląskiego*. "Rozprawy Komisji Językowej ŁTN" 67, pp. 403–420.

Zaręba A. (1969–1996): *Atlas językowy Śląska*. T. 1–7. Warszawa–Kraków.

Corpus

Ajschylos (2013): *Prōmytojs przibity*. Trans. Z. Kadłubek. Kotōrz Mały.
Burns R. (2016): *Wiersze i śpiywki Roberta Burnsa. Spōmnijcie se tamowã klaczkã*. Trans. M. Syniawa. Kotōrz Mały.
Dante i inksi i jeszcze inksi (2021). Trans. M. Syniawa. Kotōrz Mały.
Goscinny R. (2023): *Mikołojek*. Trans. G. Buchalik. Kotōrz Mały.
Jansson T. (2020): *We Muminkowyj Dolinie*. Trans. M. Melon. Katowice.
Kafka F. (2017): *Aforyzmy*. Trans. J. Ciurlok. Kraków.
Lindgren A. (2022): *Pippi Långstrump*. Trans. R. Szyma. Kotōrz Mały.
Saint Exupéry de A. (2018): *Mały Princ. Ze ôbrozkami ôd autora*. Trans. G. Kulik. Poznań.
Tolkien J.R.R. (2023): *Hobit abo tam i nazŏd*. Trans. G. Kulik. Kotōrz Mały.