Ukrainian Galicia at the Crossroads. The 'Ruthenian Alphabet War' of 1834
Jan Fellerer

Introduction

On 19 July 1834, a proposal to write 'Ruthenian' in the Polish version of the Latin alphabet, rather than with Cyrillic letters, appeared in *Rozmaitości* (*Miscellanea*) nr. 29; the weekly supplement to the *Gazeta Lwowska* (*Lwów Daily*). Its author was Josyf I. Lozyns'kyj (1807–1889), at the time chaplain to the Greek Catholic bishop of Przemyśl, Ivan Snihurs'kyj (1784–1847). The article had the title: *O wprowadzeniu abecadła polskiego do piśmiennictwa ruskiego* (*About the Introduction of the Polish Alphabet to Ruthenian Literature*). The notoriously ambiguous glottonym 'ruski' here refers to Ukrainian as spoken, and occasionally written, in the east of what was then Austrian Galicia. There was the additional understanding that it bore some special relation to the language in the Ukrainian lands under Tsarist rule. In a broader sense, the term could include the entire written tradition in the Ukrainian lands since the Kievan Rus' (cf. Unbegaun 1950). In particular, it referred to texts with a substantial vernacular element, as opposed to literature in Church Slavonic. The English rendering 'Ruthenian' keeps some of this ambiguity. In what follows, however, the term will be mostly used in its narrow sense, i.e. to refer to the Ukrainians in Galicia under Austrian rule. The idea to codify their language in the Latin-Polish alphabet, as Lozyns'kyj suggested in July 1834, met with strong opposition. There were three replies: the first one by Denys Zubryc'kyj, dated 1 October 1834, originally unpublished and first reproduced in its entirety by Mychajlo Voznjak (1929); a second one by Josyf Levyc'kyj, dated 1 October 1834 too and published as a special addendum to the *Rozmaitości* of 20 December 1834; and a third one by Markijan Šaškevyč which the Greek Catholic diocese of Przemyśl printed separately in 1836 — not at the beginning of 1835 as Franko (1913a: 109) has it. Lozyns'kyj replied to Levy'ckyj and Šaškevyč individually and also prepared a third, joint reply to both of them. Presumably, he wrote these texts soon after Levyc'kyj's and Šaškevyč's critiques had appeared, but they did not pass the censor. Makovej (1903b: 77–96) published the relevant manuscripts posthumously.

These sources form the core of what came to be known as the first 'Ruthenian Alphabet War'. The term was calqued on the 'Slovene ABC Dispute' of the early 1830s, which Matija Čop escalated into the 'Slovene ABC War' with an article in German of the same title and first published in *Illyrisches Blatt* nr. 30 of 27 July 1833. Lozyns'kyj's proposal to use the Latin-Polish alphabet for Ruthenian and the rebukes it received from Zubryc'kyj, Levyc'kyj and Šaškevyč are well known (cf. e.g. Magocsi 1983: 111–12; 2002: 85–86). They have been documented in detail by three outstanding Ukrainian scholars of early 20th-century Galicia: Ivan Franko (1913a), Osyp Makovej (1903a: 25–51; 1903b: 77–96), and Mychajlo Voznjak (1925; 1929). Makovej accorded the debate a central role in the cultural and linguistic history of eastern Galicia. According to him, it inspired M. Šaškevyč, J. Holovac'kyj and I. Vahylevyč, the so-called 'Ruthenian Triad',

to adopt a phonetic spelling system based on the civil Cyrillic script for their famous *Rusalka Dnjistrovaja*, a collection of folk songs and pieces of original writing, and one of the earliest consistent attempts at using the Galician Ukrainian vernacular in literature and scholarship. He also considered the debate crucial to the emergence of Ukrainian populism and Russophilism (Makovej 1903a: 32; cf. also Chudaš 1992: 33–34). Later, in the 1860s, these became two of the country's most important cultural movements. Teršakovec' (1910b: 111–19) contested Makovej's conclusions about the significance of the first 'Ruthenian Alphabet War'. He did not accept the view, as Lozyns'kyj had put it himself, that, 'after that article [of July 1834], it was as if the Ruthenians woke up and became conscious of themselves'[1] ['po toj stat'i Rusiny jak''-by iz'' sna obudilisja i do svoego samosoznanija prichodili'] (quoted after Makovej 1903a: 42–43). According to Teršakovec', Lozyns'kyj's article was by far not as significant in the Ruthenians' early 'national awakening' as Lozyns'kyj himself and Makovej would have had it.

The purpose of the present paper is to revisit this question and to show that the replies to Lozyns'kyj and the proposal itself do in fact reveal fundamentally different views on the cultural and linguistic future of Galicia's Ruthenians: should the guiding principle be Greek Catholic clerical conservatism, close affiliation to Russia, or Western Ukrainian populism? It is not accurate to trace back to the year 1834 the beginnings of these movements, as Makovej has it. However, they were not yet fully established either. One must therefore accord to the 'Ruthenian Alphabet War' of 1834 a more important role than Teršakovec' would have accepted. It was certainly a telling display of the level of debate which the Ruthenian language question had reached among Galicia's Greek Catholic intelligentsia within just a couple of decades.

Lozyns'kyj's proposal of 1834 in context

When Austria annexed Galicia in 1772, few among the country's Greek Catholic clergy had proper knowledge of Church Slavonic. There were fresh initiatives to foster teaching and good liturgical practice, not least in order to create a new group of Greek Catholic clerics loyal to the Habsburg dynasty. The Greek Catholic eparchy of Przemyśl assumed an important role in the early cultural and linguistic revival in eastern Galicia (cf. Stępień 1999; 2005). Under the auspices of bishop Mychajlo Levyc'kyj since 1813, and Ivan Snihurs'kyj since 1818, Greek Catholic children could be taught in their own language at a growing number of parochial schools. New textbooks were needed, one of which was prepared by the eparchial canon and school inspector, Ivan Mohyl'nyc'kyj (1777–1831). His primer of 1816, the *Bukvar' slavenoruskago jazyka* (*Slavonic-Ruthenian Primer*) is of particular importance as it includes catechetic passages whose language is much closer to the vernacular (cf. Moser 2001) than to the hybrid language which, at the time, was often in use in writing. It was loosely based on Church Slavonic, but also included elements from Polish, from the vernacular, and from the literary heritage specific to Galicia. The mixture of these elements could vary considerably, such that the resulting

---

[1] All translations are my own. Quotations which appear as part of the continuous text will be given in English, followed by the original within square brackets. Where they do not form part of the continuous text, the reverse order applies. Quotations in Cyrillic will be transliterated according to the scientific system. The British Museum system is unsuitable for linguistic purposes.

varieties were often pejoratively labeled 'gibberish' ('jazyčie'), even though the term is not helpful to properly understand linguistic developments in Galicia (cf. Moser 2004).

Toward 1820, Ivan Mohyl'nyc'kyj had completed a *Treatise on the Ruthenian Language* which appeared in Polish translation in 1829 as *Rozprawa o ięzyku polskim*. He also wrote a *Grammatika jazyka Slaveno-ruskogo* (*Grammar of the Slavonic-Ruthenian Language*), which remained unpublished during his lifetime (cf. Voznjak 1909a; 1909b; Makovej 1903a: 6–16). Mohyl'nyc'kyj was one of the first in Austrian Galicia to acknowledge that Western Ukrainian should be considered a distinct language, separate from Polish and Russian in particular. At the same time, he naturally thought of Church Slavonic as the written pendant and necessarily different from the spoken vernacular. The dichotomy is, to some extent, reminiscent of Dobrovský and of Lomonosov's 'high style' and 'low style'. Mohyl'nyc'kyj died of cholera in 1831. His contribution to the new Ruthenian revival in Galicia was undoubtedly significant. Yet, it will become clear too that the next generation of Greek Catholic clerics further raised the level of debate about the Ruthenian language question. At the time of Mohyl'nyc'kyj's death, Josyf Lozyns'kyj (1807–1889) had returned to Przemyśl after finishing the fourth year of theology at L'viv University. He was appointed chaplain to bishop Ivan Snihurs'kyj in 1831. He held the position until 1836 when he departed to become parish in Medyka, a village which at the time belonged to Józef Gwałbert Pawlikowski.

In Przemyśl, partly inspired by Mohyl'nyc'kyj and his library, Lozyns'kyj started working on a Ruthenian grammar. The first version of it must have been ready by the middle of 1833 as it received the censor's 'Imprimatur' in July of that year (cf. Teršakovec' 1907: 252). Lozyns'kyj postponed the publication. Consequently, neither the second version of 1837, nor the third one of 1844 passed the censor for Ruthenian books, the theology professor Venedykt Levyc'kyj. Lozyns'kyj appealed to the censor in Vienna and was eventually given the right to print his grammar in 1846 (cf. Makovej 1903b: 93–96; Teršakovec' 1907: 254–57). Levyc'kyj, a man of the Greek Catholic 'establishment' of the time, had taken issue with Lozyns'kyj on several points of principle. Most of them were outlined in the foreword to the grammar (cf. Voznjak 1909b: 110–18). Lozyns'kyj held that Church Slavonic was a dead language that had little to do with spoken Ruthenian. He rejected the idea that written Ruthenian should be geared toward Church Slavonic and called for a vernacular-based written language for the Ukrainians of Galicia. Folk songs, tales and sayings would form a particularly valuable source to start with. Without a vernacular-based written language, Lozyns'kyj argued, there could be no social, cultural and intellectual progress. Lozyns'kyj also rejected the idea of merging written Ruthenian with Polish. At the same time, he reserved the right to explore the suitability of the Latin-Polish alphabet in search of a mainly phonetic spelling system for Ruthenian. Leaving aside the question whether Lozyns'kyj managed to comply with these tenants in practice, it has been observed that they are reminiscent of Kopitar and his *Grammatik der Slavischen Sprache in Krain, Kärnten und Steyermark* (*Grammar of the Slavonic Language in Carniola, Carinthia and Styria*) of 1808 (cf. Makovej 1903a: 56). According to Voznjak (1909c: 141), the overall structure of Lozyns'kyj's grammar bears resemblance to Kopitar's grammar too, and there is also influence in some matters of detail (cf. e.g. Makovej 1903a: 47).

Teršakovec' (1910b: 111–19) rightly pointed out that we cannot be sure whether Lozyns'kyj's published grammar of 1846 is similar to the first draft because the

manuscript of 1833 has been lost. Hence, we cannot tell for certain whether it was as much informed by Kopitar's grammar as the published version of 1846. It is clear, however, that Lozyns'kyj knew the work by the middle of 1836. He explicitly referred to it in his third, joint reply to Levyc'kyj and Šaškevyč, the two men who had strongly criticized his alphabet proposal (cf. above). He even quoted quite extensively from the introduction (cf. Makovej 1903: 91), to which we shall return below. Similarly unambiguous evidence is lacking for the years before 1836. However, there is no doubt that Lozyns'kyj was familiar at least with some of Kopitar's main views on the alphabet question when he started working on his article in 1833 or 1834. At its beginning, Lozyns'kyj referred to three sources which inspired him to propose the Latin Polish alphabet. The first one was Ruthenian songs printed in the *Rozmaitości*, and the *Pielgrzym Polski* of 1822. The second source was Wacław z Oleska's collection *Pieśni polskie i ruskie ludu galicyjskiego* (*Ruthenian and Polish Songs of the Galician People*) published in 1833 in the Latin-Polish alphabet. The third one was a review of this collection by Kopitar in the *Oesterreichischer Beobachter* (*Austrian Observer*) of 8 December 1833. Kopitar was pleased to see the songs published in Latin letters and commended z Oleska's writing system to Lozyns'kyj and Levyc'kyj. He knew that each of them was preparing for publication a Ruthenian grammar. In fact, in his capacity as 'Censor of Greek and Slavonic Books' at the Imperial Library in Vienna, he had already commented on Levyc'kyj's *Grammatik der ruthenischen oder kleinrussischen Sprache in Galizien* (*Grammar of the Ruthenian or Ukrainian Language in Galicia*) when it was submitted for publication in 1832 (Teršakovec' 1907: 1–4), and before it finally went into print as Galicia's first published Ruthenian grammar in 1834. In all likelihood, Kopitar had also read Lozyns'kyj's manuscript (cf. Makovej 1903a: 27). He also censored a second book by Lozyns'kyj. This was *Ruskoje wesile* (*Ruthenian Wedding*), a detailed description of the Ruthenians' wedding customs and songs. Lozyns'kyj must have been working on it during 1833. Its first version was in the Cyrillic alphabet and, according to Chudaš (1992: 29), even in the civil script. Kopitar reviewed and approved the manuscript in March 1834 (cf. Teršakovec' 1907: 14–15). Lozyns'kyj referred to Kopitar's comments in his memoirs (quoted in Makovej 1903a: 28). He liked the work, but commended that the spelling should be less pedantic and more truthful to the vernacular. Lozyns'kyj's solution was to transliterate *Ruskoje wesile* into the Latin-Polish alphabet before it went to the Greek Catholic printshop in Przemyśl in 1835.

Given all this, it is very likely that Lozyns'kyj knew Kopitar's grammar when he set out to write his alphabet article (cf. also Makovej 1903a: 29–30). If so, he will have been aware that Kopitar was not only an advocate of phonetic spelling, i.e. of the principle that each 'word (the stream of articulated sounds) should be decomposed into its simple elements, and [that each element should] be represented with separate signs' ['Analysire das Wort (den articulirten Menschenschall) bis auf seine einfachen Bestandtheile, und [...] stelle [sie] durch ein eigenes Zeichen dar'] (Kopitar 1808: xxii–xxiii). Kopitar was also unambiguous about the Latin alphabet. He considered it preferrable to the Cyrillic script because 'it facilitates communication and close ties with the other educated Europeans' ['sich die Communication und Annäherung der übrigen gebildeten Europäer erleichtert'] (Kopitar 1808: xxi). At the same time, Kopitar admired Cyril. He hoped for *one* Slavonic orthography and commended that, similar to Cyril's use of Greek, new letters should be invented where the Latin alphabet failed to represent

sounds in the Slavonic languages. More precisely, Kopitar (1808: 203) spoke of '20 impeccable Roman letters' ['untadelhaften 20 Römischen Buchstaben'] — according to him, *<a>*, *<b>*, *<k>*, *<d>*, *<e>*, *<f>*, *<g>*, *<h>*, *<i>*, *<j>*, *<l>*, *<m>*, *<n>*, *<o>*, *<p>*, *<r>*, *<s>*, *<t>*, *<u>*, *<v>*[2] — and the need for at least seven additional letters in Slovene, possibly some more or some less in other Slavonic languages. Thus, Kopitar was fully aware of the deficiencies of the Latin alphabet and would lament about it on various occasions in the future, as I will discuss. Still, he did not accept the Cyrillic alphabet as a viable alternative, not even in the guise of the new civil script. In a polemical rebuke to an imaginary Russian, Kopitar (1808: 205–06) effectively called Cyrillic a deformation of Greek letters and aesthetically inferior to the 'Western' Latin alphabet.

To balance this charged statement, it is useful to refer to some of Kopitar's later comments about the two alphabets. Take for example his review of Peter Maior's book about the *History of the Origins of the Romanians in Dacia* (*Istoria pentru începutul românilor în Dacia*), published in 1812. Kopitar reprimanded the Romanians for their liking of the Latin alphabet for purely historical reasons. The Cyrillic script would be much more suitable because it offered simple letters for all Romanian sounds. If the Romanians were so fond of the Latin alphabet for its elegance and the size of its letters, Kopitar (1857: 241) had the following advice for them:

> […] then, for heaven's sake, take those [Latin] letters which correspond to sounds in your language (other Europeans will be grateful as this will facilitate communication); but […], in order to replace those 8 to 9 simple letters which are missing from the Latin alphabet, do not adopt any Teutonic letter combinations or even make up new ones of your own (…). If the relevant letters from your existing Cyrillic-Wallachian alphabet can not be shaped such that they resemble Latin letters, then invent new, simple signs, but under no circumstances use letter combinations.

> [[…] nun so nehmt in Gottes Namen daraus die [lat.] Zeichen in euer Alphabet auf, denen Laute in eurer Sprache entsprechen (die übrigen Europäer werden euch für diese Erleichterung der Communication sogar danken); aber übereilt euch […] nicht so sehr, um statt der in diesem lateinischen Alphabet noch fehlenden 8 bis 9 einfachen Buchstaben teutonische Combinationen anzunehmen oder gar selbst neue zu machen […]. Nehmen die betreffenden Zeichen aus eurem jetzigen cyrillisch-walachischen Alphabete keine den lateinischen analoge Form, so erfindet neue einfache Zeichen, aber nur keine Combinationen.]

We can conclude that Kopitar was first and foremost interested in rational writing systems, i.e. those where *one* letter represents *one* sound. Which particular alphabet suits this purpose for a given language would then appear to be of secondary importance. In fact, as mentioned above, Kopitar was well aware of the shortcomings of the Latin alphabet and the advantages of Cyrillic. Take for example the lack of Latin letters for

---

[2] Letters in italics and within angle brackets refer to graphemes. Square brackets are used for phonetic representations. Rather than in the International Phonetic Alphabet, these will be in the simplified, Slavonic phonetic transcription. This is sufficient for the present purposes and, essentially, equals Czech spelling; i.e., for example, [č] for the voiceless alveolar affricate.

Slavonic [ž], [š], [č], where Cyrillic has <ж>, <ш>, <ч>. Still, in his own grammar, Kopitar favoured an enhanced version of the Latin alphabet for all Slavs. It was not so much its actual suitability for phonetic spelling which sparked Kopitar's doubts about the Cyrillic alphabet. Ultimately, he found it less refined, too far removed from Greek and not sufficiently European.

This peculiar mixture of rational argument and ideological persuasion is also in evidence in Lozyns'kyj's proposal to write Ruthenian in the Latin Polish, rather than in the Cyrillic alphabet. Some of its main tenants go as follows: Lozyns'kyj (1834) started off with an attempt at a historical argument: There were a few Ruthenian books in his possession which were printed in the Latin-Polish alphabet. They appeared 'to belong to times gone-by' ['do bardzo odległych należéć czasów'] (Lozyns'kyj 1834: 228), and, thus, showed that there was a tradition of Ruthenian literature in the Latin alphabet. The point was easily refuted by Zubryc'kyj, who established that the books in question were probably not older than from the late 18th century (cf. Voznjak 1929: 132–33). They were cheap collections of prayers and songs from print shops which did probably not have sorts for Cyrillic typesetting, and which served a Greek Catholic audience illiterate in Cyrillic. It is interesting to note that, in the face of these refutations, Lozyns'kyj was fast to relinquish the historical thread to his argument. In fact, he even called for a break with history in his subsequent unpublished replies to Levyc'kyj and Šaškevyč (cf. Makovej 1903b: 77–78, 83). He specified that the existing literary heritage and existing grammars were in Church Slavonic and, thus, incompatible with his main aim: the foundation of a vernacular-based written language. As the traditional language of the books was fundamentally different from spoken Ruthenian it was not suitable as a point of reference. Thus, Lozyns'kyj disconnected the vernacular from the written heritage in the Old Cyrillic alphabet.

Lozyns'kyj meant his alphabet proposal to serve the purpose of creating a new vernacular-based Ruthenian written language, as opposed to the existing literary tradition in Church Slavonic. The article of 1834 shows that novelty was crucial to Lozyns'kyj. In fact, he considered it commensurate with the notion of progress more generally. The Latin-Polish alphabet, as opposed to the Old Cyrillic letters, would help 'to Europeanize' the Ruthenian language and literature. This, according to Lozyns'kyj, would work both ways. It would make the new written language accessible to others, notably to other Slavs and the Poles in particular. It would also provide a better chance for Ruthenian to develop properly through contacts with other living European languages, while Old (Church) Cyrillic was like the 'skeleton of a dead language' ['w szkelecie zaś martwego języka'] (Lozyns'kyj 1834: 230). Lozyns'kyj (1834: 228) further wrote that the Old Cyrillic letters 'hamper the integration of Slavonic literature into Europe's literature at large' ['wcieleniu literatury sławiańskiéj [sic] do ogólnej masy literatury europejskiéj na przeszkodzie stają']. He took this view from the above mentioned collection of folk songs by z Oleska (1833: 49). In his unpublished reply to Levyc'kyj, Lozyns'kyj added that the Latin alphabet was 'used among all elaborate languages' ['upowszechnionym między wszystkiemi wykształconemi językami'] (Makovej 1903b: 80). Two years later, in his equally unpublished joint reply to Levyc'kyj and Šaškevyč, Lozyns'kyj further specified that the Latin alphabet was widely used and acclaimed by many scholars for being particularly beautiful while the Old Cyrillic letters were 'square and appeared indistinct' ['kwadratowe i nie widać w nim pojedyńczości'] (Makovej 1903b: 90–91). Thus,

sophistication and integration into European civilization were crucial themes in Lozyns'kyj's narrative about the Latin-Polish letters. Old Cyrillic, on the other hand, should be only taught to future priests, teachers and others alike. Lozyns'kyj concluded his alphabet article of 1834 on this particular point.

It is interesting to note that the civic script did not feature at all in the initial article of 1834. Lozyns'kyj mentioned the 'graždanka' only briefly in his replies to Levyc'kyj and Šaškevyč (cf. Makovej 1903b: 80, 92). He commended it as more suitable than Old Cyrillic because it allows for more accuracy, is closer to the Latin letters, and is used by the Serbs and Russians. However, despite its merits, he considered it inferior to Latin, the 'most beautiful' ['najpiękniejsze'] alphabet and 'widely used among so many and different people' ['upowszechniło się między tylu i tak rozmaitemi narodami'] (Makovej 1903b: 91). With these ideological underpinnings it was easy to condemn Lozyns'kyj as a traitor and Polish agent, and to forget about the progressive side of his proposal: the call for a vernacular-based written language with predominantly phonetic spelling (cf. Chudaš 1989). To give an impression of its application in practice, here are the first 13 lines from the above mentioned *Ruskoje wesile* in the Latin-Polish alphabet.

> Wowód. Widoma je ricz, że gospodar na seli, kotryj z uprawy zemli żyje, bez gospodyni obejtysia ne może. Dla toho każdyj mołodec sposoblaczysia na gospodara, starajesia zarazom ożenyty; a diwczata dospiwszy do lit doziriłych i myslaczy o małżeństwi prosiat zawczasu S. Pokrowy (1ho Oktobra) o czepec: Świata Pokrowońko! pokryj hołowońku; w weczér zaś predpraznycza S. Jandryja (30ho Łystopada) roblat rozmaityi zabawy i sztuki, z kotrych sobi worożat, czy w tym roci za muż pójdut abo ni, i czy im sia toj dóstane, kotrohoby rady (Lozyns'kyj 1835: 1).

> [Introduction. It is known that the farmer in the countryside who lives off the land cannot do without a wife. Therefore, every young man preparing to be a farmer aspires to get married fast; and the girls who have grown up and think of marriage ask for the bonnet by 1 October, the feast of 'Pokrov' (the Feast of the Veil of Our Lady): Holy Veil! Cover the little head; on the eve of St. Andrew Day on 30 November they play various games and tricks to foretell each other whether they will marry this year or not, and whether get the one with whom they would be happy.]

Apart from the ideological underpinnings discussed above, Lozyns'kyj also used his alphabet article of July 1834 to mount a direct comparison between the Cyrillic and the Latin-Polish alphabets. The aim was to establish which one of the two would conform better to the basic priniple of '*one* letter for *one* sound'. Lozyns'kyj may well have learnt the principle from Kopitar. However, he was in stark contrast with his teacher when it came to sounds where the Latin alphabet lacked graphemes, such as Slavonic [š], [ž], [č]. Even if not ideal, he considered Polish letter combinations preferrable to newly invented signs. This is spelled out explicitly, and with reference to the 'Slovene ABC War' (mentioned above), in the reply to Levyc'kyj and Šaševyč of 1836 (cf. Makovej 1903b: 90). Lozyns'kyj's initial article of 1834 suggested that he had no objections to diacritics either, again unlike Kopitar (1808: 192). He proposed to use an apostrophe to show

palatalization, e.g. <*t'*>, <*d'*>. This was modelled on Polish <*ś*>, <*ź*>, <*ć*>, <*ń*>, and, effectively, a substitute for Cyrillic <ь> (or the 'pajerčik'). He also suggested <*é*>, <*ó*> for [e], [o] in newly closed syllables (cf. also Lozyns'kyj 1835: i), which mirrored the use of the acute with Polish vowel graphemes. Lozyns'kyj's proposal even included the Latin length sign to show stress in a word, such as *mūka*. Compared to this grapheme inventory, Lozyns'kyj found that Old Cyrillic failed on all accounts: Different letters represent the same sound or sounds, e.g. <я> and the small 'jus' for [ja]. The same letter represents different sounds, e.g. <я> for [ja], but for [a] following a palatalized consonant. There are superfluous graphemes, notably <ъ>; and there are missing ones for the Ruthenian sounds [g], [dž], word-initial [e] — as opposed to [je] —, and [jo]. We shall see in the subsequent two sections how Lozyns'kyj's critics, i.e. Zubryc'kyj and Levyc'kyj and, especially, Šaškevyč, responded to these charges.

At this point, we turn to a more general observation. Lozyns'kyj himself, as well as his critics, failed to notice a curious fact which, in hindsight, seems obvious: allowing for additional devices, such as letter combinations, diacritics and newly invented letters, as, in one way or another, everyone did, the Cyrillic alphabet and the Latin alphabet were equally suited from a purely technical point of view (cf. e.g. Chudaš 1992: 36). To put it crudely, in principle one might as well use Cyrillic letters for English, as one might have codified Ruthenian in the Latin alphabet. However, the choice was about much more than just a technical problem. For most, the rejection of the Cyrillic alphabet was a complete denial of the Ruthenians' cultural heritage and a declaration of bankruptcy in the face of Polish influence. Disconnecting the vernacular from the Old Cyrillic written heritage was almost high treason. After all, the Cyrillic alphabet represented the historical continuity which was key to projecting a Ruthenian nation. One senses that Lozyns'kyj did not fully appreciate that these were the connotations of his proposal. Partly he treated the alphabet question as a technicality, as a form of linguistic engineering. And partly he followed his linguistic intuitions. As with many other Greek Catholic intellectuals of the time, they were shaped by the fact that he was primarily literate in Polish. It was these symbolic and ideological aspects of Lozyns'kzj's proposal, rather than the actual comparison of the two alphabets, which alarmed his critics.

The replies by D. Zubryc'kyj and J. Levyc'kyj

The first published reply to Lozyns'kyj's proposal was Josyf Levyc'kyj's *Odpowiedź na zdanie o zaprowadzeniu abecadła polskiego do piśmiennictwa ruskiego* (*Answer to the Proposal about the Introduction of the Polish Alphabet to Ruthenian Writing*). It appeared as a special addendum to the *Rozmaitości* of 20 December 1834. V. Ščurat discovered that the reply bore close resemlance to an incomplete manuscript that he had found in 1899 entitled *O zaprowadzeniu Abecadła polskiego zamiast Kirylicy do ruskiej pisowni* (*About the Introduction of the Polish Alphabet instead of Cyrillic for Ruthenian Spelling*). In addition, the unfinished manuscript was dated and signed in Ukrainian on 9 December 1834 by a certain Mykolaj z'' Vetlyna, which Ščurat (1908) identified as the pseudonym of Mykola Kmycykevyč. At the time, Kmycykevyč took part in the so-called *Tovarystvo učenych* (*Society of Scholars*). This was a small, improvised literary and learned circle of former high-school friends which was active in Przemyśl since the early 1830s (cf. Teršakovec' 1907: 15–25). It had among its members Greek Catholic seminary

students as well as Polish participants, e.g. Kazimierz Józef Turowski (1813–1874) who became an important editor of Polish literature. Kmycykevyč was the Society's librarian. In a letter to Turowski, he talks about his excitement at the thought of liberating the Ruthenians and gaining independence for them (cf. Teršakovec' 1907: 22–23). This brief testament to Kmycykevyč's view on the Ruthenians aroused Voznjak's suspicion. In the introductory passage of the manuscript published by Ščurat it was argued at length that the Ruthenians formed part of one large 'Rusian' nation of East Slavs. This could have hardly come from Kmycykevyč, i.e. from someone who was dreaming of Ruthenian independence. Voznjak (1925) argued that the author of the text was in fact the well-known Galician Russophile Denys Zubryc'kyj. This view was corroborated two years later when Voznjak received a complete copy of the same manuscript which Ščurat had edited. The authograph was clearly by Denys Zubryc'kyj. Apart from the heading on Ščurat's manuscript, it had the title *Apologia Cyryliki czyli Azbuki ruskiej* (*Defense of the Cyrilic, i.e. Ruthenian Alphabet*). More importantly, it was dated 1 October 1834. This proved that Zubryc'kyj's text was the original. The manuscript published by Ščurat' was a copy which Kmycykevyč had prepared for himself in December 1834.

There is clear evidence that Levyc'kyj's article of December 1834 was an excerpt from Zubryc'kyj's manuscript too. It is known that Zubryc'kyj, by 1834 aged 57, generously shared the fruits of his intellectual pursuits (cf. Voznjak 1925: 118). His alphabet essay will have circulated among the seminary students of L'viv and Przemyśl such that not only Kmycykevyč, but also the then chaplain Levyc'kyj could get hold of it. Levyc'kyj dated his *Odpowiedź* 1 October 1834, i.e. the same day as Zubryc'kyj's manuscript. There are, however, three pieces of evidence which suggest that Levyc'kyj had in fact used Zubryc'kyj's text rather than the other way around (cf. Voznjak 1929: 125–28): Firstly, Levyc'kyj's article appeared only late in December. Secondly, Zubryc'kyj's paper is much longer and elaborate. Thirdly, Levyc'kyj's grammar of 1834 provides independent evidence of the author's tendency to make unacknowledged use of the work of others (cf. Voznjak 1909b: 93). Thus, it is very likely that Levyc'kyj also plagiarized Zubryc'kyj's manuscript.

Given these textological facts, we shall first turn to Zubryc'kyj and his text. Zubry'ckyj (1777–1862) was senior by more than twenty years to Lozyns'kyj, Levyc'kyj and Šaškevyč. His early interests were in agriculture and economics. Since the 1820s he was increasingly drawn toward the history of his native Eastern Galicia. In 1830, he became the director of the print shop of the *Stavropihijs'kyj Instytut* (*Stauropegial Institute*) in L'viv. In the same year, he published his first historical paper about *Die Griechisch-Katholische Stavropigialkirche in Lemberg und das mit ihr vereinigte Institut* (*The Greek-Catholic Stavropegial Church in L'viv and its Institute*). Six years later, his second historical study appeared: *Historyczne badania o drukarniach rusko-slawiańskich w Galicyi* (*Historical Studies about the Ruthenian-Slavonic Print Shops in Galicia*). Between these two he wrote his unpublished *Apologia Cyryliki czyli Azbuki ruskiej* of 1834 (for a complete reprint cf. Voznjak 1929: 128–42). In a long introduction, Zubryc'kyj lamented that a general spirit of subversion, revolution and ruthless change had befallen the world. It targeted everything that was established and traditionally held in esteem, including the ancestors and their language. The new vice first appeared among the Ruthenians in the guise of Lozyns'kyj's alphabet article. After testifying in this way to a conservative world view, Zubryc'kyj moved on to outline his ideas about the

Ruthenians and their language (cf. Voznjak 1929: 130–32 for the following quotations of ethno- and glottonyms).

They were part of the 'narod[em] ruski[m]' which comprised all East Slavs. To distinguish Zubryc'kyj's specific understanding of 'ruski', we shall use the derivative 'Rusian' of '(Kieven) Rus''. All 'Rusians' ['Rusini'], Zubryc'kyj held, spoke dialects of the same language. However, those living in close vicinity to the Poles had been subject to particularly harmful influences. They now used a mixed language. The further away they were from the Poles, the cleaner and the closer to 'Old Rusian' ['do starego ruskiego'] their language was. 'Old Rusian' used to be the vernacular of all 'Rusians'. It was first introduced as the language of religion and liturgy in 988, i.e. the year of the adoption of the Christian faith in the 'Rusian lands' ['Rus'']. Thus, to note, Zubryc'kyj did not explicitly distinguish between the East Slavonic redaction of Church Slavonic and East Slavonic proper. He further wrote that the dialects of the 'Old Rusian language', i.e. of East Slavonic, changed somewhat in the course of history. Yet in writing, 'Old Rusian' stayed the same. Russian in particular remained very close to it. At present, the East Slavs have two written languages: Russian and 'Old Rusian'. In Galicia, school children should learn the latter. Zubryc'kyj concluded the section by saying that the correct German translation of the term 'ruski' ['Rusian'] would be the – somewhat archaizing – adjective 'rewsisch', rather than 'ruthenisch'. It is clear from this that Zubryc'kyj did not believe in an independent Ruthenian language. However, he did not yet declare either that the Ukrainians of Galicia should use Russian in writing. This would have been the fully fledged Russophile view for which Zubryc'kyj became known eventually. To be sure, he already understood as Russian as a standard language for all East Slavs. At the same time, he still considered 'Old Rusian' the Ruthenians' primary written language. By 'Old Rusian', it seems, he meant the entire literary tradition in the Old Cyrillic alphabet in the East Slavonic lands since 988.

After these introductory remarks, Zubryc'kyj engaged directly with Lozyns'kyj's proposal. It is also at this point where Levyc'kyj took Zubryc'kyj's text and copied large parts to produce his own *Odpowiedź* of December 1834. Presumably, he omitted the introduction because he did not subscribe to Zubryc'kyj's conviction of an East Slavonic unity with Russian as a privileged language. We will return to the ideological differences between Zubryc'kyj and Levyc'kyj later in this section. For now, the focus will be on the points where their texts are more or less identical. Crucially, Zubryc'kyj drew amply on his bibliographic and archival expertise to refute the main ideological underpinnings of Lozyns'kyj's proposal. He did not only rightly assume that, as mentioned in the previous section, those Ruthenian books in the Latin-Polish alphabet which Lozyns'kyj kept in his own library were not older than from between 1760 and 1801. He also referred to various hand-written and printed sources, which showed that the 'Rusian' language and the Cyrillic alphabet had a long tradition in large parts of the Polish Kingdom. For Zubryc'kyj, Cyrillic court records in a more colloquial style from Galicia, Podolia and other areas belonged to this tradition as much as the first Church Slavonic prints which Szwajpolt Fiol prepared in Cracow in 1491. In the same vein, Zubryc'kyj, and with him Levyc'kyj, referred to Church Slavonic grammars, such as L. Zyzanij's *Grammatika slovenska* (1596) and M. Smotryc'kyj's *Grammatiki slavenskija* (1619), to refute Lozyns'kyj's claim that Ruthenian did not have any grammars. In short, Zubryc'kyj and

Levyc'kyj did not seem to grasp, or to accept, Lozyns'kyj's crucial distinction between spoken Ruthenian and written Church Slavonic.

On the other hand, Zubryc'kyj implicitly conceded to Lozyns'kyj that there was a lack of good 'Rusian' authors, comparable to the great Polish writers of the 16th century. It is interesting to note that he took a rather sober approach to Lozyns'kyj's other central theme too. This was the idea that the Latin Polish alphabet, as opposed to the Old Cyrillic script, would 'Europeanize' the Ruthenian language and literature. Unlike Šaškevyč who replied to this in much length, Zubryc'kyj countered relatively briefly: firstly, German literature, for instance, did not attract less interest because it was in the 'Schwabacher' typeface, and Romanian literarure was not read more because it was now printed in the Latin rather than in the Cyrillic alphabet. Secondly, the Latin alphabet had been adjusted to different languages, including Slavonic, in a large variety of ways. The point had already been made by Dobrovský. Zubryc'kyj quoted Kopitar to excoriate this 'unselige [...] Discordanz' ['unfortunate [...] discord'] (quoted after Voznjak 1929: 141). Thus, to support his argument he harnessed the authority of the scholar to whom Lozyns'kyj, his opponent, adherred. Zubryc'kyj did not mention though that Kopitar still considered the Latin alphabet preferrable even if it was in want of additional letters to represent all Slavonic sounds. He had generally little to say about Lozyns'kyj's 'Kopitarian' idea of the 'Europeanizing' effect of the Latin alphabet. It appears that giving up the Old Cyrillic alphabet made no sense altogether to someone like Zubryc'kyj who neither grasped nor accepted Lozyns'kyj's aspiration. To recall, this was to replace the existing literary idiom with a new, vernacular-based written language.

The failure to understand this central distinction is also in evidence from the discussion of Lozyns'kyj's detailed criticism of the Cyrillic alphabet. Clearly, Zubryc'kyj did not think of the vernacular as a possible point of reference at all. Written 'Rusian', for him, was based on Church Slavonic with the Old Cyrillic spelling system. For example, he had no doubt that <я> and the small 'jus' represented different, if relatively close sounds. For an analogy, he referred to German <ä>, <ö>, <e>, <eh>. His basic intuition to adhere to etymological spelling aside, one cannot but notice that he had a somewhat limited understanding of the principles of spelling and phonetics. For instance, he critized Lozyns'kyj for claiming that Cyrillic was in breach of the central criterion that *one* letter should represent *one* sound. Lozyns'kyj had used the mistaken example of <u> and <ŭ>, which he regarded as the same letter representing different sounds. Zubryc'kyj correctly noticed the error. However, a few lines later he fell into the same trap by declaring that Polish <e>, <é>, <ę> were the same letter, but for different sounds. Lozyns'kyj had also found fault with the Cyrillic alphabet for the opposite shortcoming. He maintained that it had single letters for different sounds, such as <я> for [ja], but for [a] following a palatalized consonant. Zubryc'kyj again rightly countered that Polish <i> was similarly ambiguous. It could either mean [i], or show palatalization, or, in the old spelling, even represent [j]. At the same time, he failed to say anything conclusive about the important question of yodized vowel graphemes in Cyrillic. Lozyns'kyj had also criticized the letter <ъ> as, in most cases, it lacked any function as far as contemporary Ruthenian was concerned. Zubryc'kyj did not appreciate the essence of the point. He took it to mean that <ъ>, as well as <ь>, were too bulky. He countered that they could be replaced with existing Old Cyrillic diacritics (the so-called 'jerčyk' and 'pajerčyk'). Lozyns'kyj's criticism, however, concerned the function, not the size of the letter <ъ>. Zubryc'kyj's

judgement was again sounder on Lozyns'kyj's final allegation that Cyrillic lacked certain letters. He rightly pointed out that [g], even though of minor importance for Ruthenian, could be easily spelled <г> (or <кг>). He also clarified that Lozyns'kyj's [dz] and [dź], as in *dzwin* ('bell') and *dziub* ('beak'), were Polish and, thus, could not be claimed to be missing from the Cyrillic alphabet. However, he did not have to say anything about [dž] as Ukr. *ходжу* ('I go').

Zubryc'kyj's response correctly identified some flaws in Lozyns'kyj's discussion of the Cyrillic alphabet. At the same time, however, it was compromised by a somewhat limited understanding of the subject area. It appears Zubryc'kyj, as much as Lozyns'kyj himself, were primarily driven by principled views on the Ruthenians and their language, rather than by the relative merits of the Latin alphabet and the Cyrillic script. To recall, Zubryc'kyj held that the Ruthenians belonged to one 'Rusian', i.e. East Slavonic, nation which possessed two written languages: firstly, 'Old Rusian', spelled in the Old Cyrillic alphabet and loosely based on Church Slavonic; and, secondly, Russian.

We shall now turn to Josyf Levyc'kyj and his adaption of Zubryc'kyj's article. Similar to Lozyns'kyj, Levyc'kyj (1801–1860) entered the service of bishop Snihurs'kyj of Przemyśl after graduating in 1825. As mentioned in the previous section, Levyc'kyj was also the author of a Ruthenian grammar (published 1834). Kopitar had censored the book and criticized the language it projected as a hybrid between Church Slavonic and the vernacular (cf. Makovej 1903b: 59–76). Voznjak (1909b: 93, 107) dismissed it altogether as an incoherent piece of plagiarism. It should be stressed that Levyc'kyj's general contribution to the cultural and linguistic history of Eastern Galicia merits a much more balanced view (cf. e.g. Moser 2006–2007; Stępień 1999: 129; 2005: 58). As far as his adaption of Zubryc'kyj's manuscript is concerned, it is clear that Levyc'kyj was a conservative. Like Zubryc'kyj, he supported etymological spelling and the traditional written idiom, which was more or less based on Church Slavonic. Unlike him, however, he did not consider Russian a point of reference for Galicia's Ruthenians. In fact, he carefully cancelled all explicit references to the Russian language (but not the implicit ones in the form of the Russian graphemes <э> and <ё>). Given that he omitted Zubryc'kyj's entire introduction (cf. above), it also seems that he did not agree with the idea of an East Slavonic unity in the form of *one* '(Old) Rusian' written language. In the same vein, he cancelled passages where Zubryc'kyj marginalised Lozyns'kyj's language as the 'Przemyśl-Ruthenian dialect' ['przemyslsko-ruski [sic] Dialekt'; Voznjak 1929: 134]. Unlike Zubryc'kyj, Levyc'kyj also made allowance for two typically non-Russian innovations of the traditional written language: Firstly, this was the literal graphemic representation of <о> from <е> after 'hushings' and after [j] (irrespective of stress, cf. e.g. Modern Ukr. *жона*, *йому*). In passing, it is worth noting that Levyc'kyj liked to advance this to the principal difference between the vernacular and Church Slavonic (cf. Voznjak 1909b: 103). Secondly, he conceded that the typically Ukrainian ikavism, i.e. [i] from [ě], and [i] from [e] and [o] in newly closed syllables, should be represented by the letters 'jat'' and <ö>. The former was typical of the Galician literary tradition. The latter was taken from the Carpatho-Ruthenian grammar (1830) by M. Lučkaj (Voznjak 1909b: 102), who, presumably, had adopted it from Maksymovyč's proposed <ô> (1827).

To be sure, Levyc'kyj was otherwise a staunch supporter of etymological spelling. For example, he even included the Old Cyrillic yodized <е> in his Ruthenian alphabet. Zubryc'kyj had relegated the letter to the remote past, albeit its reintroduction

did in fact make sense (cf. Mod. Ukr. <є>). Generally, Levyc'kyj had a somewhat better understanding of spelling and phonetics than Zubryc'kyj. He omitted or clarified a few erroneous or confusing passages, e.g. Zubryc'kyj's convoluted discussion of the letters <ь> and <ъ> (cf. above). He was also keen to moderate Zubryc'kyj's sometimes highly polemical, or even condescending tone. After all, Lozyns'kyj was an immediate colleague and peer, and the article — a rejection of the Latin Polish alphabet — was to appear in a Polish journal. Levyc'kyj's text still turned out such that Lozyns'kyj found it 'mischievous, cunning' and 'abusive' ['boshaft-witzig[e]' and 'schimpflich[e]'] (cf. Makovej 1903b: 86). This perception was not only driven by a strong sense of competition and jealousy between the two young men. Lozyns'kyj also felt that the censor had unjustly deprived him of the possibility to reply to his critics (cf. above). He was keen to rebuff Levyc'kyj for his clerical conservatism. Zubryc'kyj's manuscript which testified to the author's proto-Russophile views and his belief in one East Slavonic nation had, it seems, not come to Lozyns'kyj's attention.

The reply by M. Šaškevyč

There remains the third and final reply by M. Šaškevyč. Voznjak (1912: xviii–xix) assumed that M. Šaškevyč (1811–1843) worked on his reply to Lozyns'kyj in the year 1835. It was ready by the beginning of 1836 and published as a separate brochure entitled: *Azbuka i abecadło. Uwagi nad rozprawą 'O wprawadzeniu Abecadła polskiego do piśmiennictwa ruskiego, napisaną przez ks. J. Łozińskiego'* (*The Cyrillic Alphabet and the Latin Polish Alphabet. Thoughts on the Essay 'About the Introduction of the Polish Alphabet to Ruthenian Literature', by father J. Łoziński*) (Šaškevyč [1836] 1969). At the time, Šaškevyč was a student at the Greek Catholic seminary in L'viv. The article was Šaškevyč's first opportunity to welcome, in print, the fact that Slavs now pursued the idea 'of founding a truly national literature' ['osnować prawdziwie narodową Literaturę'] (cf. Šaškevyč 1969: 3). His own aspirations for written Ruthenian to be a national language, based on the people's idiom, had materialised already earlier. In our context, a manuscript fragment is of particular interest which Voznjak (1912: xviii) dated back to some time between autumn 1833 and the year 1834. He published it under the title *Projekt fonetyčnoho pravopysu* (*Project for a Phonetic Spelling System*) (Voznjak 1912: 143–45). It shows that Šaškevyč had already adopted for himself the idea of phonetic spelling by the time Lozyns'kyj's alphabet article appeared. Unlike the deep ideological divide that separated Lozyns'kyj from Zubryc'kyj and Levyc'kyj (cf. previous section), Šaškevyč and Lozyns'kyj agreed on one fundamental point: Ukrainian Galicia needed a vernacular-based written language, and this could only be achieved by way of a phonetic spelling system. In fact, Šaškevyč called Lozyns'kyj a 'man of good intentions' ['dobrych chęci męża'] (Šaškevyč [1836] 1969: 3–4). However, he strongly disagreed with him on the question of introducing the Latin-Polish alphabet to Ruthenian.

In particular, Šaškevyč took issue with the view that the Latin-Polish alphabet would help 'to Europeanize' the Ruthenian language and literature. As mentioned earlier, Lozyns'kyj had adopted it from the Polish writer and ethnographer z Oleska. Šaškevyč understood that the position was ideologically charged and dedicated a large portion of his essay to argue with it. He thought of 'Europeanization' as an influx of 'foreign formulations and foreign expressions' by which 'we will impose on one body with its

soul another, foreign soul' ['obce zwroty i obcy sposób wyrażania się, (…) wtrącać będziemy w ciało duszę mające, drugą obcą duszę'] (Šaškevyč [1836] 1969: 8–9). He further argued that Europe's written languages were highly fragmented due to the various adaptions of the Latin alphabet. The Cyrillic script, on the other hand, provided unique letters, such as <ж>, <ш>, <щ>, <ц>, <ч>, for typically Slavonic sounds. Zubryc'kyj had already used this argument. Ultimately based on Dobrovský's *Institutiones* (1822: 7–9), Šaškevyč applied it in a more competent and skillful manner. Unlike Zubryc'kyj, he was clearly aware that Kopitar preferred the Latin alphabet even if he was critical of it. He also couched his discussion in the wider scholarly context of the time; notably the 'Slovene ABC Dispute' and I. Berlić's *Grammatik der illirischen Sprache* (*Grammar of the Illyrian language*) of 1833. Berlić recommended (Vuk Karadžić's) Cyrillic alphabet as superior not only for Serbian, but also for Croatian. Šaškevyč quoted the corresponding passage from Berlić's foreword. It is interesting to note that he omitted from his quotation Berlić's brief allusion to the 'schism' ['Kirchenspaltung'] between the Orthodox Church and Catholicism as represented by the two different alphabets (cf. Berlić 1833: x–xi): perhaps he did not want to suggest a similar divide between the Greek and the Roman Catholic Churches. Apart from the South Slavs and Dobrovský, Šaškevyč also called on Šafárik's authority to argue that 'the Cyrillic alphabet was better suited for a writing system for the Slavs' ['"das kyryllische [sic] Alphabet sich mehr zu einer Pasigraphie der Slaven eigne"'] (quoted after Šaškevyč [1836] 1969: 14). The conclusion that Cyrillic was the Slavonic people's real alphabet bore the mark of early Pan-Slavism. Together with his belief in the 'soul' and the 'spirit' of the Ruthenian folk language, which was under 'Latin-Polish' threat, Šaškevyč projected a distinctly Romantic view on the alphabet question.

Šaškevyč gave less prominence to historical continuity as an argument against Lozyns'kyj's proposal. He readily gave preference to the civic script and, in defense of his position, even referred to Trediakovskij's *Razgovor [...] ob orfografii starinnoj i novoj* (*Conversation [...] about the New and Old Orthography*). By way of reminder, Levyc'kyj had carefully cancelled all references to Russia. As to historical continuity, it appears that Šaškevyč may have excerpted a few pieces of bibliographical information from Zubryc'kyj, either from the manuscript if he knew it, or via Levyc'kyj's published adaption. This concerns, for example, the correct dating of Lozyns'kyj's allegedly ancient Ruthenian books printed in the Latin-Polish alphabet (as discussed). Unlike Zubryc'kyj, however, Šaškevyč was much more selective about the materials which should be claimed for the Ruthenian linguistic and literary heritage. Those without a substantial portion of vernacular elements were to be excluded, notably Church Slavonic monuments and texts of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, which 'was a time of corruption of the Ruthenian language under the influence of corrupted Polish' ['był czasem zepsucia języka ruskiego pod wpływem zepsutej polszczyzny'] (Šaškevyč [1836] 1969: 18). Šaškevyč's awareness of the difference between Church Slavonic, Polish and vernacular Ruthenian had taken shape irrespective of Lozyns'kyj's alphabet proposal. His ideas about a phonetic spelling system in the Cyrillic alphabet were equally advanced by 1835. One can assume though that they further consolidated while he was working on his response to Lozyns'kyj. Apart from some ideological underpinnings discussed so far, Šaškevyč ([1836] 1969: 20–30) dedicated the last third of his essay to matters of

orthographic detail. Here, we find spelling proposals which reappear in practice in the famous collection *Rusalka Dnjistrovaja* (1837).

Lozyns'kyj had criticized the Cyrillic alphabet for containing single letters which represented different sounds, notably yodized vowel graphemes. In response, Šaškevyč explained their function — effectively an elegant solution to the specific Slavonic problem of representing palatalization and the sound [j] —, and revised the more radical approach which he had taken in *Projekt fonetyčnoho pravopysu* (*Project for a Phonetic Spelling System*). Unlike there, he now proposed to retain *<я>*, *<ю>*. He maintained that there was a need to distinguish between yodized and non-yodized *e* and *o* too. For yodized *e*, this led on to using *<є>* in *Rusalka Dnjistrovaja*. For *o*, he effectively proposed *<ьо>* after palatalized consonants. Corresponding *<ŭo>* already featured in the *Projekt fonetyčnoho pravopysu*. Eventually, both combinations were used in *Rusalka Dnjistrovaja*. Lozyns'kyj had further criticized the Cyrillic alphabet for containing letters which represented the same sound, e.g. *<я>* and the small 'jus' for [ja]. Even if rather indecisive, Šaškevyč's refutation seemed to imply that Ruthenian might in fact not need certain Old Cyrillic letters, such as the small 'jus'. His comments on *<u>* were more conclusive and suggested that he regarded the letter *<ы>* as dispensable. He showed that the same applied to *<ъ>*; a letter which already Lozyns'kyj had declared superfluous. The idea that Ruthenian did not need the letters *<ъ>* and *<ы>* had already appeared in Šaškevyč's *Projekt fonetyčnoho pravopysu*. Together with some typically Old Cyrillic letters, such as small 'jus', they were then also omitted from the orthography used for *Rusalka Dnjistrovaja*. Finally, Lozyns'kyj had criticized that Cyrillic lacked letters for some Ruthenian sounds, notably [g] and [dž]. In response, Šaškevyč again repeated an idea from *Projekt fonetyčnoho pravopysu*: For [dž], one could use Serbian *<џ>*, while [g], even though rare in Ruthenian, could be written as *<кг>* or *<ґ>*. The former, but not the latter, was also used in *Rusalka Dnjistrovaja*.

Šaškevyč was undoubtedly an oustanding philologist. It is therefore interesting to note that, in his response to Lozyns'kyj, he remained unexpectedly inconclusive on some crucial problems of phonetic spelling. As mentioned above, he was vague about typically Old Cyrillic letters. His comments about the representation of [i] from [o] and [e] in newly closed syllables were incomplete too: He rejected Lozyns'kyj's idea of using Latin-Polish *<ó>* and *<é>*, but he did not unambiguously promote proper phonetic representation as *<i>* either. In fact, he seemed to consider it acceptable to retain *<o>* and *<e>*. This was a concession to etymological spelling which was not only missing from *Rusalka Dnjistrovaja*. Šaškevyč had also given it up in his earlier *Projekt fonetyčnoho pravopysu*. These inconsistencies suggest that he paid less attention to Lozyns'kyj's critique of individual Cyrillic letters than to the ideational background of the proposal. It seems the technical side of the dispute was secondary to its ideological connotations. In fact, Šaškevyč used two thirds of his essay to discuss them. He projected a distinctly Romantic view: The Cyrillic script was part of the vernacular's 'soul' and 'spirit', while the Latin alphabet was a vehicle for Polonization and a symbol of confusion.

Conclusion

The 'Ruthenian Alphabet War' between 1834 and 1836 consisted of four contributions: Lozyns'kyj's initial proposal and the replies by Zubryc'kyj, Levyc'kyj and Šaškevyč. It

was the symbolic and ideological aspects of Lozyns'kyj's proposal, rather than the actual comparison between the Latin-Polish alphabet and the Cyrillic script, which sparked the debate. It was one of the earliest modern debates in Ukrainian Galicia about the country's linguistic and cultural future in a newly emerging political context of national aspirations. D. Zubryc'kyj projected East Slavonic unity under Russian leadership. J. Levyc'kyj was a conservative too. However, unlike Zubryc'kyj, he believed in a local, Ruthenian form of Greek Catholic clerical conservatism under Austrian hegemony. M. Šaškevyč took a distinctly Romantic view advocating Western Ukrainian populism. It is interesting to note that, in his reply to Lozyns'kyj, he does not at all mention the Ukrainians across the river Zbruč. J. Lozyns'kyj was also a Romantic who looked toward the Ruthenian people. However, his approach was more technocratic, perhaps in places even reminiscent of the mentality of a linguist of the Enlightenment. It also still bore the mark of a generation of Greek Catholic intellectuals who affiliated with the Polish cause.

There were further comments and voices too. For instance, Šaškevyč returned to the topic in the collection *Rusalka Dnjistrovaja* of 1837. He included in it his review of Lozyns'kyj's *Ruskoje vesile* of 1835 where he again criticized the use of the Latin-Polish alphabet (cf. Voznjak 1912: 79–80). Šaškevyč's companion Ivan Vahylevyč (cf. Brock 1982) alluded to Lozyns'kyj's proposal as 'alphabet frenzy' ['abecadłowego szału'] in his *Gramatyka języka małoruskiego w Galicii* (*Grammar of the Ukrainian Language in Galicia*) of 1845 (cf. pp. xxii–xxiii). On the other hand, Latin-Polish transliterations of Ruthenian appeared in various places. For example, the editor of the 1822 edition of *Pielgrzym Polski* (p. 91) used the Latin-Polish alphabet to print the popular Ruthenian folk song *Dumka ruska o Hryciu* (*Ruthenian Thought about Georg*) (cf. the section on Lozyns'kyj). So did J. Levyc'kyj for a Cyrillic reading exercise in his grammar of 1834 (pp. 23–27), and I. Vahylevyč for general purposes of transliteration in his grammar. Ruthenian and Ukrainian spelled in the Latin alphabet continued to appear occasionally in different contexts (cf. Remy 2005: 175) and subsequent decades. In Galicia, there was a second attempt to introduce it more widely in 1859 — this time in the Czech variant (Franko 1913). The initiative was officially engineered and had political, even 'colonializing' overtones. But the debate of the 1830s was different: I hope to have shown that it was a crossroads where, at a relatively early moment in the nineteenth century, newly emerging opinions about the cultural and linguistic future of Galicia's Ukrainians met. That they would and should eventually use the Cyrillic alphabet is of course beyond doubt.

Bbliography

Brock, Peter, 'Ivan Vahylevych (1811-1866) and the Ukrainian National Identity', in *Nationbuilding and the Politics of Nationalism: Essays on Austrian Galicia*, ed. by Andrei S. Markovits and Frank E. Sysyn (Cambridge/Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982), pp. 111–48.

Berlić, Ignaz Al., *Grammatik der illirischen Sprache* (Ofen 1833).

Dobrovský, J. [Dobrowsky, J.], *Institutiones linguae Slavicae dialecti veteris* (Vindobona: A. Schmid, 1822).

Chudaš, M. L., 'Iz malovidomoji movozn. spadščyny J. I. Lozyn'koho', *Movoznavstvo*, 4 (1989), 63–68.

Chudaš, M. L., 'Alfavitno-pravopysni pryncypy J. Lozyns'koho', in *J. I. Lozyns'kyj: Ukrajins'ke vesillja*, ed. by R. F. Kyrčiv (Kyjiv: Naukova Dumka, 1992), 27–44.

Franko, Ivan. 'Azbučna vijna v Halyčynji 1859 r. ', *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva imeny Ševčenka*, 114 (1913a), 81–116; 115 (1913b), 131–53; 116 (1913c), 87–125.

Kopitar, Bartholomäus, *Grammatik der Slavischen Sprache in Krain, Kärnten und Steyermark* (Laibach: Wilhelm Heinrich Kors, 1808).

Kopitar, Bartholomäus, 'Walachische Literatur', in *Barth. Kopitars Kleinere Schriften: Erster Theil*, ed. by Fr. Miklosich (Wien: Friedrich Beck, 1857) pp. 230–47.

Levyc'kyj, J. [Lewicki, J.], *Grammatik der ruthenischen oder kleinrussischen Sprache in Galizien* (Przemyśl: Gr.-kath. bischöfl. Buchdruckerei, 1834).

Levyc'kyj, J. [Lewicki, J.], 'Odpowiedź na zdanie o zaprowadzeniu abecadła polskiego do piśmiennictwa ruskiego', *Dodaktek Nadzwyczajny do Nru 51 Rozmaitości Lwowskich* (1834).

Lozyns'kyj, J. [Łoziński , J.], 'O wprowadzeniu abecadła polskiego do piśmiennictwa ruskiego', *Rozmaitości: Pismo dodatkowe do Gazety Lwowskiej*, 29 (1834), 228–30.

Lozyns'kyj, J. [Łoziński , J.], *Ruskoje wesile* (Przemyśl: Typografia Władyczna gr. kat., 1835).

Magocsi, Paul R., *Galicia: A Historical Survey and Bibliographical Guide* (Toronto: University Press, 1983).

Magocsi, Paul R., 'The language question as a factor in the national movement in Eastern Galicia', in *The Roots of Ukrainian Nationalism: Galicia as Ukraine's Piedmont*, ed. by Paul R. Magocsi (Toronto: University Press, 2002), pp. 83–91.

Makovej, Osyp, 'Z istoriji našoji fil'ol'ogiji: Try halyc'ki hramatyky (Ivan Mohyl'nyc'kyj, Josyf Levyc'kyj i Josyf Lozyns'kyj)', *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva imeny Ševčenka*, 51 (1903a), 1–58; 54 (1903b), 59–96.

Michael Moser, '"Jazyčije" — ein Pseudoterminus der sprachwissenschaftlichen Ukrainistik', *Studia Slavica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 49.1–2 (2004), 121–47.

Moser, Michael, 'Zwei "ruthenische" (ukrainische) Erstlesefibeln aus dem österreichischen Galizien und ihre sprachliche Konzeption', *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch*, 47 (2001), 93–122.

Moser, Michael, 'Josyf Levyc'kyj jak borec' za kul'turu "rus'koji" (ukrajins'koji) movy', in *Confraternitas: Juvilejnyj zbirnyk na pošanu Jaroslava Isajevyča*, ed. by Mykola Krykun (L'viv 2006–2007), pp. 447–60.

Remy, Johannes, 'The Ukrainian alphabet as a political question in the Russian Empire before 1876', *Ab Imperio*, 2 (2005), 167–90.

Šaškevyč, Markijan, *Azbuka i abecadlo: Peredruk z unikal'noho oryhinalu z 1836 r.* (Vinipeg: Šaškevyčijana, 1969).

Ščurat, V., 'Azbučna statja Mykoly Kmycykevyča z 1834 r.', *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva imeny Ševčenka*, 81 (1908), 134–44.

Stępień, Stanisław, 'Rola Przemyśla w ukraińskim odrodzeniu narodowym w Galicji w pierwszej połowie XIX w.', *Warszawskie Zeszyty Ukrainoznawcze*, 8–9 (1999), 127–37.

Stępień, Stanisław, 'Borderland city: Przemyśl and the Ruthenian national awakening in Galicia', in *Galicia: A Multicultured Land*, ed. by Christopher Hann and Paul R. Magocsi (Toronto: University Press, 2005), pp. 52–70.

Teršakovec', Mychajlo, *Materijaly j zamitky do istoriji nacional'noho vidrodžennja Halyc'koji Rusy v 1830 ta 1840 rr.* (L'viv: Naukove Tovarystvo im. Ševčenka, 1907).

Teršakovec', Mychajlo, 'Vidnosyny Vartolomeja Kopitara do halyc'ko-ukrajins'koho pys'menstva', *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva imeny Ševčenka*, 94 (1910a), 84–106; 95 (1910b), 107–54.

Unbegaun, Boris O., 'Le nom des Ruthènes slaves', *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves*, 10 (1950), 611–18.

Voznjak, Mychajlo, 'Studiji nad halyc'ko-ukrajins'kymy hramatykamy XIX v.', *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva imeny Ševčenka*, 89 (1909a), 111–43; 90 (1909b), 33–118; 91 (1909c), 126–50; 93 (1910a), 90–131; 94 (1910b), 107–63; 95 (1910c), 83–106; 98 (1910d), 75–146.

Voznjak, Mychajlo, *Pysannja Markijana Šaškevyča* (L'viv: Naukove Tovarystvo im. Ševčenka, 1912).

Voznjak, Mychajlo, 'Avtorstvo azbučnoji statti z 1834 r.', *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva imeny Ševčenka*, 136–37 (1925), 109–18.

Voznak, Mychajlo, 'Apolohija kyrylyci Denysa Zubryc'koho', *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva imeny Ševčenka*, 150 (1929), 121–42.

z Oleska, Wacław, *Pieśni polskie i ruskie ludu galicyjskiego* (Lwów: Franciszek Piller, 1833).