



The President and Fellows of Harvard College

A Linguistic Analysis of Ivan Mazepa's Universals and Letters

Author(s): Michael A. Moser

Source: *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, Vol. 31, No. 1/4, POLTAVA 1709: THE BATTLE AND THE MYTH (2009-2010), pp. 391-411

Published by: [Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41756509>

Accessed: 08/09/2014 00:17

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute and *The President and Fellows of Harvard College* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

A Linguistic Analysis of Ivan Mazepa's Universals and Letters

MICHAEL A. MOSER

UKRAINIAN AS THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGE OF THE HETMANATE UNDER HETMAN IVAN MAZEPA

IN TERMS OF BOTH FUNCTIONALITY AND LANGUAGE STATUS, it is obvious that the sphere of administration is a particularly important domain of any written language. Studies on the history of languages, however, often pay scarce attention to administrative documents, especially if they deal with periods when other domains, in particular those of belles-lettres, are already represented in the corpus quite well. As for the Ukrainian case, earlier documents, such as the charters of the late fourteenth century and early part of the fifteenth, have been rather thoroughly analyzed by linguists, and their significance for the study of the Ukrainian language is widely acknowledged. Philological and linguistic research on the language of later official documents, including those of the Hetmanate in Left-Bank Ukraine, has been much less intense, though, and information on this topic is usually reduced to a few remarks in textbooks.¹

As a result, little is known about Ukrainian as a chancery language during the Hetmanate. However, a general look at the Ukrainian situation in the eighteenth century makes it plausible to assume that it was not a new formation, but a continuation of earlier Ruthenian traditions. Like other varieties of Ukrainian, the language of administration was still exposed to the rather strong impact of the Polish language despite the political divide, while the role of Russian as a contact language gradually became more important during that period, too.²

Although we are not dealing with Ivan Mazepa's personal language but with that of his chancery, a brief look at Mazepa's own linguistic profile is apropos here. Born on 20 March 1639 in Mazepyntsi near Bila Tserkva, Mazepa, a descendant of émigrés from the more western parts of Ukraine, studied at the Kyivan Mohyla College in Kyiv and the Jesuit College in Warsaw. After spending some time in the German and Italian lands, the Netherlands, and

France, he became a royal courtier in Warsaw before returning to Ukraine in 1663. Based on these biographical data, it is safe to assume that Mazepa was fluent in both Ukrainian and Polish and that he knew Church Slavonic and Latin well; his excellent command of Latin was praised by his contemporaries.³ Back in Ukraine, Mazepa forged an impressive career. After being captured during one of his many diplomatic missions to the Crimean Tatars by the Zaporozhian Cossacks in 1674, he was handed over to the Left-Bank hetman, Ivan Samoilovych. From that time onward he “quickly gained the confidence of Samoilovych and Tsar Peter I, was made a ‘courtier of the hetman,’ and was sent on numerous missions to Moscow.... In 1682 Mazepa was appointed Samoilovych’s general osaul,”⁴ and in July 1687 he was elected the new hetman. From then on, Mazepa was in continuous contact with Muscovite officials and their Russian language, but this does not necessarily mean that Mazepa had a very good active command of Russian. If Oleksander Ohloblyn maintained in his fundamental book that, “along with Polish, Muscovite, and Tatar, he had a command of Latin, Italian, and German, and knew French,”⁵ this might seem to be too bold an assumption. However, Tatiana Tairova-Iakovleva, obviously relying on the memoirs of Mazepa’s French contemporary, Jean Casimir de Baluze, partly agrees that Mazepa, “along with Ukrainian, Russian, and Polish, knew Latin perfectly...and spoke Italian and German,” adding that it was Pylyp Orlyk who maintained that Mazepa also knew the Tatar language “very well.”⁶

THE SOURCES

One of the crucial problems of studying the language of Ivan Mazepa’s chancery becomes evident very quickly: Only a few texts have been edited in a way that can be called more or less satisfactory from a philological or linguistic perspective. As for the many editions of Mazepa’s letters, for example, even the most fundamental matters of text tradition often remain unclear. Time and again one cannot be certain whether the edited text is based on an original manuscript from the Hetmanate’s chancery, a copy, or simply another edition, and very often it is not even clear if the edition is based on the version that was issued in the hetman’s chancery or on a translation made for Russian addressees.

Fortunately, questions like these have not been neglected by Ivan Butych in his editions of Mazepa’s universals (*MU*, *MUII*) or by V’iacheslav Stanislavs’kyi in his edition of Mazepa’s letters of 1687–91 (*ML*). Since a number of important documents from the Hetmanate, particularly the universals, have been recently edited more carefully than ever (*XU*, *HU*), one might be quite optimistic.⁷ New studies could significantly deepen our knowledge of the official Ukrainian language of the Hetmanate in the second half of the seventeenth century and the beginning of the eighteenth (although, admittedly, a closer look soon reveals

a considerable amount of dubious or clearly erroneous renderings in some of these recent editions, too). After all, the importance of this topic for Ukrainian historical sociolinguistics is obvious. In the end, we are dealing with an idiom that represents the last historical variety of Ukrainian functioning as a vital official language prior to the first new steps that were taken in the Austrian Empire after the Revolution of 1848.⁸

My present small contribution focuses on one major question: To what extent did the Muscovite official language already exert an influence on the language of the Hetmanate's chancery under Ivan Mazepa? My tentative answer will be based on an analysis of two universals from Mazepa's chancery, dating from different periods of his hetmancy, and a comparison with the language of some official letters to Muscovite addressees. While Mazepa's universals represent the internal official written language of the Hetmanate at the turn of the eighteenth century and offer an answer to the question of whether the Hetmanate's linguistic traditions remained intact, Mazepa's external correspondence with Muscovite addressees is situated in a rather different context because this communication constellation is multilingual from the very outset. Against the background of upcoming developments it is the factors of Russian-Ukrainian linguistic adaptation and comprehension that are of significant interest: Was the language of the hetman's letters to Muscovite addressees basically identical to the internal official language of the Hetmanate, and was it understood as such in Muscovy? Or was the Hetmanate's official language maintained on the Ukrainian side, but translated in order to be understood by the Russian side? Or did the Hetmanate's chancellery adapt its correspondence with Muscovites to Russian linguistic traditions already at this rather early stage?⁹

TWO UNIVERSALS

In Butych's edition one of the first universals, which is based on an original manuscript, was issued by Ivan Mazepa on 9 October 1687 in Baturyn:

Іоанъ Мазепа, гетманъ з Войскомъ ихъ царского пресвѣтлого величества Запорозскимъ.

Всей старшинѣ и чернѣ Войска ихъ царского пресвѣтлого величества Запорозского, а меновите пану полковникови прилуцкому, обозному, суди и осаулом полковым, сотником [sic] атаманом, войтомъ и кождому, кому колвекъ о томъ вѣдати надлежит, ознаймует: ижъ заховуючи мы права манастиреви Густинскому Прилуцкому от бывшихъ антецесаровъ нашихъ наданые симъ нашимъ унѣверсаломъ оныя ствержаемъ и

позволяем превелебному в Богу отцу Авксентію Якимовичю, ігуменови монастира мененного Густинского Прилуцкого и по немъ будучым отцем ігуменом и всѣмъ тоей обители законником для уставичной в[аших] милоствах¹⁰ щоденных хвалы Божой и для вспартя всегдашних расходовъ манастирских селом Деймановкою владѣти и з млыновъ Давыденкового о двох каменях в селѣ Валкахъ и под мѣстомъ Варвою Івана Точеного и Івана Ляшка о двохъ каменях з ступами на рецѣ Удаю, а в селѣ Деймановцѣ Хвескового и Костиного жителей тамошних, же о двохъ каменях з ступами на рѣчцѣ Лисогорцѣ стоячихъ вшеляких розмѣрових и [sic] приходячих пожитковъ зъ козацкого ведлугъ волностей козацких половину, а з мужицкого двохъ частей заживати. Теды абы ему, отцу ігумену, из всѣм законником манастира Густинского з [!, probably instead of в] держаню оного села и в отбѣраню з помененных млиновъ належатых [sic] пожитковъ жадная не дѣялася ни от кого з старшины и чернѣ перешкода и трудност, мѣти хотим, а войтови и всей громадѣ села Деймановки приказуем, жебы без спротивенства вшелякое помененной обывелѣ належитое оддавали послушенство, варуемъ однакъ, жебы козаки в том селѣ мешкающие при своихъ козацкихъ волностяхъ ненарушне зоставали, не узнаючи жадной от пререченого отца ігумена и братий долегливости.

Данъ в [!] Батуринѣ, октобрія 9, року 1687.

Звишъ менованый гетман, рукою власною.¹¹

At a time much closer to the Battle of Poltava, on 20 April 1708, Mazepa issued another brief universal in Bila Tserkva, close to his original home-
stead:

Пресвѣтлѣйшого и державнѣйшого великого государя его царского [sic] величества Войскъ Запорожскихъ гетманъ славного чина святого апостола Андрея и Бѣлого Орла Кавалеръ Іоанъ Мазепа.

Пану полковникови переяславкому, старшинѣ полковой, сотникомъ и всѣмъ старшимъ и меншимъ войскового и посполитого чину в полку томъ знайдующимся обывателемъ и каждому, кому бы колвекъ о томъ вѣдати належало, симъ унѣверсаломъ нашимъ озмаймуемъ [sic], ижъ панъ Денисъ Деркачъ, сотникъ бобновскіи просилъ нашего такого респекту, абисмо къ вспартю домовихъ его потребъ надали ему село Сушку в полку Переяславкомъ в сотнѣ Бубновской знайдующоеся. Мы прето гетманъ и кавалеръ респектуючи на роненые его и теперъ ронячіеся в Войску Запорожскомъ услуги, а и впредъ до оныхъ заохочуючи, а до того углядаючи и на тое, что онъ панъ сотникъ бубновскіи чрезъ певное

время неволю швецкую терпѣль и тымъ самымъ до крайнего на субстанціи своей пришлоъ знищеня, надаемъ ему, пану Денису, сотникови бубновскому преречное село Сушки в зуполную поссесію зъ всѣми кгрунтами, добрами и угодіями здавна и тепер [sic] туда приналежащими, позволяючи *от* людей посполитих [sic] належитое послушенство и повинности аз [sic] грунтовъ и добръ тамошних [sic] користи всякіе и пожитки *отбирати*, за чимъ абы панъ полковникъ переяславскій, тепер наказный, а впредъ совершенный, старшина полковая, сотники и нихто згола, не важился, ему пану Деркачу, в том жадной чинити перешкоды, пиано приказуем и грозно варуем, войт зась тамошній съ посолствомъ, опрочъ самих козаковъ (?),¹² повинны въсей послушенство и повинности ему, п. Деркачу, *отдавать* [sic].

Данъ в Бѣлой Церкви, апреля 20, року 1708.

Звишѣменованный гетманъ и кавалер, рукою власною.¹³

Basically, the two documents—both editions are based on original documents—are written in the same language. It is the typical Ukrainian chancery language of the period, with its significant amount of genuinely Polish elements and lexical loans from Latin (mostly via Polish), but still almost no loans from Russian. The substance of this language is clearly Ukrainian with some elements of a North Ukrainian dialectal character, both in terms of phonology and inflectional morphology.

The following phonological and orthographic features make the text typically Ukrainian:

- The treatment of etymological *ě*, which is usually used etymologically correctly, but is sometimes confused with *y*: 1687: *суди* (dative singular) or *ѣ* for etymological *i* in *унѣверсаломъ*; as is typical of North Ukrainian dialects, *ě* appears as *e* only in unstressed syllables, as in *на рецѣ* along with *на рѣчцѣ* // 1708: *унѣверсаломъ*; see also в Бѣлой Церкви (the noun is probably formed from the nominative form *церква*, so *-и* is likely to be the reflex of *ѣ* here);
- The mixing of *и* and *ы*: *млыновъ*, *обытелѣ*, *Звишѣ*, *Густинскому* along with *Густынского*, *прыказуем*, *розмѣрових*, *бывшихъ*, *будучым*, *приходячыхъ*; 1708: *користи*, *Звишѣменованный*, *абисмо*, *домовихъ*, *посполитихъ*;
- The reflex *C(C)ʹV < *CьjV*: 1687: *вспартя* (genitive singular); 1708: *вспартю* (dative singular), *знищеня* (genitive singular), but 1708 with the Church Slavonic reflex: *угодіями*;
- The treatment of **jъzъ* and *sъ*: 1687: *з млыновъ*, *з мужицкого*, *з ступами*, *из* [= *із* or *і з*? — ММ] *всѣм законником*, *з старшины* и *чернѣ*, *зоставали*;

- 1708: зъ всѣми кгрунтами, знищеня (genitive singular), знайдуючимъся, знайдуючоеся, згола, зуполную;
- The loss of *jъ-: 1687: мѣти, мененного, з помененных, менованый; 1708: Звишъменованный;
 - The spelling “о” after sibilants: 1687: Божой (genitive singular feminine); 1708: Пресвѣтлѣйшого, державнѣйшого, нашего, знайдуючоеся;
 - The hardening of *r*, which is typical of North Ukrainian (and partially Southwest Ukrainian), but not Southeast Ukrainian dialects: 1687: манастира, 1708: теперь, but: 1708: государя;
 - The spelling “що”: 1687: щоденных; but 1708: что;
 - The spelling “оа-”: 1687: одавали (in this case the Russian pronunciation rules could also have yielded the spelling “а” due to the regressive assimilation of дав-;
 - The spelling “менш-” (not меньш-): 1708: меншимъ;
 - The spelling “кг-”: 1708: кгрунтами; but 1708: грунтовъ;
 - The spelling “запорозским, запорозского” instead of etymologically oriented запорожского, which would have been preferred in the Russian documents of the time.

As for morphology, the following elements are noteworthy:

- The frequent use of the dative ending -ови with masculine nouns: 1687: полковникови, манастиреви, войтови, et al.; 1708: полковникови, сотникови;
- The hard stem in всегдашних;
- The soft-stem masculine locative ending -[u] in в отбѣраню;
- The conjugation of хотѣти: 1687: хочем;
- The personal endings in past tense and conditional forms of the verb: 1708: абисмо [...] надали;
- The instrumental singular form тымъ: 1708: тымъ;
- The instrumental singular form чимъ: 1708: чимъ;
- The inflectional form двохъ: 1687: о двох каменях, о двохъ каменях, двохъ частей.

At the syntactic level, the noun phrase *о* + locative case with a qualitative meaning, which is typical of older Ukrainian (and Polish) sources, is noteworthy (о двох каменях).

Only a few elements come into play if the question of a possible impact of the Russian tradition is raised. In the universal of 1687 it is virtually only the Church Slavonic form владѣти, which is not typical of older Ukrainian chancery texts,¹⁴ but is widespread in Middle Russian secular sources; in the universal of 1708 it is the Church Slavonic form время (which is combined

in one nominal phrase with the Polonism певное) and, as another Church Slavonic form, совершенный. None of these elements is genuinely Russian,¹⁵ and all of them were well known from the Ukrainian Church Slavonic traditions. Still, Church Slavonic does not play a particularly important role in these or any other universals from Mazepa's chancery. Even in the tsar's epithets the adjectival ending of the genitive masculine singular quite consistently reads -oro in the original documents, not -аго (ихъ царского пресвѣтлаго величества, Пресвѣтлѣйшого и державнѣйшого великого государя его царского величества).

On the other hand, genuinely Polish elements occur in both texts rather frequently. To name only those that are phonologically marked (markers are emphasized without comments):

1687: колвекъ, **вспартя**, **варуемъ**, **вшелякое**, **вшеляких**, **ведлугъ**, **теды**,
перешкода, **пререченого**, **власною** [from Czech]; adverbs in -е:
меновите, **ненарушне**.

1708: колвекъ, **вспартю**, **варуем**, **певное**, **перешкоды**, **впредъ** (cf. Polish *wprzód*), **пререченое**, **власною** [via Polish from Czech], **кгрунтами**.

Functional words often coincide with their Polish equivalents, too: the conjunctions **ижъ**, **же**, **жебы**, and the negative pronoun **жадная** in the document of 1687 or the conjunction **ижъ** (along with **что**), the coordinative causal conjunction **прето**, the negative pronoun **жадной** and the particle **засъ** in the universal of 1708.

Both universals are, to wit, perfectly representative for the whole corpus of Ivan Mazepa's universals, which continued the Hetmanate's linguistic traditions without any disruption.

TWO EARLY LETTERS TO MUSCOVITE ADDRESSEES

The status of the Hetmanate as a Muscovite protectorate had already been established for more than three decades when Ivan Mazepa became hetman, but the Hetmanate's chancery still did not compose its letters to Muscovites in Russian. In fact, a crucial caveat must be added here. Both earlier and more recent editions contain a lot of Russian documents that were issued by Mazepa, but a closer look reveals that virtually all these texts are mere translations. Very often they are introduced by remarks, such as "Во „в-м“ квеликимъ гсѣремъ / гетманскомъ листѣ поимя / нованіи їтитлахъ написано"¹⁶ or "список с листа белоруского письма,"¹⁷ and a comparative look at the language of these "списки" and other documents makes it clear that "список" does not mean "copy" here but "translation."¹⁸

The following two letters to Muscovite addressees are apparently based on original documents.¹⁹ The first letter was written by Mazepa to Count Vasili Golitsyn in Baturyn on 10 January 1689:

Божією милостію пресвѣтлѣйшихъ и державнѣйшихъ великихъ государей царей и великихъ князей Іоанна Алексѣевича Петра Алексѣевича и великіа государини благовѣрніа царевны и великіа княжны Софіи Алексѣвны, всея Великія и Малія и Бѣлыя Россіи самодержцевъ, и многихъ государствъ и земель восточныхъ и западныхъ и сѣверныхъ отчичей и дѣдичей и наслѣдниковъ и государей и обладателей ихъ царского пресвѣтлого величества ближнему боярину и Большого полку дворовому воеводѣ, ясневелможному князю Василію Васи́лєвичу Голицину, царственніа болшія печати и государственныхъ великихъ и посолскихъ дѣлъ оберегателю, и намѣстнику новгородскому, моему велце ласкавому господину, приятелеви и милостивому благодѣтелеви, низкое мое засылаю чолобитъе.

Толмача сѣвского Диниса Лихининиа по указу великихъ государей и великое государини, сполне з толмачомъ *отъ* мене з Переволочной вынайденымъ до Криму посланого, и в Казикерменѣ через беа казикерманского насилно назад заверненого, и ко мнѣ в Батуринъ генвара 8 прибылого отпустилѣмъ я к царствующому великому граду Москвѣ з листом моимъ до ихъ царского пресвѣтлого величества, о насилномъ заверненію ихъ писаномъ, з которого листа все мое донесеніе вашей княжой велможности вѣдомо будет. А же тот толмач Денисъ Лихининъ а з ним и *от* мене выправованный другий толмач в Кримъ проѣхати не возмогли, и способъ тот о провѣдованніи [*sic*] крымского поведенія не восприялъ желаемого совершенства; тебѣ развѣ з языковъ, якихъ Господь Богъ подати намъ изволилъ поведеніе и намѣреніе неприятельское вѣдомо будетъ, о якіе языки я ватагу полевому Іосипу Куликови з великимъ прилежаніемъ старатися приказалѣмъ; и вперед всяко кому годно приказу. При семъ отдаюся милостивой вашей княжой велможности благодѣтельской ласце.

З Батурина генвара 10 року 1689.

Вашой княжой велможности зычливый всего добра приятел и низкий слуга

Іванъ Мазепа гетман Войска ихъ царского [*sic*] пресвѣтлого величества Запорозкого.²⁰

The second letter is dated the very same day and was addressed to the Russian tsars, Ivan and Peter Alekseevich, and Tsarina Sophia Alekseevna:

Божією милостію пресвѣтлѣйшимъ и державнѣйшимъ великимъ государемъ царемъ и великимъ княземъ Іоанну Алексѣевичю, Петру Алексѣевичю, и великой государынѣ благовѣрной царевнѣ, и великой княжнѣ Софіи Алексѣевнѣ, всеа Великія и Малыя и Бѣлыя Россіи самодержцемъ, московскимъ, киевскимъ, владимѣрскимъ, новгородскимъ, царемъ казанъскимъ, царемъ астраханъскимъ, царемъ сибѣрскимъ, государемъ псковскимъ, и великимъ княземъ литовскимъ, смоленъскимъ, тверскимъ, волынъскимъ, подолскимъ, югорскимъ, пермскимъ, вятцкимъ, болгарскимъ и иныхъ, государемъ и великимъ княземъ Новгорода низовскіе земли, чернѣговскимъ, резанъскимъ, полотцкимъ, ростовскимъ, ярославскимъ, белоозерскимъ, удорскимъ, обдорскимъ, коньдѣйскимъ, витепскимъ, мстиславскимъ и всея сѣверныя страны повелителемъ и государемъ иверскія земли, карталинскихъ и кгрузинскихъ царей и кабардинское земли, черкаскихъ и горскихъ князей и иныхъ многихъ государствъ и земель восточныхъ, и западныхъ, и сѣверныхъ отчичемъ и дѣдичемъ, и наслѣдникомъ, и государемъ, и обладаателемъ, вашему царскому пресвѣтлому величеству.

Іванъ Мазепа гетманъ з Войскомъ вашего царского пресвѣтлого величества Запорожскимъ падъ до лица земного предъ пресвѣтлымъ вашему царскому величества маестатомъ, у стопы ногъ монаршихъ смиренно челомъ бю. По преможномъ вашомъ царского пресвѣтлого величества указу, яко я первѣе по предложенію ближнего боярина и Большого полку дворового воеводы ясневелможного его милости князя Василія Василіевича Голицына, царственныя болшіе печати и государственныхъ великихъ и поселскихъ дѣлъ оберегателя и намѣстника новгородского, по вѣрной моей ку вамъ великимъ государемъ и великой государынѣ службѣ прилѣжное мое прикладаю старанье, о высланію в Крымъ такового посыщика, который бы о всякомъ тамошнемъ повоженію вывѣдаться могъ: якожь тимъ моимъ прилѣжнымъ стараньемъ и вынашол и высалъ былъ толмача Данила переволочанъского который до такого дѣла былъ способенъ; такъ и потомъ по милостивой вашей царского пресвѣтлого величества грамотѣ з присланнымъ з Сѣвска толмачемъ Денисомъ Лихининымъ, тоежь мое ложилемъ прилѣжное старанье: же оного переволочанъского толмача в одностайную посылку совокупивши выправилемъ былъ обоихъ оныхъ до Сѣчи Запорозкой, якожь власне на Сѣчь а некуда инуда тотъ путь надлежитъ, и писалемъ до атамана кошового, и до всего Низового Войска, пилно вашимъ царского величества монаршимъ указомъ приказуючи, абы они з Сѣчи ихъ обоихъ толмачовъ выслали до Казикермена, и жебы от себе писали до бея казикерменъского, чтобъ бей ихъ толмачовъ

не задержавши, пропустил до Перекопу и внутрь Крыму. Где атаманъ кошовый и Войско Низовое (любю нѣкоторые тамъ же упорными голосами своими в томъ перешкожали:) ихъ толмачовъ з Сѣчи Запорожкой до Казикермену порядне при провожатыхъ отпустили и до бея казикерменъского о отпускъ оныхъ до Крыму писали. Которыи толмачѣ когда прибыли до Казикермену, и дѣло свое о иску и розмѣне и окупѣ неволниковъ объявили, тебѣ тотъ бей казикерменъский списавшись о томъ з беемъ перекопскимъ, не допустилъ имъ толмачамъ ехати в Крымъ но насилно ихъ завернулъ назадъ до Сѣчи, отколь атаманъ кошовый и Низовое Войско отпустили ихъ в города малоросійскіе и прибыли они толмачѣ в Батуринъ генваря 8 числа, где о своемъ поездѣ и о насилномъ з Казикермена поворотѣ такъ словесно сказали, яко вышей тутъ написалося. Я тебѣ толмача сѣвского Дениса Ликонина з симъ листомъ моимъ для повнѣйшого и обширнѣйшого о томъ донесенія к вамъ великимъ государемъ и великой государынѣ отпускаячи листъ от атамана кошового ко мнѣ о поворотѣ ихъ толмачовъ писанный, и листъ бея казикерменъского на Запорожье писанный, и з Запорожя з ними ж толмачами ко мнѣ присланный, в приказ Малыя Россіи посылаю: и при семъ яко найпокорнѣй отдаю мене премилосердной вашего царского пресвѣтлого величества благодѣтели. З Батурина генваря 10 року 1689.

Вашего царского пресвѣтлого величества вѣрный подданный и
наинижайший слуга,

Іванъ Мазепа гетманъ Войска вашего царского пресвѣтлого
величества Запорозкого.²¹

It is immediately clear that the language of both documents is still very different from the Russian chancery language of the time. But what makes these documents typically Ukrainian?

In trying to answer this question, one should certainly not focus on the introductory or closing parts, with their Church Slavonic-based official epithets and titles of the tsars, which were clearly adopted from Russian. It is noteworthy, however, that typically Ukrainian traits can be found even in these formulae. Thus, the letter to Golitsyn features the spelling *ї* and *и* instead of *ы* in *государини*, *благовѣрніа*, *Малія*; in the remainder of the address, the spelling *ы* instead of *и* in *печаты*; the spelling *о* after the sibilant in *чолобитъ*; the hard stem in *ближнему*, the dative singular ending in *приятелеви* and *благодѣтелеви*; and the typically Ukrainian epithets *ясневелможному* (with the interfix *-е-*, not *-о-*), *велце ласкавому* (in combination with the Russian form of address *господину*), and *милостивому* (in the secular sense, in combination with the lexical neutral noun, *приятелеви*, and the Church Slavonic

form *благодѣтелеви*). In the address of the letter to the tsars and the tsarina, toponyms are spelled with an *e* instead of an *и* in *владимерскимъ*, *ѣ* instead of *и* in *сибѣрскимъ* and *чернѣговскимъ*, and *кг* in *кгрзуинѣскихъ*, whereas the spelling of *e* and not *о* after the sibilant in *вашему*, *челомъ* (*бю*) and *вашего* and particularly the adjectival ending of the genitive singular feminine *-ья* confirm the considerable Slavonicization of this part (cf. also the etymological spelling of *Запорожскимъ*).

The closing paragraph of the letter to Vasilii Golitsyn is also written in keeping with Ukrainian traditions: *при семъ отдаюся милостивою вашою княжою велможности благодѣтелскою ласце* (with the North Ukrainian *-e* as a reflex of *ě* in the unstressed ending). The rendering of place and time in the subscription shows *з < *ъзъ* in *з Батурина*, again *генвара* with hardened *r* and the markedly Ukrainian form *поку*, while in his signature Mazepa uses the typically Ukrainian adjective *зычливый* and the phonetically oriented spelling *Запорозкого*. In the closing paragraph of the letter to the tsars, the *e* after the sibilant is again encountered in *вашего* (*царского пресвѣтлаго величества*), while the Ukrainian background of the text is confirmed by the spelling *благостинѣ* (dative singular) with *и* instead of *ы*, although this is again only an orthographic peculiarity, while place and time in the subscription are also clearly rendered in Ukrainian with *з < *ъзъ* in *з Батурина* and the Ukrainian form *поку* (this time *генваря* does not show hardened *r*). Instead of *зычливый* всего добра приятел и низкий слуга in the signature of the letter to Golitsyn, whom Mazepa obviously regarded as an equal, one now finds the particularly humble *вѣрный подданный и найнижайший слуга*, whereas *запорозкого* is now surprisingly written according to phonetics, as opposed to the above-mentioned spelling of *Запорожскимъ* in the address.

The narrative parts of the two letters are much less bound to formal prescriptions. The letter to Golitsyn is characterized by numerous markedly Ukrainian features. The following spellings are of interest: *и* instead of *ы* in *государини* and *Кримъ*, *Криму*, *кримѣского*, *и* instead of unstressed *e* in *Диниса* (along with *Денисѣ*), *о* after sibilants in *царствующему*, *вашою*, *княжою*, *з толмачомъ*, hardened *r* in *генвара*, *з (< *ъзъ)* in *з языковъ* and *з которого листа* as well as *з (< съ)* in front of vowels, voiceless consonants, or sonorants, as in *з Переволочною* (*съ* + genitive case), *з великимъ прилежаніемъ*, *з листомъ*, *з нимъ*. As for inflectional morphology, the following elements are noteworthy: the personal endings in the past tense forms as in *отпустилемъ* and *приказалемъ*; the dative ending in *Куликови*; the locative ending in *-[u]* with a soft-stem neuter noun, as in *о насилномъ заверненю*; and the genitive feminine singular ending of the adjective in *великое* and the genitive form of the personal pronoun *мене*. Two prepositional phrases are of syntactic interest: the Ukrainian *до* with the genitive case in a directional, non-terminative meaning, as in *до Криму посыланого* or *отпустилемъ...до*

их царского пресвѣтлого величества, and the Ukrainian черезъ with the accusative for the expression of agency, as in черезъ бея казикерманского насилно назадъ заверненого.²²

Several lexical elements, some of which are genuinely Polish, confirm the Ukrainian character of the letter to Golitsyn, such as the form of address велможности (dative singular) and the lexemes сполне (note the adverbial -е), вынайденымъ, выправованыи, листъ) (з листом, з которого листа), способъ (which functioned as a quite recent loan from Polish and Ruthenian also in the Russian language of the time), the relative pronoun якій (якіе, яких), and the conjunction же and its markedly Polish correlative element тедаы.

The letter to Golitsyn also contains a few elements that are likely to have been adopted from Russian and Russian Church Slavonic. Apart from the above-mentioned titles and epithets, it is the construction по указу великихъ государей и великое государини with Russian указъ (the word is not attested in *SSUM* or Тум) and the local adverbial к царствующему великому граду Москвѣ with the Slavonic participle and the Slavonic metathesis in граду, whereby it is noteworthy that both phrases immediately refer to elements of Muscovite rule, either to the tsars themselves or to their residence. But more Church Slavonic elements are encountered in the text: возмогли, восприялъ, and совершенства, with the vowel in the prefix according to the rules of the Second South Slavic Influence; the spelling -іа in поведеніа, also according to the rules of the Second South Slavic Influence; the form извоилиъ with the Church Slavonic prefix из- (which probably cannot be interpreted as з with a prothetic i- here; cf. Polish *zwolic*); the present passive participle желаемого (ending in -оро, not -аро, though); the form развѣ with Church Slavonic раз- instead of the North Slavic (including East Slavic) поз-; and, finally, the spelling forms with the Church Slavonic і from the *CьjV- group in поведеніе, намѣреніе and прилежаніемъ. At the same time, no markedly Russian elements, such as the spelling ево instead of еро, the adjectival ending -ой in the nominative masculine singular, etc., occur in documents like these.

The narrative part of the letter to Ivan and Peter Alekseevich and to Tsarina Sophia Alekseevna (*ML*, 271–73) is basically written in Ukrainian, too, as attested by the following orthographic and phonological elements: и for ы in в Кримъ, упорними and тимъ (rather [tɨm] than [tim] < тѣмъ); е for unstressed и in некуда; ѣ for і in толмачѣ (several times); and е for ѣ only in an unstressed position, as in о [...] розмѣне or after j, as in ехати, о своемъ поездѣ,²³ о after sibilants, as in вашомъ, вашой, кошовый, кошового, толмачовъ, повнѣйшого и обширнѣйшого, вынашол (although о was often written phonetically in this last position in Middle Russian, too), з < *jъzъ in з Сѣвска, з Сѣчи (several times), з Казикермена, as well as з for съ in front of voiceless vowels and sonorants, as in з присланнымъ [...] толмачемъ, з симъ листомъ, з ними; finally, hardened r in внутръ, but retained soft r' in

генваря. Even *v* for etymological *l* occurs in the spelling of повнѣйшого. East Slavic continuants of the **CьjV*- group are reflected in the spellings старанѣ, Запорожѣ, донесенѣя (genitive singular), по предложенѣю, о высланѣю, о [...] повоженѣю, старанѣмъ; the typically Ukrainian spelling is encountered in з Запорожя, while the Church Slavonic reflex *i* occurs exclusively in the Russian name Василѣя Василѣевича. The word где is written with -е, not -ѣ. The following morphological features are noteworthy: the locative ending -и of the soft neuter stem in о высланѣю and о...повоженѣю (some hard-stem masculine nouns show the locative singular ending -и; cf. о иску with a velar consonant and о...окупѣ in the same syntagm);²⁴ the short adjectival form способенѣ in the predicate (which was in general already quite rarely used in Late Middle Ukrainian texts); the comparative form вышей;²⁵ the forms of the personal pronouns мене and себе; the long neuter form of the pronoun тое(жѣ) and its instrumental form тимѣ [tym]; the personal form in past tense verbs, as in прикладаемѣ, ложишемѣ, виправишемѣ былѣ, писалимѣ, etc.; and the remote past tense form, as in вынашол и выслаалѣ былѣ and виправишемѣ былѣ. Two prepositional constructions are noteworthy at the syntactic level: the frequent non-limitative до + genitive, as encountered in до такого дѣла былѣ способенѣ, писалимѣ до атамана кошового and виправишемѣ былѣ обоихѣ оныхѣ до Сѣчи Запорозкой, и до всего Низового Войска, as well as о + accusative case with the meaning of topic, as in до бея казикарменѣского о отпускѣ оныхѣ до Криму писали.

A number of lexemes are characteristic of the Ukrainian (and often Polish) traditions, such as: преможномѣ (locative singular masculine); the title ясневелможного его милости (genitive singular) and the epithet милостивой (genitive singular feminine); and о...повоженѣю, вывѣдатися, вынашол, способенѣ (cf. the remark for способѣ above), одностайную, виправишемѣ, пишно, перешкожали, неволниковѣ, листѣ, обширнѣйшого, донесенѣя. Markedly Polish forms are поселскихѣ (дѣлѣ) (genitive plural, along with посыщика, посылку, cf. посолскихѣ дѣлѣ in the letter to Vasili Golitsyn), теда, and ку. Along with the genuinely Czech Polonism власне, порядне is encountered as another adverb ending in -е. The conjunction яко(жѣ) seems to be rather based on the Polish *jako(ż)* than on Church Slavonic яко (же) here, and the use of the conjunction любо corresponds rather to that of the older Polish form *lubo* than with the older Russian любо. The genuinely Polish conjunctions же and жебы occur along with абы, which was also used in Polish, but not in Russian, and чтобѣ, which was encountered in Ukrainian as well as in Russian. Finally, the noun искѣ as in о иску might be a loan from Russian (there is no entry for искѣ or even поискѣ in *SSUM* or *Tym*).

Russian and Church Slavonic elements occur sporadically in the narrative part of the letters to the tsars. Along with the already encountered titles, the syntagm царственѣные болшие печати from Vasili Golitsyn's title with the

Slavonicizing adjectival ending -ые (but not -ья) and в приказ Малыя Россіи, with the Church Slavonic ending -ья, are noteworthy, but these forms are quotations of Russian terms. More interesting are the verb совокупивши, which is marked as a Church Slavonic form by the vowels in the prefixes according to the rules of the Second South Slavic Influence, and the form of the conjunction когда, which was (and still is) widely used in Russian, but not in Ukrainian. The lexeme посьищика (genitive singular) is likely another genuinely Russian form. Finally, not only the lexeme указ(ъ), but also the prepositional phrase по преможномъ вашомъ царского пресвѣтлого величества указу are probably based on the model of Russian.²⁶

Apart from the adoption of some ready-made formulae and isolated lexemes of the Russian chancery practice both letters are, however, still virtually unaffected by the official language varieties of their Muscovite addressees.

LATER LETTERS TO MUSCOVITE ADDRESSEES

As evidenced, e.g., by Tatiana Tairova-Iakovleva's original-based edition of Ivan Mazepa's letters to Aleksandr Menshikov from the years 1704 and 1705, the language of the letters to Muscovite addressees remained basically the same.²⁷ Elements of Russian or Church Slavonic still occur only sporadically in typically Ukrainian texts of the time. Especially as regards the letters to the tsars—or, since 1696, to Tsar Peter alone—most of the documents that can be found in the editions are still not based on original texts from the Hetmanate but on their translations into the Russian chancery language.²⁸ This confirms, first and foremost, that Mazepa's letters to the tsars were still written in a language that was alien to Muscovites and which usually had to be translated.

On the other hand, those few editions that seem to be based on the original documents demonstrate that the language of Mazepa's letters to the tsars changed right on the eve of Poltava. The following letter, from a collection of copies of originals that once belonged to the historian and writer Orest Levyts'kyi, was written in September 1706. Although the edited version is thus not immediately based on the original text, it is representative of a number of Mazepa's letters to Peter I from the latter years of his hetmancy:

Пресвѣтлѣйшій Державнѣйшій / Великій Государь.

Неточію веселыми устами, но ѣ сердцемъ идушею / радостно цѣлую богомъ украшенный, восвояси воз/вратившийся, ваши Ц. Пр. В. монаршіи стопы, / которій ради предидушей славы и помножения / всему православному російскому государству / пожитку, и далечайшіи страны земнымъ / и воднымъ путемъ влеій [*sic*, for *велій*? —ММ] подаша трудъ, все/сердечною убо подданскою вѣрностію,

благопривѣт/ствую вамъ велик. го́сдрю В. Ц. Пр. В. премилос/
тивѣйшому моему собладателю, того щасли/вого иблагополучного,
на свои высокіи ипреславныи / монаршии престолы возвращенія; и
желаю все/цѣло истиннымъ рабскимъ желаніемъ дабы вы / великій
государь благосердый ипремудрый Монарха / въпремногіи лѣта,
благодатію божіею, добре здравствовали // и благополучное вовесть
преславного ибогохрани/мого своего царствія имѣли правленіе.

Покорственно осемь вамъ В. Г. доношу, же по/милостивомъ
вашемъ Ц. Пр. В. указу, посылалъ / янарочно человека [*sic*] своего въ
Мулянтскую и / Волоскую землю, для досмотрѣнія при берегу Чор/
ного моря приличныхъ пристанищъ и сладкихъ водъ, / который
черезъ немалое бытія своего время, добре / положенія краевъ
тамошнихъ досмот/рѣвшись, возвратился назадъ, и отповѣдалъ /
мнѣ, гдѣ есть отъ гирла Дунайского, до устья рѣки / Днѣстра, а отъ
того устья до рѣки Богу и до самого / Днѣпровского Лиману, таковыи
утого Чорного мо/ря пристанища и сладкіи воды. Также и зем/нымъ
путемъ чрезъ увесь Буджакъ къ Волоской и / Мулянтской землѣмъ,
гдѣ обрѣтаются выгодыи / станы иночлеги. Которого человека любо
на/лежало мнѣ послати въ царствующій градъ / Москву однако тую
оного посылку отложилемъ // радитого же владѣтеля Мулянтскій по
моему / предложенію тамошнихъ странъ искуного [*sic*, for *искусного*?
—ММ] и во всемъ / того морского состоянія вѣдомого квамъ В. Г.: /
выправилъ человека, который отихъ всѣхъ до извѣстія надобныхъ
вещехъ достаточные вамъ / В. Г. донести можетъ. А якии тотъ мой
по/сылный человекъ принеслъ мнѣ от владѣтеля мул/тянского
письма, тыи я тутже посылаю / квамъ В. Г. его же премилосердно
монаршой / благодѣи въспокорно мя вручаю.

В. Ц. Пр. В. / вѣрный подданный / и нижайшій слуга / Иванъ
Мазепа Гетманъ.

зъ Батурина септемврій.²⁹

It is obvious at first glance that this language is much closer to Late Church Slavonic than the language of any other text that we have analyzed up to now, as confirmed by the heavy use of forms like имѣли (not мѣли), точію, возвращенія (accusative plural), благопривѣт/ствую, здравствовали, богохрани/мого (but still not -aro), обрѣтаются, дабы, the aorist подаша, etc. Owing to the archaic character of the language, it is reasonable to assume that the prevailing conservative orthography of the edited text widely corresponds to the original. Some deviations are, perhaps, more questionable, but the spelling щасли/вого is very well known from the East Slavic and, in particular, the Ukrainian traditions. The spellings of человека and владѣтель might be explained as a Ukrainian-based rendering of и for ѣ, and the spelling

of увесь is also well attested in Late Middle Ukrainian (cf. the Modern Standard Ukrainian увесь), while other spellings, such as премилос/тивѣйшому and монаршой or положеня and устя (2x) have already been encountered in the above-cited documents.³⁰ A number of word forms seem to confirm that we are dealing with a text that was originally written by a Ukrainian: cf., inter alia, пожитку (genitive singular), Монарха (nominative singular, cf. Polish *monarcha*), выгодыи, належало;³¹ the twice-occurring adverb добе (ending in -e); the locative ending -и after the velar consonant in бреры (instead of брезѣ); the pronominal forms тыи, тую and тихъ; the pronoun якии; the use of the non-limitative до in о всѣхъ до извѣстія надобныхъ вещей; the twice-occurring conjunction (not particle!) же and the past tense form отложилемъ with the personal ending; and, finally, the rendering of the place of origin in this letter as зъ Батурина.

Owing to the unfortunate fact that the history of this text is not entirely clear, one might still be tempted to question its authenticity, and the fact that Mazepa's later letters to Tsar Peter are still marked as translations (cf. "Квеликому гѣдрю влиств гетман ікавалера / івана степановича мазепы / ...написано," *ES*, 149) might even confirm these doubts. It should be noted, however, that the language of this document is very far from the typical language of the translations, which reveal only comparatively few residua from the Ukrainian originals and are not characterized by such a strong and rather archaic Church Slavonic layer. Moreover, the language of the September 1706 letter does not stand alone in the corpus of Ivan Mazepa's official documents. In Serhii Pavlenko's collection of documents from the period of Ivan Mazepa's hetmancy (*DM*) one finds more letters with a similar language, both letters to Muscovite officials of more or less equal status, e.g., letters to Gavriil Golovkin (23 April 1706, etc.), Vasili Dolgorukii (4 February 1707), or Aleksandr Men-shikov (30 January 1708, etc.) (all in *DM*, 222–48), and letters to Peter I dated 11 February 1706 (*DM*, 221–22), 22 April 1706 (*DM*, 223–24), 23 September 1706 (*DM*, 224–25), 24 February 1708 (*DM*, 233–34), and 9 March 2008 (*DM*, 237). Some of the letters to Peter, particularly those dealing with the affair of Vasyľ Kochubei and Ivan Iskra, are written in an even more archaized Church Slavonic language, as represented by a letter dated 30 April 1708 (*DM*, 238–39) and another one bearing the date of 16 July 1708 (*DM*, 243–44). Although both letters are based on clearly unreliable editions, the following fragments with their particularly archaic forms, such as поверг (as a past active participle), ущедрaеши, нетребѣ, еже, видѣста, воспріяша, etc. give a fairly good impression of the language that was actually used in these texts:

Божією милостію Пресвѣтлѣйшему и Державнѣйшему Великому
Государю, Царю и Великому Князю Петру Алексѣевичу, всеа Великія
и Малыя и Бѣлыя Россіи Самодержцу, и прочая.

Иван Мазепа, гетман и кавалер з Войском Вашего Царского Величества поверг себѣ пред Пресвѣтлѣйшим Вашего Царского Величества маестатом, у стопи ног монарших смиренно челом бію. На праведном мѣрилѣ высокодержавною своею десницею содершишъ, Ваше Царское Величество, милость [*sic*] и суд, когда правдою себѣ служащих и вѣрно работающих милуеши и ущедреаши, неправеднѣ же напаствующих и клеветующих лжу судиши и отмщаеши [...] Нетребѣ мнѣ здѣ, ко утверждѣнію того, еже пишу, искати многих доводов, видѣста бо очи мои, како Ваше Царское Величество [...] праведным своим судом смирил клеветником моих, Кочубѣя и Искру [...] воспріяша по дѣлом своим смертнѹ кончину [...].³²

It can thus be observed that around 1706 the language of Ivan Mazepa's correspondence with Muscovites changed significantly, inasmuch as at least in some letters it was increasingly Slavonicized. One might ask, therefore, what happened in Mazepa's chancery in 1706, and then find that something substantial changed precisely that year, namely, that Pylyp Orlyk was appointed as Ivan Mazepa's new general chancellor (*heneral'nyj pysar*).³³ The later hetman, who in this function was responsible for the hetman's internal and external correspondence as well as for the universals,³⁴ had not only studied at the Kyiv Mohyla College, but also worked for some time as a secretary of the consistory of the Kyiv metropol, where he must have acquired considerable experience in corresponding in Church Slavonic with the church authorities of Muscovy. Obviously, Orlyk subsequently transferred this ecclesiastical practice into the Hetmanate's secular correspondence with Muscovites, whereas the internal official language of the Hetmanate remained widely untouched by this development. Orlyk's famous letter to Stefan Iavors'kyi of 1 (12) June 1721,³⁵ which was written in a very similar, archaizing Church Slavonic language, substantially supports our thesis.

CONCLUSIONS

As an analysis of Ivan Mazepa's universals demonstrates (and as a study of his letters to Ukrainian addressees would confirm), Ukrainian remained widely intact as a language of internal administration until the end of Mazepa's hetmanacy. Letters to Muscovites were usually written in essentially the same Late Middle Ukrainian language and then translated into the Russian chancery language of the period by translators on the Muscovite side. Although the accessibility of reliable source materials is still not satisfactory and our picture must therefore remain rather tentative, it seems that a shift occurred in the practice of the Hetmanate's correspondence with Muscovy only in 1706. At

the time that Orlyk became Mazepa's general chancellor, letters to Muscovite authorities were increasingly composed in Late Church Slavonic, while other documents were still written in a language that had to be translated in Muscovy "from the Belarusian script"—that is, from Ukrainian. It thus appears that not only in the sphere of ecclesiastically oriented high culture but also in the sphere of official secular correspondence it was Late Church Slavonic—and not the Russian chancery language—which Ukrainians initially regarded as the primary source for a common language with the Muscovites, despite the fact that numerous loans from Ukrainian and Belarusian, most of which were of Polish or Western European origin, increasingly entered the Russian language during the second half of the seventeenth century and the beginning of the eighteenth.³⁶

The Hetmanate and its linguistic practices underwent substantial changes in the decades after the Battle of Poltava, when the Ukrainian language temporarily lost its century-old functions as an official language, while Modern Standard Russian evolved and spread throughout the elites of the empire, including those of Ukraine. Generations later, however, when late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century awakeners began to reestablish the functionality of Ukrainian in the sphere of administration, they were able to do this in full awareness of the former status of their language, a status that had been fully granted for the last time during the hetmancy of Ivan Mazepa.

NOTES

1. See, e.g., V. M. Rusanivs'kyi, *Istoriia ukrains'koï movy* (Kyiv, 2001), 90; and the scarce information in V. A. Peredriienko, *Formuvannia ukrains'koï literaturnoi movy XVIII st. na narodnii osnovi* (Kyiv, 1979), 55–56.
2. See George Y. Shevelov, *A Historical Phonology of the Ukrainian Language* (Heidelberg, 1979), 570: "The prestige of the P language in those areas which severed their political ties with Poland was not undermined. P was continuously used in writing, often even by the Orthodox high clergy (e.g., Lazar Baranovyč, and Polonisms were still fashionable in the language written and spoken by the educated. The main novelties were twofold: the vernacular...was broadly reintroduced in the records of the local and central government, often comprising features of local dialects.... The second novelty was increased contacts with R[ussian]."
3. Tat'iana Tairova-Iakovleva, *Mazepa* (Moscow, 2007), 15–16. Orest Subtelny's edition of Ivan Mazepa's letters to Adam Sieniawski gives a good impression of Mazepa's command of Polish and Latin. O. Subtelny, ed., *On the Eve of Poltava: The Letters of Mazepa to Adam Sieniawski, 1704–1708* (New York, 1975).
4. Oleksander Ohloblyn, "Mazepa, Ivan," *Encyclopedia of Ukraine: The Internet Encyclopedia of Ukraine*, <http://www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/pages/M/A/MazepaIvan.htm>, updated 2008.

5. "Він знав кілька мов (крім польської, московської й татарської мов, він володів латинською, італійською, німецькою й знав французьку)." Oleksander Ohloblyn, *Het' man Ivan Mazepa ta ioho doba* (New York, Paris, Toronto, 1960), 19; also available online: <http://litopys.org.ua/coss3/ohl06.htm> (accessed 23 February 2012); http://ukrainaforever.narod.ru/mazepa_ogloblin1.htm (accessed 23 February 2012).
6. Tairova-Iakovleva, *Mazepa*, 15–16.
7. The abbreviations given here refer to the following sources: *HU: Universalnyi ukrains'kykh het' maniv vid Ivana Vyhovs'koho do Ivana Samoilovycha (1657–1687)*, ed. I. Butych, V. Rynsevych, and I. Teslenko (Kyiv and Lviv, 2004); *ML: Lysty Ivana Mazepy 1687–1691*, ed. V. Stanislavs'kyi (Kyiv, 2002); *MU: Universalnyi Ivana Mazepy 1687–1709*, ed. I. Butych (Kyiv and Lviv, 2002); *MU II: Universalnyi Ivana Mazepy 1687–1709*, vol. 2, ed. I. Butych and V. Rynsevych (Kyiv and Lviv, 2006); *XU: Universalnyi Bohdana Khmel'nyts'koho*, ed. V. Smolii et al. (Kyiv, 1998).
8. See Michael Moser [Mozer], "Ukraïns'ka ('rus'ka') versija 'Obshchoho Věstnyka zakonov' derzhavn'nykh y pravytel'stva' (1849–1852 rr.), 'Věstnyka zakonov' derzhavn'nykh dlja korolevstv' i kraëv' v' derzhavn'noj dumě zastuplenn'nykh' (1870–95/6 rr.) i 'Vistnyka zakoniv derzhavnykh dlja korolivstv i kraïv zastuplennykh v radi derzhavnykh' (1895/06–1918 rr.)," in *Prychynky do istorii ukrains'koï movy* (Kharkiv, 2008), 667–83.
9. For a general outline of eighteenth-century developments, see Michael Moser [Mozer], "Mova skhidnoukraïns'kykh hramot i dilovykh paperiv u XVIII st.," in *Prychynky do istorii ukrains'koï movy*, 280–302; and Michael Moser, "Russisch in der Privatkorrespondenz ukrainischer Frauen aus dem 18. Jahrhundert," in *Die russische Sprache und Literatur im 18. Jahrhundert: Tradition und Innovation—Russkii iazyk i literatura v XVIII veke: traditsiia i innovatsiia, Gedenkschrift für Gerta Hüttl-Folter*, ed. J. Besters-Dilger and F. Poljakov (Frankfurt, 2009), 289–322. It should not be forgotten at this point that the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries was a period of time when Ukrainian and Belarusian employees of the Department of Foreign Affairs as well as leading clergymen fostered the spread of numerous Ruthenian loan words, many of which were of Polish or Western European origin, into Russian. At the same time, the Church Slavonic language of the Muscovite recension was heavily influenced by the Church Slavonic language of the Ukrainian recension (for a discussion of these developments, see Michael Moser, *Die polnische, ukrainische und weißrussische Interferenzschicht im russischen Satzbau des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts* (Frankfurt, 1998), 9–46, and the literature cited there.
10. In the edition the word is rendered as милоствах, which seems to be a mistake.
11. *MU*, 97–98.
12. This bracketed question mark was introduced by the editor.
13. *MU*, 533.
14. See *Slovnyk staroukraïns'koï movy XIV–XV st.*, vols. 1–2, ed. L. L. Humets'ka (Kyiv, 1977; hereafter abbreviated as *SSUM*); and Ie. Tymchenko, *Materialy do slovnyka*

pysemnoi ta knyzhnoi ukrains'koï movy XV–XVIII st., bks. 1–2 (Kyiv and New York, 2002; hereafter: Tym).

15. The form *чрезъ* from 1708, on the other hand, is not necessarily marked as a Church Slavonic form. It is also sporadically encountered, perhaps as an allegro form, in other Middle Ukrainian chancery documents (*SSUM* vol. 2, s.v. “чрѣсъ”). The prefix *пре-* with the metathesis may be of Church Slavonic (пресвѣтлый) as well as Polish origin in Ukrainian (Polish pre-adjectival *prze-* is again likely to be an early loan from Church Slavonic).
16. *Z epistoliarnoi spadshchyny het'mana Ivana Mazepy*, ed. V. Stanislavs'kyi (Kyiv, 1996; hereafter abbreviated as *ES*), 122.
17. See *ML*, 248, 270, etc.
18. Izmail Sreznevskii, however, does not list the meaning of “translation,” “translate,” etc., s.v. “списати,” “списъкъ” (I. I. Sreznevskii, *Materialy dlia slovaria drevnerusskogo iazyka*, 3 vols. [Moscow, 1895–1903]). It should be noted that Ukrainian was still consistently called *Belarusian*, while the term *Little Russian* was applied as a toponym, but not yet as a glottonym in these texts.
19. Unfortunately, the editor is ambiguous here. He states: “Є кілька українських копій і ряд оригіналів” (There are a few Ukrainian-language copies and a number of originals) and lists the two cited documents among several others. It is thus not entirely clear in each case if one is dealing with original documents or copies.
20. *ML*, 273–74. In his edition V'iacheslav Stanislavs'kyi underlines letters that are clearly rendered as ligatures in the original. Owing to deviating rules in other editions, I italicize both omitted letters and ligatures here as throughout.
21. *ML*, 271–73.
22. This construction was adopted into Russian at that time; see Moser, *Polnische, ukrainische und weißrussische Interferenzschicht*, 245–60.
23. This spelling is typical of North Ukrainian; see Shevelov, *Historical Phonology*, 432.
24. As for the locative of hard-stem masculine nouns, see V. Nimchuk, ed., *Istoriia ukrains'koï movy: Morfolohiia* (Kyiv, 1978), 98–101.
25. But not *выше*; see Nimchuk, *Istoriia ukrains'koï movy*, 377; cf. Polish *wyż-ej*.
26. The context is ambiguous, though, because Russian *по указу* renders *по* + the dative case, while the adjectival forms in the present Ukrainian context suggest the interpretation as locative. The syntagm *по предложенью князя Василя Василювича Голицына* is less problematic; cf. Polish *po przedłożeniu* with an unambiguous form of the locative case.
27. *Getman Ivan Mazepa: Dokumenty iz arkhivnykh sobranii Sankt-Peterburga, 1687–1705*, pt. 1, ed. T. Tairova-Iakovleva (St. Petersburg, 2007), 129–58.
28. Usually this information is found at the beginning or end of documents. See the edition of a letter to Peter I dated 13 October 1705 in *Doba het'mana Ivana Ivana Mazepy v dokumentakh*, ed. S. Pavlenko (Kyiv, 2007; hereafter *DM*), 216–18, where a supplement to the document reads as follows: “В верху писма написано: ‘К

великому государю в листу гетмана и кавалера Ивана Степановича Мазепы, каково принято в Тикотинѣ, чрез куріера Кабринского, октября в 18 день [sic] 1705-го году, написано” (ibid., 218). Obviously, this is a note by the translator.

29. *ES*, 147–48.
30. The spellings влей and искусного are, however, likely to be mere typographical errors.
31. These words were adopted into Russian at the turn of the eighteenth century from Polish, Belarusian, and Ukrainian. There is, e.g., no entry for *выгоднь* or *належати* with the present meaning in Sreznevskii, *Materialy*, but both words are included in Wiesław Witkowski’s dictionary of Polish loans in Russian; Wiesław Witkowski, *Nowy słownik zapożyczeń polskich w języku rosyjskim* (Cracow, 2006).
32. *DM*, 243.
33. Between 1687 and 1699 Vasyl’ Kochubei had been one of his best known predecessors, while under his own hetmancy Semen Savych was to become one of his most famous successors.
34. Based on Pylyp Orlyk’s diary, Tairova-Iakovleva describes how Orlyk wrote one of Mazepa’s letters: “16 сентября 1707 года произошло событие, обозначившее перелом. Мазепа по-прежнему был в Киеве, наблюдая за строительством Печерской крепости. Орлик, находясь в доме гетмана, по его приказу писал длинное послание к Петру. Работа эта затянулась до ночи. Гетман проявлял нетерпение несколько раз выходил из своей внутренней комнаты, спрашивая, скоро ли конец, и объясняя, что есть еще другое дело....” (On 16 September 1707 an event took place that signified a turning-point. As before, Mazepa was in Kyiv, overseeing the construction of the Pechers’k fortress. Orlyk, who was at the hetman’s home, on his order wrote a lengthy letter to Peter. The work dragged on into the night. The hetman showed impatience, left his inner chamber several times asking whether it would be finished soon, and explained that there was still another matter.) Tairova-Iakovleva, *Mazepa*, 195.
35. Pylyp Orlyk, “Istoricheskie akty. Pis’mo: Orlika k” Stefanu Iavorskomu [1721].” In *Osnova: Iuzhno-russkii literaturno-uchenyi vĕstnik*, no. 10, 1862, 1–28.
36. See note 9 above.