

Clerics and Laymen in the History of Modern Standard Ukrainian

Michael Moser

Two Questionable Elements of the Master Narrative

Virtually all extant textbooks on the history of the Ukrainian language have forged a master narrative suggesting that up to the 1860s¹ the building of the Modern Standard Ukrainian language (henceforth MSU) on the basis of the vernacular was a process that took place almost exclusively in the Russian Empire and in a secular setting. Both of these suggestions should be questioned, as the following contextualized discussion of four fragments of Ukrainian texts from the second half of the 1840s shall demonstrate.

Orthodox laymen in the Russian Empire in fact took a leading role in the building of MSU in both the secular and the religious sphere. Yet some clerics of the Russian Orthodox Church also had a modest share in the religious context. In Galicia Greek Catholic clerics virtually constituted the only Ruthenian intellectual elite of the time, and quite a few of them, contrary to the master narrative, attempted to establish a Galician variety of MSU in the religious and secular spheres. Finally, a handful of prominent lay intellectuals of Galicia also played a certain role in the process of language building at the earliest stage of the Ruthenian national movement.²

¹ The chronological scope of this study covers the period from the publication of Ivan Kotljarevskyj's *Eneida* in 1798 up to the early 1860s, when the Populist movement began spreading in Galician secular and clerical circles and, after the 1863 circular of the tsarist interior minister Petr Valuev prohibited non-belletristic publications in Ukrainian in the Russian Empire, Galicia became Ukraine's acknowledged "Piedmont." But I will concentrate here on the 1840s, one of the crucial micro-periods in the history of Ukrainian in both the Russian and the Austrian Empire. This was the time when Taras Ševčenko entered the scene and when the clandestine Cyrillo-Methodian Brotherhood evolved and was uncovered. This was also the time when the Galician Ruthenian national movement gradually became a mass movement, particularly during the Revolution of 1848–49. All of the texts analysed in this paper were written or published in the 1840s. Personal names and bibliographic titles in this article are transliterated according to the International Linguistic System.

² Limited space does not allow me to discuss Transcarpathian or Bukovynian Ruthenian matters here. The Bukovynians joined the Galicians in their efforts only in the last decades of the nineteenth century, while the Transcarpathians stayed apart until the interwar period.

The Secular Canon of the History of the Ukrainian Language in the Russian Empire

According to the master narrative, the formation of MSU was initiated in 1798, when the first three parts of Ivan Kotljarevs'kyj's *Enejida*, a burlesque travesty of the *Aeneid*, were published. Although Kotljarevs'kyj had studied at the Poltava Theological Seminary from 1780 to 1789—this experience surfaces in the language of his work, especially in the students' jargon—he was above all a secular person: Born into the family of a chancery scribe in 1769, he worked as a tutor at rural gentry estates while writing *Enejida*, took an active part in the military defence against Napoleon Bonaparte's troops in 1812, and was a director of several civic philanthropic agencies (see Petrenko 1989).

Hryhorij Kvitka-Osnov'janenko, the next important protagonist of the master narrative, entered the Kuriash Monastery at the age of twenty-three but soon returned to secular life. Kvitka, who descended from a family of the Cossack elite (*starshyna*) and was highly engaged in several philanthropic and cultural organizations, worked above all as a loyal official of the Russian imperial government in Kharkiv. His Ukrainian works typically have a secular village setting. As with Kotljarevs'kyj, the described milieu of Kvitka's works is perfectly reflected in his language, which is firmly based on the peasant vernacular. In Kotljarevs'kyj's case it was the language of the Poltava region, while in Kvitka's it was the language of Slobidska Ukraine (see Koshelivets 1989).

Taras Ševčenko, whose oeuvre was beyond doubt a true milestone in the history of MSU, was born into a serf family in Right-Bank Ukraine. He learned to read and write from a church precentor, and during his childhood he occasionally read from the Bible at funerals instead of the precentor. Consequently Ševčenko was intensely exposed to the Church Slavonic language. He was delivered from serfdom in 1838 thanks to his outstanding talent as a painter, and in the following years he established his fame as a writer, also mostly in a secular setting (Antokhii et al 2004). In Ševčenko's later works religious motifs play an increasingly significant role; this is also reflected in the linguistic make-up of his poems, with their increasing amount of Church Slavonic elements. Ševčenko also wrote an adaption of the Psalms, and in his small primer of 1861 some fragments of the Psalms play a leading role, in accordance with century-old methods of alphabetization in the Orthodox world (on Ševčenko's language, see Moser 2008b).

Mykola Kostomarov, another prominent member of the Cyrillo-Methodian Brotherhood, was the premarital son of a Russian owner of a large estate in Voronezh Gubernia and his former Ukrainian female serf. According to the laws of the Russian Empire, he was thus a serf until his father's early death. Kostomarov led the life of a secular intellectual, and he earned his reputation above all as a historian—for some time he was a renowned professor of Russian history in St. Petersburg—but also as a writer and journalist. Kostomarov authored the programmatic texts of the Cyrillo-Methodian Brotherhood, in particular the so-called *Books of the Genesis of the Ukrainian People*. Whereas he wrote most of his theoretical and political studies in Russian, he composed this work, which dates

from late 1845 and early 1846 but was not published until the twentieth century, in Ukrainian. Here is a transcription of the first few lines of the handwritten text:³

Богъ сотворивъ свѣтъ небо и землю и землю насѣливъ всякими тварями и поставивъ надъ усѣю⁴ тварью царемъ чоловѣка и казавъ⁵ ему ~~вмѣстѣ~~ плодиться и множиться, и постановивъ, щобъ родъ чоловѣческій подѣлился на колѣна и ~~народ~~ племена, и ~~щобъ~~ каждому⁶ колѣнови и⁷ племени⁸ ~~жило на~~ даровавъ ~~землю~~ краину жити ~~и повелѣвъ~~⁹ щобъ кажде колѣно и племенó шукало Бога, котрый отъ ~~кажде~~ чоловѣка недалеко, и поклонялись бы Ему всѣ люди и щобы вѣровали въ Его и любили Его и були бѣ усѣ счастливи.

Але родъ чоловѣческій забувъ Бога и ~~вѣрми~~ предався діаволу, и кажде племенó вымыслило¹⁰ собѣ новыхъ богѣвъ¹¹ и стали тоди битися за своихъ богѣвъ, и почала¹² земля поливатися кровію и усеѣватися костями и ~~запанивало над землею~~ воевѣмъ свѣтъ стались горе и бѣдность и хороба¹³ несчастья и незгода.

И такъ покаравъ ихъ справедливый Господь испершу потопомъ, потомъ войнами, потомъ неволею.

Боединъ есть Богъ истинный, и единъ царь надъ родомъ чоловѣческимъ, а люде якъ поробили собѣ много богѣвъ, то поробили зъ тимъ [...] (Kostomarov 1845–6, 252).¹⁴

³ The facsimile fragment was published in the three-volume edition of documents pertaining to the trial of the members of the Cyrillo-Methodian Brotherhood (Kostomarov 1845–46, 252): The entire text is published there in a version largely adapted to MSU.

⁴ The diacritic sign covers both “e” and “ю”. This might have been Kostomarov’s way of rendering MSU *усією*.

⁵ The word is written above crossed out “давъ.”

⁶ The letters “ому” are written above an unreadable letter, which should read “e”. Kostomarov apparently wanted to write: “[...] щобъ кажде колѣно и племя жило на [...].”

⁷ The “ви” of the ending has to be reconstructed. Kostomarov wanted to replace “колѣно и” with “колѣнови и”, but instead of “ви” one finds a sign similar to “в” only, written above “о”. Cf. the footnote above.

⁸ The letters “ену” replace unreadable “я”, the “а” is written across “я.”

⁹ The letter “ѣ” is written above another letter, probably “и.”

¹⁰ The word is written above crossed out “поробило.”

¹¹ Above the line some words are added in smaller script. Without the original text I cannot decipher them.

¹² The word is written above crossed out “стала.”

¹³ The word “хороба” was added later above the line.

¹⁴ Kostomarov’s text is also extant in a handwritten copy made by Mykola Hulak, another prominent member of the Cyrillo-Methodian Brotherhood. The tsarist police found the manuscript among Hulak’s materials. The facsimile fragment was published in Kostomarov 1845–46a, 153: The text there is based on an orthography largely adapted to MSU. The transcription of that facsimile reads: “Законъ Божій. / переписано Костомаровымъ найдено въ бумагахъ Гулака. 1. Богъ создавъ свѣтъ, небо и землю и насѣливъ усякими тварями, и поставивъ надъ усею тварью ~~царемъ~~ чоловѣка и казавъ ему плодиться и множитися и постановивъ, щобъ родъ чоловѣческій подѣлился на *колѣна и* племена, и кожному колѣновѣ и племени даровавъ край жити, щобъ кожде колѣно и кожде племено шукало Бога, котрый одъ чоловѣка

All edited versions of Kostomarov's texts reveal deviations from the original text beyond the orthographic level.¹⁵ What can be noticed immediately is that Kostomarov's orthography is still far from MSU inasmuch as it follows, above all, the so-called *Maksymovychivka*, the "learned" Ukrainian etymological orthography of the time as developed by the Ukrainian historian Мухайло Максимович. This includes the spellings *отъ*¹⁶, *даровавъ* instead of *дарувавъ*¹⁷, *счастливѣ* instead of *щасливі*, but is counterbalanced by the spellings *усѣ* or *зѣ тимъ*. A closer look reveals some more inconsistencies, such as the spelling *чоловѣчеській* along with *чоловѣчеській*, *чоловѣчеськимъ*; *люди* along with *люде*; *всѣ* along with *усѣ* (both referring to *люди/е*); and so on. Some of these features might have been removed if the work had been prepared for publication, yet inconsistent forms such as these are quite typical of many printed Ukrainian texts of the time.

Apart from that, we find some other forms deviating from MSU, e.g., *кажде* instead of *кожне*; *племенѣ* and *племену* (dat. sg.) instead of *плем'я* and [...] *племені*; *въ Его* instead of *въ Нього*; and *хороба* instead of *хвороба*. Some deviations might result from the conservative orthography and some inconsistencies with regard to diacritics: cf. *царѣ* instead of *царь*; *бѣднѣсть*, *потомъ*, *войнами* instead of *бѣднѣсть*, *потѣмъ*, *вѣйнами*; or unspecific *ему*, *Его*, which could be interpreted as *jeho*, *jemu*, but perhaps also as *joho*, *jomi*. The spelling of the preposition in *вовсѣмъ свѣтѣ* is seemingly archaic,¹⁸ but *во* was apparently used in some conservative orthographic systems for rendering the preposition with a syllabic value, that is MSU *у*.

недалеко, и поклонялись бы Ему всѣ люди и вѣровали въ Его, и любили бѣ Его, и были бѣ усѣ счастливѣ.

2. Але родъ чоловѣчій забувъ Бога и отдався дѣяволу, и кожне племенѣ вымыслило собѣ богѣвъ, въ кожному племену народы повидумували собѣ богѣвъ, и стали за тихъ богѣвъ битися, и почала земля поливатися кровью [...]" (Kostomarov 1845–46, 153).

¹⁵ This is the same text in the edited version: "[1.] Бог сотворив свѣт, небо і землю, і землю населив всякими тварями, і поставив над усею твар'ю царем чоловіка, і казав йому плодитися і множитися, і постановив, щоб род чоловічеський поділився на коліна і племена, і кож[но]му колінові і племену даровав країну жити, щоб każde коліно і племено шукало [Б]ога, котрий от чоловіка недалеко, і поклонялись би йому всі люди, і віровали в його, і любили його, і були б усі щасливі.

[2.] Але род чоловічеський забув [Б]ога і предався дияволу, і кожне племено вимислило собі нових богів, і в кожному племені народ вимисли[в] собі нових богів, і стали тоді битися за своїх богів, і почала земля поливатися кровію і усіватися костями, і во всім світі стались горе і бідність і хороба, нещастя і незгода.

[3.] І так покарав їх справедливий [Г]осподь, іспершу потопом, потім війнами, потім неволею.

[4.] Бо один єсть [Б]ог істинний і один цар над родом чоловічеським, а люде як пороби́ли собі много богів, то пороби́ли з тим і царів" (Kostomarov 1845–46, 251 and 253).

¹⁶ In Hulak's copy *одъ* occurs along with *отъ*.

¹⁷ In Hulak's copy *-ова-* occurs along with *-ува-*.

¹⁸ Here the vowel in the preposition is the regular outcome of the back *jer* in front of the next syllable with original front *jer* (*въ vьsěxъ*, West Slavic *въ vьsěxъ*); cf. also Russian *во всех* [...] and Polish *we wszystkich*.

Particularly striking is the abundance of Church Slavonic or archaic elements: cf. *Сотвориъ*,¹⁹ *единъ, кровію, родъ, предався, чоловічеській*.²⁰ But even more striking is the general tone of this political manifest, which ostentatiously leans on the style of the Bible not only in the cited parts of the texts but also in those passages where Ukrainian national matters and Ukrainian-Polish and Russian-Ukrainian historical political relations are discussed.²¹ Although the text's code was Ukrainian and not Church Slavonic, Kostomarov apparently believed that the political message about the Ukrainian nation could be best delivered to the commoners in a language that would remind them of the traditional language of the church and its "eternal" religious messages. But Kostomarov did not invent this sacralization of the nationalist discourse: it suffices to mention that "the title of the work and its literary style, especially in the first half, are reminiscent of Adam Mickiewicz's *Księgi narodu polskiego i pielgrzymstwa polskiego* (Books of the Polish People and of the Polish Pilgrimage)" (Zhukovsky 1989a).

Like that of his contemporaries, much of Kostomarov's Ukrainian national consciousness was based on his knowledge of early modern Ukrainian history, in particular of the Cossack traditions. He carefully studied older Ukrainian texts as a historian, but the language of his literary works primarily reflects the vernacular of his time and the language of Ukrainian folk songs. Apart from the conservative orthography, relics of older stages of written Ruthenian traditions do not play an important role.

Much greater importance for the history of MSU can be ascribed to another member of the Cyrillo-Methodian Brotherhood, whom at least non-Soviet scholars have rightly included in the Ukrainian master narrative: Pantelejmon Kuliš. He was born into an impoverished Cossack-gentry family and worked as a writer, historian, folklorist, translator, and for some time as a tsarist official in Russian-occupied Poland. Along with his important orthographic contribution—the so-called *Kulišivka*, an immediate predecessor of MSU orthography—Kuliš's outstanding role as a

¹⁹ In Hulak's copy another Church Slavonic word is used: *создавъ*.

²⁰ In Hulak's copy the word appears along with *чоловчій*.

²¹ Unfortunately these other fragments are at that point available to me only in versions with an adapted orthography, and the adaption in fact reaches beyond orthography. Here are some fragments of the more concrete nationalist part of the text: "[76] І не любила Україна ні царя, ні пана, а зкомпоновала собі козацтво, єсть то істее братство, куди кожний, пристаючи, був братом других — чи був він преж того паном чи невольником аби християнин, і були козаки між собою всі рівні, і старшини вибирались на раді і повинні були слугувати всім по слову христовому, і жодної помпи панської і титула не було між козаками" (Kostomarov 1845–46, 164), "[89] Але скоро побачила Україна, що попалась у неволю, бо вона по своей простоті не пізнала, що там був цар московський, а цар московський усе рівно було, що ідол і мучитель" (Kostomarov 1845–46, 164), "[96] А німка цариця Катерина, курва всесвітня, безбожниця, убійниця мужа свого, востанне доконала козацтво і волю, бо, одібравши тих, котрі були в Україні старшими, наділила їх панств[ом] і землями, понадавала їм вольну братію в ярмо і поробила одних панами, а других невольниками" (Kostomarov 1845–46, 167), "[109] Україна буде неподлеглою Річчю Посполитою в союзі слов'янським. Тоді скажуть всі язики, показуючи рукою на те місто, де на карті буде намальована Україна: «От камень, его же не брегоша зиждущий, той бисть во главу»." (Kostomarov 1845–46, 169).

person who significantly broadened the functional domains of Ukrainian can hardly be emphasized enough. In our context it is most important that it was Kuliš, a layman, who prepared the first full modern Ukrainian translation of the Bible (see Luckyj 2004). But this happened only in the late 1860s. Kuliš, however, worked together with the Galician Ukrainian Ivan Puljuj, an internationally recognized physicist who contacted Kuliš while studying theology in Vienna. Their co-operation was cemented as a result of Kuliš's command, albeit limited, of the classical languages.

Kuliš's predecessor as a translator of the Bible in the Russian Empire was Pylyp Moračevs'kyj, a pedagogue, poet, and philologist who was born into an impoverished noble family in the Chernihiv region and graduated from Kharkiv University's Faculty of History and Philology in 1823. Moračevs'kyj worked as a teacher of mathematics, logic, and Russian literature, and he was a school inspector in various regions of Ukraine, including in the towns of Sumy, Luts'k, Kamianets-Podil's'kyi, and Nizhyn. In the early 1830s he had several poems published in Ukrainian. In 1853 Moračevs'kyj, who was apparently a deeply loyal subject of the tsar, sent a dictionary of "Little Russian"—"Словарь малороссійскаго языка"—to the Russian Imperial Academy of Sciences for evaluation. But the dictionary was not published. By the end of 1861 Moračevs'kyj had translated the four Gospels into Ukrainian; subsequently he also translated the Acts of the Apostles, the Apocalypse, and the Psalms; and he also wrote a textbook about biblical motifs for elementary schools. Unfortunately Moračevs'kyj's heritage has been insufficiently researched, and the fate of certain of his manuscripts is unknown. Moračevs'kyj's translation of the Bible was one of the immediate triggers for the 1863 Valuev circular that prohibited non-bellevistic publications in Ukrainian, and his translation was not published until 1906 (on the Ukrainian translations of the Bible, see Nimčuk 2005; on the history of Moračevs'kyj's translation, see Vulpius 2005, 125–34).

It is true that virtually all major figures in the earlier development of MSU in the Russian Empire up to the turn of the twentieth century were laymen, including even those who organized the translation of religious books and such later anticlerical figures as Myxajlo Drahomanov. "Little Russian" clerics in fact contributed very little to the development of MSU up to the interwar period. This can at least partly be explained by the persecution of the Uniate (Greek Catholic) Church in the Russian Empire and its abolition there in 1839. Unlike in Galicia, no Ukrainian national church functioned in the Russian Empire after it had long before been subordinated to the Russian Orthodox Church and subjected to increasing Russification beginning in the latter part of the eighteenth century, when Samujil Myslavs'kyj was the rector (1761–68) of the Kyiv Academy and the metropolitan (1783–96) of Kyiv (see *EUU*, s.v. "Миславський, Самуїл"). From that time on, the Russian Orthodox hierarchy also tried to expunge the use of the Ukrainian pronunciation of Church Slavonic (on Myslavs'kyj, see Archaimbault and Wakoulenko 2010, 23–24).

Bishop Vasyl' Hrečulevyč and His Contribution to the Development of MSU

There are, however, some isolated examples of Orthodox clerics who should have a place in the canon of the history of MSU (although they in fact do not). The most outstanding example is Vasyl' Hrečulevyč. The son of an Orthodox priest in Podillia, he studied theology in St. Petersburg and worked there as a teacher, Orthodox priest, and archimandrite before returning to Ukraine in 1879 as Bishop Vitalij of Ostrih. From 1882 to his death in 1885 he was the Orthodox bishop of Mahilioŭ and Mstislaŭ in Belarus'. Along with several works in Russian, Hrečulevyč published his Sermons in the Little Russian Language in St. Petersburg in 1849 (see Hrečulevyč 1849). His book of sermons became so popular that a second edition, prepared by Pantelejmon Kuliš (see EUU, s.v. "Гречулевич, Василь"), was published in 1857. In 1852 another religious work by Hrečulevyč, a catechetical study, was published in Ukrainian (Hrečulevyč 1852).

Why did Hrečulevyč become the exception to the rule? One answer is provided in the following fragments of the Russian-language preface (dated 9 December 1848) to his collection of sermons. Though he does not name him, Hrečulevyč explains there why his collection is addressed to Hedeon Vyšnevs'kyj, who directed the Podillian Theological Seminary (where Hrečulevyč later studied) from 1828 and became the Orthodox bishop of Poltava in 1838. Hrečulevyč states that it was an "undeniable truth" that for sermons to be effective it is mandatory that they be entirely "understandable and close to the hearts of the people" ("народъ"). He emphasizes that "this very truth" should have been taken into account long ago "particularly in Little Russia." Yet the Orthodox priests there, who had by that time become accustomed to speaking in "pure Russian," were, according to Hrečulevyč, either unable or unwilling to abandon that language despite the fact that it was "if not completely not understood, then at least little understood" by their parishioners. According to Hrečulevyč, the priests had thus "neglected the mother tongue of their flock, a language spoken by millions of Orthodox believers." Consequently they had in a sense become "barbarians" (1 Cor. 14, 11) to their church audience, and therefore their sermons were of little use.²²

²² "Высокопресвященнѣйшій Владыко,
Богомудрый Іерархъ!

Истина неоспоримая, что для успѣха проповѣди – едва-ли не всего важнѣе и необходимѣе, со стороны нашей, говорить народу на языкѣ для него совершенно понятномъ, близкомъ къ сердцу, родномъ.

И сія-то истина, если гдѣ, то особенно въ Малороссіи, давно-бы уже должна быть приведена въ исполненіе, и приносить вождѣнные плоды.

Но, къ сожалѣнію, доселѣ еще, сколько мнѣ извѣстно, нигдѣ почто не видно опытовъ проповѣди на малороссійскомъ языкѣ. Наши служители Слова Божія, получая образованіе въ Семинаріяхъ и Академіяхъ, и привыкая въ нихъ къ чистому русскому языку, немогутъ, или не хотятъ, въ послѣдствіи времени, отвыкнуть отъ заученнаго ими образа выраженія; и вотъ иные изъ [П:] нихъ проповѣдуютъ народу слово Божіе на языкѣ для него если не вовсе непонятномъ, то по-крайней-мѣрѣ весьма маловразумительномъ, какъ-бы пренебрегая

Hrečulevyč goes on to say that that he had always been aware of the need for sermons in Ukrainian during the twenty-nine years he served as a priest in Podillia Eparchy, and that is why he had decided to publish some of his own homilies. He then points to the fact that in light of the novelty of this enterprise among “us Orthodox,” he needs a high-ranking patron, who would not only enhance the general standing of his work, which Hrečulevyč himself felt was inadequate in literary terms, but would also bestow upon the Little Russian language itself “a certain importance and substance.” Because this language was, according to the author, poorly known within “the fatherland’s [Ukraine’s] educated stratum,” the support of such a high-ranking person would demonstrate that this very language did not lack the dignity to serve as the voice of high Christian truths.²³ Hrečulevyč adds that the native inhabitants of the Podillia region were, in fact, linguistically related to the bishop of Poltava,²⁴ and he imparts a modest national message through his pastoral work: according to his preface, the inhabitants of both Podillia and Poltava gubernias belonged to the same nation of “millions of Orthodox believers.” In order to actually reach them, one would have to speak to them in their vernacular, which Hrečulevyč unequivocally calls a separate language and not a dialect of Russian.

Here are the beginning and the end of the first sermon in Hrečulevyč’s collection, which (the sermon) was originally issued in 1823:

Проповѣдь на Рождество Христово

Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа.

Куды не обернуться, куды не направить стопы свои Царь земный, вслидъ за Нымъ вси вельки паны и сенатори шествуютъ; вси вельчаютъ Його, и

роднымъ языкомъ пасомыхъ, языкомъ, на которомъ говорятъ миллионы православныхъ. Оттого-то, такіе проповѣдники, почти всегда бывая для своихъ слушателей, нѣкоторымъ образомъ, „иноязычниками“ (Кор. 14, 11.), – не получаютъ, можно-сказать, никакой пользы отъ своего проповѣданія, – не достигаютъ главной цѣли своего высокаго служенія” (Hrečulevyč 1849: I-II).

²³ “Но, въ семь новомъ и небываломъ еще, въ настоящее время, у насъ-православныхъ, дѣлѣ, я почувствовалъ необходимость отдать себя подъ покровительство высокой Особы, которой благосклонное вниманіе внушило-бы мнѣ бодрость, а знаменитое имя, украшая собою посильный трудъ мой, своимъ величіемъ восполняло-бы его малость и недостаточность, и чрезъ то не только этому бѣдному въ литературномъ отношеніи труду, но и самому, малоизвестному – въ кругу отечественнаго образованнаго сословія – малороссійскому языку придало-бы нѣкоторую важность и значимость, какъ недостойному органу высокихъ христіанскихъ истинъ” (Hrečulevyč 1849, III).

²⁴ “[...] съ нынѣшней ВАШЕЮ паствою, Полтавскою, мы, Подольцы, находимся въ родствѣ, по языку малороссійскому” (Hrečulevyč 1849, IV–V). Cf. the concluding words of the preface: “Къ ВАШИМЪ-то стопамъ, ВЫСОКОПРЕОСВЯЩЕННѣЙШІЙ Владыко, осмѣливаюсь повергнуть свой скудный трудъ, и отъ ВАШЕГО-то отеческаго вниманія и покровительства ожидаю не только себѣ, но и всѣмъ православнымъ, малороссійскимъ проповѣдникамъ общедренія въ дѣлѣ общепонятнаго благовѣствованія слова спасенія! – А мы усугубимъ о ВАСъ свои усердныя молитвы къ небесному Пастыреначальнику и Совершителю нашея Вѣры, Господу Иисусу Христу!” (Hrečulevyč 1848, IV–V).

стараються робити все, що тільки Він скаже. Так як Царь небесный, Господь наш Ісус Христос, Синь Божий, колы по нескананному свому мылосердью и неисповидимымъ Grill судьбамъ своимъ, зоставивъ небеса и зійшовъ на землю, родившись одъ безизвистной и пречыстои Дивы Маріи; то вслидъ за Нымъ вси сылы небесни, вси Ангелы и Архангелы двыгнулыся, вси прыслужовалы Іому, и предстоя со страхомъ, выхвалялы Іого пресвяте имя, воспиваючы сладчайшымы голосамы: „Слава въ вышнихъ Богу, и на земли миръ, въ чловѣцѣхъ благоволеніе“ [...]

Торжествуймо и лыкуймо! Радуймось и веселимся! Непрыступный Богъ, отсе вже теперъ для насъ прыступный, Отець чадолубивый, а мы Іого любезни диты! И для того, во всякій нашій потреби, во всякій нашій нужди до Нѣго Единогo прыбигаймо, Просимъ во всѣму Іого небесной помочи. Умоляймо Іого усердною молитвою. Вінъ насъ выслушае, и поможе намъ, во всякимъ добримъ дили. Те вже вси знаютъ, що ниho безъ гриха, тилько одынь Богъ. Мы не богы и не янголы [sic], а люде немощни; посему зробившы яке зле дило, не одчаеваймося, не покидаймося надіи; – знаймо те, що билыше естъ мылосердье Боже, нижъ грихы всѣго свита, просимъ зъ щырымъ покаяньемъ Іого помывованья, и Вінъ помывуе насъ, и простыть намъ вси вольни и невольни прегришенья наши, яко щедрый и мылостывый Господь, долготерпывый и многомылостывый и не по беззаконьямъ нашымъ сотворыть намъ, ниже по грихамъ нашымъ воздасть намъ. Аминь.

Говор. Декабря 25 1823 г. (Hrečulevyč 1849, 1 and 4–5)

The published title of the sermon is in Russian, but already the formula *Во имя Отца и Сына и Святого Духа* shows a sign of a switch to Ukrainian because of *-ого* in *Святого* instead of the Church Slavonic and pre-revolutionary Russian written form *-аго*. (Note, however, the use of *Отца* with a hard *ц*, which is not of dialectal origin and incompatible with the use of soft *ц'* elsewhere.)

Like many of his contemporaries, including Ševčenko, Hrečulevyč uses the Russian alphabet to render Ukrainian phonology. Despite widespread myths, this works quite well if one simply applies the rules of Ukrainian, and not Russian, phonology while reading out loud: e.g., no consonants should be palatalized before *e*, and *ы* should not be pronounced as Russians do. Altogether, the Russian spelling in Hrečulevyč's publication is quite close to a phonetically based orthography. There are, however, some exceptions, which result from a certain lack of courage: Hrečulevyč writes *зъ щырымъ покаяньемъ* although he most probably pronounced it and wanted it to be pronounced as it is in MSU, *покаянням*. Moreover, he does not express the change of [v] to [u] (*вслидъ за Нымъ вси* [instead of: *уси*]), but he does write *вже* instead of *уже*. Elsewhere he writes *во* where in MSU we would expect *у*, e.g., *во всякій нашій потреби, во всякій нашій нужди, во всякимъ добримъ дили*. However, as with Kostomarov, *во* might have served as a tradition-based spelling for a variant of the preposition with a syllabic value (cf. n. 17).

Apart from some other less convincing spellings (*сенатори*, *янголи* instead of *-ы*) and some inconsistent spellings and forms, such as the use of both *имя* and *имья*, *Отца* (in *во имя отца* [...]) and *Отець*, *Ангелы* and *янголи*, and *предстоя* and *воспиваючы* (see below), Hrečulevyč's text is still full of forms that are not acceptable in MSU.

This also applies to some regional variants: *естѣ* with the hard ending, which probably has to be interpreted as a Podillian Polonism; *невольни* with the retained Polish *o*; and *тількио* (the latter two forms are however widespread and are also characteristic of Ševčenko's language). It applies even more so to some Church Slavonic elements, which are, however, partly Ukrainianized; e.g., the fragment *предстоя со страхомъ* (which could be interpreted as the result of a switch to Church Slavonic) and the words *беззаконьямъ*, *долготерпимый* (note the etymological spelling with *л*), *воздасть*, *шествуютъ*, *неисповиднымъ*, *безизвѣстною*, *воспѣваючы*, *сладчайшымы*, *чадолюбивый*, *немоцни*, *одчаеваймося* (note the spelling *-ева-* instead of *-юва-*), *прегришенья*, and *сотворыть* (the Ukrainianized elements are in bold). At the syntactic level, the frequent use of *no* with the dative case, which is often interpreted as a loan from Russian, is worth mentioning.

In Hrečulevyč's text all quotations from the Bible are in Church Slavonic. Although it is not entirely clear how they were meant to be pronounced, after Samujil Myslavs'kyj's initiatives, they were likely to be read according to the Russian rules, that is, [e] and not [i] for *ѣ*, the retention of etymological [i] and [y], and the like.

Altogether, Hrečulevyč's sermons are clearly in Ukrainian, but they are not much closer to MSU than many works by his Galician and Transcarpathian contemporaries whose language has traditionally been labeled as "*jazyčije*" (cf. my criticism of this very concept in Moser 2004). It is striking that in his preface Hrečulevyč does not refer at all to the rich early modern Ruthenian traditions in the fields of homiletics and catechization.

Despite Hrečulevyč and a few other isolated counter-examples, the observation that the "Little Russian" clergy contributed little or next to nothing to the development of MSU up until the Revolution of 1905 is apparently not an unjustified exaggeration. Moreover, one should not overlook the fact that Hrečulevyč was born in 1791 and his native Podillia region was integrated into the Russian Empire only two years later, in 1793. Another rare cleric who delivered sermons in "Little Russian" was Ioann Babčenko, whose *Поученія на малоросійскомъ языкѣ, Священника Іоанна Бабченк* was published in Kharkiv at the eastern periphery of Ukrainian-speaking territory, in 1863 on the eve of the Valuev circular (Vulpus 2005, 301).

It was obviously not only the tsarist prohibition of publications in Ukrainian in 1863 and again in 1876 (the Ems ukase) that caused the role of clerics in the history of the Ukrainian language to remain very modest in the Russian Empire until the revolution of 1905. Yet their share in the fostering of Ukrainian changed significantly with the cancellation of the bans, with the rise of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, and with the appearance of leading Ukrainian clerical figures such as Ivan Ohijenko.

Greek Catholic Clerics as Ukrainian Language and Nation Builders

During the past decade, I have challenged some traditional canonic views in Ukrainian linguistic historiography by demonstrating that the developments in Galicia were different from those in the Russian Empire in very many ways and

were no less important (see Moser 2008). One of the most striking differences is the fact that almost all protagonists in the history of the Ukrainian language in Galicia up until the Revolution of 1848–49 were clerics, and that until the 1860s they were still clearly the majority. It should be emphasized that virtually all of these clerics, regardless of their orientation, were perfectly aware of their common history with their “Little Russian” brethren in the Russian Empire. Therefore they more often than not referred to their language and other matters as “Ruthenian or Little Russian” or “Ruthenian (Little Russian)” (see Moser 2011), and they never intended to forge a separate “Galician Ruthenian (or Rusyn) language.” As opposed to Belarusian or “Belorussian,” they never saw Russian or “Great Russian” as part of that “Ruthenian or Little Russian” world, and even the Russophiles did not do so. Disagreement was in fact limited to the question of the relationship between “Little Russian” and “Great Russian” (and, partly, “Belorussian”) matters. That is, was there an overarching “all-Russian” identity, was the Russian standard language “Great Russian” by origin and destination? And was the Russian language in fact “all-Russian” and even originally forged primarily by “Little Russians”?

The Galicians were perfectly aware of the achievements of Ukrainian language construction in the Russian Empire. Ivan Mohyl'nyc'kyj, the Greek Catholic canon from Peremyshl (Polish: Przemyśl) who began his fruitful work around 1815 and can be regarded as the first true “awakener” in Galicia, knew Ivan Kotljarevs'kyj's *Enejida*, and his successors knew the most important “Little Russian” writers. Yet the Galicians usually had quite different intentions than their brethren in the Russian Empire: they composed primarily texts of very different sorts both due to their inclinations and to the demands of their Greek Catholic clerical and Austrian imperial context. It thus comes as no surprise that their language was usually based on different foundations than that of the Little Russian authors, and not only in terms of dialectal distinctions.

Many of these texts were of a primarily clerical or at least religious character: Ivan Mohyl'nyc'kyj's earliest publications were a catechism in 1815 and a primer in 1816. Both of them were re-edited several times and revised in an increasingly vernacular direction; both works played an enormous educational in Galicia's Greek Catholic parochial schools. In the early 1820s Mohyl'nyc'kyj composed a secular scholarly grammar in a language that he obviously regarded as a model for the literary “Ruthenian” language. In this respect he remained a pioneer for several decades. In his scholarly works, and particularly in his quite influential preface to the grammar, which was published in Russian and Polish translation, Mohyl'nyc'kyj maintained on a scholarly basis that Ruthenian (“*rus'kyj jazyk*,” which still included Belarusian) was a language distinct from both Polish and Russian as well as Church Slavonic. Mohyl'nyc'kyj based a great deal of his scholarly insights and Ruthenian consciousness on his study of early modern traditions of written culture. His argumentation in support of the independent status of Ruthenian was firmly based on early modern texts such as Francysk Skaryna's adaptation of the Bible or the Lithuanian Statutes (both of which primarily belong to the Belarusian sphere of early modern Ruthenian territory; see Moser 2009).

It should be emphasized that Mohyl'nyc'kyj's scholarly treatise was in fact the outcome of a dispute regarding Metropolitan Myxajlo Levyc'kyj's pastoral letter of 1821: Austrian officials had refused to permit publication of the letter because of its "Cyrillic" (i.e., Church Slavonic) language and urged the metropolitan see to issue the letter not in the liturgical language, but in a language that would be understandable to Galicia's Greek Catholic believers. Mohyl'nyc'kyj argued that Church Slavonic was perfectly understandable to the Greek Catholic public—which is highly doubtful, and Mohyl'nyc'kyj was certainly aware of that—and he also maintained that Ruthenian was an independent language with regard to the Slavic languages with which it was time and again lumped together—Church Slavonic, Russian, and Polish (see Harasevyč 1862, 1000–1007). It thus turns out that Mohyl'nyc'kyj's treatise on the Ruthenian language, a text of major significance for the national discourse of the time, was not only written by a cleric but also generated by a debate of clerical matters.

Like Mohyl'nyc'kyj, his followers in Peremyshl Eparchy still do not have the place they deserve in the history of MSU. The master narrative still tells us a story about so-called *jazyčije*, a backward mixture of Church Slavonic, Russian, Polish, and local linguistic elements. *Jazyčije* allegedly predominated across Galician Ruthenian written culture, except in the works of the heroized Ruthenian Triad and their literary miscellany *Rusalka Dnistrovaja* (Buda, 1837). But the master narrative is not at all convincing: the Galician Greek Catholic clerics not only wrote pastoral works (see Moser 2005) but also composed classical high-style texts such as odes to Greek Catholic hierarchs and hymns in a language that was often clearly based on the vernacular (e.g., Josyf Levyc'kyj; see Moser 2006). Moreover, quite early on Greek Catholic lower clergy of Peremyshl and Lviv Eparchies began using virtually the same language for secular works of various genres: translations of poems by Goethe and Schiller (Josyf Levyc'kyj), their own secular poems (Markijan Šaškevyč), folklore studies (Josyf Lozyns'kyj), farming manuals (Josafat Kobryns'kyj), and so on (see Moser 2011a). In the course of the Revolution of 1848–49 Galician Greek Catholic clerics got increasingly involved in questions of secular politics, and most of them maintained their orientation toward using the vernacular until the spread of Russophilism in Galicia during the 1850s.

It is true that religious matters also played quite an important role in the Galician process of language construction: Rev. Markijan Šaškevyč was the first person to work on a translation of the Gospels into MSU, but he and other Greek Catholic clerics in Galicia, unlike their Orthodox brethren in the Russian Empire, also contributed much to the forging of a written Ukrainian language for secular topics.

An outstanding example is Josafat Kobryns'kyj's *Наука в оуправъ тютюну для галиційанѡвъ* (1847). Already in 1842 Kobryns'kyj, who was born in Kolomyia in 1818 and had studied theology in Vienna and Lviv, had anonymously published two of the best primers of their time: *Букварь новымъ способомъ оуложеный для домашнои науки* and *Способъ борзо выучити читати* (see Levyc'kyj 1888, 21; Dovidnyk 1993–99, s.v. Kobryns'kyj; cf. Wendland 2001, 379–81). Although Kobryns'kyj is said to have been a Russophile (Wendland 2001, 379–80), he wrote all of his works of the Vormärz period in a language that is clearly based on the

vernacular. His booklet *Наука в оуправѣ тютюну для галиціанѡвъ*, which stands in a tradition of various works on tobacco cultivation beginning with Rieselbach's *Unterricht für die Tobakbauer der Königreiche Hungarn und Galizien* (1790, 2nd ed. 1807),²⁵ is printed in traditional Cyrillic letters, and its orthography is based on etymology. Although it thus looks very old-fashioned, it is not.

The fragments below from Kobryns'kyj's *Наука* clearly demonstrate the modernization efforts behind this brochure for readers "among us in Eastern Galicia."

From the preface:

Предсловіє. Навиклисмо до звичаю нашихъ дѣдовъ и прадѣдовъ а не мыслачи чи тїи звичаи згаджаятсѧ з' розумомъ, и добро наше множать, слѣпосѧ ихъ тримають. [...] Часть оуже помислити надъ тымъ ажь коло тютюну ходити належитъ, абы праца наша виплатила сѧ. Предлежаче пѣсмо [!] оучить нетѡлько ажь добрый тютюнъ зыскати можна; але надто, всѣ роботы вколо тютюну, причины тыхъ роботъ вписує. Розумный тютюнникъ потрафить всудити, що в' его краю застосовати, в' чимъ засѣ при давнѡмъ звичаю по-зѡстати можна; и еслибы декотрыи подлугъ тои науки, коло тютюну походити хотѣли, преконали бы сѧ и другїи видачи, же тымъ способомъ, и лѣпшїи и бѡльше тютюну зыскати можна; а оуправа тютюну, теперъ такъ тажка праца богато бы пожитку приносила; котрый то зыскъ оуже давно приносить в' краяхъ, где ани такъ тепло, ани грунта такъ способный, ажь оу насѣ в' восточнѡй Галиціи (Kobryns'kyj 1847, without pagination).

From the main text:

На чѡмъ залежытъ оуправа тютюну. Тютюнъ росте з' насѣна, которого насѣна, не в' разѣ сѣсѧ на ролю, для тютюну назначенну, але треба го в' передѣ на розсадникѣ оумысл' не зробленномъ розсѣати; на такомъ розсадникѣ, росте розсада борзен'ко, при нагодѣ множытсѧ листа и бѡльше; а коли оуже досытьвелика [sic, instead of досыть велика], садитсѧ на грунтѣ приспособленномъ (Kobryns'kyj 1847, without pagination).

If some Galician clerics managed to write odes to Greek Catholic hierarchs in a language that was clearly based on the vernacular, it is no surprise that they succeeded in keeping a pragmatic text such as Kobryns'kyj's tobacco-farming manual in the vernacular. His language is, apart from the question of the alphabet and orthography, not identical with MSU above all for the simple reason that its southwestern dialectal foundation is different from that of Ukrainian authors in the Russian Empire: for example, the reflexive verb ending *сьсѧ* without *-t'* (*-t*); hard endings in the third person present tense (e.g., *тримають*); personal preterital endings (e.g., *навиклисмо*); mobile reflexive particles (e.g., *слѣпосѧ ихъ тримають* and *преконали бы сѧ*); long adjectival and pronominal endings (e.g., *тїи*, *декопїи*); the oblique form of the personal pronoun *єго* with its enclitic counterpart *го*; and the conjunction *же*. Nevertheless this language is quite consistently based on the vernacular, it is beyond a doubt suitable for use in writing, and it may be regarded as a quite successful example of how a Galician variety of MSU would look.

²⁵ Kobryns'kyj's text is not a translation of this German-language work.

It should be added, however, that the orthography of this work is certainly not perfect, as demonstrated by the concurrence of *навиклисмо*, *звичаяю*, and *звычайи*; *в' чимъ* and *на чѣмъ*; *декотрыи* and *зде*; and by the inconsistent rendering of *ѡ*, e.g., *в' восточнѡй Галицїи* but *на такомъ розсадникѹ*. Moreover, the printed version oscillates between etymological and “phonetic” spellings without a convincing ratio: e.g., *з' розумомъ* on the one hand and *ѡ разу* instead of *одразу* on the other. Why we find *ы* after sibilants (*залежытъ*, *множытсѧ*) or *нѣсмо* instead of *нисмо* despite the predominating etymological orthography is not entirely clear. Nonetheless, the rather traditional orthography reflects the phonetic reality of the depicted language quite well, and the spelling *нѣсмо* in fact reflects the pronunciation [p'ismo], which points to the foreign—in this case Polish—origin of the word (despite its all-Slavic character). Owing to the quality of the orthography, we can also be quite certain that *з' настѣна* was meant to render the exact southwestern dialectal form, the reflex *C'V*, and not *C*: *'V < CъV*. For merely traditional reasons, past preterital participles show the spelling *-ни-* in accordance with Meletian Church Slavonic traditions, e.g., *призначеннѹ*, *але зробленномъ*. We know from other sources that the orthography of the printed version of Kobryns'kyj's work did not coincide with that of the original text: Several other people and institutions intervened. As usual, they did so not only for the sake of the text.

Another Polonism in these fragments besides *нѣсмо* is *преконали бы ся* without the pleophonization of the prefix; the same might apply to *предлежаще*, which in fact seems to be Slavonicized Polish *przedleżące*. Both prefixes reveal the metathesis as it is known from the Church Slavonic traditions, but in both forms we are dealing with Polonisms. Slavonicisms are represented, however, by *предословіе* (notably not *предисловіе*, as in Russian) and the adjective *восточный*, as in *оу насъ в' восточнѡй Галицїи*.

It is thus true that there are some more Polish and Slavonic loans in Kobryns'kyj's text that were not integrated later into MSU. But this does raise any doubts that Kobryns'kyj's manual must have been perfectly understandable to Ukrainian peasants—in particular to those in Galicia—and that it could be taken as yet another convincing proof that the Galician Ruthenian vernacular could be successfully used in writing particularly for them. In his tobacco manual Kobryns'kyj anticipated an approach toward the language question in Galicia that proved to be typical in the following decades. Even the most ardent Galician Russophile clerics of the second half of the nineteenth century, such as Ivan Naumovyč, wrote their farming manuals in the vernacular not only because farming was probably the sphere where the vernacular could most easily be used quite consistently, but also because it was the vernacular—and no high language whatsoever—with which they could best reach commoners (see Moser 2012).

The Greek Catholic priests of Galicia understood this fact as well as their Orthodox counterpart Vasyl' Hrečulevyč in the Russian Empire. Yet, beginning at least from the 1830s, an increasing number of them drew much farther-reaching conclusions than Hrečulevyč and a few other isolated clerics in “Little Russia.” They not only preached in that language, but they also used it in writing “high”

literature as well as merely pragmatic texts. By doing so, the Greek Catholic clerics actively worked on forging a language with all modern standard qualities.

Moreover, Greek Catholic clerics (and not only of the Ruthenian Triad) sent out national messages. They did so not only when they “mapped” out the Ruthenian linguistic space in their grammars and referred to the glorious past of the Ruthenian language in early modern as well as medieval times (see Moser 2011 and, regarding the Ruthenian Triad, Moser 2006a). Along with that, in their panegyric poems for Greek Catholic bishops the priestly poets often created a relationship between the bishops and the Ruthenian nation. In that case, however, the nation’s frame of reference was usually reduced to the Greek Catholic church or, in the case of the Greek Catholic bishop of Przemyśl, in fact only to his eparchy. As an example, here are some fragments of Josyf Levyc’kyj’s 1841 panegyric about Hryhorij Jaxymovyč:

О мужу! вѣрьнь Царю и Вѣрѣ,
Твоа то нынѣ доброта
Во русско галиційскѣмъ клѣрѣ
Сїає ажь нова звѣзда.
Во Тобѣ край и Церковь русска
Теперь надѣю зрить свою,
Тому держава Ти ракуска²⁶
Достойносьть ввѣрила сїю.

Смотри на сгромаджены станы,
Смотри на русскїи лица,
Тобѣ сердца ихъ всѣ приданы,
Съ Тобовъ слученна ихъ душа.
Они въ Твоѣй оуже особѣ
На будущїи то часы,
Къ народа русскаго оздобѣ
Владыку видать высоты.

Невѣрство, темнота и зрада,
Котри завадовъ ко добру,
Най счезнутъ, най вся сила ада
Тобовъ зѣтреса дѣ знаку.
Натомѣсть помнажай всѣ цноты,
Надѣю въ Русинахъ крѣпи,
Ко вышнимъ додавай охоты,
Та прикладомъ своимъ свѣти.

Храни и Вѣру, заховай Звычаи,
Котри Отцы предали намъ;
Диви ажь взнеслись инши край,
Веди и насъ по ихъ стопамъ;
Бо знаєшь тамъ яка побожносьть,

²⁶ Levyc’kyj remarks: “Ракуска, то есть: Австрыйска.”

Де бистрь Дунай, краса всѣхъ рѣкъ,²⁷
 Най буде надъ Днѣстромъ возможность
 Во тойже перебути въ вѣкъ (Levyc'kyj 1841, 7).

Ivan Holovac'kyj and His Significance in the History of MSU

The only Galician Ruthenian lay intellectual of the Vormärz period was the historian Denys Zubryc'kyj. He was also the first (and initially, isolated) prominent Galician Russophile and played no role in the Ruthenian movement at least as far as questions of the elaboration of MSU are concerned. Another representative of the few secular intellectuals is of much greater significance in our context, namely Ivan Holovac'kyj, the brother of the much better-known Slavist Jakiv Holovac'kyj. Ivan was a prototypical example of the early Galician Ruthenian secular intellectuals inasmuch as, though he was not a priest, his father was. As a student of medicine in Vienna, Ivan contributed much to the organized Galician Ruthenian cultural and literary efforts in the imperial capital. In 1846 and 1847 he made his major contribution by publishing two miscellanies in Vienna, both under the title *Вѣнок Русинам на обжинки* (Holovac'kyj 1846). Later on he translated Austrian official texts into Ruthenian and worked as a journalist of the Viennese *Вѣстникъ*,” the first newspaper explicitly addressed to all “Ruthenians of the Austrian state,” including those from Transcarpathia. Like many of his Galician contemporaries, including his brother, Ivan Holovac'kyj became a Russophile around 1849, and later he became the first instructor of Russian at the Institute for Slavic Studies at the University of Vienna (see Moser 2008a, 30).

Holovac'kyj wrote the preface to the first volume of *Вѣнок Русинам на обжинки* in the typical tone of the Herderian “awakeners” of that time and using their typical metaphors. In it he states that it is high time for the Ruthenian people to awaken after so many other peoples had already done so and mentions that even in the Slavic periodicals of the time much too often “we the Galician Ruthenians,” a people of about “three times five million,” have been overlooked.²⁸ Yet he expresses his conviction that the Ruthenian people, which is also “mapped” in this text, would never die. The miscellany was meant to be not only a symbol of the vitality of the Ruthenian language and culture. The income from sales of it was earmarked for aiding the victims of the floods of 1845 that had inundated so many places in Galicia.

Приговор читателям

Звѣстная величь душевного житя 'нинѣшной Словенщины: куды оком повернешь, так по всѣхъ усюдахъ безчисленни зѣрочки мрѣют и мрѣют благоноснымъ свѣтломъ, ажъ любо взглянути на проясненне небо. И надъ нашою Русью заблкнули, мовъ зоря на розсвѣтъ, и порадовали насъ декуды саморѣдны то умнотворни цвѣточки. А однакожъ лучило съ не раз, в часописяхъ словен-

²⁷ Levyc'kyj remarks: “Розумѣся Вѣдень, де Всеаугустѣйшая родина цѣсарска своею побожностію всѣмъ поѣданнымъ Австрійской Імперіи присвѣчує [«vorleuchtet»].”

²⁸ In this regard little has changed.

ских и чужезычных с жалом учти помовку за нас Галичан Русинѡв, що, мовляв той, здѣмали 'сьмо ся – тяженько хропом' – ба либонь чи не со всѣм позавмерали!

Не лѣзя и не тут мѣстце, доходить жерела и розберати причины сих кривовязых мнѣній: не нам то с' декотрыми осужовати долю Галицких Русинѡв и их языка: але гляньмо лиш' на просторонь нашой Руси, вѡд Сяна, Вислы и Буга аж' по Дѡн и Донець, а з по за Бескида, Днѣстра й Чорноморя ген-ген горѣ по Припечь и Десну – вдивѣм' ся в се здорове чисте ядро безмалъ не тричи пять миллионного народа – пригляньмо ся в зеркалѣ его величественных дѣяній и недолей, сѣвнаймо его глубокоумное, так разумительно розвинутое житѣе и образование народне: а с радостным возхищеньем зголосимо: Сей нарѡд живе в цѣлости народнѣй, и николи не заузре, а его доля – то вѡдземная парѡсть всемирной судьбы предвѣчной Словеничины!

Трудами и помочью наших родолюбивых крайнѡв придбав я невеличку сѣбѣрку пѣснотвореній и розправок у поточнѣй бесѣдѣ; во имени всѣх Русинѡв почтеніем благодарю честных дописателѣв, котри скинули сь' по квѣточцѣ, по колосочку до сего вѣнка, а по хлѣбови и по грудцѣ соли для наших побратимцѣв, котрых поводнею и невзгодою так тяжко Бог побѣдив – и передаю бѣлому свѣту отсю перву часть, нибы то на показ и образец сим Русинам, котри заложивши руки, головоньку похилили, и мовѣ дѣвицы у пѣсни задумались', буцѣм то хотѣли б' сказати: сю землю нам мысленьками засѣяти, и вѣдав аж' у нѣй журбы на вѣки позбутис'! –

Ни, миліи краєне!
Не в землю – а в житѣе, в свѣт
Мыслею быстров взлетѣт':
Гадка гадку згонит,
Гадка гадки изронит!
Слава Богу, а добрым людям честь

од Издателя

У Вѣдни в день Успенія Пресвятои Богородицѣ 1845
(Holovac'kyj 1846, 7–10).

Compared to the earlier *Русалка Днѣстровая* (1837), to which his brother had contributed, Holovac'kyj's orthography is rather conservative, although he does not use the hard sign at the end of words (e.g., *Приговор, читателям*), as did Kostomarov, Hrečulevyč, Kobryns'kyj, and, in the second volume of *Вѣнокъ*, Holovac'kyj himself. The etymological orthography of the text, which is confirmed by the etymological spelling of *с*, *с-* (*с жалом, сѣвнаймо*) and *со* (*со всѣмъ*), is counterbalanced not only by the phonologically oriented spelling of *у* and *в* (e.g., *позавмерали*, but *заузре*), and the spelling of *вѡд* along with *од*, but also by the form *'нынѣшной* instead of *'нынѣшней* and the inflectional endings *у поточнѣй бесѣдѣ* or *в цѣлости народнѣй*.

Unlike Holovac'kyj's later works, his preface of 1846 is altogether still clearly written on the basis of the vernacular. Apart from some markers that are not encountered in all other Galician Ruthenian texts of the time, such as *о* after the sibilant in *нашою*, *роз-* and not *раз-* in *на розсвѣтъ* (cf., however, *разумительно*), or the form *що* and not *что*, this is confirmed by word forms such as

мѣстце, гадка, величь, жерела (gen. sg.), *сбѣрку* (acc. sg.), *помовку* (acc. sg.), *невзгодною* (instr. sg.), *журбы* (gen. sg.), *краяно́в* (with the vernacular ending in this paradigm), *зѣрочки, по квѣточцѣ* (along with *цвѣточки*), *по колосочку, головоньку* (acc. sg.), *мысленьками* (instr. pl.), *по всѣх усядах, невеличку* (acc. sg. fem.), *тяженько, тричи, учути, мрѣют, заблыкнули, позавмерали, позбутис', придбав, розвинуте, с' декотрыми, горѣ* (adverb), *николи, безмалъ, ген-ген, куды, декуды, але, чи, аж' любо, нибы то, буцѣм то, мовѣ, мовляв, ба, иди, либонь*. As for syntax, the use of *за* + accusative, as in *помовку за нас Галичан Русинѣв*, is of particular interest.

The text is clearly written on a Galician basis (although it is certainly not written “in the Galician dialect”). See, for example, the personal preterite ending and the mobile reflexive particle in *здѣмали* ‘сьмо ся; the hard endings in the third-person present forms *здогонит, изронит* and in the imperative form *взлетѣт*’ (the apostrophe does not mark softening, but the “omission” of a letter); the shortened feminine instrumental singular ending of *быстров* (along with *Мыслею*); the generalized hard ending in the instrumental singular of *с жалѣом*; the hard stem in ‘нинѣшной [Словеничины]; the verb form *повернешь* instead of *повернешься*; the authentic Ukrainian reflex *i* of *o* in *нарѣд*; the spelling *розберати* instead of *розбирати*; the use of *сей* instead of *цей* (cf., however, *отсю*, which is equivalent to *оцю*) and of *то* instead of *це* in *его доля – то вѣдземная парѣсть всемирной судьбы предѣльной Словеничины*. The form *его* is widespread in most Galician Ukrainian dialects. Therefore we have no reason to assume that it stands for *його*. Some lexemes used in the text are typically Western Ukrainian or Galician too, e.g. *просторонь, парѣсть*.²⁹

As is to be expected, particularly with regard to texts from Galicia, in Holovach'kyj's preface some Polish loans occur; e.g., *розправок* (gen. pl.) and *поточнѣй* (loc. sg. fem.), with both lexemes belonging to the “learned” vocabulary. The form *приговор* in the meaning of ‘preface’ might be one of Holovach'kyj's neologisms. (I have not found it anywhere else among my [quite rich] excerpts from Galician Ruthenian texts of the time; it seems to be coined from German *Beiwort* (in the meaning of ‘*Geleitwort*,’ or it might simply echo Polish *prze-* (without *d*) in *przemowa*).

Of interest also are the shortened forms of the reflexive particle, such as *лучило сь*, because they are not at all typical of Galicia. Notably, they are likely to have been inspired by Ukrainian texts from the Russian Empire. In fact certainly not all deviations from MSU occur only due to linguistic conservatism. Cf. *зеркало* as well as *жерела*; *осушовати* with possibly dialectally based *з, ж* instead of *дз, дж*; *здогонит* instead of the other paradigmatic form of the imperfect aspect *здоганяє*; *в часописях* with the soft stem instead of *у часописах*; and *перву часть* without the suffixes instead of *первиу (> першу) частину* as forms that were widely used in texts from all Ukrainian-speaking territories of the time.

²⁹ The word has no entry in the Ukrainian normative dictionaries. Želexiv's'kyj's two-volume dictionary has only the entries *парість* and *парісток* (derived from *парість*).

It is nevertheless obvious that Holovac'kyj's striving toward the vernacular is in fact by no means more consistent than that of his contemporaries from the Galician Ruthenian clergy. In fact he uses a whole range of non-Ukrainian words and word forms, such as (the phonological, orthographic, or morphological features are in bold) *читателям, дописательѣв, од издателя, разумительно, благоносным* [свѣтлом], *благодарю, почтеніем* (instr. sg.), *изронит* (cf. "poetical" MSU *зронити*, which can only in certain contexts occur in the form *ізронити*), *с* [...] *возхищеньем, во*³⁰ *имени всѣх Русинѣв, предвѣчной* [Словеничины], *умнотворни цвѣточки* (along with *по квѣточѣ*), *чужезычных* (notably, with *e* after the sibilant), *не лѣзя, помочью* (notably, with *o* and not *ѡ* in the root), *проясненіе* [небо] with -нн-, *кривовязых мнѣній* [...] *величественных дѣяній, пѣснотвореній* (note also the noun endings of the last three genitive forms), *глубокоумное* (the ending occurs along with predominating -е), *вѣдземная* (the ending -ая was no longer used in common speech), *образованье, образец, родолюбивых, побѣдив, всемірной* (gen. sg. fem.).

The name of the Christian feast in *в день Успенія Пресвятои Богородицѣ* stands apart. What is much more interesting is the fact that non-vernacular high-style forms—all of them backed by Russian forms of the time—occur in a condensed form precisely at the point where the national message of the text is most strongly emphasized. For example (the Church Slavonic forms or forms with Church Slavonic elements are in bold), "пригляньмо ся в зеркалѣ его [referring to *народ*] **величественных дѣяній** и недолей, срѣвнаймо его **глубокоумное**, так **разумительно** розвинуте житѣе и **образованье** народне: а с радостным **возхищеньем** зголосимо: Сей нарѣд живе в цѣлости народнѣй, и николи не заузре, а его доля – то вѣдземная парѣсть **всемірной** судьбы **предвѣчной** Словеничины! [...] **во имени всѣх Русинѣв почтеніем благодарю честных дописательѣв.**" It thus turns out that the Galician layman Ivan Holovac'kyj also employed features of the clerical discourse of the time as well as some elements of the church language itself in order to sacralize the nation.

Conclusions

It need not be questioned that laymen from the Russian Empire took a leading part in the earlier phase of constructing MSU. The Orthodox clerics' share was very modest and was limited to pastoral work, whereas laymen undertook the translation of the Bible, and often tended to sacralize even their national message, as Mykola Kostomarov did quite ostentatiously in "Законъ Божій" in his *Книги битія українського народу*.

But laymen in the Russian Empire were not the only protagonists in the history of MSU, and their achievements have sometimes been exaggerated on the basis of manipulated editions. An analysis of a facsimile of Kostomarov's *Книги битія* confirms that early Ukrainian works written in the Russian Empire in fact reveal considerably more deviations from MSU than the contemporary manipulated editions suggest. On the other hand, an analysis of Josafat Kobryns'kyj's brochure

³⁰ In this particular phrase *во* is still today pronounced in the Church Slavonic manner in MSU.

on the cultivation of tobacco demonstrates that not only the so-called Ruthenian Triad, but quite a few other Galician Greek Catholic clerics wrote in a language clearly based on the vernacular and much closer to MSU than the master narrative has made us believe. As opposed to their Orthodox clerical brethren, these clerics not only wrote religious works in Ruthenian/Ukrainian, but also texts of a clearly pragmatic character, and these latter works were particularly close to the vernacular. Galician laymen were scantily represented among the Ruthenian intellectual elite until the 1860s, and most often they were in fact still the sons of priests. Altogether, their contribution to the elaboration of MSU does not significantly differ from that of the Galician clerics in the first decades of the nineteenth century. In Galicia the national question was of course also sacralized, in terms both of contents and language. The clerics there were also influenced by the spirit of the time, according to which nationalism was understood as an emancipatory project that would lead to the democratization of society and its public discourse.

Bibliography

- Antokhii, M[yroslav]., D[aria]. Darewych, M[arko]. R[obert]. Stech, and D[anylo] H[usar]. Struk. 2004. "Shevchenko, Taras." In *IEU* (last update: 2004) <www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/display.asp?linkpath=pages%5CS%5CH%5CShevchenkoTaras.htm>.
- Archaimbault, S., and S. Wakoulenko [Vakulenko]. 2010. *Un comparatiste avant la lettre: Ivan Pereverzev et ses "Préceptes de la rectitude grammaticale russe... à l'usage des Ukrainiens" (1782)*. Paris.
- Dovidnyk* 1993–99 = *Довідник з історії України*. 3 vols. Ed. I Z. Pidkova and R. M. Shust. Kyiv.
- EU* = *Encyclopedia of Ukraine*. 5 vols. Ed. Volodymyr Kubijovyč (vols. 1–2) and Danylo Husar Struk (vols. 3–5). Toronto, 1984–93. <www.encyclopediaofukraine.com>.
- EUU* = *Енциклопедія українознавства: Словникова частина*. 11 vols. 1955–84. Ed. Volodymyr Kubijovyč. Munich. Repr. Lviv, 1993–2003.
- Harasevyč, Mykhajlo [Harasiewicz, Michael]. 1862. *Annales ecclesiae ruthenae, gratiam et communionem cum s. Sede Romana habentis, ritumque Graeco-Slavicum observantis, cum singulari respectu ad dioeceses ruthenas Leopoliensem, Premisliensem et Chelmensem*. Leopoli [Lviv].
- Holovas'kyj, Ivan. 1846. [Головацький, Иван]. "Приговор читателям." In *Вѣнок Русинам на обжінки, уплѣв Иван Б. О. Головацькій. Часть первая. к пользѣ и вспоможенію галицкихъ селянъ черезъ поведень вторѣчну подупалыхъ*. Vienna.
- Hrečulevyč, Vasyľ. 1849: *Проповѣди, на малороссійскомъ языкѣ, Протоіерея и Кавалера Василя Гречулевича*. St. Petersburg.
- . 1852: *Катихизическія бесѣды на девять блаженствъ евангельскихъ и десять заповѣдей Божіихъ, говоренныхъ на малороссійскомъ языкѣ*. St. Petersburg.
- IEU*: *Internet Encyclopedia of Ukraine* <www.encyclopediaofUkraine.com>. Hosted by the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies.
- Kobryns'kyj, Josafat. 1847. [Anon.] *Наука в оуправѣ тютюну для галиціановъ: Иждивеніемъ правительскимъ издадеса*. Vienna.

- Kostomarov, Mykola 1845–46: “Рукопис М. І. Костомарова «Книги буття українського народу».” In *Кирило-Мефодіївське товариство*. Vol. 1: 250–58. Kyiv, 1990.
- . 1845–46a: “Список «Книги буття українського народу» М. І. Костомарова, що був вилучений у М. І. Гулака під час обшуку в Олексіївському Равеліні 2 квітня 1847 р., «Закон Божий». Переписано Костомаровым, найдено в бумагах Гулака.” In *Кирило-Мефодіївське товариство*. Vol. 1: 152–69. Kyiv, 1990.
- Koshelivets, Ivan. 1989. “Kvitka-Osnovianenko, Hryhorii.” In *IEU* (original contribution of 1989). <www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/display.asp?linkpath=pages%5CK%5CV%5CKvitka6OsnovianenkoHryhorii.htm>.
- Levyc'kyj, Josyf. 1841. *Стихъ во честьъ Его Превсвященства Куръ Григорія Ахимовича, [...] во день поставленія Его во Епископы дня 21/9 Ноемвриа 1841 року, во Архікаведральной Церкви Львѣвскѣй Святого Великомученика Георгіа [...], сложенный Іосифомъ Львицкимъ Парохоу Школьскимъ зъ русскои Дієцезіи Перемыскои, съ найбільшимъ почтеніємъ* [in Ruthenian/Ukrainian and German]. Vienna.
- Luckyj, George. S. N. 2004 [last update]. “Kulish, Panteleimon.” <www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/display.asp?AddButton=pages\K\U\KulishPanteleimon.htm>.
- Moser, Michael. 2002. “Ruthenisch oder Russisch: Die Sprache der ukrainischen Russophilen in der Habsburgermonarchie.” *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch* 48 (2002): 99–115. Also in Moser 2008, 602–26.
- . 2004. “‘Jazyčije’ – ein Pseudoterminus der sprachwissenschaftlichen Ukrainistik.” *Studia Slavica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 49, nos. 1–2: 121–47 (= “«Язичіє» – псевдотермін в українському мовознавстві.” In *Збірник Харківського історико-філологічного товариства. Нова серія* 10: 207–32). Also in Moser 2008, 641–66.
- . 2005. “Das Ukrainische im Gebrauch der griechisch-katholischen Kirche in Galizien (1772–1859).” In *Das Ukrainische als Kirchensprache / Українська мова в церквах*, 151–241. Ed. Michael Moser. Vienna. Also in Moser 2008, 474–561.
- . 2006. “Panegyrika für griechisch-katholische Bischöfe und die galizisch-ukrainische Erneuerung – Josyf Levyc'kyjs „Стихъ во честьъ Его Преосвященству Куръ Іоанну Снѣгурскому“ von 1837.” In *Iter philologicum: Festschrift für Helmut Keipert zum 65. Geburtstag*, 125–37. Munich. Also in Moser 2008, 462–73.
- . 2006a. “„Русь“ і „руські“ справи в збірках «Синь Русь» й «Русалка Дністровая».” In *Семантика мови й тексту: Матеріали IX міжнародної науково-практичної конференції. 26–28 вересня 2006 року*, 505–12. Ivano-Frankivsk.
- . 2008. [Міхаель Мозер]. *Причинки до історії української мови*. Kharkiv. 2nd ed. 2009. 3rd ed. Vinnytsia, 2011.
- . 2008a. “„Austroruthenisch?“ – Der Wiener „Вѣстникъ“ als Zeitung „für die Ruthenen des österreichischen Staates“.” In *Die Ukrainer (Ruthenen, Russinen) in Österreich-Ungarn und ihr Sprach- und Kulturleben im Blickfeld von Wien und Budapest*, 29–100. Ed. Michael Moser and András Zoltán. Vienna.
- . 2008b. *Taras Ševčenko und die moderne ukrainische Schriftsprache: Versuch einer Würdigung*. Munich.
- . 2009. “Язык Литовских Статутов и вопрос о его „нормализации“ (с синопсисом параллельных мест первого раздела Статутов 1529, 1566 и 1588 гг.)” *Studia Russica* (Budapest) 23: 177–225.

- . 2011. “«Русини» й «руська мова» в галицьких граматах першої половини XIX ст.” In *Галичина – простір, люди, мови*, 9–54. Ed: Jaroslav Isajevyč, Mixael' Mozer [Michael Moser], and Natalja Xobzej. Lviv.
- . 2011a. “Die Ukrainer auf dem Weg zur Sprachnation – kritische Anmerkungen zur ukrainistischen Sprachhistoriographie.” In *Die Ukraine: Prozesse der Nationsbildung*, 97–110. Ed. Andreas Kappeler. Vienna.
- . 2012. “Дещо про мовну спадщину галицьких москвофілів (на прикладі творів Івана Наумовича).” In *Studien zu Sprache, Literatur und Kultur bei den Slaven: Gedenkschrift für George Y. Shevelov aus Anlass seines 100. Geburtstages und 10. Todestages*, 154–80. Ed. Andrij Danylenko and Serhij Vakulenko. Munich and Berlin.
- Nimčuk, Vasyľ. 2005. “Українські переклади Святого Письма.” In *Das Ukrainische als Kirchensprache / Українська мова в церквах*, 15–64. Ed. Michael Moser. Vienna.
- Petrenko, P. 1989. “Kotliarevsky, Ivan.” In *IEU* (original contribution of 1989) <www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/display.asp?linkpath=pages%5CK%5CO%5CKotliarevskyIvan.htm>.
- Rieselbach, von. 1790. [Anon.] *Unterricht für die Tobakbauer der Königreiche Hungarn und Galizien*. Wien (mit von Kurzbeckischen Schriften). 2nd ed.: *Unterricht für die Tobakbauer der Oesterreichischen Monarchie. Verfaßt vom k. k. wirklichen Gubernial = Rath und Tobakgefällen = Director von Rieselbach*. Vienna, 1807.
- Vulpus, Ricarda. 2005. *Nationalisierung der Religion: Russifizierungspolitik und ukrainische Nationsbildung (1860–1920)*. Wiesbaden.
- Wendland, Anna Veronika. 2001. *Die Russophilen in Galizien: Ukrainische Konservative zwischen Österreich und Rußland, 1848–1915*. Vienna.
- Zhukovsky, A[rkadii]. 1989. “Kostomarov, Mykola.” In *IEU* (original contribution of 1989) <www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/display.asp?linkpath=pages%5CK%5CO%5CKostomarovMykola.htm>.
- . 1989a. “Knyhy bytiia ukrains'koho narodu.” In *IEU* (original contribution of 1989) <www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/display.asp?linkpath=pages%5CK%5CN%5CKnyhybytiiaukraI5nshDAkohonaroduIT.htm>.

im Habsburgerreich (1996), *Die Perle des Imperiums: Der russische Krim-Diskurs im Zarenreich* (2007), and *Geschichte der Ukraine* (2010).

MICHAEL MOSER is a professor at the University of Vienna's Institute of Slavic Studies, Péter Pázmány Catholic University in Piliscsaba, and the Ukrainian Free University in Munich. He is the author of ten books, including *"Ruthenische" (ukrainische) Sprach- und Vorstellungswelten in den galizischen Volksschullesebüchern der Jahre 1871 und 1872* (2007), *Taras Ševčenko und die moderne ukrainische Schriftsprache – Versuch einer Würdigung* (2008, Ukrainian trans. 2012), *Prychynky do istorii ukraïns'koï movy*, 3 eds. (2008, 2009, 2011), *Ukraïns'kyi P'iemont? Deshcho pro znachennia Halychyny dlia formuvannia, rozbudovy i zberezhennia ukraïns'koï movy* (2011), and *Language Policy and the Discourse on Languages in Ukraine under President Viktor Yanukovych (25 February 2010–28 October 2012)* (2013).

OLEH PAVLYSHYN is a docent at the Ukrainian Free University in Munich and the Department of the Modern History of Ukraine at Lviv National University, and a research associate of the latter university's Institute for Historical Research. He is the author of *L'vivshchyna v dobu Zakhidno-Ukraïns'koï Narodnoi Respubliky (1918–1919)* (2008) and *Yevhen Petrushevykh (1863–1940): Iliustrovanyi biohrafiichnyi narys* (2013), and the coeditor of *Zakhidno-Ukraïns'ka Narodna Respublika, 1918–1923: Iliustrovana istoriia* (2008).

MARTIN SCHULZE WESSEL is the professor of the history of Eastern Europe at Ludwigs-Maximilians University, director of the Collegium Carolinum in Munich, chairman of the Association of Historians of Germany and the German-Czech and German-Slovak Historians' Commission, and head of the History Department at the East European Institute in Regensburg. He is the author of *Russlands Blick auf Preussen: Die polnische Frage in der Diplomatie und der politischen Öffentlichkeit des Zarenreiches und des Sowjetstaates 1697–1947* (1995), *Revolution und religiöser Dissens: Der römisch-katholische und russisch-orthodoxe Klerus als Träger religiösen Wandels in den böhmischen Ländern und in Russland 1848–1922* (2011), and many articles; and the editor of the journals *Bohemia* and *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* and several books.

FRANK E. SYSYN is a professor of history at the University of Alberta, director of the Peter Jacyk Centre for Ukrainian Historical Research at the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, and editor-in-chief of the centre's Hrushevsky Translation Project. He is the author of *Between Poland and the Ukraine: The Dilemma of Adam Kysil, 1600–1653* (1985), *Mykhailo Hrushevsky: Historian and National Awakener* (2001), *Religion and Nation in Modern Ukraine* (2003, with Serhii Plokhyy), and numerous studies on the Khmelnytsky Uprising, Ukrainian historiography, and early modern Ukrainian political culture, and editor in chief of Mykhailo Zubrytsky's *Zibrani tvory i materialy u tr'okh tomakh*, vol. 1, *Naukovi pratsi* (2013).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.